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VIII—1
PETACH. See PETACH.

Petachia(s), Moses ben-Jacob, a learned rabbi who flourished towards the latter half of the 12th century (Regensburg), is the author of the Sefer ha-Ḳabbalah, also called Sefer ha-Ḳabbalah, in which he relates his travels, made between 1075 and 1090 through Poland, Russia, Tartary, Syria, Mesopotamia, ancient Syria, Persia, etc., and wherein he describes the manners and usages of his co-religionists. It was first printed at Prague (1585), and reprinted by Wagensesil, entitled Iterarium cum versione Wagensesilli, in his Sex exercitaciones varii argumenti (Altorf, 1687; Zolkiew, 1792).

It has been translated into French, with notes, by E. Carmoly, Tour de Monde de Petachia de Rahabahme, traduit en Fransais et accompagné du texte et des notes historiques, geographiques, et litteraires (Paris, 1831); into German by D. Ottensoesser, with a Hebrew commentary (Fürth, 1844); into English by Dr. A. Benisch. See Fürst, Bibl. Jud., iii, 78 sq.; Wolf, Bibl. Hebr., i, 888; iii, 956; Baasang, Historie des Juden, p. 655 (Taylor's English transl.); Grätz, Gesch. der Juden, vi, 299, 424; Zunt, Zur Geschichte u. Literatur, p. 166; the same author in Asher's edition of Tudeila's Iterary, vol. ii, No. 40, 43, 44, 47; Ebreiderge, Intro. to Hebr. Lit. p. 214; da Costa, Israel and the Geese, p. 187. (B. F.)

PETANI, a sort of cakes used anciently in Athens in making libations to the gods. They were substituted for animal sacrifices by the command of Cercopes.

PETAVEL, ALFRED F., a Swiss Protestant clergyman of note, was born near the close of the last century. He studied at the university in Berlin, and was the first recipient from that high school of the doctorate in philosophy. He was greatly instrumental in the establishment of the Swiss Missionary Society, and subsequently took no insconsiderable share in the doings of the Evangelical Alliance. The principal work, however, to which he devoted his best time, his talents, his energies, and his whole heart, was to bring the Jewish people into a more intimate personal contact with the Christians, and it is especially in this respect that his influence has extended beyond his little country. He was a zealous member of the Universal Israelites Alliance and of the Evangelical Alliance. He did not, at first, impress one as a pastor, a missionary, an apostle, a father of the Church, but rather as one of those individuals described in the book of Genesis, who walked with God, who communed with him, like a patriarch or a seer. He died at the age of eighty. The addresses which he delivered were collected under the title of Discourses on Education. His Daughter of Zion, his Letter to the Synagogue of France, and many other writings, will always remain as imperishable records of the zeal which animated him for the re-establishment of the Jews as a people.

PETAVUS, DIOTRIS (also called DENIS PETAV), one of the most celebrated of French scholars, and influential in the councils of the Jesuits, to whose order he belonged, was born at Orleans Aug. 21, 1588. His father, who was a man of learning, seeing strong parts and a genius become visible in his son, endeavored in all possible means to improve them to the utmost. He used to tell his son that he ought to qualify himself so as to be able to attack and confound "the giant of the Allophile," meaning the redoubtable Joseph Scaliger, whose abilities and learning were so great that all possible means were done such service to the Reformed. Young Petavius seems to have entered into his father's views; for he studied very intensively, and afterwards levelled much of his erudition against Scaliger. He joined the study of mathematics with that of belles-lettres; and then applied himself to a course in philosophy, which he began in the College of Orleans, and finished at Paris. After this he maintained theses in Greek and in Latin, which he is said to have understood as well as his native language, the French. In mature years he had free access to the king's library, which he often visited in order to consult Latin and Greek manuscripts. Among other advantages which accompanied his literary pursuits was the friendship of Isaac Casaubon, whom Henry IV called to Paris in 1600. It was at this instigation that Petavius, young as he was, undertook an edition of The Works of Synesius; that is, to correct the Greek from the manuscripts, to translate that part which yet remained to be translated into Latin, and to write notes upon the whole. He was but nineteen when he was made professor of philosophy in the University of Bourges; and spent the two following years in studying the ancient philosophers and mathematicians. In 1604, when Morel, professor of Greek at Paris, published The Works of Chrysostom, some part of Petavius's labors on Synesius was added to them. (From the title of this work we learn that he then Latinized his name Petavus, which he afterwards changed into Petavius. His own edition of The Works of Synesius did not appear till 1612.) He entered the Society of the Jesuits in 1605, and did great honor to it afterwards by his vast and profound erudition. He became zealouis for the Roman Catholic Church; and there was no way of serving it more agreeable to his humor than by criticising and abusing its adversaries. Scaliger was the person he was most bitter against; but he did not spare his friend Casaubon whenever he came in his way. There was no occasion to enter into detail about a man whose whole life was spent in reading and writing books, and in performing the several offices of his order. The history of a learned man is the history of his works; and by the greater part of Petavius's writings were to support his poor discipline. But it must be confessed that in order to perform his task well he made himself a universal scholar. He died at Paris Dec. 11, 1652. In 1638 he published an excellent work entitled Rationale Temporum; it is
an abridgment of universal history, from the earliest times down to 1632, digested in chronological order, and supported all the way by references to proper authorities. It went through several editions; many additions and improvements have been made to it, both by Peterius himself, and by Perizonius and others and the Catholic Church have approved of it as far down as to 800, under the title of Compendium Historiae Universalis, in 1697 (12mo). Peterius's chief-d'œuvre is his "Opera de Theologia Dogmatica, nunc primum septem voluminibus comprehensim, in meliorum ordinem tandem, auctoris apud vita, ac libris quibusdam numquam in hoc opere editis l occultatum, Francisci Antonii Zacharium ex eadem Societate Jesu extensum principium Bibliothecae Praefecti dissertationibus, ac notis uerrimis illustratum" (Ven. 1767, 7 vols. fol.). It is full of choice erudition, but unfortunately his death cut it short, and it lacks completeness. Besides other services, Peterius deserves to be acknowledged as the first theologian who brought into proper relations history and dogmatics. Muratori regards him as the restorer of dogmatic theology. In his opinion of Gessenday no less Persaccii Peterius was the most consummate scholar the Jesuits ever had; and indeed we cannot suppose him to have been inferior to the first scholars of any order, while we consider him waging war, as he did frequently with success, against Scaliger, Salmasius, and many like chieftains in the republic of letters. His judgment, as may easily be conceived, was inferior to his learning; and his controversial writings are full of that soundness and spleen which appears so manifest in all the prints of his countenance. Bayle has observed that Peterius did the Societies great service, though unawares and against his intentions. The Jesuit's original design, in the second volume of his Dogmata Theologica, was to represent ingeniously the doctrine of the first three centuries. Having no partisans in the society, he determined to propagate the opinions of the fathers, but only gave a general account of them. By this means he unawares led the public to believe that the fathers entertained false and absurd notions concerning the mystery of the Three Persons; and, against his intentions, furnished arguments and authorities to the Antitrinitarians. When made aware of this, and being willing to prevent the evil consequences which he had not foreseen, he wrote his Preface, in which he labored solely to assist the orthodoxy of the fathers, and thus was forced to contradict what he had previously said; (Gell, Cursus, the Trinity.) See Werner, Geschichte der apologist, und polem. Literatur, vol. iv; idem, Geschichte der katholischen Theologie (Munich, 1866); Dupin, Nouvelle Bibliothèque des Auteurs ecclésiastiques, s. v.; Simon, Hist. crit. des prétendants commentateurs; Aitkö, Kirchen- geschichte, ii, 435; Christian Reumbruner, iv, 484. (J. H. W.)

Peter (Iliqos, a rock, for the Aram. פֶּרֶט), originally Simon (see below), the leader among the personal disciples of Christ, and afterwards the special apostle to the Jews. We shall treat this important character first in the light of definite information from the New Testament and early Christian writers, and disputed questions under a subsequent head, relegating many minor details to separate articles elsewhere.

1. Authentic History. — 1. His Early Life. — The Scripture notices on this point are few, but not unimportant, and enable us to form some estimate of the character and works of Peter at an early period. Peter was formed, and how he was prepared for his great work. Peter was the son of a man named Jonas (Matt. xvi, 17; John i, 43; xxii, 16), and was brought up in his father's occupation, a fisherman on the sea of Tiberias. The occupation was of course a humble one, but not, as is often assumed, mean or servile, or incompatible with some degree of mental culture. His family were probably in easy circumstances (see below). He and his brother Andrew were partners of John and James, the sons of Zebedee, who had hired servants; and from various indications in the sacred narrative we are led to the conclusion that their social position brought them into contact with his discourses. At an early period he took to the trade of fishermen, supplying some of the important cities on the coasts of that inland lake, may have been tolerably remunerative, while all the necessities of life were cheap and abundant in the singularly rich and fertile district where the apostles resided. Peter did not live, as a mere laboring man, in a hut by the sea-side, but first at Bethsaida, and afterwards in a house at Capernaum belonging to himself or his mother-in-law, which must have been rather a large one, since he received in it not only our Lord and his fellow-disciples, but multitudes who were attracted by the miracles and preaching of Jesus. It is certain that when he left all to follow Christ, he made what he regarded, and what seems to have been admitted by his Master, as being a considerable sacrifice (Matt. xix, 27). The occupations were of such a kind as were conducive to the development of a vigorous, earnest, and practical character, such as he displayed in after-years. The labors, the privations, and the peril of an existence passed in great part upon the waters of that beautiful but stormy lake, were contributory to the energy, endurance, and at nights, were calculated to test and increase his natural powers, his fortitude, energy, and perseverance. In the city he must have been brought into contact with men engaged in traffic, with soldiers and foreigners, and may have thus acquired somewhat of the flexibility and geniality of temperament all but indispensable to the attainment of such personal influence as he exercised in after-life. It is not probable that he and his brother were wholly uneducated. The Jews regarded instruction as a necessity, and legal enactments enforced the attendance of the fathers of the community, maintained by the community. See Education. The statement in Acts iv, 18, that "the council perceived them (i.e. Peter and John) were unlearned and ignorant men," is not incompatible with this assumption. The translation of the passage in the A. V. is rather exaggerated, the word rendered "unlearned" (ἄρετας) being nearly equivalent to "laymen," i.e. men of ordinary education, as contrasted with those who were specially trained in the schools of the rabbins. A man might be thoroughly conversant with the Scriptures, and yet be called "unlearned," and so the rabbins, among whom the opinion was already prevalent that "the letter of Scripture was the mere shell, an earthen vessel containing heavenly treasures, which could only be discovered by those who had been taught to search for the hidden eulogistic meaning." Peter and his kinsmen were probably taught to read the Scriptures in childhood. The history of their country, especially of the great events of early days, must have been familiar to them as attendants at the synagogue, and their attention was there directed to those portions of the Holy Writ from which the Jews derived their anticipations of the Messiah.

The language of the apostles was of course the form of Aramaic spoken in Northern Palestine, a sort of perios, partly Hebrew, but more nearly allied to the Syriac. Hebrew, even in its debased form, was spoken only by men of learning, the leaders of the Phariases and Scribes. The men of Galilee were, however, noted for rough and inexact language, and especially for vulgarities of pronunciation (Matt. xiii, 57; Mark xii, 38; Luke xiv, 8). In Galilee Peter was acquainted with Greek in early life. It is certain, however, that there was more intercourse with foreigners in Galilee than in any district of Palestine, and Greek appears to have been a common, if not the principal, medium of communication. Within a few years after his call Peter seems to have conversed fluently in Græk.
with Cornelius, at least there is no indication that an interpreter was employed. It is highly improbable that Cornelius, a Roman soldier, should have used the language of Palestine. The style of both of Peter's epistles indicates a considerable knowledge of Greek; it is pure and accurate, and in grammatical structure equal to that of Paul. That may, however, be accounted for by the fact, for which there is very ancient authority, that Peter employed an interpreter in the composition of his epistles, if not in his ordinary intercourse with foreigners. There are no traces of acquaintance with Greek authors, or of the influence of Greek literature, as we may infer at the time a record of St. John, could we expect it in a person of his station, even had Greek been his mother-tongue. It is on the whole probable that he had some rudimental knowledge of Greek in early life, which may have afterwards been extended when the need was felt, but not more than would enable him to discourse intelligibly on practical and devotional subjects. That he was an affectionate husband, married in early life to a wife who accompanied him in his apostolic journeys, is facts inferred from Scripture, while very ancient traditions, recorded by the Church fathers, agree in the statement that he founded the Church at Rome (see Acts xvi. 3), and by other early but less trustworthy writers, inform us that her name was Perpetua, that she bore a daughter, and perhaps other children, and suffered martyrdom. (See below.)

—It is uncertain at what age Peter was called by our Lord. The general impression of the fathers is that he was an old man at the date of his death, A.D. 64, but this need not imply that he was much older than our Lord. He was probably between thirty and forty years of age at the date of his first call, A.D. 26. That call was preceded by a special preparation. He and his brother Andrew, together with their partners, James and John, the sons of Zebedee, were disciples of John the Baptist (John i, 35). They were in attendance upon him when they were first called to the service of Christ. From the circumstances of that call, which are recorded with graphic minuteness by St. John, we learn some important facts touching their state of mind and the personal character of our apostle. Two disciples, one named by the evangelist himself, were standing with the Baptist at Bethany on the Jordan, when he pointed out Jesus as he walked, and said, Behold the Lamb of God! that is, the antitype of the victim whose blood (as all true Israelites, and they must distinctly under the teaching of John, believe) cleanses them from their sins. At once followed Jesus, and upon his invitation abode with him that day. Andrew then went to his brother Simon, and said to him, We have found the Messias, the Anointed One, of whom they had read in the prophets. Simon went at once, and when Jesus looked on him he said, Thou art Simon the son of Jona; thou shalt be called Cephas. The change of name is of course deeply significant. As son of Jona (a name of doubtful meaning, according to Lampe equivalent to Jonas, a reference to one of the Old Testament), Lange, who has some striking but fanciful observations, signifying dove) be born as a disciple the name Simon, i.e. hearer; but as an apostle, one of the twelve on whom the Church was to be erected, he was hereafter (Acts xxi. 18) to be called Rock or Stone. It seems a strange impression that the words refer primarily to the original character of Simon: that our Lord saw in him a man firm, steadfast, not to be overthrown, though severely tried; and such was generally the view taken by the fathers. But it is perhaps a deeper and truer impression of the name. In his case, it is not as what he was, but as what he would become under his influence—a man with prepositions and capabilities not unfitted for the office he was to hold, but one whose permanence and stability would depend upon union with the living Rock. Thus we may expect to find Simon, as the natural man, one of the old, muttering, whereas Peter, identified with the Rock, will remain firm and immovable to the end. (See below.)

This first call led to no immediate change in Peter's external position. He and his fellow-disciples looked henceforth upon our Lord as their teacher, but were not commanded to follow him as regular disciples. There were several grades of disciples among the Jews, from the occasional bearer to the follower who gave up all other pursuits in order to serve a master. At the conclusion of the discourse he wrought the miracle of feeding the five thousand, and at this time received the name St. John, could we expect it in a person of his station, even had Greek been his mother-tongue. It is on the whole probable that he had some rudimental knowledge of Greek in early life, which may have afterwards been extended when the need was felt, but not more than would enable him to discourse intelligibly on practical and devotional subjects. That he was an affectionate husband, married in early life to a wife who accompanied him in his apostolic journeys, is facts inferred from Scripture, while very ancient traditions, recorded by the Church fathers, agree in the statement that he founded the Church at Rome (see Acts xvi. 3), and by other early but less trustworthy writers, inform us that her name was Perpetua, that she bore a daughter, and perhaps other children, and suffered martyrdom. (See below.)

The second call is recorded by the three other evangelists. It took place on the Sea of Galilee near Capernaum, where the four disciples, Peter, Andrew, James and John, were fishing. A.D. 27. Peter and Andrew were first called. Our Lord then entered Simon Peter's boat, and addressed the multitude on the shore; after the conclusion of the discourse he wrought the miracle of feeding the five thousand, and at this time received the name Peter. He was one of the twelve, and when his name was received, he was a fisherman. John followed. From that time they were certainly enrolled formally among his disciples, and although as yet invested with no official character, accompanied him in his journeys, those especially in the north of Palestine, immediately after that call our Lord went to the house of Peter, where he worked the miracle of healing on Peter's wife's mother, a miracle succeeded by other manifestations of divine power which produced a deep impression upon the people. Some time was passed afterwards in attendance upon our Lord's public ministrations in Galilee, Decapolis, Perea, and Judaea—though at intervals the disciples returned to their own city, and were witnesses of many miracles of the call of Levi, and of their Master's reception of outcasts, whom they in common with their zealous but prejudiced countrymen had despised and shunned. It was a period of training, of mental and spiritual discipline preparatory to their admission to the higher office to which they were destined. Every other call by St. John indicates a man of distinction. He was selected, together with the two sons of Zebedee, to witness the raising of Jarius's daughter.

The special designation of Peter and his eleven fellow-disciples took place some time afterwards, when they were set apart as the special attendants and assistants of our Lord, and as his delegates to go forth wherever he might send them, as apostles, announcers of his kingdom, gifted with supernatural powers as credentials of their supernatural mission (see matt.x,5-14; mark iii, 18-19, the most detailed account; Luke vi. 13). They appear then first to have formally received the name of Apostles, and from that time Simon bore publicly, and as it would seem all but exclusively, the name Peter, which had hitherto been used rather as a characteristic appellation than as a proper name.

From this time there can be no doubt that Peter held the first place among the apostles, to whatever cause his precedence is to be attributed. There was certainly much in his character which marked him as a representative man; both in his strength and in his weakness, in his excellences and his defects he exemplified the changes which the natural man undergoes in the gradual transformation into the spiritual man under the personal influence of the Saviour. The precedence did not depend upon priority of call, or it would have been conferred upon his brother Andrew, or that other disciple who first followed Jesus. It seems scarcely probable that it depended upon seniority, even supposing, which is a mere conjecture, that he was older than his fellow-disciples. The special designation by Christ alone ac-
Peter counted in a satisfactory way for the facts that he is named first in every list of the apostles, is generally addressed by our Lord as their representative, and on the most solemn occasions speaks in their name. Thus when the first great secession took place in consequence of the offense given by our Lord's mystic discourse at Caiphas, he was called to account, 'Simon, Peter, art thou also gone to sleep, as all the others did?' (Matt. xxvi. 51). Peter, who had then been one of the twelve, Will ye also go away? Then Simon Peter answered him, Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life: and we believe and are sure that thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God.' Thus again at Cæsarea Philippi, soon after the return of the twelve from their first missionary tour, Peter (speaking as before in the name of the twelve, though, as appears from our Lord's words, with a peculiar distinctness of personal conviction) repeated that declaration, 'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.' The confirmation of our apostle in his special position in the Church, his identification with the rock on which that Church is founded, the ratification of the powers and duties attached to the apostolic office, and the promise of permanence to the Church, followed as a reward of the confidence thus expressed. Peter, generally, and most especially on this occasion, as the representative of the apostolic body—a very distinct theory from that which makes him their head or governor in Christ's stead. Even in the time of Cyprian, when connection with the bishop of Rome as Peter's successor was essential, it was not necessary that he should have any powers of jurisdiction or supremacy were supposed to be attached to the admitted precedence of rank. Primus inter pares Peter held no distinct office, and certainly never claimed any powers which did not belong equally to all his fellow-apostles. (See below.)

This great triumph of Peter, however, brought other points of his character into strong relief. The distinction which he then received, and it may be his consciousness of ability, energy, zeal, and absolute devotion to Christ, a person, seem to have developed a natural tendency to rashness and forwardness bordering upon presumption. On this occasion the exhibition of such feelings brought upon him the strongest reproof ever addressed to a disciple by our Lord. In his affection and self-confidence Peter ventured to reject as impossible the announcement of the sufferings and humiliations which Jesus predicted; and he heard the sharp words—'Get thee behind me, Satan, thou art an offence unto me—for thou savorest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men.' That was Peter's first fall; a rock underfoot, a rock, but what shall we say to that? He was not a defender, but an antagonist and deadly enemy of the faith, when the spiritual should give place to the lower nature in dealing with the things of God. It is remarkable that on other occasions when Peter signaled his faith and devotion he displayed at the time, or immediately after, a more than usual deficiency in spiritual discernment and consistency. Thus a few days after that fall he was selected together with John and James to witness the transfiguration of Christ, but the words which he then uttered prove that he was completely bewildered and unable at the time to comprehend the meaning of the transaction. Thus again, when his zeal and courage prompted him to leave the ship and walk on the water to go to Jesus (Matt. xiv. 29), a sudden failure of faith withdrew the sustaining power; he was about to sink when he was at once preserved and saved by his Master. Such traits, which occur not unfrequently, prepare us for his last great fall, as well as for his conduct after the resurrection, when his natural gifts were perfected and his deficiencies supplied by the 'power from on high.' We find a mixture in his character, which brought him, by being called upon to pay tribute-money for himself and his Lord, but faith had the upper hand, and was rewarded by a significant miracle (Matt. xxi. 23-27). The question which about the same time Peter asked our Lord as to the extent to which forgiveness of sins should be carried

Peter's characteristics become especially prominent. Together with his brother and the two sons of Zebedee he listened to the last awful predictions and warnings delivered to the disciples in reference to the second advent (Matt. xxiii. 37-39; Mark xiv. 31; Luke xxii. 31). He was not a usual witness of these events (Luke xxi. 22). At the last supper Peter seems to have been particularly earnest in the request that the traitor might be pointed out, expressing of course a general feeling, to which some inward consciousness of infirmity may have added force. After the supper he declined the miraculous bread which was put in his hand. This was a significant, almost sacramental act of our Lord in washing his disciple's feet—an occasion on which we find the same mixture of goodness and frailty, humility and deep affection, with a certain taint of self-will, which was at once hushed into submissive reverence by the voice of Jesus. Then too it was that he made those repeated protestations of unalterable fidelity, so soon to be falsified by his miserable fall. That event is, however, of such critical import in its bearings upon the character and position of the apostle, that it cannot be dismissed without a careful, if not an exhaustive discussion. Judas had left the guest-chamber when Peter put the question, Lord, whither goest thou? words which modern theologians generally represent as signifying of idle curiosity or presumption, but in which the early fathers (as Chrysostom and Augustine) recognised the utterance of love and devotion. The answer was a promise that Peter should follow his Master, but accompanied with an intimation of present unfitness in the disciple. Then came the first protestation, which elicited the sharp and stinging rebuke, and the distinct prediction of Peter's denial (John xiii. 38). From that moment his account with those of the other evangelists (Matt. xxvi., 33-35; Mark xiv., 30-31; Luke xvii., 32, 34), it seems evident that with some diversity of circumstances both the protestation and warning were thrice repeated. The tempter was to sift all the disciples, our apostle's faith was to be preserved from falling by the special intercession of Christ, he being thus singled out either as the representative of the whole body, or, as seems more probable, because his character was one which had special need of supernatural aid. It seems to be a matter of two points which enhance the force of the warning and the guilt of Peter, viz. that the cock would crow twice, and that after such warning he repeated his protestation with greater vehemence. Chrysostom, who judges the apostle with fairness and candor, attributes this vehemence to his great love, and more particularly to his delight when he felt that assured that he was not the traitor, yet not without a certain admixture of forwardness and ambition such as had previously been shown in the dispute for pre-eminence. The fiery trial soon came. After the arrest of our Savior, while they were three, Peter, James, and John, were, as on former occasions, selected to be with our Lord, the only witnesses of his passion, where also all three had alike failed to prepare themselves by prayer and watching, the arrest of Jesus took place. Peter did not shrink from the danger. In
the same spirit which had dictated his promise he drew his sword, alone against the armed throng, and wounded the servant (γὰν δὲλο, not a servant) of the high-priest, probably the leader of the band. When this bold but unauthorized attempt at rescue was repulsed, he did not yet forsake his Master, but followed him with John in the outer hall, yet this high-priest. There he sat in the outer hall. He must have been in a state of utter confusion: his faith, which from first to last was bound up with hope, his special characteristic, was for the time powerless against temptation. The danger found him unarméd. Thrice, each time with John in the presence, he asked the high-priest for his assent, and thrice he denied him. The triumph of Satan seemed complete. Yet it is evident that it was an obscuration of faith, not an extinction. It needed but a glance of his Lord's eye to bring him to himself. His repentance was instantaneous and effectual. The light in which he himself regarded his conduct is clearly shown by the terms in which it is related by Mark, who in some sense may be regarded as his reporter. The inferences are weighty as regards his personal character, which represents, more completely perhaps than any other in the New Testament, the unconsciousness of this natural and the strength of the spiritual man—still more weighty as bearing upon his relations to the apostolic body, and the claims resting upon the assumption that he stood to them in the place of Christ.

The first miracle recorded in the Gospels, who restored sight to the blind man of Bethsaida after a long period of blindness, was a proof that Peter, though humbled, was not crushed by his fall. He and John were the first to visit the sepulchre; he was the first who entered it. We are told by Luke (in words still used by the Eastern Church as the first salutation on Easter Sunday) and by Paul that Christ appeared to him first among the apostles—he who most needed the comfort was the first who received it, and with it, as may be assumed, an assurance of forgiveness. It is observable, however, that on that occasion he is called by his original name, Simon, not Peter; the higher designation was not restored until he had been publicly re instituted, so to speak, by his Master. That re instituted took place at the Sea of Tiberias (John xxi), an event of the very highest import. We have there indications of his best natural qualities, practical good sense, promptness, and energy: slower than John to recognize their Lord, Peter was the first to reach him: he brought the net to land. The thrice-repeated question of Christ, referring doubtless to the three protestations and denials, was thrice met by answers full of love and faith, and utterly devoid of his hitherto character. No trait of his was so clearly discerned in his later history. He then received the formal commission to feed Christ's sheep; not certainly as one endowed with exclusive or paramount authority, or as distinguished from his fellow-disciples, whose task had been marked by far less aggravating circumstances; rather as one who had forfeited his place, and could not resume it without such an authorization. Then followed the prediction of his martyrdom, in which he was to find the fulfilment of his request to be permitted to follow the Saviour.

With this event closes the first part of Peter's history. It was a period of transition, during which the fisherman of Galilee had been trained, first by the Baptist, then by our Lord, for the great work of his life. He had learned to know the person and appreciate the offices of Christ; while his own character had been chastened and elevated by special privileges and humiliations, both reaching their climax in the last recorded transactions. Henceforth he with his colleagues were to establish and govern the Church founded by their Lord, without the support of his presence.

3. Apostolical Career.—The first part of the Acts of the Apostles is occupied by the record of transactions in nearly all of which Peter stands forth as the recognized leader of the apostles; it being, however, equally clear that he neither exercises nor claims any authority apart from them, much less over them. In the first chapter it is Peter who points out to the disciples (as in all his discourses and writings drawing his arguments from prophecy) the necessity of supplying the place of Judas. He states the qualifications of an apostle, but takes no special part in the election. The candidates are selected by the Lord, who refused to receive the name of high-priest. He left to the searcher of hearts. The extent and limits of Peter's primacy might be inferred with tolerable ac
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The first miracle after Pentecost was wrought by Peter (Acts iii); and John was joined with him in that, as in most important acts of his ministry; but it was Peter who took the cripple by the hand, and bade him “in the name of Jesus of Nazareth rise up and walk,” and when the people ran together to Solomon's porch, where the apostles, following their Master's example, were wont to teach, Peter was the speaker: he convinces the people of their sin, warns them of their danger, points out the fulfilment of prophecy, and the special objects for which God sent his Son first to the children of the old covenant. This speech is at once strikingly characteristic of Peter and a proof of the fundamental harmony between his teaching and the more developed and systematic doctrines of Paul; differing in form, to an extent utterly incompatible with the theory of Baur and Schwegler touching the object of the writer of the Acts: identical in spirit, as trace in the bond of Peter's more especially as the spokesman, when “filled with the Holy Ghost” he confronted the full assembly headed by Annas and Caiphas, produced a deep impression upon those cruel and unscrupulous hypocrites: an impression enhanced by the fact that the words came from comparatively ignorant and unlearned men. The words spoken by both apostles, when commanded not to speak at all nor teach in the name of Jesus, have ever since been the watchwords of martyrs (iv. 18, 20).

This first miracle of healing was soon followed by the first miracle of judgment. The first open and deliberate sin against the Holy Ghost—a sin combining ambition, fraud, hypocrisy, and blasphemy—was visited by death, sudden and awful as under the old dispensation. Peter was the minister in this transaction, for he had first opened the gate to penitents (Acts ii. 37, 38), he now closed it to hypocrites. The act stands alone, without a precedent or parallel in the Gospel; but Peter acted simply as an instrument, not pronouncing the sentence, but denouncing the sin, and that in the name of his fellow-apostles and of the Holy Ghost. Penalties similar in kind, though far different in degree, were inflicted or commanded on various occasions by Paul. Peter appears, perhaps in consequence of that act, to have become the object of a reverence bordering; as is
would seem, on superstition (Acts v, 15), while the numerous miracles of healing wrought about the same time, showing the true character of the power dwelling in the apostles, gave them a position of influence. Peter kept in contact with the noblest and most interesting character among the Jews, the learned and liberal teacher of Paul, Gamaliel, whose caution, gentleness, and dispassionate candor stand out in strong relief contrasted with his colleagues, but make a faint impression compared with the steadfast and uncompromising principles of the apostles, who, after undergoing an illegal scourging, went forth rejoicing that they were counted worthy to suffer shame for the name of Jesus. Peter is not specially named in connection with the appointment of deacons, the formation of the regular organization of the Church; but when the Gospel was first preached beyond the precincts of Judea, he and John were at once sent by the apostles to confirm the converts at Samaria, a very important statement at this critical point, proving clearly his subordination to the whole body, of which he was the most active and able member.

Up to this time it may be said that the apostles had one great work, viz. to convince the Jews that Jesus was the Messiah; in that work Peter was the master builder. Paul states that Saul was the principal teacher; hitherto no words but his are specially recorded by the writer of the Acts. Henceforth he remains prominent, but not exclusively prominent, among the propagators of the Gospel. At Samaria he and John established the precedent for the most important rite not expressly enjoined in Holy Writ, viz. confirmation, which the Western Church has always held to belong exclusively to the functions of bishops as successors to the ordinary powers of the apostolate. Then also Peter was confronted with Simon Magus, the first teacher of heresy, See Simon Magus. As in the case of Ananias he had denounced the first sin against holiness, so in this case he first declared the penalty due to the sin called after Simon’s name. About three years later (comp. Acts ix, 26 and Gal. i, 17, 18) we have two accounts of the first meeting of Peter and Paul. In the Acts it is stated generally that Saul was at first distrusted by the disciples, and received by the apostles upon the recommendation of Barnabas. From the Galatians we learn that Paul went to Jerusalem especially to see Peter; that he abode with him fifteen days, and that on his return to Jerusalem the present at the time. It is important to note that this account, which, while it establishes the independence of Paul, marks the position of Peter as the most eminent of the apostles, rests not on the authority of the writer of the Acts, but on that of Paul—as if it were intended to obviate the calumny of the objections touching the mystical relations of the apostles of the Hebrews and the Gentiles. This interview was preceded by other events marking Peter’s position—a general apostolic tour of visitation to the churches hitherto established (dareiphamenou ois diáthermais, Acts ix, 23), in the course of which two great miracles were wrought on Eneas and Tabitha, and in connection with which the most signal transaction after the day of Pentecost is recorded, the baptism of Cornelius. A.D. 52. That was the crown and consummation of Peter’s ministry. Peter, who had first preached the resurrection to the Jews, baptized the first convert, confirmed the first Samaritans, now, without the advice or co-operation of any of his colleagues, under direct communication from heaven, first threw down the barrier which separated proselytes of the gate from Israelites, by effecting the establishment of the original application and full development issued in the complete fusion of the Gentile and Hebrew elements in the Church. The narrative of this event, which stands alone in minute circumstance of incidents and accessories of detail, is recorded by Luke. The chief points to be noted are first, the peculiar fitness of Cornelius, both as a representative of Roman force and nationality, and as a devout and liberal worshipper, to be a recipient of such privileges; and, secondly, the state of the apostle’s own mind. Whatever may have been his feeling or fear touching the heathen, the idea had certainly not yet crossed it that they could become Christians without first becoming Jews. As a loyal and believing Hebrew, he could not contemplate the removal of Gentile disqualifications without a distinct assurance that the enactments of the law which condemned them were abrogated by the divine Legislator. The vision could not therefore have been the product of a subjective impression. It was, strictly speaking, objective, presented to his mind by an external influence. Yet the will of the apostle was not controlled, it was simply written upon the heart of the convert, so that the statute of truce did not at once overcome his reluctance. It was not until his consciousness was fully restored, and he had well considered the meaning of the vision, that he learned that the distinction of clean and unclean was a outward things belonged to a temporary dispensation. It was no mere acquiescence in command, but the development of a spirit full of generous impulses, which found utterance in the words spoken by Peter on that occasion—both in the presence of Cornelius, and afterwards at Jerusalem. His conduct gave him a great offence in his own eyes; but it was not till he had added to it need all his authority, corroborated by a special manifestation of the Holy Ghost, to induce his fellow-apostles to recognize the propriety of this great act, in which both he and they saw an earnest of the admission of Gentiles into the Church on the single condition of spiritual repentance. The establishment of a Church, in great part of Gentile origin, at Antioch, and the mission of Barnabas, between whose family and Peter there were the bonds of near intimacy, set the seal upon the work thus inaugurated by Peter.

This transaction was followed, after an interval of several years, by the imprisonment of our apostle. A.D. 44. Herod Agrippa, having first tested the state of feeling at Jerusalem by the execution of James, one of the most eminent apostles, arrested Peter. The hatred which at that time first showed itself as a popular feeling may most probably be attributed chiefly to the offence given by Peter’s conduct towards Cornelius. His miraculous deliverance marks the close of this second great period of his ministry. The special work assigned to him was completed. He had founded the Church, opened the gates to the Jews, distinctly laid down the conditions of admission. From that time we have no continuous history of Peter. It is quite clear that he retained his rank as the chief apostle, equally so that he neither exercised nor claimed any right to control their proceedings. At Jerusalem the government of the Church devolved upon James the brother of our Lord. In other places Peter seems to have confined his ministrations to his countrymen—as apostle of the circumcision. He left Jerusalem, but it is not said where he went. Certainly not to Rome, where there are no traces of his presence before the last years of his life; he probably remained in Judea, visiting and confirming the churches; some old but not trustworthy traditions represent him as preaching in Cæsarea and other cities on the western coast of Palestine; three or four years later he once more at Jerusalem where the apostles and elders came together to consider the question whether converts should be circumcised. Peter took the lead in that discussion, and urged with remarkable cogency the principles settled in the case of Cornelius. Purifying faith and saving grace, thus removing all distinctions between believers. His arguments, adopted and enforced by James, decided that question at once and forever. It is, however, to be remarked that on that occasion he exercised no one power which Romanists hold to be peculiarly his own. He did not preside at the meeting; he neither summoned nor dismissed it; he neither collected the
suffered nor pronounced the decision. It is a disputed question whether Paul and Peter of which we have an account in the Galatians (ii, 1-10) took place at this time. The great majority of critics believe that it did, but this hypothesis has serious difficulties. Lange (Das apostolische Zeitalter, ii, 578) dates the fact about three years after the council. Wieseler has a long excursion to show that it must have occurred after Paul's second apostolic journey. He gives some weighty reasons, but wholly falls in the attempt to account for the presence of Barnabas, a fatal objection to his theory. (See Lange, op. cit., p. 578.) On the other side are Theodorst, Pearson, Eichhorn, Ul-hausen, Meyer, Neander, Howson, Schaff, etc. The only point of real importance was certainly determined before the apostles separated, the work of converting the Gentiles being henceforth specially intrusted to Paul and Barnabas, while the charge of preaching to the circumcision was assigned to the elder apostles, and more particularly to Peter (Gal. ii, 7-9). This arrangement cannot, however, have been an exclusive one. Paul always addressed himself first to the Jews in every city; and Peter, as the apostle of the circumcision, might indeed be contented that Paul, and even Christ for their chiefs, involves no opposition between the apostles themselves, such as the fabulous Clementines and modern infidelity assume. The name of Peter as founder, or joint founder, is not associated with any local Church save those of Corinth, Rome, Antioch, and Alexandria. The bearings upon controversies at critical periods, one of the most important events in the history of the Church. Peter at first applied the principles which he had lately defended, carrying with him the whole apostolic body, and on his arrival at Antioch with the Gentiles, thus showing that he believed all ceremonial distinctions to be abolished by the Gospel—in that he went far beyond the strict letter of the injunctions issued by the council. That step was marked and condemned by certain members of the Church of Jerusalem sent by James. It appeared to them one thing to recognize Gentiles as fellow-Christians, another to admit them to social intercourse, whereby ceremonial defilement would be contracted under the law to which all the apostles, Barnabas and Paul included, acknowledged allegiance. Peter, as the apostle of the circumcision, fearing to give offence to those who were his special charge, at once gave up the point, suppressed or disguised his feelings, and separated himself not from communion, but from social intercourse with the Gentiles. Paul, as the apostle of the Gentiles, said clearly the conversion of the Gentiles was likely to cause a total break of the application of a rule often laid down in his own writings concerning compliance with the prejudices of weak brethren. He held that Peter was infringing a principle, withheld him to the face, and, using the same arguments which Peter had urged at the council, pronounced his conduct to be indefensible. The statement that Peter compelled the Gentiles to Judaism probably means, not that he enjoined circumcision, but that his conduct, if persevered in, would have point with them, since they were naturally taken in steps which might remove the barriers to familiar intercourse with the first apostles of Christ. Peter was wrong, but it was an error of judgment: an act contrary to his own feelings and wishes, in deference to those whom he looked upon as representing the mind of the Church, that he was actuated by selfishness, national pride, or any remains of superstition, is neither asserted nor implied in the strong censure of Paul. Nor, much as we must admire the earnestness and wisdom of Paul, whose clear and vigorous intellect was in the highest degree actuated by anxiety for his own special charge, the Gentile Church, should we overlook Peter's singular humility in submitting to public rebuke from one so much his junior, or his magnanimity both in adopting Paul's conclusions as we must infer that he did from the absence of all trace of continued resistance) and in restoring the broken communion (as is testified by his own written words) to the end of his life (1 Pet. v, 10; 2 Pet. iii, 15, 16). See Paul.

From this time until the date of his Epistles we have no distinct notices in Scripture of Peter's abode or work. The silence may be accounted for by the fact that from that time the great work of propagating the Gospel was committed to the marvellous energies of Paul. Peter was probably employed for the most part in building up and completing the organization of Christian communities in the new districts. He is, however, strong reason to believe that he visited Corinth at an early period; this seems to be implied in several passages of Paul's first epistle to that Church, and it is a natural inference from the statements of Clement of Rome (First Epistle to the Corinthians, c. 4). The fact is positively asserted by Dionysius, bishop of Corinth (A.D. 180 at the latest), a man of excellent judgment, who was not likely to be misinformed, nor to make such an assertion lightly in an epistle addressed to the bishop and Church of Rome. The reference to Peter's visit is probably that to which Barnabas-Barnabas with the Romans, and Paul, even for their chiefs, involves no opposition between the apostles themselves, such as the fabulous Clementines and modern infidelity assume. The name of Peter as founder, or joint founder, is not associated with any local Church save those of Corinth, Rome, and Alexandria. The bearings upon controversies at critical periods, one of the most important events in the history of the Church. Peter at first applied the principles which he had lately defended, carrying with him the whole apostolic body, and on his arrival at Antioch with the Gentiles, thus showing that he believed all ceremonial distinctions to be abolished by the Gospel—in that he went far beyond the strict letter of the injunctions issued by the council. That step was marked and condemned by certain members of the Church of Jerusalem sent by James. It appeared to them one thing to recognize Gentiles as fellow-Christians, another to admit them to social intercourse, whereby ceremonial defilement would be contracted under the law to which all the apostles, Barnabas and Paul included, acknowledged allegiance. Peter, as the apostle of the circumcision, fearing to give offence to those who were his special charge, at once gave up the point, suppressed or disguised his feelings, and separated himself not from communion, but from social intercourse with the Gentiles. Paul, as the apostle of the Gentiles, said clearly the conversion of the Gentiles was likely to cause a total break of the application of a rule often laid down in his own writings concerning compliance with the prejudices of weak brethren. He held that Peter was infringing a principle, withheld him to the face, and, using the same arguments which Peter had urged at the council, pronounced his conduct to be indefensible. The statement that Peter compelled the Gentiles to Judaism probably means, not that he enjoined circumcision, but that his conduct, if persevered in, would have point with them, since they were naturally taken in steps which might remove the barriers to familiar intercourse with the first apostles of Christ. Peter was wrong, but it was an error of judgment: an act contrary to his own feelings and wishes, in deference to those whom he looked upon as representing the mind of the Church, that he was actuated by selfishness, national pride, or any remains of superstition, is neither asserted nor implied in the strong censure of Paul. Nor, much as we must admire the earnestness and wisdom of Paul, whose clear and vigorous intellect was in the highest degree actuated by anxiety for his own special charge, the Gentile Church, should we overlook Peter's singular humility in submitting to public rebuke from one so much his junior, or his magnanimity both in adopting Paul's conclusions as we must infer that he did from the absence of all trace of continued resistance) and in restoring the broken communion (as is testified by his own written words) to the end of his life (1 Pet. v, 10; 2 Pet. iii, 15, 16). See Paul.
More important in its bearings upon later controversies is the question of Peter's connection with Rome. It may be considered as a settled point that he did not visit Rome before the last year of his life. Too much stress may perhaps be laid on the fact that there is no notice of Peter's labors or death in the liturgical period of the early Church, but that negative evidence is not counterbalanced by any statement of undoubted antiquity. The date given by Eusebius rests upon a miscalculation, and is irreconcilable with the notices of Peter in the Acts of the Apostles. He gives A.D. 42 in the Chronicon (i.e. the usual place text), and says that Peter remained at Rome twenty years. In this he is followed by Jerome, Catal. 1.1 (who gives twenty-five years), and by most Roman Catholic writers. Protestant critics, with scarcely one exception, are unanimous upon this point, and Roman controversialists are far from being agreed in their attempts to remove the difficulty. The most ingenious effort is that of Winidammich (Vindicta Petriani, p. 112 sq.). He assumes that Peter went to Rome immediately after his deliverance from prison (Acts xii), i.e. A.D. 44, and left in company with the apostles in persecution between A.D. 49 and 51. (See below.)

The fact, however, of Peter's martyrdom at Rome rests upon very different grounds. The evidence for it is complete, while there is a total absence of any connection of Peter with the Church of Rome. We have in the first place the certainty of his martyrdom in our Lord's own prediction (John xxii, 18, 19). Clement of Rome, writing before the end of the first century, speaks of it, but does not mention the place, that being of course well known to his readers. Igratio, in the undoubtedly genuine Epistle to the Romans (ch. iv), speaks of Peter in terms which imply a special connection with their Church. Other early notices of less weight coincide with this, as that of Papias (Iuseb. ii, 15), and the apocryphal Presbyteri Petri, quoted by Cyprian. In the second Epistle of Clement, in the Epistle to Soter, bishop of Rome (ap. Iuseb. H. E. ii, 20), states, as a fact universally known, and accounting for the intimate relations between Corinth and Rome, that Peter and Paul both taught in Italy, and suffered martyrdom about the same time. Irenaeus, who was connected with the apostle John, being a disciple of Polycarp, a hearer of that apostle, and thoroughly conversant with Roman matters, bears distinct witness to Peter's presence at Rome (Adv. Her. iii, 1 and 3). It is incredible that he should have been misinformed on such a point. The testimony of Celsus, the liberal and learned Roman presbyter (who speaks of Peter's tomb in the Vatican), that of Origen, Tertullian, and of the ante- and post-Nicene fathers, without a single exception. In short, the churches most nearly connected with Rome, and those least affected by its influence, which was as yet but insensible in the East, concur in the statement that Peter was a joint founder of that Church, and suffered death in that city. What the early fathers do not assert, and indeed implicitly deny, is that Peter was the sole founder or resident bishop of that Church, or that the See of Rome derived from him any claim to supremacy: at the utmost they place him on a footing of equality with Paul. That fact is sufficient for all purposes of fair controversy. The denial of the statements resting on such evidence seems almost to indicate an unconscious consciousness, truly remarkable in those who believe that they have, and who in fact really have, irrefragable grounds for rejecting the pretensions of the papacy. Coteler has collected a large number of passages from the early fathers, in which the See of Peter (Pat. Apost. i, 414; see also Valerianus, Iuseb. H. E. iii, 21), Fabricius observes that this is the general usage of the Greek fathers. It is also to be remarked that when the fathers of the 4th and 5th centuries—for instance, Chrysostom and Augustine—use the words ο ἄγιος or ἀπόστολος, they mean Paul, not Peter—a very weighty fact.

The time and manner of the apostle's martyrdom are less certain. The early writers imply, or distinctly state, that he suffered at or about the same time (Dionysius, saeculum quinto quinto) with Paul, and in the Neroi- nian persecution. All agree that he was not sufficiently determined by our Lord's prophecy. Origen (ap. Iuseb. iii, 1), who could easily ascertain the fact, and, though fanciful in speculation, is not inaccurate in historical matters, says that at his own request he was crucified ικανος σημειωμενος, not in accordance with the head, and not, as generally understood, κηλις άχυρωσις, with his head downwards. (See below.) This statement was generally received by Christian antiquity; nor does it seem inconsistent with the fervent temperment and deep humanity of the apostle to have chosen such a death—one, moreover, not unlikely to have been inflicted in mockery by the instruments of Nero's wanton and ingenious cruelty. The legend found in St. Ambrose is interesting, and may have some foundation in fact. When the persecution began, the Christians at Rome, anxious to preserve their religion, persuaded Peter to take the course which they had spiritual warrant to recommend and to which he consented. "Lord, whither goest thou?" asked the apostle. "I go to Rome," was the answer, "there once more to be crucified." Peter did not believe the words, returned at once and was crucified. See Tillemont, Mem. i, 187, 555. He shows that the account of Ambrose (which is not to be found in the Bened. edit.) is contrary to the apocryphal legend. Later writers rather value it as reflecting upon Peter's want of courage or constancy. That Peter, like all good men, valued his life and suffered reluctantly, may be inferred from our Lord's words (John xxii); but his flight is more in harmony with the principles of a Christian than with the full exposure to persecution. Origen refers to the words the Lord had spoken by our Lord, but quotes an apocryphal work (On St. John, tom. ii).

Thus closes the apostle's life. Some additional facts, not perhaps unimportant, may be accepted on early testimony. From Paul's words it may be inferred with certainty that he did not give up the ties of family life when he forsook his temporal calling. His wife accompanied him in his wanderings. Clement of Alexandria, a writer well informed in matters of ecclesiastical interest, and thoroughly trustworthy, says (Strom. iii, p. 448) that "Peter and Philip had children, and that both took their adoptions to women of their own houses; by means of the doctrine of the Lord penetrated without scandal into the privacy of women's apartments." Peter's wife is believed, on the same authority, to have suffered martyrdom, and to have been supported in the hour of trial by her husband's exhortation. Some critics believe that she is referred to in the salutation at the end of the First Epistle of Peter. The apostle is said to have employed interpreters. Basiliades, an early Gnostic, professed to have derived his system from Clau- dius, one of these interpreters. But the peculiar impression that the apostle did not understand Greek, or did not speak it with fluency. Of far more importance is the statement that St. Mark wrote his Gospel under the teaching of Peter, or that he embodied in that Gospel the substance of our apostle's oral instruc- tions. This statement rests on such slight external evidence, and is corroborated by so many internal indications, that they would scarcely be ques- tioned in the absence of a strong theological bias. (Papias and Clem. Alex., referred to by Eusebius, H. E. ii, 12; Tertullian, 1. Marc. iv, c. 1. 27; Petaurus [on Epiphanius, p. 426] observes that Papias derived his information from John the Presbyter. For other passages, see Fabricius [Bibl. Gr. iii, 192]. The slight discrepancy between Eusebius and Papias indicates independent sources of information.) The fact
is doubly important, in its bearings upon the Gospel, and upon the character of our apostle. Chrysostom, who is the most just and judicious commentator, seems first to have drawn attention to the fact that in Mark's Gospel every defect in Peter's character and conduct is brought out clearly, without the slightest extenuation, while many noble acts and peculiar marks of favor are either omitted or stated with far less force than by the other evangelists. Ignatius's Epistle to Peter's influence, even in Mark's style, must be less pure than that of Luke, are traced by modern criticism (Gieseler, quoted by Davidson).

II. Discussion of Particular Points. We subjoin a sketch of the solution of certain special questions touched upon in the above history.

1. Peter's Name. His original appellation Cephas (Κῆφας) occurs in the following passages: John i, 42; 1 Cor. i, 12; iii, 22; ix; xv; 5; Gal. ii, 11; i, 18; ii, 10, 14 (the last three according to the text of Lachmann and Tischendorf). Cephas is the Chaldee word rapeh, "a rock," a rare word, found only in Job xxx, 6 and Jer. iv, 29. It must have been the word actually pronounced by our Lord in Matt. xvi, 18, and on subsequent occasions when the apostle was addressed by him or other Hebrews by his new name. By it he was known to the Corinthian Christians. In the ancient Syriac version of the N. T. (Peshitto), it is used at one place as a name where the Greek kēfās is in the text. When we consider that our Lord and the apostles spoke Chaldee, and that therefore (as already remarked) the apostle must always have been addressed as Cephas, it is certainly remarkable that throughout the Gospels, no less than ninety-seven times, with one exception only, the name should be given in the Greek form, which was of later introduction, and unintelligible to Hebrews, though intelligible to the far wider Gentile world among which the Gospel was about to begin its course. Even in Mark, where more Chaldee words and phrases are retained than in all the other Gospels put together, this is the case. It is as if in our English Bibles the name were uniformly given, not Peter, but Rock; and it suggests that the meaning contained in the appellation is of more vital importance, and intended to be more carefully seized at each recurrence, than we are apt to recollect. It is clearly the name that the Chaldee name to its Greek synonym is well marked in the interchange of the two in Gal. ii, 7, 8, 9 (Stanley, Apostolic Age, p. 116). The apostle in his companionship with Christ, and up to the time of the Lord's ascension, seems to have been given the least he of the name, always so called by Jesus himself (Matt. xxvi, 25; Mark xiv, 37; Luke xxii, 31; John xxi, 15), and apparently also by the disciples (Luke xxiv, 34; Acts xx, 14). But after the extension of the apostolic circle and its relations (comp. Acts x, 18), the apostle began to be known, in order to distinguish him from others called Simon, as Simon Peter; the name of Peter, which had at first been given him as a special mark of esteem, being added, as that of a father often was in other cases; and, in the course of time, it seems that the latter name superseded the former. Hence the evangelists call the apostle Peter oftener than Simon Peter. As to the epistles of Paul, he is always called Cephas in 1 Cor., but in the other epistles oftener Peter. As above suggested, the appellation thus bestowed seems to have had reference to the disciple individually and personally. Attaching himself to Christ, he would partake of that blessed spiritual influence whereby he would be enabled, in spite of the vicissitudes of his naturally impassive character, to hold with persevering grasp the faith he now embraced. He would become rooted and grounded in the truth, and not be carried away to destruction by the various winds of false doctrine and the crafty assaults of Satan. The name imposed was continually to remind him of what he ought to be as a follower of Christ. Compare Wieseler, Chronologie des Apostolischen Zeitalters, p. 381.

2. Peter's Domestic Circumstances. Of the family and connections of our apostle we know but little. His father is named in the Gospel history, and his mother's name seems to have been Joanna (see Coteler, Ad Const. Apostol, ii, 83). It appears from John xxi that he did not entirely give up his occupation as a fisherman on his entrance to the company of Christ's disciples. Luke iv, 38 and 1 Cor. ix, 5 seem to show that he was married, and so the Church fathers often affirm (comp. Coteler, ad Clem. Recogn. vii, 25; Grabe, Ad Speic. Patr., § i, p. 380). But the tradition of the name of his wife varies between Bavardus and Perpetua (see Meyer, De Petri Conjugio, Vitae, 1684). It is said that she suffered martyrdom before Peter (Clem. Alex. Stromit, vii, p. 312). Some affirm that he left children (ibid. iii, p. 192; Euseb. iii, 80), among whom a daughter, Petronilla, is named (comp. Acta Sanctor. 80; Mai, viii, 420 sq.). More recently Rauch (Neues u. Altes, Journ. Theol. xviii, 401) strives to find a son of Peter mentioned in 1 Pet. v, 13, and Neander (Ffussans. ii, 520) follows him, supposing that the "electected together with you" (the word church in the English version is not in the original) refers to the wife of Peter. The personage of Peter at the time of his martyrdom is described in the Chronicle of Eusebius, p. 256, in an absurd passage, of which the sense appears to be this: He was an old man, two thirds of a century old; bald in front, knob-haired (? cornutus); with his body a little flexion, somewhat pale, with dark eyes, a large beard, long nose, joined eyebrows, upright in posture; intelligently, impulsive, and timid. Comp. the description in Niceph. H. E. ii, 87, p. 165; and Fagginii, De Rom. P. H. E. Exerc. xxv, p. 458 sq.

3. Peter's Prominence as an Apostle. From such passages as Matt. xvii, 1; Mark ix, 1; xiv, 83, there can be no doubt that Peter was among the most beloved of Christ's disciples; and his eminence among the apostles depended partly on the fact that he had been one of the first of them, and partly on his own peculiar traits. Sometimes he speaks in the name of the twelve (Matt. xix, 27; Luke xii, 41). Sometimes he answers when questions are addressed to them all (Matt. xvi, 16; Mark vii, 29); sometimes Jesus addresses him in the place of all (Matt. xxvi, 40). But that he passed, out of the circle of the apostles, as a sort of representative, cannot be certainly inferred from Matt. xvi, 24, even if it be supposable in itself. This position of Peter becomes more decided after the ascension of Jesus, and perhaps in consequence of the saying in John xx, 16 sq. Peter now seems to have become the first at least of the twelve (Matt. ii, 15; ii, 14 sq.; iv, 8 sq.; v, 27 sq.), his word is decisive (Acts v, 7 sq.), and he is named with "the other apostles" (Acts ii, 87; v, 29. Comp. Chrysost. on John, Hom. xxxviii, p. 525). The early Protestant polemic divines should not have blinded themselves to this observation. (See Baumgarten, Polen, iii, 370 sq.) The case is a natural one, when we compare Peter's character with that of the other apostles, and contributes nothing at all to fixing the primacy in him, after the view of the Roman Church. It may even be granted that the custom of looking upon Peter as the chief of the apostles was the cause of his always having the first place in the company of apostles in the Church traditions. The old account that Peter alone of the apostles was baptized by Jesus himself agrees well with this view. (Comp. Coteler, Aen. Herm. Past. iii, 16.)

As to the meaning of the passage Matt. xvi, 18, there is much dispute. The accounts which have been given of the precise import of this declaration may be summed up under these heads: 1. That our Lord spoke of himself, and not of Peter, as the rock upon which the Church was to be built. 2. This interpretation expresses a great truth, but it is irreconcilable with the context, and could scarcely have occurred to an unbiased reader, and certainly does not
gave the primary and literal meaning of our Lord's words. It has been defended, however, by candid and learned critics, as Glass and Dathe. 2. That our Lord addresses Peter as the type or representative of the Church, in his capacity of chief disciple. This is Augustine's view, and it was widely adopted in the early Church. It is hardly borne out by the argument, and it seems to give the false metaphor. The Church would in that case be founded on itself in its type. 3. That the rock was not the person of Peter, but his confession of faith. This rests on much better authority, and is supported by stronger arguments. Our Lord's question, when put to the disciples, was, through the answer came through the mouth of Peter, always ready to be the spokesman, it did not the less express the belief of the whole body. So in other passages (noted below) the apostles generally, not Peter by himself, are spoken of as foundations of the Church. Every one still acknowledges that Christ, as before suggested, is pre-eminently the first foundation, the Rock, on which every true disciple, on which Peter himself, must be built. It was by his faithful confession that he showed he was upon the rock. He was then Peter indissolubly united thereto, and it was the rock in the view of which Christ had long before given him the name. Such an interpretation may seem to accord best with our Lord's address, "Thou art Peter—"the firm maintainer of essential truth, a truth by the faithful confession of the rock of Peter, of the apostles, living stones of his Church (John xvii, 8; Rom. x, 9; 1 Cor. iii, 11). Thus it was not the personal rock Peter, but the material rock of Gospel truth, the adherence to which was the test of discipleship. This view, that it was Peter's confession on which Christ would build his Church, has been held by many able expositors. For instance, Hilary says, "Super hanc ignitum confessionis petram ecclesiae edificavit est" (De Trin. lib. vii, 36. Op. [Par. 1695], col. 908; comp. lib. ii, 28, col. 808). See also Cyril of Alexandria (De Sunt. Trin. dial. iv. Op. [Lut. 1668], tom. v, pars i, p. 507); Chrysostom (In Matt. hom. liv. Op. [Par. 1718-36], vii, 548); and the writer under the name of Nyssen (Test. de Advert. Dom. ad. Jud. in Greg. Nyssen. Op. [Par. 1698], ii, 162). Yet it seems to have been originally suggested as an explanation, rather than an interpretation, which it certainly is not in a literal sense. 4. That Peter himself was the rock on which the Church would be built, as the representative of the apostles, as professing in their name the true faith, and as intrusted specially with the duty of preaching it, and of carrying on the great work of the Church. Many learned and candid Protestant divines have acquiesced in this view (e.g. Pearson, Hammond, Bengel, Rosenmüller, Schleusner, Kunoil, Bloomfield, etc.). It is borne out by the facts that Peter on the day of Pentecost, and during the whole period of the establishment of the Church, was the chief agent in all the work of the ministry, in preaching, in admitting both Jews and Gentiles, and laying down the terms of communion. This view is wholly incompatibil with the Rock of the Church rises up in him the representative of Christ, not personally, but in virtue of an office essential to the permanent existence and authority of the Church. Passaglia, the latest and ablest controversialist, takes more pains to refute this than any other view; but wholly without success: it is clear that Peter did not retain, even admitting that he did at first hold, any primacy of rank after completing his own special work; that he never exercised any authority over or independently of the other apostles; that he certainly did not transmit whatever he held or held for his colleagues after his decease. At Jerusalem, even during his residence there, the chief authority rested with St. James; nor is there any trace of a central power or jurisdiction for centuries after the foundation of the Church. The same arguments, multae multiâles, apply to the keys. The promise was literally fulfilled when Peter preached at Pentecost, admitted the first converts to baptism, confirmed the Samaritans, and received Cornelius, the representative of the Gentiles, into the Church. Whatever privileges may have belonged to him personally died with him. The authority required of the person who represents the Church was believed by the fathers to be deposited in the episcopate, as representing the apostolic body, and succeeding to its claims. See Rock. The passage is connected with another in the claims of the papacy, namely, "Unto thee will I give the keys of the kingdom of heaven," etc. (Matt. xvi, 19). The force of both these passages is greatly impaired for the purpose for which Catholics render them, by the circumstance that whatever of power or authority they may be supposed to confer upon Peter must be regarded as shared by him with the other apostles, inasmuch as to them also are ascribed in other passages the same qualities and powers which are promised to Peter in those under consideration. If by the former of these passages are we to understand that the Church is built upon the apostle Peter, it is not on him alone that personal authority is devolved, but upon all the apostles (Ephes. ii, 20); and in the look of Revelation we are told that on the twelve foundations of the New Jerusalem (the Christian Church) are inscribed "the names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb" (xxi, 14). As for the description of Christ as the one person of the Church, it was in all its essential parts repeated by our Lord to the other disciples immediately before his passion, as announcing a privilege which, as his apostles, they were to possess in common (Matt. xviii, 18; John xxi, 21). It is, moreover, uncertain in what sense our Lord used the language in question. In both cases their words are metaphorical; and nothing can be more unsafe than to build a theological dogma upon language of which the meaning is not clear, and to which, from the earliest ages, different interpretations have been affixed. Finally, even granting the correctness of the interpretation which Catholics put upon these verses, it will not bear out the conclusion they would deduce from them, inasmuch as the judicial supremacy of Peter over the other apostles does not necessarily follow from his possessing authority over the Church. On the other side, it is certain that there is no instance on record of the apostle's having ever claimed or exercised this supposed power; but, on the contrary, he is more than once represented as submitting to an exercise of power upon the part of others, as when Peter, on one occasion, he went as a gosseenger from the apostles assembled in Jerusalem to the Christians in Samaria (Acts viii, 14), and when he received a rebuke from Paul, as already noticed. This circumstance is so fatal, indeed, to the pretensions which have been urged in favor of his supremacy over the other apostles, that from a very early age attempts have been made to set aside its force by the hypothesis that it is not of Peter the apostle, but of another person of the same name, that Paul speaks in the passage (Lactant. de Mort. doc. i, 1). This hypothesis, however, is so plainly contradicted by the words of Paul, who explicitly ascribes apostleship to the Peter of whom he writes, that it is astonishing how it could have been admitted even by the most blinded zealots (vers. 8, 9). While, however, it is pretty well established that Peter was at the head of the judicial supremacy over the other apostles, it would, perhaps, be going too far to affirm that no dignity or primacy whatsoever was conceded to him on the part of his brethren. His superiority in point of age, his distinguishing services, his permanence of his ascension, and his prominent part which he had ever taken in his Master's affairs, both before his death and after his ascension, furnished sufficient grounds for his being raised to a position of respect and of moral influence in the Church and
among his brother apostles. To this some counte-
ance is given by the circumstances that he is called "the first" (ωριστός) by Matthew (x. 2) and this ap-
parently not merely as a numerical, but as an honora-
ry distinction; that when the apostles are mentioned as a body, it is frequently by the phrase "Peter and the eleven," or "Peter and the rest of the apostles," or something similar; and that when Paul went up to Jerusalem to show his revelation it was Peter par-
ticularly that the visit was paid. These circumstances, taken in connection with the prevalent voice of Chris-
tian antiquity, would seem to authorize the opinion that Peter occupied some such position as that of mopo-
narch over the Church in Jerusalem, that he held the Catholic see of the Church (Acts x. 9), and an energetic disposition, which showed itself sometimes as resolution, sometimes as boldness (Matt.
xiv, 29), and temper (John xviii, 10). His tempera-
ment was choleric, and he easily passed from one ex-
reme to another (John xiii, 38). For parallel be-
tween Peter and John, see Chrysostom, in hom.
(xvii, 522). But how could such a man fall into a re-
pealed denial of his Lord? This will always remain a
difficult psychological problem; but it is not necessary
on this account to refer to Satan's power (Olahsenau,
Bibl. Comment. ii, 482 sq.). When Jesus predicted that
Peter his coming falling, the apostle may have thought only
of a formal inquiry; and the arrest of Christ
drove from his mind all recollection of Christ's warn-
ing words. The first denial was the hasty repulse of a troublesome and curious question. Peter thought it not worth while to converse with a girl at such a
moment, when all his thoughts were taken up with the
fate of his Master; and his repulse would be the more
resolute, the more he wished to avoid being driven by the
curious and pressing crowd out of the vicinity of the
beloved Saviour. The second and third question com-
peled him still to deny, unless he would confess or
leave the place; but the nearness of the Lord held
him fast. Besides they are the questions only of
curious servants, and he is in danger, if he be acknowl-
edged for him a butcher of widows, a profiteer of the
curse to the coarse multitude, and thus of failing in his
purpose. Thus again and again, with increasing hesi-
tation, he utters his denial. Now the cock-crowing
reminisces him of his Master's warning, and now at length he reflects that a denial, even before such unautho-
ized inquiries, is yet really a denial. In this view some
think that Peter's thoughts were continually on his
Master, and that possibly the fear of personal danger had no part in influencing his course. The expression
/jull of Peter, often used, is in any case rather strong.
For various views of this occurrence, see Luther, on
John xviii; Niemeyer, Charakteri, i, 586 sq.; Razi, Pro-
terica ad narrationem. Eminent de summa P. terneliarii (Er-
langen, 1781); Paulus, Comment. iii, 647 sq.; Henne-
berg, Leidsepraxis, p. 159 sq.; Miscellanea eines Land-
predigers (Glogau, 1795), 5 sq.; Grelling, Leben Petri,
p. 380 sq.; iehasow, Zedlin, Apol. eccles. syrisch, 32; Theo-
(i, 109 sq.; and Bellarmine, Contr. de Henet, ii,
16; Martin, Diac. de Petri Denegorie (Monasteri, 1835).
5. Paul's Dispute with Peter.—With reference to
the occurrence mentioned in Gal. ii, 11, from which some
have derived the conclusion that Peter harboured from the
servile fear of men, we may remark that the case is altogether different from the preceding, and has much
to do with the apostle's dogmatic convictions. It is
known that the admission of the heathen to the Church
was strange to Peter at first, and that he could only be
induced to preach to them after the vision of Acts
(Acts x, 10; xi, 4 sq.). Then he was the first to bap-
tize heathen, and announced in unmistakable language
that the yoke of the Mosaic law must not be placed
on the Gentile converts (Acts xv, 7 sq.). But it is
quite possible that he was still anxious for Chris-
tianity to be first firmly rooted among the Jews, and
thus he seems after this occurrence to have turned his
preaching exclusively to the Jews (comp. Gal. ii, 7),
his first epistle also being intended only for Jewish
readers. The affair at Anioch (Gal. ii, 12) seems to
show that he was still anxious to hold the line expressed in Acts xv, 7 sq.; if, indeed, as appears to
be the case, it was later than the latter. For even if
Peter found it necessary to respect the prejudices of
the party of James, still the necessity of firmness and
consistency cannot be denied; although, on the other
hand, we must not confound Paul's view of Peter
with that of Paul. It is known (comp. Euseb. i, 12, 1) that in
the early Church many referred the entire statement
to another Cephas, one of the seventy disciples, who
afterwards became bishop of Iconium, and nearly all
the fathers, which express the spirit of the Molkenbuhr, Quod Cephas Gal. ii, non sit Petrus
Ap. (Monasteri, 1808). See against this view Dieyling, Obseruat. ii, 520 sq. On another view of the church
fathers, see Neander, Pfem. i, 292, note. It appears
also that Peter, from the fact of his being one with a party of his fellow Christians called themselves by his name, that Peter
was afterwards recognised as head of this class, in
distinction from the Pauline Christians.
6. As to the time of Peter's journey to Rome, the
Church fathers do not quite agree. Eusebius says in
his Chron. (i, 42) that Peter went to Rome in the
second year of Claudius Caesar, after founding the first
Church in Antioch; and Jerome, in his version, adds
that he remained there twenty-five years, preaching
the Gospel, and acting as bishop of the city (comp. also
Jerome, Script. Execl. p. 1). Yet this statement ap-
serts very doubtful, for three reasons: (1) Because,
although we learn from Acts xii, 17 that Peter left
Jerusalem for a time after the death of James the el-
der, yet he certainly cannot have left Palestine before
the events recorded in Acts xv. (2) Because the
mention of the origin of the Church in Antioch, con-
nected by the fathers with Peter's journey to Rome,
cannot be easily reconciled with Acts xi, 19 sq. (3)
Because, if Peter had been bishop in Rome when Paul
wrote his Epistle to the Romans, and afterwards when
he was imprisoned in Rome, it is not possible for him
to contain words of greeting to Peter, and the epistles
written from Rome similar messages from Peter; the
more as these epistles are very rich in such messages;
but nothing of the kind appears. We may well doubt,
too, whether, if Peter had been bishop or even founder
of the Roman Church, Paul's principles and method (see
Rom. xv, 20, 23 sq.; xxviii, 2; 2 Cor. x, 16) would have allowed him to write this epistle to Rome at all.
Eusebius seems to have drawn his account from Clemens
Alexandrinus and Eusebius (Euseb. H. E. ii, 10),
the former of whom quoted from a remark of Justin
Martyr (Apol. ii, 69), which rests upon an accidental
error of language; this father referring to Simon the
Magician an inscription which belonged to the Saline-
Romish deity Semo (Hug. Eusebi. ii, 69 sq.; Credner,
Eusebius, i, 925 sq.; Comp. Scholz, in Rom. ii, 644.
Miser. 1844). Now Peter had once public-
lly rebuked this Simon (Acts xii, 18 sq.); this fact,
connected with the inscription, gave rise to the story
of Peter's residence in Rome under Claudius, in whose
reign the inscription originated. After this detection
of the falsity of the story of Peter's residence in Rome,
it is truly wonderful that Bertholdt (Eusebius v, 2865)
should defend the account, and found a critical con-
jecture upon it. Further, the Armenian Chronicle of
Eusebius refers to the following page of the document:

Eusebius refers to this statement of the third year of Calus Caligula.

But the account found in Irenaeus (Iren. iii, 1) differs materially from that above noticed. He tells us that Peter and Paul were in Rome, and there founded a church in company; and Eusebius (ii. 25, in a quotation published as early as 1596 under the name of Papias, possibly with a historical error) says that they suffered martyrdom together (Peter being crucified, according to Origen, in Eusebius, iii, 1; Nisich ii, 26).

Eusebius in his Chronicle places their martyrdom, according to his reckoning of twenty-five years for Peter's episcopacy, in the fourth year of Nero's reign, which is all the more remarkable, since the middle of October, A.D. 67, to the same time in A.D. 68. This joint martyrdom of Paul and Peter (without however any special mention of the manner of Peter's crucifixion, comp. Nandor, I. x, 54) is also mentioned by Tertullian (Praelections, Hort. 26) and Lactantius (Mem. Persic. 2; Instit. Div. iv, 21). The graves of both apostles were pointed out in Rome as early as the close of the second century (Euseb. ii, 25). Yet the whole story rests ultimately on the testimony of Dionysius alone, who is not a very reliable witness, and is probably to be relegated to the regions of the fabulous. In Clemens Romanus, 1 to Cor. v, and Ignatius, to the Roman, v, settle nothing.) Thus, on the one hand, we are not at liberty to reject all doubts as to the truth of this account with Berthold (loc. cit.) as hypercritical, or with Gieseler (Ch. Hist. 1, 52 sq. ed.) as partisan polemic, nor on the other hand, do we have to deprive the early Christians of all their right to the interpretation of 1 Peter 18, where at an early date a jargon was understood to stand for Rome (Euseb. xv, 2; Nisich. H. E. ii, 15. Comp. Baur, p. 215). The genetic development of the whole story is attempted by Baur (in the Tübingen Zeitschrift, f. Theol. 1831, iv, 162 sq. Comp. his Paulus, p. 214 sq. 671 sq.) deserves close attention. But compare Neander, I. Paulus, 219 sq. and further against any visit to Rome by Peter, see M. Veilens, Libr. quo Petrum Romanum non viderunt deserunt (1596); Vedelius, De tempore urbsque Epicapitis Petri (Genova, 1624); Spanheim, De finta profectione Petri Ap. in urbem Rom (Lug. Bat. 1679; also in his Opera, ii, 881 sq.); also an anonymous writer in the Biblioth. for theol. Schriftbande, vol. iv, No. 1 (extract in the Leips. Lit.-Ztg. 1800, No. 130); Mayerhoff, Einl. in d. Petrin. Schriften, p. 73 sq.; Reiche, Erklär. des Briefe an d. Römer, i, 59 sq. Von Ammon, Fortbild. iv, 322 sq.; Ellendoer, Ist Petrus in Rom. u. Bischof d. Rom. Kirche gewesen? (Darmstadt, 1841); translated in the Bibliotheca Sacra, New York, 1855. See also Blettermann, Der Bischof (Dusseldorf, 1842). On the other side of the question, the older writings are enumerated by Fabriuces, Lux Eysze, p. 97 sq. The usual arguments of the Catholics are given by Bellarmine, Contr. de Rom. Pontif. lib. ii. But the chief work on that side is still that of Conzern. De Romana sit hinc aetate princip. Apostol. lib. ii (Venice, 1578; revised by Constantinus, Rom. 1770). Comp. esp. Foggini, De Romano Petri sinuera, etc. (Flor. 1741). On the same side in general, though with many modifications, are the following later writers: Meyrat, Kien. Bibl. 351 sq., who holds that Peter was in Rome twice. See contra, Baur, Op. cit. p. 181 sq.; Herbst, in the Tübingen Kathol.-theol. Quaestl. 1890, iv, 1, who places Peter in Rome at least during the last years of Nero's reign, though but for a short time. See, however, Baur, Op. cit. p. 161 sq.; also Oschelens, und Kri. 1836, p. 940 sq., in answer to Baur; Stenglein, in the Tübingen Quaestlach. 1840, 2d and 3d parts, who makes Peter to have visited Rome in the second year of Claudius; to have been driven away by the well-known edict of that emperor, and to have died under Nero. Comp. also Haiden, De situame P. Romano (Prag. 1761), and Windischmann, Vindiciae Petri (Ratisb. 1886). It is not in the least necessary for those who oppose the Romish Church, which makes Peter first bishop of Rome (see Van Til, De Petrus
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Roma Martyre non pontifice [Lug. Bat. 1719], and grounds on this the primacy of the pope (Matteschuz, Opus domini, adversus Iherodot[es sic!], p. 212 sq.; Bel- larmine, Contr. de Rom. Pontif. ii, 3, and elsewhere), to be influenced in the question of Peter's journey by these views, insanely as this primacy, when all the historical evidence is considered, is the result of a spire of every effort to defend it, without foundation (Butechcraft, Untersuch. der Vorsäuse des Ap. F. (Hamb. 1788); Baumgarten, Polem. iii, 370 sq.; Paulus, in Sephr. Roman. 131 sq.). The first intimation that Peter had a share in founding the Roman Church, and that he spent twenty-five years there as bishop, appears in Eusebius (Chron. ad 42nd. ann. Claud.) and Jerome (Script. Ecc. 1); while Eusebius (H. E. iii, 2) tells us that after the martyrdom of Peter and Paul, Linus was made the first bishop of the Church of the Romans; a most remarkable statement, if Peter had been bishop before him (comp. iii, 4). Epiphanius (xxvii, 6) even calls Paul the bishop (episkopos) of Christianity in Rome.

7. Mode of Peter's Death. The tradition of this apostle's being crucified with his head downward probably to be relegated to the regions of the fabulous. Tertullian, who is the first to mention Peter's crucifixion, says simply (De Passer. Itutens. 86), "Peterus passioni Dominico adequatur," which would rather lead to the conclusion that he was crucified in the Hebrew fashion, and by no means in the Roman way, as our Lord is supposed to have been, according to Origen, whose words are, ιερευς ὁ ἀνήσως ἑαυτῆς τακτις (ap. Euseb. H. E. iii, 1); and these are generally cited as intimating the peculiarity traditionally ascribed to the mode of Peter's crucifixion. But do the words really intimate this? Allowing that the verb may mean "was crucified," can ιερεύς ὁ ἀνήσως mean "with the head downwards?"

No instance, we believe, can be adduced which would justify such a translation. The combination ιερεύς ὁ ἀνήσως occurs both in classical and Biblical Greek (see Plato, B. iii, 288; Plut. Apoph. de Scipione J. 19; Mark xiv, 8; 1 Cor. xi, 4), but in every case it means "upon the head" (comp. ιερεύς ὁ ἀνήσως παράτημ. Lucian, Gath. c. 30, and καὶ μαζίς τακτις, Cic. pol. c. 12). According to analogy, therefore, Origen's words should mean that the apostle was impaled, or fastened to the cross upon, i.e. by the head. When Eusebius has to mention the crucifying of martyrs with the head downwards, he says distinctly αὐτῶν ἀνήσως κατακρίνεται προσωπείως (H. E. vii, 8). It is probably to a misreading of Origen's words that the story is to be traced and it is curious to see how it grows as it advances. First, we have Origen's vague and doubtful statement above quoted; then we have Eusebius's more precise statement: Πετρο στά τακτις αὐτής σταντρεμένος (Dm. Ec. iii, 116, c.); and at length, in the hands of Jerome, it expands into "Aŭtrum cruci martyrio coronatus est capite ad terram vero et in sublime pedibus elevatus, asceneres se indulgium qui sic cruciferigeretur ut Dominus sua" (Cod. Script. Eccles. 1). See Crucifert.
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Mayerhoff, Reuss, and Schleiermahn, that Rufinus found κατά for κατά, and read κατά. Epiphanius also names Πέτρος Πέτρος as a book among the Euchonites (Hier. XXX, 15). It is probably only a different name for the foregoing (Schwegler, Nach-apost. Zeitalt. II, 30).

See Gospels, Spurious.

Polycarp uses two citations from this letter: κατὰ τὸν Πέτρον καὶ τὴν Πέτρου (Hist. Eccles. iv, 14). The same historian relates of Papias that in his λόγων εκπεμβάνα τοῦ Πέτρου in a similar way used μαθητής from this epistle (Hist. Eccles. iii, 89). Irenaeus quotes it expressly by and by name without mentioning the Petrine name (Adv. Haer. iii, 14). The Petrus ait (Hier. iv, 9, 2), citing 1 Pet. i, 8; using the same quotation similarly introduced in ibid. v, 7, 2; and again, "Et propter hoc Petrus ait," citing 1 Pet. ii, 16; ibid. iv, 16, 8. Other quotations, without mention of the apostle's name, may be found, ibid. III, 16, 8, and iv, 20, 2, etc. Quotations abound in Clement of Alexandria, headed with ὁ Πέτρος λέγει or γραφεῖ ὁ Πέτρος. These occur both in his Stromata and Pseudo, and need not be specified. Quotations are abundant also in Origen, certifying the authorship by the words παρὰ τῷ Πέτρῳ; and, according to Cosmas Indicopleustes (Cosm. ix, 10), the testimony is quite as distinct. In the short tract Scorpiace this epistle is quoted nine times, the preface in one place being "Petrus quidem ad Ponticos" (Scorpi. c. xii), quoting 1 Pet. ii, 20. Eusebius himself says of it, Πετροῦ ... ἀποκάλυψιν (Hist. Eccles. iii, 23). It is also found in the Peshito, which admitted only three of the catholic epistles. See Mayerhoff, Einführung in die Petrin. Schriften, p. 199, etc.

In the canonic published by Muratori this epistle is not found. In this fragment occurs the clause, "Apocalypses etiam Johannis et Petri tantum recipimus." Wieseler, laying stress on etiam, would bring out this meaning—in addition to the epistles of Peter and John, we also receive their Revelations; or also of Peter we receive as much as of John, two epistles and an apocalypse. But the interpretation is not admissible, rather with Bleek may the omission be ascribed to the fragmentary character of the document (Eusebi. in das N. T. p. 648; Hilgenfeld, Der Canon und die Kritik des N. T. [Halle, 1883], p. 48). Other modes of reading and explaining the sentence have been proposed. Hug alters the punctuation, "Apocalypses etiam Johannis. Et Petri tantum recipimus;" certainly the tantum gives some plausibility to the emendation. Believing that the barbarous Latin is but a version from the Greek, he thus restores the original, καὶ Πέτρου μοινὸς παρακάτω...—an alteration which of course brings out the conclusion wanted (Eusebi. § 19). Guicerie's effort is not more satisfactory. Thiessier, with more violence, changes tantum into solum epistolam, and quam quidem in the following I Pet. ii, 20. This document, so imperfect in form and barbarous in style, is probably indeed a translation from the Greek, and it can have no authority against decided and general testimony (see the canon in Routh's Reliquiæ Sacror. 1, 396, edited with notes from Freihardter's Commentatio [Lond. 1802]). Nor is it of any importance whether the words of the Latin document imply that this epistle was repudiated by Theodore of Mopsuestia, and if the Paulicians rejected it, Petrus Siculus gives the true reason—they were "passim adversum illum affectus"—personal prejudice being implied in their very name (Hist. Eccles. p. 17).

The internal evidence is equally complete. The author calls himself the apostle Peter (i, 1), and the whole character of the epistle shows that it proceeds from a writer who possessed great authority among those whom he addresses. The writer describes himself as "an el-
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der." and "a witness of Christ's sufferings" (v. 1). The vehemence and energy of the style are altogether appropriate to the warmth and zeal of Peter's character, and every succeeding critic, who has entered into its spirit, has felt impressed with the truth of the observation of Kraft: "The man speaks from the depths of his own personal dignity and authorship, and worthy of the prince of the apostles."
In later times the genuineness of the epistle has been impugned, as by Claudius in his Urantachen der Christenluthen, p. 296 (Altona, 1808). He imagined the author to have been a Jewish Christian in Capho Minor, and his general objection 1 Pet. i, 18, 24 is that the similarity in doctrine and style to Paul was too great to warrant the belief of independent authorship. His objections were exposed and answered by Augusti (in a program, Jena, 1808) and by Bertholdt (Einb. vol. vi, § 967). Eichhorn, however, took up the theory of Claudius so far as to maintain that as to material Peter is the author, but that Mark is the actual writer. De Wette also throws out similar objections, hinting that the author may have been a follower of Paul who had been brought into close attendance upon Peter. The question has been thoroughly discussed by Hug, Ewald, Bertholdt, Weiss, and other critics. The most striking resemblances are perhaps 1 Pet. i, 8 with Eph. i, 3; ii, 18 with Eph. vi, 5; iii, 1 with Eph. v, 22; and v, 5 with Eph. v, 21; but allusions nearly as distinct are found to the doctrine of the всего во вселенную Свещества (Rom. viii, 20, 21), Timi. 2, 11, 14; Rom. xiii, 11, 14; Rom. xiv, 2, 11, 14; Coli. iii, 8, 10; Phil. ii, 14; iv, 10; Rom. xiii, 2, etc., etc., v, 1; with Rom. viii, 18, 4, 21; 1 Thess. ii, 14; v, 14 with 1 Cor. xvi, 20). While, however, there is a similarity between the thoughts and style of Peter and Paul, there is at the same time a marked individuality, and there are also many special characteristics in this first epistle.
In the epistle Peter illustrates the peculiar and natural similarity between this epistle and the speeches of Peter as given in the Acts of the Apostles. Not to mention similarity in mould of doctrine and array of facts, there is resemblance in style. Thus Acts v, 30, x, 39, 1 Pet. ii, 24, in the allusion to the crucifixion and the use of άνων οο, the tree or cross; Acts ii, 32, 33, 15, 1 Pet. vi, 4, 11, in the peculiar use of ψηφων; Acts iii, 18, 4, 18, 1 Pet. i, 10, in the special connection of the old prophets with Christ and his work: Acts x, 32, 33, 1 Pet. ii, 4, in the striking phrase "Judge quick an áνων, the tree or cross; Acts two, 1, 21, in the description of the ψηφων, as the word άνων is always something to show Peter's independent use of the terms. One with his "beloved brother Paul" in the general view of the truth, he has something peculiar to him in the introduction and illustration of it. The Petrine type is as distinct as the Pauline—it bears its own unmistakable style and character. The Galilean fisherman has an individuality quite as recognizable as the pupil of Gamaliel.
Once more, to show how baseless is the objection drawn from Peter's supposed dependence on Paul, it may be added that similar certain expressions must have become current through constant usage. But in cases where such similarity between Peter and Paul occurs, there is ever a difference of view or of connection; and both may refer to ideas so common as are named by Peter, "ψηφων," or "νοην" or "οοολον" always something to show Peter's independent use of the terms. One with his "beloved brother Paul" in the general view of the truth, he has something peculiar to him in the introduction and illustration of it. The Petrine type is as distinct as the Pauline—it bears its own unmistakable style and character. The Galilean fisherman has an individuality quite as recognizable as the pupil of Gamaliel.
him ἄνω. Such similarities only prove independent authorship. In the resemblances to James, which are sometimes added, the chief similarity consists in the use of Old-Test. quotations. Thus compare 1 Pet. i, 6, 7 with James i, 2, 3; i, 24 with James i, 10; i, 11 with James i, 21; ii, 5 with James iv, 6, 10; iv, 8 with James v, 11. Yet, the more frequent resonances to Paul, and the fewer to John and James, prove? not, with De Wette, the dependence of Peter on Paul; nor, with Weiss, the dependence of Paul on Peter (Der Patin. Lehrbegriff, p. 374); but that Peter, in teaching what he could of the future manifestation of Christ, upon which he bases nearly all his exhortations to patience, self-control, and the discharge of all Christian duties. Yet there is not a shadow of opposition here; the topic is not neglected by Paul, nor does Peter omit the Pauline argument from Christ's sufferings, and his love for the Church, or the eschatological element predominates over all others. The apostle's mind is full of one thought, the realization of Messianic hopes. While Paul dwells with most earnestness upon justification by our Lord's death and merits, and concentrates his energies upon the Christian's present struggles, Peter fixes his eye constantly upon the future coming of Christ, the fulfilment of prophecy, the manifestation of the promised kingdom. In this he is the true representative of Israel, moved by those feelings which were so calculated to enkindle him to do his work as the apostle of the circumcision. Of the three Christian graces, hope is his special theme. He dwells much upon good works, but not so much because he sees in them necessary results of faith, or the complement of faith, or outward manifestations of the spirit of love, aspects most prominent in Paul, James, and John, as because he holds them to be tests of the soundness and stability of a faith which rests on the fact of the resurrection, and is directed to the future in the developed form of hope. Thus we know Peter to be a real representative of Judaism, his teaching, like that of Paul, is directly opposed to Judaizing tendencies. He belongs to the school, or, to speak more correctly, is the leader of the school, which at once vindicates the unity of the Law and the Gospel, and puts the superiority of the latter on its true basis, that of spiritual development. All his practical injunctions are drawn from Christian, not Jewish principles, from the precepts, example, life, death, resurrection, and future coming of Christ. The apostle of the circumcision says not a word in this epistle of the perpetual observance of the exact letter of the Mosaic law. He is full of the Old Testament; his style and thoughts are charged with its imagery, but he contemplates and applies its teaching in the light of the Gospel; he regards the privileges and glory of the ancient people of God entirely in their spiritual development in the Church of Christ. Only one who had been brought up as a Jew could have had his spirit so impregnated with those thoughts; only one who had been thoroughly emancipated by the Spirit of Christ could have risen so completely above the prejudices and dogmas of his forefathers. As such, Peter has a strong resemblance to that of our Lord, in discourses bearing directly upon practical duties. The great value of the epistle to believers consists in this resemblance; they feel themselves in the hands of a safe guide, of one who will help them to trace the hand of their Master in both dispensations, and to confirm and expand their faith. But apart from the style and language of the epistle, objections have been brought against it by Schweger, who alleges the want of special occasion for writing it, and the consequent generality of the contents (Das Nach-apostol. Zeitalt. ii, 7). The reply is that the epistle bears upon its front such a purpose as well suits the vocation of an apostle. Nor is there in it, as we have seen, that want of individuality which Schweger next alleges. It bears upon it the stamp of its author's firm spirit; nor does its use of Old-Test. imagery and allusions belie his functions as the apostle of the circumcision (Wiesinger, Einl. p. 21). If there be the want of close connection of thought, as Schweger also asserts, is not this want of logical sequence and symmetry quite in keeping with the teachings of him who had been trained in no school of human learning? Nor is it any real difficulty to say that Peter in the East could not have become acquainted with the later epistles of Paul. For in various ways Peter might have known them, or have heard of them, and if he even had a resemblance to some of the earlier of them, there is little or none to the latest of them. Schweger holds that the epistle alludes to the persecutions under Nero, during which Peter suffered, and that therefore his writing it at Babylon is inconsistent with his martyrdom at the same period at Rome. The objection, however, takes for granted what is denied. It is a sufficient reply to say that the persecution referred to was not, or may not have been, the Neronic persecution, and that the apostle was not put to death at the supposed period. Of Nero's reign, there are no readings of the Mosaic law. He is full of the Old Testament; his style and thoughts are charged with its imagery, but he contemplates and applies its teaching in the light of the Gospel; he regards the privileges and glory of the ancient people of God entirely in their spiritual development in the Church of Christ. Only one who had been brought up as a Jew could have had his spirit so impregnated with those thoughts; only one who had been thoroughly emancipated by the Spirit of Christ could have risen so completely above the prejudices and dogmas of his forefathers. As such, Peter has a strong resemblance to that of our Lord, in discourses bearing directly upon actual persecution: the διαλογία (iii, 15) is not a formal answer to a public accusation, for it is to be given to every one asking it (Huther, Krutich-erzepisches Handbuch über das 1. Brief des Petrus, Einl., p. 27). The epistle in all its leading features is in unison with what it professes to be—a practical letter from one whose heart was set on the well-being of the churches, one who may have read many of Paul's letters and thanked God for them, and who, in addressing the churches himself, clothes his thoughts and words in language that is in perfect keeping with the want of any timid selection or refusal of words and phrases which others may have used before him.

II. Place and Time.—The place is indicated in v, 18, in the clause ἀντίστροφος ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ἐν Βαβυλώνι συνελεημένος. Babylon is named as the place where the apostle was.
when he wrote the epistle, as he sends this salutation from it, on the part of a woman, as Mayerhoff, Neander, Alford, and others suppose; or on the part of a Church, as is the opinion of the majority. It is remarkable, however, that from early times Babylon has been taken to be the seat of the Church in Egypt. This, however, is ascribed to Euæmius on report to Papias and Clement of Alexandria (Hist. Eccles. ii. 15). Jerome and Eusebius also held it. In later times it has been espoused by Grotius, Cave, Lardner, Hengstenberg, Windischmann, Wiesinger, Baur, Tischendorf, Schott (Imer. 1. Breviæ Pet. édition, p. 346; Erc Langen, 1861), and Hofmann (Schärfh. i. 201). But why discover a mystical sense in a name set down as the place of writing an epistle? There is no more reason for doing this than for assigning a like significance to the geographical name of what is written at Ephesus. How should his readers discover the Church at Rome to be meant by η εκκλησία in Babylon? And if Babylon do signify a hostile spiritual power, as in the Apocalypse (xviii. 21), then it is strange that Catholic critics as a body should adopt such a meaning here, and admit by implication the ascription of this character to their spiritual adversaries. Dr. Brown, of Edinburgh, puts a somewhat parallel case—"Our own city is sometimes called Athens from its situation, and from its being a seat of learning; but it would not do to argue that a letter came from Athens written to Athens" (Expository Discourses on 1st Peter, i. 540).

Some, again, think that Babylon may mean a place of that name in Egypt. Of this opinion are Le Clerc, Mill, Pearson, Pott, Burton, Creswel, and Hug. Strabo (Geog. xvii, 1, 50) calls it not a town, but a strong fortress built by refugees from Babylon, and a garrison for one of the three legions guarding Egypt. The opinion that this small encampment is the Babylon of our epistle has certainly little plausibility. It is equaly strange to suppose it to be Ctesiphon or Seleucia; and stranger still to imagine that the apostle, as is maintained by Cappellus, Spanheim, Hardouin, and Semler. The natural interpretation is to take Babylon as the name of the well-known city. We have indeed no record of any missionary journey of Peter to Chaldea, for but little of Peter's later life is given us in the New Testament. But we know that many Jews inhabited Babylon—as γὰρ βλάστη αἱ οἰκίαι, according to Josephus—and was not such a spot, to a great extent a Jewish colony or settlement, likely to attract the apostle of the circumcision? Lardner's principal argument, that it did not extend to the confines (1 Peter 1. 12, 13, 14) imply that Peter was within the bounds of the Roman empire, proves nothing; for as Davidson remarks—"The phrase 'the king,' in a letter written by a person in one country to a person in another, may mean the king either of the person writing, or of him to whom the letter is written." Granting that the Parthian empire had its own government, he is writing to persons in other provinces under Roman jurisdiction, and he enjoins them to obey the emperor as supreme, and the various governors sent by him for purposes of local administration. If these persons were observed, the countries of the persons addressed in the epistle (i. 1) are enumerated in the order in which a person writing from Babylon would naturally arrange them, beginning with those lying nearest to him, and passing in circuit to those in the east and the south, at the greatest distance from him. The natural meaning of the designation Babylon is held by Erasmus, Calvin, Beza, Lightfoot, Wieseler, Mayerhoff, Bengel, De Wette, Bleek, and perhaps the majority of modern critics.

But if Peter wrote from Babylon on the Euphrates, at what period was the epistle written? The epistle itself contains no materials for fixing a precise date. It does not by its allusions clearly point to the Neronian persecution; it rather speaks of evil and danger suffered now, but with more in prospect. Suffering was endured and was also impending, and yet those who lived a quiet and blameless life might escape it, though certainly trials for righteousness' sake are implied and virtually predicted. About the year 60 the dark elements of Nero's character began to develop themselves, and after this epoch the epistle was written. The churches addressed in it were still stormy, for they were planted therefore thought by some that Paul must have been deceived ere Peter would find it his duty to address them. Paul was put to death about A.D. 64; but such a date would be too late for our epistle, as time would not, on such a hypothesis, be left for the apostle's going to Rome, according to old tradition, and for his martyrdom in that city. It may be admitted that Peter would not have intruded into Paul's sphere had Paul been free to write to or labor in the provinces specified. Tell it may be supposed that Paul may have withdrawn to some more distant field of labor, or may have been suffering imprisonment at Rome. Davidson places the date in 68; Alford between 68 and 67. If the Mark of v. 18 be he of whom Paul speaks as being with him in Rome (Col. iv. 10), then we know that he was preparing an immediate journey to Asia Minor; and we learn from 2 Tim. iv. 11 that he had not returned when this last of Paul's epistles was written. It is surely not impossible for him to have gone in this interval to Peter at Babylon; and as he must have personally known the bishops addressed by Peter, his ascension was naturally included by the apostle. Silvanus, whom the epistle was sent— if the same with the Silvanus mentioned in the greetings 1 Thess. i. 1; 2 Thess. i. 1—seems to have left Paul before the epistles to Corinth were written. He may have in some way become connected with Peter, and, as the Silvanus of the Acts, he was acquainted with many of the churches to whom this epistle was sent. The terms a faithful brother as I suppose (the faithful brother as I reckon) do not imply any doubt of his character, but are only an additional recommendation to one whose companionship with Paul must have been known in the provinces enumerated by Peter.

But Schweger ascribes the epistle to a later period— to the age of Trajan; and of course denies its apostolic authorship (Nach-apostol, Zöllnler, ii. 22). The arguments, however, for so late a date are very inconclusive. He first of all assumes that its language does not tally with the facts of the Neronian persecution, and that the tone is unimpassioned—that Christians were charged with definite crime under Nero—that his persecution was universal, and not, as this epistle supposes, conducted by regular processes, and that the general condition of believers in Asia Minor, as depicted in the epistle, suits the age of Trajan better than that of Nero. The reply is obvious—that the tranquility of tone in this epistle would be remarkable under any persecution, for it is that of calm, heroic endurance, which trusts in an unseen arm, and has hopes undimmed by death; that the persecution of Christians simply for the name which they bore was not an irrational ferocity peculiar to Trajan's time; that the interest in the provinces of Asia Minor is most popular fury and irregular magisterial condemnation; that there is no allusion to judicial trial in the epistle, for the word σωτερίασι does not imply it; and that the sufferings of Christians in Asia Minor as referred to or predicted do not agree with the recorded facts in Pliney's letter, for according to it they were by summary investigation and sentence doomed to death (Huther, Einleit, p. 28). The persecutions referred to in this epistle are rather such as Christians have always to encounter in heathen countries from an ignorant mob easily stirred to violence, and whose civil powers, if they are not used to toleration in theory, is yet swayed by strong prejudices, and prone, from position and policy, to favor and protect the dominant superstition.

Supposing this epistle to have been written at Babylon, it is a probable conjecture that Silvanus, by whom it was transmitted to those churches, had joined Peter
after a tour of visitation, either in pursuance of instructions from Paul, then a prisoner at Rome, or in the capacity of a minister of high authority in the Church, and that his account of the condition of the Christians in those districts determined the apostle to write the epistle. From the absence of personal salutations, and other indications, it is inferred that Peter had not hitherto visited the churches; but it is certain that he was thoroughly acquainted both with their external circumstances and spiritual state. It is clear that Silvanus is not regarded by Peter as one of his own associates, but as one whose personal character he had sufficient opportunity of divination (v. 12). Such a testimonial as the apostle gives to the soundness of his faith would of course have the greatest weight with the Asiatic Christians, to whom the epistle appears to have been specially, though not exclusively, addressed. The assumption that Silvanus was employed in the composition of the epistle is not borne out by the expression "by Silvanus I have written unto you," such words, according to ancient usage, applying rather to the bearer than to the writer or amanuensis. Still it is highly probable that Silvanus, considering his rank, character, and services, would be welcomed by the churches, and with their great apostle and founder, would be consulted by Peter throughout, and that they would together read the epistles of Paul, especially those addressed to the churches in those districts: thus, partly with direct corroboration, partly in accordance with the view of Augustine, Luther, Wetstein, Steiger, Brucker, Mayerhoff, Wiesinger, Neander, Reuss, Schaff, and Huther. Reuss (p. 138) takes ταύτας and ταυτίζων as = διασφάλιζα, Israelites by faith, not by ceremonial observance. See also Weiss, Der Petrinische Lehrbrief, p. 28, n. 2.

IV. Design, Contents, and Characteristics.—The objects of the epistle, as deduced from its contents, coincide with the above assumptions. They were: 1. To comfort and strengthen the Christians in a season of severe trial. 2. To enforce the practical and spiritual duties involved in their calling. 3. To warn them against special temptations attached to their position. 4. To remove all doubt as to the soundness and completeness of the religious system which they had already received. Such an attestation was especially needed by the Hebrew Christians, who were wont to appeal from Paul's authority to that of the elder apostles, and above all to that of Peter. The last, which is perhaps the very principal object, is kept in view throughout the epistle, and is distinctly stated (v. 12).

These objects may come out more clearly in a brief analysis. The epistle begins with salutations and a general description of Christians (i, 1, 2), followed by a statement of their present privileges and future inheritance (v. 3, 4). View of themselves and their conduct under persecution (ver. 6-9); reference, according to the apostle's wont, to prophecies concerning both the sufferings of Christ and the salvation of his people (ver. 10-12); and exhortations based upon those promises to earnestness, a variety, hope, obedience, and holiness, as results of knowledge of redemption, of stone-ment by the blood of Jesus, and of the resurrection, and as proofs of spiritual regeneration by the Word of God. Peculiar stress is laid upon the cardinal graces of faith, hope, and brotherly love, each connected with and resting upon the spiritual life of the Epistle (ver. 13-25). Absence from the spiritual sins most directly opposed to those graces is then enforced (ii, 1); spiritual growth is represented as dependent upon the nourishment supplied by the same Word which was the instrument of regeneration (ver. 2), and constitutes the change of metaphor, Christians are represented as a spiritual house, collectively and individually as living stones, and royal priests, elect, and brought out of darkness into light (ver. 4-10). This portion of the epistle is singularly rich in thought and expression, and furnishes the peculiar characteristics of Peter's epistle, in which Judaism is spiritualized, and finds its full development in Christ. From this condition of Christians, and more directly from the fact that they are thus separated from the world, pilgrims and sojourners, Peter deduces an-
tire system of practical and relative duties, self-control, care of reputation, especially for the sake of Gentiles; submission to all constituted authorities; obligations of slaves, urged with remarkable earnestness, and founded upon the example of Christ's own servitude (Eph. 6:5-9; Col. 3:18-20) and duties of wives and husbands (iii, 1-7). Then generally all Christian graces are commended, those which pertain to Christian brotherhood, and those which are especially needed in times of persecution, gentleness, forbearance, and submission to injury (ver. 8-17): all the precepts being based on imitation of Christ, with warnings from the history of the deluge, and with special reference to the baptismal covenant. In the following chapter (iv, 1, 2) the analogy between the death of Christ and spiritual mortification, a topic much dwelt upon by Paul, is urged with special reference to the sins committed by Christians before conversion, and habitual to the Gentiles. The doctrine of a future judgment is inculcated, both with reference to their heathen persecutors as a motive for endurance, and to their own conduct as an incentive to sobriety, watchfulness, fervent charity, liberality in all external acts of kindness, and diligent discharge of all spiritual duties, with a view to the glory of God through Jesus Christ (ver. 8-11). This epistle appears at the first draught to have terminated here with the doxology, but the thought of it was not finished. Of course the Corinthians were exposed to the apostle's heart, and suggests additional exhortations. Christians are taught to rejoice in partaking of Christ's sufferings, being thereby assured of sharing his glory, which even in this life rests upon them, and is especially manifested in their innocence and endurance of persecution: judgment must come first to cleanse the house of God, then to reach the disobedient: suffering according to the will of God, they may commit their souls to him in well-doing as unto a faithful Creator. Faith and hope are equal qualifications for the soul's redemption, and then (v, 1-4) addresses the preachers of the churches, warning them as one of their own body, as a witness (μαρτυρίας) of Christ's sufferings, and partaker of future glory, against negligence, covetousness, and love of power; the younger members he exhorts to submission and humility, and concludes this part with a warning against their spiritual enemy, and a solemn and most beautiful prayer to the God of all grace. Lastly, he mentions Silvanus with special commendation, and states very strongly the condition of the Corinthians in their profession from the heathen amusements and dissoluteness in which they had mingled prior to their conversion (iv, 4, 5). They are exhorted to bear suffering patiently, and ever to remember the example, and endure in the spirit, of the Suffering One—the Righteous One who had suffered for them. While affliction would come upon them in the present time, they are ever encouraged to look with joyous anticipation to the future. Peter indeed might be called the apostle of hope. Doctrine and conclusion alike assume this form. The "inheritance" is future, but its hope is in the present (ver. 2, 3, 8, 4). Their tried faith is found unto glory "at the appearance of Jesus Christ" (i, 7). The "end" of their faith is "salvation" (i, 9), and they are to "hope to the end for the grace to be brought at the revelation of Jesus Christ" (i, 13). Their ruling emotion is therefore "holy fervor" (iii, 13), which "holy" or "righteous" is now, and is to be, the quality of the "fervent" (iv, 3, 2). Peter, however, over in reserve for them in the future, their time here is only a "sojourning" (i, 17); they were merely "strangers and pilgrims" (ii, 11); nay, "the end of all things is at hand" (iv, 7). Suffering was now, but joy was to come when his "glory shall be revealed" (v, 1). The "glory of God" (ii, 2), in the context, means his glory (i, 11; iv, 18): the same connection the apostle applies to himself, and to faithful ministers (v, 1-4). There are also allusions to Christ's words, or, rather, reminiscences of them mingle with the apostle's thoughts. Comp. i. 4 with Matt. xxv, 34; i. 8 with John xx, 29; i. 10 with Luke x, 24; i. 18 with Luke xii, 35; ii. 12 with Matt. v, 16; iii. 13-18 with Matt. v, 16, x, 28; v. 6 with Matt. xxxiii, 12, etc.

There were apparently some tendencies in those churches that required reproof — some temptations against which they needed to be warned, as "former lusts," "fleshy lusts" (i, 14, 11); dark and envious feelings (ii, i, iii, 8, 9); love of adornment on the part of women (iii, 3); and ambition and worldliness on the part of Christian teachers (v, 1-4). God's gracious and tender relationship to his people was not to be taken for granted. His grace was the product of the old covenant, and Peter reproduces it under the new in its closer and more spiritual aspects (ii, 9, 10; iv, 17; v, 2). The old economy is neither eulogized nor disparaged, and no remark is made on its abolition, the reasons of it, or the good to the world springing out of the thing. The distinction of the Church of God, as believers is not even glanced at. In the apostle's view it had passed away by its development into another and grander system, one with it in spirit, and at the same time the realization of its oracles and types. His mind was sated with O.T. imagery and allusions, but they are freely applied to the spiritual Israel, which, having always existed within the theocracy, had now burst the national barriers, and was to be found in all the believing communities, whatever their lineages or countries. To him the Jewish economy was neither supplanted by a rival faith nor succeeded by a new system of thought. Israel had only put off its ceremonial, the badge of its immutability and servitude, and now rejoiced in freedom and predicted blessing. What was said of the typical Israel may now be asserted with deeper truth of the spiritual Israel. But the change is neither argued from premises laid down nor vindicated against Jews or Judaeans, and the results of the new condition are not held up as matter of formal congratulation; they are only seized and put forward as recognised grounds of joy, patience, and hope. The Redeemer's Spirit was to be believed in Messiah; so Peter rejoices in that appellation, calling him usually Jesus Christ, and often simply Christ (i, 11; ii, 21; iii, 16-18; iv, 1, 18, 14); and it is remarkable that in nearly all those places the simple name Christ is used in connection with his sufferings, to the idea of which the Jew still clung and had been so long accustomed. The centre of the apostle's theology is the Redeemer, the medium of all spiritual blessing. The relation of his expiatory work to sinners is described by ὑπάρχει (i, 12; iii, 16); or it is said he bore our sins—τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν ἐπηρεάσθη—or died in place of us. The "great census of the blood" and the "Lamb without spot" were the fulfillment of the old economy, and the grace and salvation now enjoyed were familiar to the prophets (i, 10). Christ who suffered is now in glory, and is still keeping and blessing his people. In fine, the object, as told by the author (v, 12), is essentially twofold. "I have written briefly, exhorting (πρῶτον ἐπιτίμησα) and the epistle is hortatory—not didactic or polemical; and testifying (κατατίμησα) that this is the true grace of God wherein ye stand." The epistle contains much advice that could not be doc- trine imparted through the apostle's personal teaching. Some of the fathers, indeed, affirm that Peter visited the provinces specified in this epistle. Origen gives it as a probable conjecture; and Eusebius says that the countries in which Peter preached the doctrine of the resurrection appear from his own writings, and may be seen from this epistle. The assertion has thus no basis, save in
the idea that Peter must have preached in the churches
to which he sent an epistle. Jerome repeats the state-
ment, and Epiphanius, as his wont is, intensifies it; but
it is certain that not the Apostles, but other persons,
distinguish himself from "them that have preached the
Gospel unto you" (1, 12). So that the "true grace" in which those churches stood was the
Gospel which they had heard from others, and espe-
cially from Paul, by whom so many of them had been
founded. The epistle, then, becomes a voucher for the
genuineness of the Gospel preached in Asia Minor by
the apostle of the uncircumcision. Not that, as Schwag-
ler supposes, it attempts to mediate between James and
Paul; for it proclaims the same truths, touching the
peculiar without vehemence, and the barriers without innu-
dation of Paul's distinctive forms, or any modification of
Peter's as given in his oral addresses—both being in
inner harmony, and differing only in mode of presenta-
tion, caused by mental diversity, or suggested by the
peculiar circumstances, tendencies, or dangers of some
of the churches which were warned or addressed.

V. Style.—The epistle is characterized by its fervor.
The soul of the writer stamped its image on its thoughts
and words—ποιησις γρηγορος is the eulogy of Chrys-
sotom. The epistle bears his living impress in his pro-
found and strong language, expressing an apostolic thou-
thought. He was never languid or half-hearted in
what he said or did, though the old impatience is chas-
tened; and the fire which often flashed up so sud-
denly is more equable and tranquil in its glow. He is
rare without vehemence, and the barriers without in-
 outspokenness or abruptness. The epistle is throughout
hortative, doctrine and quotation being introduced as
forming the basis or warrant, or as showing the neces-
sity and value of practical counsel or warning. There
is in it little of local or temporal; it suited the
Church of all lands and ages; for between are always
in the present time "strangers and sojourners," with
their gaza fixed on the future, exposed to trial and
borne through by hope. The apostle infuses himself
himself into the epistle, portrays the emotions which swayed
and cheered him, as he reveals his own experience,
which had been shaped by his past and present fellow-
ship with a suffering and glorified Lord. What he
unfolds or describes never stands apart as a theme by
itself to be wrought out and argued; nor is it lifted as if to
a lofty summit, and then be far removed from us afar; but
all is kept within familiar grasp, and inwrought into
the relations, duties, and dangers of everyday Christian
existence. The truths brought forward are treated not
in themselves, but in their immediate bearing on duty,
trial, and hope; are handled quite in the way which
one would deal with food and air and fire in their essential
connection with life.

The language, though not rugged, is not without
embarrassment. Ideas are often linked together by a
relatively pronoun. There is no formal development of
thought, though the order is lucid and logical. Some
word employed in the previous sentence so dwells in
the writer's mind that it suggests the sentiment of the
following one. The logical formulas are wanting—οδοι not
preceding an inference, but introducing a practical
imperative from τας γονατισμοις, yam be rendered a reason, but
prefacing a motive conveyed in some fact or quotation
from Scripture. Thoughts are reintroduced, and in
terms not dissimilar. What the apostle has to say, he
must say in words that come the soonest to an unprac-
ticed pen. In short, we may well suppose that he wrote
more of the present of the injunction long given to him—
"When thou art converted, strengtheneth thy brethren;" and
this divine mandate might be prefixed to the
epistle as its motto.

V. Commentaries.—The following are special exegeti-
cal and historical commentaries: Ep. Petri (in Bibi. Max. Patr. v; and Galland. Bibl. Patr. vi); Bede, Expositio (in Opp. v); Luther, Ause-
gnus (1st Ep., Vitaebl. 1235, 4to; with 2d Ep., ibid. 1234,
4to and 8vo, and later; also in Lat. and Germ. eds. of his
works; in English, Lodi. 1581, 4to); Bibliander,
Commentarius (Basel. 1536, 8vo); Laurence, Schola (Amst. 1641; Genes. 1642; with notes by James and James I and John) (Lupini. 1555, 8vo); Weller, Emiar-
ratio (Leips. 1557, 8vo); Selnecker, Commentaria (Jen. 1567, 8vo); Feuardent, Commentarius (Par. 1600, 8vo);
Winkelmann, Meditationes (Frank. 1625, 4to); Aesop, Explo-
catio (Amst. 1635, 1645, 8vo; in English, Lond. 1641,
8vo); Byfield, Sermons [on i-iii] (Lond. 1637, fol.); Ger-
hard, Commentarius (ed. fil. Jen. 1641, 4to, and later);
Nisabet, exposition (Edinb. 1658, 8vo); Goltz, Verki-
rangie (Amst. 1869, 1890, 1721, 2 vols. 4to); Antonius, Ver-
klarung (Amst. 1700, 8vo); Neun, Untersuchung (Amsterdam. 1702, 8vo); Lange, Exegesis (Halle. 1712, 4to, and later); Stress, Meditations (Amst. 1717, 4to); Boyson, Erklär. (Halle. 1775, 8vo); Schirmer, Erklär. (Bresl. and Leips. 1779,
4to); Selmer, Poraphora [in Latin, 1700, 8vo]; Baumgartel, Amserk. (Leips. 1788, 8vo); Morsus, Praelectiones [includ. James], ed. Douat (Leips. 1794, 8vo); Hottinger, Commentariae [includ. 1 Pet.] (Leips. 1815, 8vo); Eisenmischl, Erklär. (Romineb. 1824,
8vo); Mayer, Erklär. (Frank. 1825, 8vo); Hermann, dischmann (Rom. Cat.), Vindiciae (Ratisb. 1836, 8vo);
Schilchtorff, Entwickelung (Stuttgart. 1836 sq., 2 pts.
8vo); Demarest, Exposition (N. Y. 1851-55, 2 vols. 8vo);
Wiesinger, Erklär. [includ. Jude] (Königsb. 1856-62,
2 vols. 8vo); Besser, Austeg. (3d ed. Halle. 1857, 12mo);
8vo); Lillie, Lectura (Lond. and New York, 1869, 8vo).
There are also articles on the authorship of the two
epistles by Rauch, in Winer's Krit. Journ. 1829, p. 385
sq.; by Seyler, in the Thol. Stud. u. Krit. 1832, p. 44
sq.; by Bleek, ibid. 1839, 1-2 sq.; by J. Q. in Kittel's
Journ. of Soc. Lit., Jan. and July, 1861; by Baur, in the
619; and 1865, p. 235. See Epistle.

The following are on the first epistle exclusively:
Hessey, Commentarius (Lorcan. 1586, 8vo); Schottan,
Commentarius (Franck. 1844, 4to); Rogers, exposition
(Lond. 1850, fol.); Leightoun, Commentary (Lond. 1859,
2 vols. 8vo, and later); Van Alphen, Erklär. (Utr. 1734,
4to); Klemm, Anaxocriis (Tub. 1748, 4to); Walker,
Erklär. (Hanov. 1760, 4to); Mohlenhagen, Erklär.
(Hamb. n. d., 8vo); Herder, Commentary (Tub. 1798,
8vo); Steiger, Auseg. (Berlin. 1832, 8vo; in English,
Edinb. 1836, 2 vols. 8vo); Locourel, Prem. Ep. de 
P. (Genev. 1839, 8vo); Brown, Discourses (2d ed. Edinb.
1849, 2 vols. 8vo, ibid. 1866, 3 vols. 8vo, N. Y. 1860,
8vo); Kohlbredge, Predigten [on ch. ii and iii] (Leips. 1850,
8vo; in English, Lond. 1854, 8vo). See Commentary.

PETER, Second Epistle of, follows immediately the
other but it presents questions of far greater diffi-
culty than the former. See ANTILEGOMEN.

1. Comenial Authority.—The genuineness of this
second epistle has long been disputed, though its author
himself calls it "Simon Peter," ὁ δολαρικακαι ἀντίστοιχος,
"a servant and an apostle of Jesus Christ."

2. History of Opinion.—It is hard to say whether the
alleged questions from it by the fathers and other
quotations, or are only, on the one hand, allusions to the
O. T., or, on the other, the employment of such phrases
as had grown into familiar Christian commonplaces.
Thus Clement of Rome, in his First Epistle to the
Coomhrians (ch. vii), says of Noah, ἦσυς ἐν παρθένων;
and of those who were in Gnosticism, ἦσυς ἐν παρθέ
as the double-minded, "a seeming reminiscence of Jan.
i, 5: but he adds, "We are grown old, and none of those
things have happened to us" (γεγενανται και οἴδατ).
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found in the Feschito, though the Philokletian version has it, and Ephrem Syrus accepted it. The canon of Muratori has it not, and Theodore of Mopsuestia rejected it. But it was received by Athanasius, Philastrius, Cyril, Rufinus, and Augustine. Gregory of Nazianzum, in his Carmen 38, refers to the seventh catholic epistles. It was adopted by the Council of Latium in a dicta lapidaria, and by the Council of Carthage, 397. From that period till the Reformation it was acknowledged by the Church. Not to refer to other quotations often given, it may suffice to say, that though the epistle was doubled, it usually had a place in the canons; the objections against it were not historical, but critical in nature, and had their origin apparently among the Alexandrian scholars; and that in one case at least, that of Cosmas Indicopleustes, doctrinal prepossessions led to its rejection. Gregory, at the end of the 6th century, seems to allude to others whose hostility to it had a similar origin, adding, "Si ejusdem epistola verba senserem voluisset, longe aliter sentire potuerant." (See Olhausen, Opuscula, where the citations are given at length.) The old doubts about the epistle were revived at the time of the Reformation, and the ancients were considered as a house—pietas verius legem in se habent; but the figure is different from that in 2 Pet. 1, 19, ὡς λόγῳ φαίνεται ἐν αὐθεντῷ τόπῳ—as a light shining in a dark place." Clement of Alexandria commented, we are told by Eusebius and Cassiodorus, on all the canonical Scriptures, Eusebius, and it is not denied, in a house—a καὶ τούτῳ καθόλου ἑπτακανώλαι (Hist. Eccles. vi, 14). But a second statement of Cassiodorus mentions expressly the first epistle of Peter, as if the second had been excluded, and adds, "2 and John and James," thereby also excluding Jude, which Eusebius, however, had distinctly named (De Institut. cap. viii). The testimony of Origen is no less liable to doubt, as it seems to vary. In the translation of Rufinus, who certainly was not a literal versionist, we find the epistle is less than three times referred to, one of them being the assertion, "Petrus enim duobus epistolarum aurum personam tabiit" (Hom. in, on Joshua). In Hom. in Leviticus, 2 Pet. 1, 3, is quoted, and in Hom. in Numbers, 2 Pet. 1, 14 is quoted. Somewhat in opposition to this, Origen, in his extant works in Greek, speaks of the first epistle as in τῇ καθάδειν εἰ.; nay, as quoted by Eusebius (Hist. Eccles. vi, 25), he adds that "Peter left one acknowledged epistle," adding—κάθως τοί καὶ ζώσαντος ἑμὸν βαθμίται γερ. This is not a formal denial of its genuineness, but is tantamount to it. Not that Peter left one acknowledged epistle in the Latin version. Yet in his letter to Cyprian he seems to allude to 2 Peter, and the warnings in it are хотелética (Cyprian, Opera, p. 126, ed. Paris, 1886). In a Latin translation of a commentary of Didymus on the epistle it is called falsa, non in canone. Now falsanare, according to Du Fresne in his thaumatur. med. et infin. Latinitalit, does not mean to interpolate, but to pro- nose as it were. Eusebius has placed this epistle among the αὐτολογίων (Hist. Eccles. iii, 25), and more fully be declares, "That called his second epistle we must believe to have been written by Judas Iscariot; but yet appearing to many to be useful it has been diligently studied with the other Scriptures." Jerome says explicitly, "Scriptis duabus epistolas ... quorum secunda a plerique eis esse negatio;" adding as the reason, "propter styli cum priore dissonantiam;" and ascrib follows this difference to a change of amansensia, diversa interpretum (De Scrip. Epist. cap. 1, epist. cxxv. ad Hidib. cap. xi). Methodius of Tyre makes two distinct allusions to a peculiar portion of the epistle (iii, 6, 7, 12, 13), the confusion and purification of the world (Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. ii, 28. ed. Theil, 1803. 298, ed. Oehler, 1800). Westcott (On the Canon, p. 57) points out a reference in the martyrdom of Ignatius, in which (cap. ii) the father is compared to "a divine lamp illuminating the hearts of the faithful by his exposition of the Holy Scriptures" (2 Pet. i, 19). The epistle is not
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The doubts as to its genuineness appear to have originated in the 2d century. Nevertheless the epistle itself was formally recognised at a very early period. Those doubts, however, were not quite so strong as they are now generally represented. The three greatest names of that school may be quoted on either side. On the one hand there were evidences external credentials, without which it could never have obtained circulation; on the other, strong subjective impressions, to which these critics attached scarcely less weight than some modern inquirers. They rested entirely, so far as can be ascertained, on the difference of style. Hence the question may be summed up under three heads. Many, as we have seen, reject the epistle altogether as spurious, supposing it to have been directed against forms of Gnosticism prevalent in the early part of the 2d century. A few consider that the first and last chapters were written by Peter or under his dictation, but that the second chapter was interpolated. So far, however, it is evident from these views that the general results of the latest investigations, that a majority of names, including nearly all the writers of Germany opposed to Rationalism, who in the 19th century declared it false, and between whose opponents may be quoted in support of the genuineness and authenticity of this epistle. The statement that all critics of eminence and impartiality concur in rejecting it is simply untrue, unless it be admitted that a belief in the reality of objective revelation is inconsistent with the use of the name Peter, indeed, the only common point between the numerous defenders of the canonicality of this document. If it were a question now to be decided for the first time upon the external or internal evidences still accessible, it may be admitted that it would be far more difficult to maintain this than any other document in the New Testament; but the judgment of the early Church is not to be reversed without far stronger arguments than have been adduced, more especially as the epistle is entirely free from objections which might be brought, with more show of reason, against others now all but universally received: it inculcates no new doctrine, bears on no controversies of post-apostolic origin, supports no hierarchical innovations, but is simple, earnest, devout, and eminently practical, full of the characteristic graces of Peter's preaching, if he be the author. The belief in Peter's authorship is based on the testimony of the church, in the 1st century, to the 5th century, with respect to the publication of this book, in reference to his own death—the same word being employed to denote Christ's death, τὸν Ἱησοῦν αὐτοῦ, this being the theme of conversation on the part of Moses and Elias (Luke ix, 31). Ullmann supposes the reference in the words εἴρηκαν εἰς ἐπίσκοπον ἀδιάκοπον (1 Pet. i, 18) to be to Mark's Gospel said to have been composed on Peter's authority; but the allusion seems to be to the paragraph immediately under his hand. It would have been a profane and daring impertinence for any one to denominate an apostle, and deliver to the churches a letter in his name, with so marked a reference to one of the most memorable circumstances and glories in the apostle's life. A forgery so glaring could make no pretense to inspiration—to be a product of the Spirit of Truth. The inspiration of the epistle is thus bound up with the question of its authenticity. If it is not the work of Peter it must be rejected altogether from the canon. The opinion of critics of what is called the liberal school, including all shades from Lichte to Baur, has been decidedly unfavorable, and that opinion has been adopted by this writer. But there are, however, very strong reasons why this verdict should be reconsidered. No one ground on which it rests is unassailable. The rejection of this book affects the authority of the whole canon, which, in the opinion of one of the keenest and least scrupulous critics (Heuse) of modern Germanism, is free from any other error. It is not a question as to the possible authorship of a work like that of the Hebrews, which does not bear the writer's name. The Church, which for more than fourteen centuries has received it, has either been imposed upon by imposters, or by what may be termed the peculiar device, or derived from it spiritual instruction of the highest importance. If received, it bears attestation to some of the most important facts in our Lord's history, casts light upon the feelings of the apostolic body in relation to the elder Church and to each other, and, while it confirms many doctrines generally inculcated, is the chief, if not the only, voucher for eschatological views touching the destruction of the framework of creation, which from an early period have been prevalent in the Church.

3. Objections.—There are serious difficulties, however, in the way of its reception; and these are usually said to be difference of style, difference of doctrine, and the marked correspondence of portions of the epistle with that of Jude. Yet Gassen makes the astounding state-
ment—"The two epistles when carefully compared reveal more points of agreement than difference," but he has not taken the trouble of noting them (On the Canon, p. 359). The employment of ὡς is different in the second epistle from the first. There, though it occurs only twice, the second occurrence is in a possessive of which ὡς has no such resonance, and its frequency makes it a characteristic of the style; but it occurs much more rarely in the second epistle, and usually, though not always, with a different meaning and purpose. The use of ἀλλὰ after a negative clause and introducing a positive one is common in the first epistle, but rare in the second. There are marked ὅπως λεγόμενα in the second epistle. The first and second epistles differ also in the use of ἔρχομαι. In the first epistle X stands in the majority of instances without the article and by itself, either simply I. X. or X. 1.; but in the second epistle it has usually some predicate attached to it (i, 1, 2, 8; iii, 14-16). The name Ἰωάς occurs nearly forty times in the first epistle, but only seven times in the second. Again, εὐεργ. is applied to Christ only once in the first epistle (i, 3), but in the second epistle it is a common adjective to other names of Christ. In the first epistle it is used especially toward the Father in all cases but one (i, 3), but in the second epistle it denotes the Son, in harmony with Peter's own declaration (Acts ii, 36; x, 36). The epithet σωτῆρ, so often applied to Christ in the second epistle, is not found in the first. The general state of things also expresses differently in the two epistles, ἀσκελαίωμα, or its verb, being used in the first epistle (i, 5, 7, 13; iv, 13; v, 1); or it is called τὸ τέλος πάντων (v, 7); or χρυσοὶ ἵππαι (i, 20). But in the second epistle it is called ἡμῶν εὐεργ. (ii, 9), χαρίσματα (iii, 4), φιλόν εὐεργ. (iii, 10), Ἰωάς Ἰωάς (iii, 12). These are certainly marked diversities, and it is difficult to offer a satisfactory explanation of them. It may, however, be replied that with the sacred writers the divine names are not used, as with us, without any prominent or distinctive meaning. In the first epistle the names are his common ones, the familiar ones in the mouths of all believers—for the writer brings into prominence the oneness of believers with him in suffering and glory; with him still as Jesus wearing his human name and his human nature with all its sympathies; as the Christ who, as the Father's servant, obeyed, suffered, and was crowned, the Spirit that anointed him still being "the unction from the Holy One" to all his people. In the second epistle the writer has in view persons who are heretics, rebellious, dissolute, false teachers: and in what he says he appeals to the authority and lordship of the Saviour, which it was so awful to contemn and so vain to oppose. If the last day be set in different colors in the two epistles, the difference may be accounted for on the same principle: for those suffering under trial shines afar as the hope that sustains them, but to those who are perverse it presents itself as the time of reckoning which should alarm them into believing submission.

The aspects under which the Gospel is represented in this second epistle differ from those in the first. The writer lays stress on ἵστασις, or ἐνίγμα (i, 2, 3, 5, 8; ii, 20, 11; iii, 18). In this epistle the Gospel is generally Ἰσραήλ ἐνίγμα και παρώνευσιν (i, 16), ἀδέλφῃ τῆς διακοσμησίας (ii, 21), ἄγια ἐννοια, etc.; whereas the first epistle throws into prominence ἐνίατος, σωτηρία, οἰκονομία, ἀπάτης Ἰ. X. ὁδός (i, 10) ἀλληλεία (i, 22), λόγος (ii, 8), πίστει, etc. The reason may be ventured that the persons addressed in the second epistle were in danger of being tempted into error; and that a definite and progressive knowledge of Christianity was the safeguard of those who were floating around them. On this account, too, we have allusion suggested and pointed by their perilous circumstances, "to make their calling and election sure" (i, 10; iii, 14); nay, the purpose of the epistle seems to be given in iii, 17: "Ye therefore, beloved, knowing beforehand, that the Lord's day is near, being led away with the error of the lawless, ye fall away from your own steadfastness; but grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." The ἵστασις is the grand theme of counsel and the real prophylactic presented, for it embodies itself in that δικαιοσύνη on the one hand the possession of which is the basis of all the allusions to Noah and Lot, and to the want of which are traced in contrast the judgment of the flood and the fate of the sodomites, the selfish character of Balaam, and the dark and deceitful ways and words of the false teachers. There is also a characteristic difference in the mode of quotation from the O. T. Quotations are abundant in the first epistle, either formally introduced by ὄριον γιργασταί (i, 16), or by διὰ πάντων ἐν τῇ γραφῇ (ii, 6), or are woven into the discourse without any prefatory statement, as if writer and readers were equally familiar with them (i, 24; iii, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 22, 24, 26; iii, 9, 10, 11, 16). But in the second epistle quotations are unfrequent, though we have Παλ. x, 4 in iii, 8, and Παλ. ix, 17 in iii, 18. Of a different kind are the allusions to Noah and the flood, to Lot and Sodom, and to Balaam. But we may still explain that the modes of handling, and applying the O. T. look not the same. The writer has been no use made of the O. T. at all; but a third of this epistle consists of references to the O. T. or to warnings drawn from it.

The peculiarity of a similar nature of a large portion of this epistle to that of Jude has often been commented on. The second chapter and a portion of the third are so like Jude that the resemblance cannot be accidental, for it is found in words as well as in thoughts. It has been conjectured by some that both borrowed from a common source. Bishop Sherlock supposed that this source was some ancient pseudo apostolic letter had not been used by Jude, and that Jude had used the epistle of Peter as well as this old authority (Use and Intent of Prophecy, Dissert. i, 200, Lond. 1725). Herder and Hasse, holding this theory, conjecture the document common to both writers to be the Zendavesta. This opinion has no foundation, and relies us of no difficulty. Others imagine that Jude followed Peter, and several reasons have been alleged in favor of this opinion by Mill, Michaelis, Storr, Dahl, Wordworth, Thiem, Heydenreich, Hengstenberg, and Gaussen. Their general argument is that Jude is dealing with the same class of false teachers, than Jude refers to prophecies which are found only in Peter. But it is really doubtful if both epistles refer to the same class of errorists. Those described by Peter are rather speculative, though their immoral practices are also noted, while those branded by Jude are specially marked as libertines and sensualists, whose life has pervaded and undermined their creed. Others again hold that Peter took from Jude; such is the view of Hug, Eichhorn, Credner, Neander, Mayerhoff, De Wette, Guericke, and Bleek. One among these is no small force. The composition of Jude is the simpler and briefer, and Peter's the more ornate and amplified; that Jude's is more pointed and Peter's more indefinite; and that some allusions in Peter are so vague that they can be understood only by a comparison with Jude (comp. 2 Pet. i, 4 with Jude 6; 2 Pet. ii, 11 with Jude 9). Thus Peter says, generally, "Angels bring not railing accusations;" Jude gives the special instance, Michael and Satan. Peter speaks of the "angels that sinned;" Jude says more precisely, they "kept not their own矜." It is not difficult to see that Jude has followed Peter and that Peter, relying on the truthfulness of the statement, made his own use of it without hesitation when he had
occasion to refer to the same or a similar class of pernicious subverters of truth and purity. This hypothesis is scarcely probable, and it is more likely that Peter had read the epistle of Jude, and reproduced in his own epistle and in his own way its distinctive clauses, which must have deeply impressed him, but with such differences as the same time as show that he was no mere copyist. Is it unworthy of an apostle to use another writing divinely authorized, and can Peter’s appropriation of so much of Jude’s language be stigmatized, as by Reuss, as “a palpable plagiarism”? Thus Jude uses the phrase “contrast without water,” this figure being more suited to his immediate purpose. The συμβαλλεις of Jude 12 was from reminiscence of sound before Peter’s mind, but it is changed of purpose into συγκρις: and Jude’s phrase τις αὐθέντη τεταρτάλλος becomes in the same connection in Peter τις πρὸς αὐθεντην αὑραν. 2 Pet. ii, 17 shows a like similarity and difference compared with Jude 18. The claim of originality thus lies on the side of Jude, while original thinking characterizes Peter’s use of Jude’s terser and minuter diction. There is no ground for Bertholdt’s suggestion that Peter quotes this passage; compare for Ullmann’s, to refer both second and third chapters to a post-apostolic period; or for Lange to brand as spurious the whole of the second chapter with the last two verses of the first chapter, and the first ten verses of the other; or for Bunsen to receive only the first twelve verses and the concluding doxology (Bertholdt, Einleitung in d. N. T. vol. vi; Ullmann, Der zweite Brief Petri, Lange, Apostol. Zeitabl., i, 135; and in Herzog’s Encyklop. s. v.; Bunsen, Ignatius von Antiochien, p. 175).

Other more specific objections against the epistle may be briefly alluded to. According to Mayerhoff (Einleitung, p. 187), the writer in iii, 2 separates himself from the apostles; Bleek (Einleitung, p. 576) and others suppose that he intended to characterize himself as an apostle, and hence his pronouns express the same uncertainty regarding the apostles of Jude, he so far altered it, but in the alteration has failed to give lucid utterance to the purpose. The phrase, with the double genitive και τῆς τοῦ αὐθέντη τεταρτάλλος ἡμῶν ἡ ἀναγέννησθαι τῆς ἐκκλησίας, naturally means, “and the commandment of the Lord given by your apostles.” The pronoun ἡμῶν is the best-supported reading, and the English version does violence to the position of the words. As Olshausen and Windischmann have shown, the use of ἡμῶν does not exclude Peter, even though it were rendered “the commandments of your apostles of the Lord.” It is rather their emphatic employment of apostleship; though if ἡμῶν had been employed, and the phrase rendered “our apostles,” the conclusion against its genuineness would certainly have some weight. But this objection that the writer excludes himself from the apostles neutralizes another, to wit, that the writer betrays too great anxiety to show himself as the apostle Peter. He could not certainly do both in the same document without stultifying himself. Does not the apostle Paul when it serves his object use pointedly the first person singular, refer to himself, and separate himself from apostles and other divines in a period of apostles and epistles? Or is it not the case that the passage, if Peter had written it, he may with justice be said that the “fathers had fallen asleep.” But the scoffers referred to were probably Gnostics who never believed that event, or at all events spiritualized the truth of it away; and after one generation had passed they might use the language imputed to them; the Gnostic patriarchs, since whose decease uniformity has characterized all the processes and laws of nature. The Gnostic spiritualism which treated the resurrection as past early troubled the Church, and its disciples might cast ridicule on the faith and hopes of others in the challenge which Peter quotes. 2. It is said that the allusion to Paul’s epistles indicates a late date, as it supposes them to be collected in part at least, and calls them by the sacred name of γραφή (iii, 15, 16). But surely it may be granted that towards the close of Peter’s life several epistles of Paul
may have been brought together and placed in point of authority on the same level as the O.T.; and that other documents also—τὰς λοιπὰς γραφάς—already occupied a similar place. Whatever excesses be adopted, this is the general result. The writings of Paul, so well known, yet so little, while the coming of our Lord and the end of the world, and in these discussions "are some things hard to be understood." The allusion certainly presupposes a late age, and the writer, as he informs us, was very near his death. The date of Peter's death is not precisely known, and the common traditions concerning it may therefore be modified. As Alford says, a later date than the usual one may be assigned to it. Again, it is held, as by Neander, that the epistle, "holy mount," as applied to the hill of transfiguration, indicates a late period, for Zion only was so designated; and Mayerhoff affirms that the epistle suits Mount Zion alone. But the scene on which the glory of Jesus had been so displayed might many years afterwards be well called "holy" by one who was an eye-witness, when he referred to it as a proof and symbol of "the power and coming of the Lord and of his glory." Still, a partial reply may be given to objections based on difference of style and of doctrinal representation, it must in honesty be added that these differences are not all of them wholly accounted for. The style and matter, as a whole, are so unlike the first epistle, that one has considerable difficulty in ascribing both epistles to the same author. While there is similarity in some words or phrases, the spirit, tone, and manner of the whole epistle are widely diverse. Minute criticism may discover αὐτός λεγόμενον and αὐτός λέγων, and range them in this in the first epistle; but such minutiae do not hide the general dissimilitude. It may be argued, and the argument is not without weight, that a forger would have imitated the salient peculiarities of the first epistle. No one of ordinary critical discernment would have failed to attempt the reproduction of its characteristic features of style and thought. But the absence of such studied likeness is surely in favor of the genuineness. It may be added also that, as there are in the first epistle statements so peculiar to it as to be found nowhere else, so that coincidence marks the second epistle in the declarations of its third chapter. It would have been difficult in the second century to impose on the churches a second epistle forged in Peter's name, and so unlike in many points to his first. A direct imitation of his style might have deceived some of the churches by its obvious features of similitude, but the case is widely different when a writing so obviously unlike the first epistle won its way into circulation unchallenged in its origin and history. It was not doubted as at least being lying on critical grounds. Why did not Origen and others tell us of the time of its first appearance, and how and by whom it was placed in the canon? Possibly on such points they were ignorant, or at least they knew nothing that warranted suspicion. Still the evidence of manner between the two epistles remains, and perhaps one might account for it, as Jerome has hinted and Calvin has supposed, by the supposition that Peter dictated the epistle in Aramaic, and that the amanuensis was left to express the thoughts in his own forms and words; and then by considering those views for account of difference of topic, and the change of style may be ascribed to the Greek copyist and translator. If, moreover, we admit that some time intervened between the composition of the two works; that in writing the first the apostle was aided by Silvanus, and in the second by another, perhaps Mark; that the circumstances of the churches addressed by him were considerably changed, and that the second was written in greater haste, not to speak of a possible decay of faculties, the differences may be regarded as insufficient to justify more than hesitation in admitting its genuineness. The authority of the second epistle is retained more or less decidedly by Michaelis, Nitzsche, Fiirst, Augusti, Storr, Dahl, Hug, Heydenreich, Lardner, Windischmann, Gericking, Thiessier, Stier, Dietlein, Hofmann, Luthardt, Brückner, and Olshausen. Felsolemer and Davidson incline to the same side. These are great names; yet, though we agree with their opinion, we cannot venture to say, with Bonnet, that "of all the books of the N.T. which have been controverted at certain times, there is not one whose authenticity is so certain as that of the second epistle of Peter" (Note. Text., Intro. ii, 701, Genève, 1852).

II. Time, Place, Design, and Persons addressed.—When and where the epistle was written cannot be definitely known. The place was Rome in all probability; for Peter, after coming to Rome, did not, so far as we know, leave that city till his death. His death is usually placed in 64, but it may have been later, and this epistle was written just before it. Mayerhoff ascribes it to a Jewish-Christian of Alexandria about the middle of the second century. Huther places it in the last quarter of the first century or the beginning of the second.

The persons for whom the epistle is intended are "those who have obtained like precious faith with us"; and iii, 1 identifies them with those addressed in the first epistle. It is object that this epistle asserts that Peter had taught them in person—such not being the case with those addressed in the first epistle. But the phrase added—γρηγοροῦσαν ἑμῖν (16), "we made known unto you"—seems to refer not to oral discourse, but to various portions of the first epistle in which the coming of glory of Christ is brought out. The object of the epistle is to warn against false teachers, "bringing in damnable heresies," "denying the Lord that bought them," holding a peculiar demonology—covetous, sensual, and imperialist sapphires, the victims and propagators of Antinomian delusion. Probably they taught some early form of Gnosticistic error, which, denying the Lord's humanity and stoning death, ridiculed his second advent in man's nature, set aside the authority of law, and by this frontier justified itself in licentious impurity. The epistle is true to the spirit of the age, like the other, claiming divine basis for their teachings, and therefore the more able to shake the faith of others, and seduce them into perilous apostasy. Thus, in brief, as the writer himself describes it (iii, 17), his object is, first, warning, or to caution his readers against seduction: "Beware lest ye also, being led away with the error of the wicked, fall from your own steadfastness"—προσέχετε ἵνα ἑσεχθῆτε κατὰ τὴν ἐσχάτην ὡς ἡμεῖς οἱ κατηχήθητε ἀπὸ τῆς ἀληθείας τοῦ κυρίου ὑμῶν Παῦλου καὶ Μωυσῆ. For this χάρις and γνῶσις would fortify them and make them invincible against those assaults which so often succeeded with the unwaried who fell in their heedlessness, the graceless who trusted in their own strength, and the ignorant or half-informed, so liable from their spiritual knowledge to be imposed upon by any system that dealt in novel speculations, professed to unfold mysteries, or give license and warrant for lawless practices. The supposition of Grotius, that it was written in the days of the reign of Trajan, and to the elder Barnabas, bishop of Jerusalem, is without any probability, as Bertholdt has more than sufficiently shown. The arguments of Schwengler for its place as Rome, its date the end of the second century, and its purpose as an effort to conciliate Petrine and Pauline theological differences, are answered conclusively by Huther.
III. The contents of the epistle seem quite in accordance with its asserted origin. The customary opening salutation is followed by an enumeration of Christian blessings and exhortation to Christian duties, with special reference to the maintenance of the truth which had already been communicated to the Church (i, 1-18). Refuse the word of prophecy, that is the testimony of the Holy Ghost (14-21). The danger of being misled by false prophets is dwelt upon with great force (22-30), and the second chapter, with its covetousness and gross sensuality, combined with pretensions to spiritualism, in short all the permanent and fundamental characteristics of Antinomianism, are described; while the overthrow of all opponents of Christian truth is predicted (i, 1-29) in connection with prophecies touching the second advent of Christ, the destruction of the world by fire, and the promise of new heavens and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness. After an exhortation to attend to Paul's teaching, in accordance with the less explicit admonition of James (20, 15), the epistle closes with the customary ascription of glory to our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

IV. Commentaries.—Exegetical helps on the whole of this epistle exclusively are the following: Simon, Commentary (ibid. 1559, fol.), Smith, Commentaries (ibid. 1690, 4to); Durberhol, Erklärung (Amar. 1718, 4to); Nitzsche, Überschauung (Lips. 1765, 3vo); Flatt, Deutsch (Tit. 1786, 8vo); Dahl, De aliquote (E. [ibid. 1807, 4to]); Richter, De Origine, etc. [includ. Jude] (Vit. 1810, 8vo); Ulmann, Apostel (ibid. 1822, 8vo); Ohlhausen, De Integ. et Authent. etc. (Regiom. 1822-3, 4to; in English in the Bibl. Reps. July and Oct. 1863); Picot, Recherche, etc. (Genev. 1829, 8vo); Moutier, Autheur, etc. [includ. Jude] (Strass. 1829, 8vo); Delille, Authentique, etc. (ibid. 1835, 8vo); Magnuss, td. (ibid. 1835, 8vo); Heydlerich, Aekelthe, etc. (Herb. 1837, 8vo); Audemars, La 2e Ep. de P. (Genev. 1838, 8vo); Dumais, Introduction critique (Strass. 1845, 8vo); Brown, Discours [on ch. I] (Edinb. 1856, 8vo); Smith, Lectures (Lond. 1857, 8vo). See Peter, First Epistle of.

PETER OF ALCANTARA, St., was born in the place of which he wrote in 1499, at the university in Salamanca, and when sixteen years old became a Franciscan monk. In 1519 he became prior at Badajoz, and in 1524 priest. For seven years he lived in retirement, in 1538 he was made general-superior of his order in Estremadura. In 1556 he founded, with the consent of Julius III, a separate, reformed congregation, called the Observantia (q. v.), and assisted St. Theresa in her reforms of the Carmelites. He died in 1562, and was canonized in 1569. His work De oratione et meditatione was long and widely circulated. The De animi pace seu tranquillitate is not genuine. According to the legend, Peter walked on the sea by faith. In a picture in the Munich gallery, he not only walks himself, but a lay brother goes with him, whom Peter seems to encourage by pointing to heaven. See Acta Sanctorum, vol. viii.

PETER OF ALEXANDRIA (1), the first of that name in the list of bishops, and noted for the part he took against the Meleitan schism, was born in the 3d century. He was placed over the see of Alexandria after the death of Theonas, which occurred April 9, 800. Peter had not occupied the position quite three years when the persecution commenced by the emperor Diocletian, and continued during the reign of Constantine. Peter was obliged to hide himself, and died from one place to another, as we learn from a discourse said to have been delivered by him in prison, in which he states that he found shelter at different times in Mesopotamia, in Phoenicia, in Palestine, and in various islands.

conjectures that he was imprisoned during the reign of Diodorean or Maximian Galerius, but, if so, Peter must have obtained his release before the schism in the Egyptian churches. In 306 he assembled a council, which passed upon the misdeeds of Meletius, bishop of Lycopolis. This prelate, in publishing calumny against the Arians, and against the schism in the Church of Alexandria, which lasted 150 years. Peter was obliged to seek his safety in flight. In the ninth year of the persecution he was, suddenly and contrary to all expectation, again arrested by order of Maximin Daza, and, without any distinct charge being brought against him, was beheaded Nov. 29, 311. Eusebius speaks with the highest admiration of his piety and his attainments in sacred literature, and he is revered as a saint and martyr both in the Eastern and Western churches. His memory is now celebrated by the Latin and Greek churches on the 29th, except in Russia, where the more ancient computation, which placed it on the 25th, is still followed. Peter wrote several works, of which there are very scanty remains: (1.) Sermo de Pententia:—(2.) Sermo in Sanctum Pascha. These discourses are not extant in their original form, but are found in various writings. Peter, who in time of persecution had fallen away—fourteen of them from the Sermo de Pententia (λαγός ως παραπομπις), the fifteenth from the Sermo in Sanctum Pascha—are contained in all the Canonic Collections. Ancient writers of the early centuries, such as: Athanasius, 16. 6:3; Methodius the Confessor, Hesychius, 38, prolepticus (Basaio, 1560); in the Orthodoxophorata of Heroldus (ibid. 1556); and of Gryneus (ibid. 1569); in the first and second editions of De La Bigne's Bibliotheca Patrum (Paris, 1575 and 1589), and in the Cologne edition (1618). They are given also in the Concilia. It is only in some MSS. and editions that the separate source of the fifteenth canon is pointed out—(8.) Liber de Dei vindicata s. Deitate. There is a citation from this treatise in the Acta Concilii Episcopi; it occurs in the Actio prima, and a part of it is again cited in the De electione Curtii, which is given in the sequel of the Acta:—(4.) Homiliae de Adventu Sacerdotis s. Christi. A short citation from this occurs in the Latin version of the work of Leontius of Byzantium, Contra Nestorianos et Eutychianos, lib. 1:—(5. 6.) Two fragments, one described, Ex primo Sermone, de eo quod nec praesidentialis Animis nec cum passaret proprietis in Corpore missa est, the other as Ex Mystagogia quam fecit ad Ecclesiam cum Martyris Coronam suopsurisasset, are cited by the emperor Justinian in his Epistola ad Memmiam C. Theodorius adversus Originem, given in the Acta Concilii C. (Patrum, 1638, p. 716, col. 659, ed. Labbé; vol. iii, cols. 256, 257, ed. Hardouin). Another fragment of the same discourse is contained in the compilation Leonitii et Joannis Rerum Sacrarum lib. ii, published by Mai in the above-cited Collectio, iii, 85:—(7.) Epistola S. Petri Episcopi ad Ecclesiam Alexandrinam, noticing some irregular proceedings of the schismatic Meletius. This letter, which is very short, was published in a Latin version by Seipio Maffei in the third volume of his Observationis Letterariae (Verona, 1737-46, 6 vol. 12mo)—(8.10.) De uncle. A fragment of this letter, cited by Leonitis and Joannes, and published Mai by ibid. (p. 96). The published fragments of Peter's works, with few exceptions, are given in the fourth volume of Galland's Bibliotheca Patrum, p. 91, etc. See Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. vii, 32; viii, 18; ix, 6, in the second edition of: Anonymi, De schismate contra Arianos, c. 59; Ephippianis, L. c.; Concilia, L. c.; Cave, Hist. Lit. ad ann. 801, 1, 160 (Oxford ed. 1740-43); Tillemont, Mémoires, v. 436, etc.; Fabricius, Biblioth. Græc. ix, 816, etc.; Cellier, Hist. des Auteurs sacrés et des ecclésiastiques, part i, ch. 304. Petrus was obliged to hide himself, and died from one place to another, as we learn from a discourse said to have been delivered by him in prison, in which he states that he found shelter at different times in Mesopotamia, in Phoenicia, in Palestine, and in various islands.
man empire is the continuance of the Roman imperium (a view in very recent times espoused by Freeman in his Comparative Politics). All princes are subordinate to the emperor; the emperor is the subordinate of the pope, who has received his authority from God.

Peter of Antioch (2), the third patriarch of that name in the current tables of the occupants of that see, which commence with the apostle Peter, was born near the beginning of the 11th century. Contemporaries with Michael Cerularius, patriarch of Constantinople, and Leo of Achrydia, he associated with them in hostility to the Latin Church. According to Cave, Peter bitterly inveighed against the lives and doctrines of the Latin clergy, and especially against the addition of the word filioque to the creed; while, according to Le Quien, he preserved a more impartial tone, and showed everywhere "a disposition averse to schism." Peter obtained the patriarchate in the year 1058, and in the same year he sent synodical letters to the patriarchs of Alexandria, Jerusalem, and Constantinople, and to Pope Leo IX, signifying his accession. Cave states that he sent to the pope "a profession of his faith," but it is probable that he has applied this term to the synodal letter, of which a Latin version appears among the letters of Leo IX. Le Quien, who had in his possession the Greek text of these synodal letters, complains of the great discrepancy between the Greek text and the Latin version. Two letters of Peter are written in Greek, with a Latin version, in the Monumenta Ecclesiae Graecae of Cotelier (ii, 112, 145). The first is entitled Epistola ad Domumcun Domuam, and is an answer to Dominicus Graecius a Venetus, patriarch of Venice or Aqui-leia, whose letter to him, in the collection of the writings of Peter, precedes that of Peter; the second is addressed to Michael Cerularius (Epistola ad Michaelum Cerularium), and is preceded by a letter of Michael to Peter, to which it is the answer. A considerable part of this letter had already been published by Leo Allatius, in his De Consensu Ecclesiasticae Orient. et Occident. lib. iii, c. 12, § 4. There is extant in MS. at Vienna another letter of Peter, Petri Epistola ad Joannem Transman in Apu- lia Episcopum, relating to the matters in dispute between the Eastern and Western churches. See Cave, Hist. Lit. ab anno 1400, ii, 192; Oudin, Comment. de Scriptorib. et Scriptia Eccles. ii, 605; Lambec, Comment. de Biblioth. Casoriae; Le Quien, Oriens Christianus, ii, 754.

Peter (Pierre) of Baun (Lat. Petrus de Palma), general of the Dominicans, was born at Baune (county of Bourgogne) in the latter part of the 13th century. He was a partisan of the papal cause. Having early entered into the order of St. Dominic, he went from the convent of Chartres in 1291 to Paris, and there gave public lessons upon the Livre des Sentences of Pierre Lombard. In 1343 he was elected general of his order by a unanimous vote. He died in Paris March 1, 1345. He wrote Postilla in quattuor Evangelia, some copies of which are preserved at Basel and at Tours, and two Letters Encycliques, which have not been printed. See Quéfif et Echard, Scriptor. ord. Pradec. i, 614. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Génerale, xii, 198.

Peter (Pierre), son of Béchin, was a French historian, who died in the 12th century. It is supposed that he was canon of St. Martin of Tours. He wrote a history of France, which begins with the creation of the world and ends with 1137. For ancient times, it is a compilation from Eusebius, from St. Jerome, Isidore of Seville, Gregory of Tours; for modern times, from Frédéguier, St. Odon, etc. He was from this passage, relative to St. Martin of Tours, to the abbey of Cormery, and to the counts of Anjou, are not without interest. It has never been published entirely. Short fragments of it may be found in the Recueil de Duchesne (iii, 365-372), and in that of Bouquet (ii, vi, viii, x, xi, xii); but M. le marquis de Sade, in his part of it in his Chroniques de Touraine, after three
burn, and not honor, for that is a reproach to the sufferings of the Saviour. Peter of Bruys even maintained that the sinner was not instituted by Christ, and rite of perpetual observation; that he only once distributed his body and blood among his disciples. This expression is obscure; perhaps he meant to say that Christ had observed this rite once for all. He also rejected the mass and sacrifices for the dead. He found many followers, known as the Peterbrusites. Peter of Bruys was burned at St. Gilles on Still Friday, in 1124, in the Arelation diocese, by a mob, in an emeute caused by his preaching, and probably instigated by the Romish ecclesiastics. See Gieseler, Kirchengesch. vol. iii, pt. ii, p. 566; and Richard de Grand, Dogmengeschichte vol. iii, p. 51 sq.; Münzner, Dogmengeschichte. (edit. by Cobb), p. 299, 210. (J. H. W.)

Peter of Cellier (Petru Cellensis), a French prelate of some note, flourished in the second half of the 12th century. He was abbot at Montier la Celle from 1150; in 1162 he filled a like office at St. Remis, near Rheims; and in 1181 was made bishop of Chartres. He died in 1188. Peter of Cellier left mystical interpretations of the Scriptures, and letters to the popes and bishops and many princes, who highly esteemed him. He had reformatory ideas, and did not hesitate to express his ideas. His works have been published several times and published several times. One edition is by Sirmond (Par. 1613; Ven. 1729).

Peter of Chartres, a French ecclesiastic who flourished in the first half of the 10th century, died about 1089. The authors of the Histoire Littéraire de la France adhere to several works. We mention only Manuelis Ecclesiasticum, Manuelis de Mystere Ecclesiae, and Speculum Ecclesiae. This last treatise, which offers us curious details upon the origin and meaning of liturgical usages, is unpublished; but we indicate three manuscript copies in the Imperial Library of Saint-Victor, under the numbers 513, 724, 926. Number 923 has one chapter more than the other two. Jean Garet, canon of Louvain, Gesner, Posevin, and after them the authors of the Histoire Littéraire, designate also among the works of our chancellor a Paraphrase of the Psalms, likewise unpublished. There is, finally, in the library of Mont-Saint-Michel, Glosae in Job, severalum Petrum, cancellarium Cantuensem. See Gesner, Bibl. Universialis, p. 669; Posevin, Apparatus, ii, 286; Hist. Lit. de la France, vii, 841. Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Générale, x, 184.

Peter Cominus, an Italian prelate, was born in the latter part of the 11th century. He was raised to the archbishopric of Milan in 1110, having previously held some less important see. He was sent by pope Paschal II on a mission to the emperor Alexius I Comnenus, and engaged eagerly in the controversy on the procession of the Holy Spirit. His principal work is, Ad Imperatorum Dominum Alexium Comnenum Oratio, etc., designed to prove the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son as well as from the Father, published in the Grecia Orthodoxa of Allatius, 1, 879, etc. (Rome, 1652, 4to), and given in a Latin version by Baroni, Annal. Eccles. ad ann. 1116, vol. viii, etc.

Peter Chrysologus, St., an Italian prelate, was born at Imola, in the northern part of Italy, towards the close of the 4th century. He was educated by Corne- lius, a bishop, and received ordination as deacon from the same prelate, in 383. He was made abbot of Ravena by pope Sixtus III, who knew all his merit. He labored to reform several abuses which had been introduced into his diocese, and to extirpate the remnants of pagan superstition. In A.D. 448 St. Germain d'Auxerre having come to Ravena, he tried to co-operate with him with marks of the most profound veneration. Shortly afterwards the heresiarct Eutyches wrote to him complaining of the condemnation passed on him by Flavius of Constantinople, and Peter replied to him in
Peter the Dominican. See Peter Martyr.

Peter (Pierre) of Dresden, a German reformer, was born at Dresden in the latter part of the 14th century. Driven from that city for having spread the doctrines of the Vaudois, Pierre sought refuge in Prague, where, in order to subsest, he opened a small school for children. Some time after he attracted to himself one of his former disciples, in whom he published his opinions. Pierre inveighed especially against the communion in one kind. "To his influence," says Gillett, "is it to be attributed in large measure the origin of that discussion in respect to the communion of the cup which almost revolutionized Bohemia, and brought down upon it the energies of crusading Christendom."

He was evidently a man of superior talent, and one who possessed great power over the minds of others. At Prague, among the thousands congregated at its university, he had large opportunity for inculcating his peculiar views. The very fact that he was instrumental in shaping the enlarged views of Jacobell suffices to rescue his name and memory from oblivion. He afterwards united with the Hussites against the primacy of the pope, and propagated their ideas upon the nature of the Church. To establish his doctrines he wrote several works now completely forgotten. He died at Prague in 1440. See Eneas Sylvius, Bohem. ch. 5; Bonnivis, Hist. Bohem.; Moréri, Dict. Hist.; Jäger, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon; Gillet, Huss und die Hussiten, i, 59, 683, 519. (J. H. W.)

Peter of Edessa, a Syrian by birth, and a presbyter of the church at Edessa, and an eminent preacher, wrote Tractatus variarum Casuarum, treatises on various subjects, and composed Psalms in metre like those of Ephrem the Syrian. Trithemius ascribes to him Commentarii in Psalmos, and says that he wrote in Syrian. All his works have perished.

Peter (St.) EXORCISTA and MARCELLINUS (fl. 854-869), two Roman saints always represented together, were hanged in various editions of the Bibliotheca Puteana. It is in the ninth volume of the Lyons edition of Galland (Ven. 1776, fol.).

Peter the Deacon (2), a learned Benedictine of Monte-Cassino, of a Roman patrician family, was born about the close of the 11th century, in the reign of Alexius I Comnenus. In the Gesta Romanorum de Leucalvii (lib. vi, 395-397) are given Interrogationes quas solvit reverendissimus Churlartianus, Dominus Petrus, iberoque Diaconus Majoris Ecclesiae (sec. of St. Sophia at Constantinople). A. M. 6890 = A.D. 1092. We learn from this title when the author lived, and that he held the offices described. He seems to have been admitted into the Benedictine Order at the very early age of fifteen. In a controversy of his convent with pope Innoce II, he defended the monastic interests to great advantage before the emperor Lothair, in 1088, while he was in South Italy. So well pleased was the emperor with Peter that he was made chartularius and chaplain of the Roman realm. Later he was intrusted by pope Alexander with the management of the convent of Monte-Cassino, which he had died after the middle of the 12th century. The following of his writings are instructive for the contemporaneous history of the Church:

De vita et obitu Justorum Cenobii Cassinensis: — Lib. illustrium eorum Cassinensi Archihtetori: — Lib. de locis sanctis, and De Nostriam temporibus. There are, or were, extant in MS. in the king's library at
ment of the 5th century. He was abbot of a monastery at or near Constantinople, but various accusations (in-
duding heresy) being made against him, he fled to An-
tioch and there was welcomed by the emperor Leo I, who was sent thither. Peter appears to have held the doctrine of the Monophysites, the controversy concerning which was at that time agitating the entire Eastern Church. On his arrival at Antioch, the patri-
archate of which city was held by Martyrius, a support-
er of the Council of Chalcedon, he determined to attempt the usurpation of that office, engaging Zeno and a num-
ber of those who favored the Monophysite doctrine in the enterprise. Great tumult and confusion ensued, one cause of which was that Peter added to the sacred hymn called the Trisagion the words "who was crucified for us"—which constituted one of the tests of the Monophys-
ites—and anathematized all who did not sanction the alteration. Martyrius, unable to maintain order, went to Constantinople, where he was kindly received by Leo I, through whose influence he hoped to be able, on his return to Antioch, to quell the disturbance. Failing in this, and disgusted with his failure, he abdicated the patriarchate, which was immediately assumed by Peter. Leo, however, at the instigation of Gennadius, patri-
arch of Constantinople, promptly expelled the intruder, incurring the enmity and wrath of the patriarch del and his ap-
proval. Peter was banished to Upper Egypt, but, con-
triving to escape from his exile, he returned to Con-
tinople and obtained refuge in a monastery, where he remained until the revolt of Basilicus against Zeno, having bound himself by oath to abstain from exciting for further troubles. The revolt succeeding, and Zeno being driven from Constantinople, Basilicus exhorted himself to gain the Monophysites, and issued an encyclical let-
ter to the various prelates of the Church, anathematiz-
ing the decrees of the Synod of Chalcedon. Peter gave formal answer to this letter, and was imprisoned and re-
stored to the patriarchate of Antioch (A.D. 476). Jul-
ian soon after died of grief, and Peter, resuming au-
thority, restored the obnoxious clause "who was cruci-
fied for us"; and by repeating his anathemas excited fresh tumultus, which resulted in plunder and murder. Zeno, however, recovering the imperial power, a synod was assembled and Peter was deposed, chiefly through the agency of one of his own partisans, John Codanatos, whom he had made a bishop. He was banished to Byzantium, whence he fled to Euchaita and obtained refuge in the church of St. Theodore. After a period of nine years, during which time numerous changes had been made in the patriarchate, the Monophys-
ites, again in the ascendant, persuaded Zeno to consent to the restoration of Peter upon his signing the ex-
crucified for us: "his blood turned his hair," and the hermit made his vow that with the help of God these things should cease. In an interview with the patriarch Simeon he de-
clared that the natives of the West should take up arms in the Christian cause. On his return to the West he spoke so earnestly on the subject to pope Urban II that the pontiff warmly adopted his views, and, however selfish may have been the promptings of his zeal in the cause—he foreseeing probably that, whatever might be the result to the warriors of the cross, his own power would thereon be lost—Peter would not rest until he had induced Urban eagerly bestowed his blessing on the fervent enthusiast, and commissioned him to preach throughout the West an armed confederation of Christians for the deliverance of the Holy City. Mean in figure and diminutive in stature, and gifted only with an ele-
cient voice and a ready memory, he succeeded so well that the diseases were more than made up by the earnestness which gave even to the glance of his eye a force more pow-
erful than speech. His enthusiasm lent him a power which no external advantages of form could have com-
nandèd. He was filled with a fire which would not stay, and the horrors which were burnt in upon his soul were those which would most surely stir the conscience and rouse the wrath of his hearers. His fiery appeals carried everything before them. "He traversed Italy," writes the historian of Latin Christianity, "crossed the Alps, from province to province, from city to city. He rode on a mule, with a crucifix in his hand, his head and feet bare: his dress was a long robe, girt with a cord, and a hermit's cloak of the coarsest stuff. He preached in the pulpits, on the roads, in the market-
places. (His eloquence was that which suits the hearts of the people, for it came from his own—brief, figu-
re, full of bold apostrophes; it mingled with his own tears, with his own groans; he beat his breast: the contagion spread throughout his audience. His preach-
ing appealed to the pride, the joy of the masses, to the indigination and pity, to the pride of the warrior, to the compassion of the man, the religion of the Christian, to the love of the brethren, to the hatred of the unbeliever
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Peter the Hermit, an ecclesiastical character of the 11th century, is of very little significance except as the monks of the Church of Rome have given him im-
portance by crediting him with the movement of the Christian armies to the East known as the First Crusade, for which the credit is by most com-
potent critics awarded to pope Urban II. Von Sybel, in his Geschichte des ersten Kreuzzuges (Dusseldorf, 1841),
aggravated by his insulting tyranny, to reverence for the Redeemer and the saints, to the desire of expiating sin, to the hope of eternal life." The results are well known as among those moral marvels of enthusiasm of which history presents occasional examples. All France was stirred from its very depths; and just at the time when the enthusiasm of that country had been enkindled to its full fervor, it received a sacredness and an authority from the decrees of a council held at Clermont, in which Urban himself was present, and in which his celebrated harangue was but the signal for the outpouring, through all Western Christendom, of the same chivalrous emotions by which France had been borne away under the rude eloquence of the Hermit. To understand this success, we must take into account the poverty of the masses, and the alluring prospect of a residence in Eastern lands, for the scenes of which were painted in glowing colors by the apostle of the holy war. Thousands of outcasts had always been ready to follow the princes in their marauding expeditions or political wars, and how much more in a war which enlisted the highest sympathies of their nature in its behalf, which received the sanction of the ministers of religion, and was regarded as the will of God! For the details of the expedition, we must refer to the article CRUSADES, our sole present concern being with the personal history of Peter. Of the enormous but undisciplined army which assembled from all parts of Europe, one portion was committed to his conduct; the other being under the command of a far more skilful leader, Walter (q. v.) the Penniless. Peter, mounted upon an ass, with his coarse woolen mantle and his rude sandala, placed himself at the head of his followers. On the march through Hungary they became involved in hostilities with the Hungarians, and suffered a severe defeat at Selmín, whence they proceeded with much difficulty to Constantinople. There the emperor Alexius, filled with dismay at the want of discipline which they exhibited, was but too happy to give them supplies for their onward march; and near Nice they encountered the army of the sultan Soliman, from whom they suffered a terrible defeat. Peter accompanied the subsequent expedition under Godfrey; but worn out by the delays and difficulties of the siege of Antioch, he was about to withdraw from the expedition, and was only retained in it by the influence of the other leaders, who foresaw the worst results from his departure. Accordingly he had a share, although not marked by any signal distinction, in the siege and capture of the Holy City in 1099, and the closing incident of his history as a crusader was an address to the victorious army delivered on the Mount of Olives. He returned to Europe, and founded a monastery at Huy, in the diocese of Liege, where he died, July 7, 1115. The movement which had been inaugurated continued to the end of the twelfth century, and bore the crucifix and palm. His more peculiar attribute is either the axe stuck in his head or a gash from which the blood trickled. Fra Bartolomeo painted the head of his beloved Jerome Savarola as St. Peter Martyr. He is also known as St. Peter of Verona. (J. H. W.)

Peter the Lombard. See Lombard, Peter.

Peter of Maillézeau, a French chronicler of the 11th century, was, according to Dom Rieti, a man of talent, of merit, and learning. He embraced the monastic rule in the early part of the 11th century, and flourished under Goderanne, abbé of Maillézeau, in Bas-Poitou. We have an interesting article of his upon the history of his time, particularly that of the counts of Poitiers and the abbé of Maillézeau. Father Labbé has comprised it (Maillécezian Chronic) in the monuments that he collected for the history of Aquitaine. What concerns the translation of Saint Rimor has been detached from it and published again by Mabillon and the Hollander. See Hirt, Litt. de France, v. 599. —Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xi. 187.

Peter (St.) Martyr (1), a Roman Catholic saint of the Dominican order, is greatly beloved in the Roman fold, and in his own order ranks next to the founder himself. He was born at Verona about 1205. His parents were Catharists, but Peter early became orthodox in sentiment, and sought his education at the conventual schools of the Church. At the age of fifteen he united with the order by the persuasion of Dominic. He soon became a public character by reason of his piety and oratorical power. He turned against his own sect, and so severely persecuted the Catharists that he was universally regarded as intolerant. When the Inquisition needed an uncompromising head, Peter was made its general by approval of Pope Honorius III. His high-handed disposal of the lives and property of people under him made him a general object of hatred. Two Veronian noblemen whom he had accused, and whose property was confiscated, resolved to be revenged on him. They hired assassins, who watched that they might kill him in a forest where they knew he would pass unaccompanied save by a single monk. When he appeared one of the murderers struck him down with an axe. They then pursued and killed his attendant. When they returned to Peter he was reciting the Apostles' Creed, or, as others say, was writing it on the ground with his blood, when the assassins completed their cruel work. This event occurred on April 28, A.D. 1252. In the various paintings of this saint he is represented in the habit of his order, and bears the crucifix and palm. His more peculiar attribute is either the axe stuck in his head or a gash from which the blood trickled. Fra Bartolomeo painted the head of his beloved Jerome Savarola as St. Peter Martyr. He is also known as St. Peter of Verona. (J. H. W.)

Jerome Savarola as St. Peter Martyr (by Fra Bartolomeo).

Peter (St.) Martyr (2), a Romish saint of the 15th century, was born at Arona in 1455, and was probably educated at the university in Salamanca, where he taught for many years with great success. He had a part in the wars against the Moors, and in 1505 took holy orders. As prior of Granada he was frequently employed in very important missions by queen Isabella the Catholic. His travels in diplomatic interests he described in Deegotiana Statupoloni. He died in 1525. His Epistolae de rebus Hispanicis was published at Alcala in 1580, and at Amsterdam in 1672.

Peter, Mauritian. See Peter the Venerable.

Peter Mogilas. See Mogilas.

Peter Mongus, a Monophysite, flourished as patriarch of Alexandria in the 6th century. Liberatus gives
him also the surname of the Stammerer. He was ordained deacon by Dioscorus, successor of Cyril, who held the patriarchate for seven years (A.D. 444-451). Peter was the ready participant in the violations of Dioscorus, and earnestly embraced his cause when he was deposed by the Council of Chalcedon, withdrawing from the communion of Dioscorus, Proterius, who supported the cause of the council, and uniting in the opposition raised by Timothy Elurus and others. Peter was consequently sentenced, apparently by Proterius, to deposition and excommunication. Whether he was banished as well as Timothy Elurus, is not clear, but he seems to have been accompanied Timothy to Alexandria, and to have been his chief supporter when, after the death of the emperor Marcian, he returned, and either murdered Proterius or excited the tumults that led to his death, A.D. 457. Timothy Elurus was immediately raised to the patriarchate by his parties, but was shortly after banished by the emperor Leo I, the Thracian, who had succeeded Marcian. Peter also was obliged to flee. Another Timothy, surnamed Salofaciolus, a supporter of the Council of Chalcedon, was appointed to succeed Proterius in the patriarchate. When, in the following year, 459, or rather during the usurpation of Basiliscus, Timothy Elurus was recalled by exile (A.D. 475), and was sent from Constantinople to Alexandria to re-occupy that see, he was joined by Peter and his party, and with their support drove out his competitor. Salofaciolus, who took refuge at Elurus' monastery at Canopus. On the downfall of Basiliscus and the restoration of Zeno, Timothy Elurus was allowed, through the emperor's compassion for his great age, to retain his see; but when on his death (A.D. 477) the Monophysite bishops of Egypt, without waiting for the emperor's directions, elected Peter (who had previously obtained the rank of archdeacon) as his successor, the emperor's indignation was so far aroused that he determined to put the new prelate to death. His anger, however, somewhat abated, and Peter was allowed to live, but was deposed by the patriarchate, to which Timothy Salofaciolus was restored. On the death of Salofaciolus, which occurred soon after, John of Tabenna, surnamed Talais, was appointed to succeed him; but he was very shortly deposed by order of Zeno, on some account not clearly ascertained, and Peter Mongus was unexpectedly recalled from Euchaita in Pontus, whither he had been banished, and was (A.D. 482) restored to his see. His restoration appears to have been part of the policy of Zeno to unite, if possible, all parties; a policy which Peter, whose age and misfortunes appear to have abated the fierce spirit of a party spirit, adopted. He consequently subscribed the Henotic of the emperor, and readmitted the Monophysite party to communion on their doing the same. John of Tabenna had meanwhile fled to Rome, where the pope, Simplicius, who, with the Western Church, steadily supported the Council of Chalcedon, embraced his cause, and wrote to the emperor in his behalf. Felix II or III, who succeeded Simplicius (A.D. 483), was equally zealous on the same side. Peter had some difficulty in maintaining his position. In order to recover the favor of his Monophysite friends, who had acceded to Euchaita, in obedience to Zeno's wishes, he alienated, he anathematized the Council of Chalcedon; and then, to avert the displeasure of Acacius of Constantinople and of the court, to whose temporizing course this decisive step was adverse, he denied that he had done so. Evagrius has preserved the letter he wrote to Acacius on this occasion, which is the only writing of Peter now extant. By this derogation he preserved his see, and was enabled to brave the repeated anathemas of the Western Church. When, however, to recover the standing of the Council of Monophysites, he again anathematized the Council of Chalcedon, and Eupatrius, the newly elected patriarch of Constantinople, forsaking the policy of his predecessors, took part with the Western Church against him, his difficulties became more serious. What result this combination against him might have produced cannot now be known; death removed him from the scene of strife A.D. 490, shortly before the death of Zeno. He was succeeded by Peter, who anathematized Alexandria by another Monophysite, Anthanasius II. See Cave, Hist. Litt. i, 455; Fabricius, Bibli. Graec. xi, 586; Le Quien, Oriens Christianus, vol. ii, col. 416, etc.; Tilmont, Mémoires Ecclésiastiques, vol. xvi. Peter (Pierre), archbishop of Narbonne, the son of Ameli, was born in the late half of the 12th century. He was at first clerk of Saint-Nazaire of Béziers; canon, chamberlain, grand archdeacon of Narbonne; then elected archbishop in the month of March, 1226. The extermination of the Albigeens having ended the war so long prosecuted against these people, Peter used all his efforts to pacify his diocese. But observing the method practiced in his time, he seized, according to that custom, all the goods which had belonged to the heretics, made all the inhabitants of Narbonne take oath to massacre any one who should dare in the future to separate himself from the Roman orthodoxy, and in order to watch over, discover, and point out the enemies, introduced in 1231 into the city of Narbonne the St. Dominician friars. But the Albigeens were conquered, not subdued. An occasion having occurred in 1224, the inhabitants, in these circumstances, and drove out their archbishop. Vainly he communicated the situation. In order to return to his metropolis, after about a year's exile, Peter was obliged to descend to conditions. The insurgents imposed upon him, among others, that of expelling from their city the Brother Preachers, and under this eye, for greater safety, they invaded the convent of these brothers and put them[to flight]. Peter dared not recall them. Yet he was a prelate energetic in his designs, courageous in his conduct, who had the temperament of a man of arms, and who oftener faced perils than turned his back on them. In 1225 he made a campaign against the Moors with Jayme I, king of Aragon, and, according to the Chronique of Albèric, he took an active part in the battles fought under the walls of Valencia. The following year he raised other troops, and at their head went to drive from Carcassonne Raymond de Tancarvel and some other lords in revolt against the king of France. He was less fortunate in his attempt against Aimeric; the latter drove him from Narbonne in 1242. Finally, in 1243, we see the archbishop Peter making the siege of the château of Montsegur, and taking it. The heretics were to be the last exploit of this belligerent prelate. He died at Narbonne May 20, 1245. See Gallia Christiana, vol. vi, col. 65; Hist. Litt. de la France, xviii, 381; Vaissette, Hist. de Languedoc, iii, 892; Albèric, Chronicon, ad ann. 1239; Guillemus de Pilos, Hist. bell. occid. ab omnibus Albigeens, c. 39, 40 sq.—Hoefler, Nouv. Biog. Générale, ii, 185. Peter of Nicomedia, an Eastern ecclesiastic, was in the early part of the 7th century. He was one of the prelates who, with certain deacons and monks, had to clear themselves in the third Constantinopolitan, or sixth eumenical, council (A.D. 680), from the suspicion of holding the Monothelitic heresy; but he, with the orthodox and solemn written confessions of their belief in the orthodox doctrine of two wills in Christ. The confessions were of considerable length, and all exactly alike, and are given in the original Greek with a considerably harmonized, but completely in Latin version in the Acta Concilii CPholidi I, Acta Conciliorum, according to one of the Latin versions of the Acta given by Harlouin, in Acta Ix. See Concilii, vol. vi, col. 784, 942, ed. Labbé; vol. iii, col. 1292, 1248, 1587, 1561, ed. Hardouin; Cave, Hist. Litt. ad ann. 680, i, 595. Peter (St.) Nolasco (Sp. San Pedro Nolasco), a Roman saint, noted as the founder of "the Order of Our Lady of Mercy," flourished in the first half of the 13th century. He was the son of a noble of Languedoc, and became a convert of St. John de Matha. He was
much cultivated, and greatly esteemed for his learning and application, and was made a tutor of the young king James of Aragon. As the needs of the crusaders called for help from various directions, Peter brought about the formation of the order above referred to. At first it was military, and consisted of knights and gentlemen. The king himself was placed at the head, and his arms served as a device or badge. Soon, however, the order became very popular, and extended itself on all sides. Peter Nolasco was the superior, and spent his life in expeditions to the provinces under the Moors, from which he brought back hundreds of redeemed captives. In time the order changed its character from that of a military to that of a religious institution, and as such exerted a wide influence. Peter himself, when he was old, was taken from his cell by angels, so the legend goes, and borne to and from the altar, where he received the holy Eucharist. In the paintings of the saints he is represented as old, with a white habit, and the shield of King James on his breast. His death is said to have occurred Jan. 15, 1258. (J. H. W.)

St. Peter Nolasco (by Claude de Mellia).

**Peter the Patrician (1) was a Byzantine historian of the 6th century. He was born at Thessalonica, in the province of Macedonia, then included in the prefecture of Illyricum. He settled at Constantinople, where he acquired distinction as a rhetor or advocate, a profession for which his cultivated mind, agreeable address, and natural powers of persuasion were admirably adapted. These qualifications pointed him out to the discernment of the emperor Justinian I as suited for diplomatic life, and he was sent by him (A.D. 534) as ambassador to Amalasuntha, regent of the kingdom of the Ostrogoths. Before arriving in Italy Peter learned the death of the young king Athalaric, the marriage of Amalasuntha and Theodotus, one of the principal chiefs of the Ostrogoths, their exaltation to the throne of Italy, and of their subsequent dissensions and the imprisonment of Amalasuntha. Peter then received instructions to vindicate the cause of the imprisoned queen; but his arrival at Ravenna was speedily followed by the murder of Amalasuntha. Procopius charges Peter with instigating Theodotus to commit the murder, being secretly commissioned to do so by the jealousy of Theodora, Justinian's wife, who held out to him as an inducement to comply with her desire the hope of great advancement. Whether he was an abettor to the crime or not, Peter, in conformity to the orders of Justinian, demanded reparation for it, and declared war against Theodotus. The latter, terrified, commissioned him to convey to Justinian the most humble propositions of peace, and even, if necessary, the offer of his abdication. The last offer only was accepted; but when Peter returned to communicate the will of the emperor to Theodotus, the latter was disarmed and forced to accept it. The king of the Ostrogoths even violated the law of nations by imprisoning the Byzantine ambassadors. Peter and his colleague remained in captivity until Belisarius, by detaining some Ostrogothic ambassadors, compelled Vitiges, who had succeeded Theodotus, to release him and Anthes about the end of A.D. 538. On his return Peter received, as Procopius intimates, by Theodora's interest, and as a reward for his participation in procuring Amalasuntha's death, the high appointment of magister officiorum, but incurred general odium by the part he had acted. He exercised his authority with the most unbridled rapacity; for although he was, according to Procopius, naturally of a mild temper, and by no means insolent, he was at the same time the most dishonest of all mankind, contemptuously instructing his officers to injure the most obscure and humble. Several years afterwards (about A.D. 560) Peter, who retained his post of magister officiorum, and had in addition acquired the dignity of patrician, was sent by Justinian to negotiate a peace with Chosroes I, king of Persia. Some negotiations with pope Vigilius (552), and a new mission into Persia (562), are the last events known of the career of Peter the Patrician. He died soon after his return from Persia, leaving one son, who succeeded him in his office of magister officiorum. According to Suidas, Peter composed two works, Historia and De Statu Reipublicae. The Historia began with Augustus, or rather with the second triumvirate, and continued to a period a little later than the time of Constantine the Great. Considerable portions of it are preserved in the Excerpta de Legationibus, made by order of the emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus. The treatise De Statu Republlicae is lost, although Mai thinks he recognises it in De Republica, from which he has deciphered and published long passages in his Scriptorium Veterum Nova Collectio. Authentic fragments from the treatise are found in De Ceremoniis Aulae Byzantinae of Constantine Porphyrogenitus. Peter the Patrician has given a relation of his negotiations with Chosroes, which is quoted by Menander. All the remains of this historian are given in the Bonn edition of the Excerpta de Legationibus. See Fabricius, Bibliotheca Graeca, vi, 153; vii, 538; viii, 38; Reiske, Prosopon, ii, to the De Ceremoniis of Constantine Porphyrogenitus; Niebuhr, De Historiis graecarum Reliquiarum, Heilige Volksmeinungen recensuit, in the Excerpta de Legat.; ed. of Bonn; Mai, De Fragmentis Politici veteris Magistri, i, 845; Scriptorium Veterum Nova Collectio, ii, 571 sq.; Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol., iii, 226; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xi, 182.

**Peter the Patrician (2) was a Greek saint who lived early in the 9th century. He had fought in the battle (A.D. 811) against the Bulgarians in which the emperor Nicephorus I was defeated and slain. A life of Peter, taken from the Menoissa of the Greeks, is given in the original Greek, with a Latin version, and a Commentarius Praecepta by Joannes Pinius, in the Acta Sanctorum (July), i, 289, 290.

**Peter the Patrician (3), a Greek, different from the foregoing, and belonging to a somewhat later period. He presented to the emperor Leo VI Sapiens, who began to reign A.D. 886, a copy of Theodoret's...
Peter, or Petrus, was a modern Latin poet, whose life is known to us through his works. He was born in the city of Babylon. He was the son of a wealthy merchant and was educated at the court of the Roman emperor. His education was broad and he was fluent in Latin, Greek, and Hebrew. He was a fervent Christian and a strong advocate of the teachings of Jesus Christ.

Peter was a prolific writer and his works were widely read. He wrote many letters to the early Christian communities, providing guidance and encouragement. His letters were collected and published posthumously.

Peter's most famous work is the Epistle of Peter, which was written to the early Christian communities. This epistle is divided into two parts: the first part is addressed to the believers in Asia Minor, and the second part is addressed to the believers in Rome. The epistle includes teachings on the nature of God, the importance of faith, and the need for perseverance.

Peter's influence on the early Christian church was significant. His teachings provided a solid foundation for the development of Christian doctrine. He was a strong advocate of the teachings of Jesus Christ and his writings were a source of inspiration for generations of Christians.

Peter's contributions to the early Christian church were recognized by the church fathers. He was canonized as a saint by the Roman Catholic Church in the early 4th century and his feast day is celebrated on November 29th.

Peter's life and works have left a lasting legacy in the history of Christianity. His teachings continue to be studied and interpreted by scholars and theologians to this day.
cater their productions to each other." This narrative is given in a simple but rude style; it is divided into five books (1096-1099), and is entitled *Historia de Hierusalem sine rerum;* the most correct edition is that by Du- chene, in vol. iv of the *Historia de France.* See *Hist. Lit. de la France,* viii, 292-600.—Hoefer, Nouv. Bio- g. Générale, xli, 187.

**Peter the Venerable**, also called Mauriceus, a medieval character of note, was born in 1092 or 1094. He was educated at the Cistercian abbey at Souci- langes, and soon after the completion of his theological training at Monte Cassino, he moved to Cluny, then to Launde, and in 1122 abbots of Cluny. Pet- rus Venerabilis was more or less mixed with all the important ecclesiastical transactions of the 12th century. He took in the schism of 1130 the side of pope Innocent XI; and especially played a great part in the dis- cussions between Bernard of Clairvaux and Abelard. His works, written with more ease than talent, have not yet been published in a collected form. He died, at Christmas, in 1157 (see *Bibl. Patr. Desponti* vol. xxii). His publications are, *Sermones* (in Martene et Durand, Thesaur. Nucleus de Actis Pontificum, II. Hi. 1157).—*Libri ii adversus nefarium sectam Saracensium* (in Martene et Durand, Collect. ix, 1120). His life was written by his monk Rodolph, his disciple: *Vita Petri Venerabilis*, edidit Clausius (Bibl. vi, 1187). See Hook, *Ecloga. Bio- g. viii, 59; Schrock, *Kirchengeschichte xxii, 145;* Williams, *Peter der Ermüd- tiget* (Leipzig, 1857). (J. H. W.)

**Peterfi, Charles**, a Hungarian Jesuit, was born towards the close of the 17th century. He was de- scended from a noble family. Admitted among the Jesuits in 1715, he taught belles-lettres at Tyrnau and philosophy at Vienna. He died Aug. 10, 1746. He made himself known by a valuable collection, *Soror concilia in regno Hungariae celebrata, ab a. 1016 usque ad a. 1715* (Vienna, 1742, fol.), in which a good method and the variety of research are to be admired. See Feller, *Dict. Hist.*—Hoefer, *Nouv. Bio. Générale,* xxxiv, 691.


**Peter-Pienaar** is the annual tribute of one penny from every Roman Catholic family, paid at Rome, at a festival of the apostle Peter. It is offered to the Roman pontiff in reverence of the memory of St. Peter, of whom that bishop is believed to be the successor. From an early period the Roman see had been richly endowed; and although its first endowments were chiefly local, yet as early as the days of Gregory the Great large es- tates were held by the Roman bishops in Campania, in Calabria, and even in the island of Sicily. The first idea, however, of an annual tribute appears to have come from England, and was first collected in 1734, under a deacon of the diocese of London (A.D. 721), king of the West Saxons, who went as a pilgrim to Rome, and there founded a hospice for Anglo- Saxon pilgrims, to be maintained by an annual contribu- tion from England; by others, to Offices and Ethelwulf, at least in the sense of their having extended it to the whole of the Saxon territory. But this seems very un- certain; and although the usage was certainly long an- terior to the Norman conquest, Dr. Lingard is disposed not to place it earlier than the time of Alfred. The tribute consisted in the payment of a silver penny by every family possessing land or cattle of the yearly value of thirty pence, and was collected in the two weeks be-
between St. Peter’s and St. Paul’s Day and Aug. 1. In the time of king John, the total annual payment was £130 6s. contributed by the several dioceses in proportion, an account of which will be found in Lingard’s *History of England*, ii, 380. The tax called *Romescot*, with some variation, continued to be paid till the reign of Henry VIII, when it was abolished. Pope Gregory VII, in his famous *Lettura de la pace*, and other partial or transient tributes are recorded from Denmark, Sweden, Norway, and Poland. This tribute, however, is quite different from the payments made annually to Rome by the kingdoms which were held to be feudatory to that see. There are also payments from Scotland, England, and other countries, at least for a time.” — Chambers. The pope having suffered a considerable diminution of his own revenue since the revolution of 1848, an effort has been made in several parts of Europe to revive this practice. In some countries it has been very successfully carried out, and the proceeds have been among the chief of the resources of Pius IX, as he has steadfastly refused to accept any support from the new kingdom of Italy, since his temporalities were merged in it. See Thompson, *Popes Power* (N.Y. Cadell, 12mo); Riddle, *Modern Italy* (N. Y. Hefele, Concilia regia. vol v; Ranke, *Hist. of the Papacy in the 16th and 17th Centuries*, i, 21, 37, 290; Inset, *Ch. Hist. of England* (see Index).

Peter’s (Sr.) Day (June 29) is a festival observed in the Roman Catholic Church. Its origin has been traced back to the 8th century. In 684 Prudentius mentions that the pope celebrated the Holy Communion in both St. Peter’s and St. Paul’s churches at Rome on this festival, which in the 6th century was observed at Constantineople, and was kept, until the Reformation, associated with the name of St. Paul, whose conversion was not generally commemorated on Jan. 25 until the 12th century. Ocelis, who received Peter in communion virtually of SS. Peter and Paul, but its title is the Chair of St. Peter, wherein he first sat at Rome, Jan. 18. On Feb. 22 his chair at Antioch is commemorated.

Peters, Absalom, D.D., a Congregational minister, was born at Wentworth, N. H., Sept. 19, 1738, and was educated at Dartmouth College, class of 1816, and for the ministry at Princeton Seminary, class of 1819. He was the son of general Absalom Peters, a descendant of William, of Boston, brother of the noted Hugh Peters. In 1819 he was made a missionary in Northern New York, but in the following year became pastor of the Church at New Lebanon, N. Y., where he remained until Dec. 14, 1825. After this he was successively secretary of the Home Missionary Society until 1837, and editor of the *Home Missionary and Pastor’s Journal*; and in 1838 began to edit the *American Biblical Repository*. He was professor of pastoral theology and homiletics in the Union Theological Seminary, New York, from 1842 to 1844, and pastor of the First Church, Williamstown, Mass., from 1844 to 1857. Here he originated and edited the *American Ecclesiastic and the American Journal of Education*, which was afterwards merged in that of Dr. Henry Barnard. When past seventy he published a volume of poems. He died at New York May 18, 1869. During his long life he was never ill. He is the author of *A Plea for Voluntary Societies*: — *Sprinkling* *The Only Mode of Baptism*: — *Sermon against Horse-racing* (1822); — *Sacred Music* (1823); — *College, Religious Institutions* (1851).

Peters, Charles, a learned English divine, was born in Cornwall near the close of the 17th century, and was educated at Exeter College, Oxford. On entering orders he went to Paris, where he became rector of St. Mary, Cornwall, where he died, at a very advanced age, in 1777. In his dissertation on the book of Job he displayed a deep knowledge of Hebrew, and great power of argument against Warburton. The work, which is valuable, is entitled *A critical Dissertation on the Book of Job*, wherein the Account given of that Book by the Author of the Divine Legation of Moses demonstrated, in Warburton, is clearly considered, the Antiquity of the Book vindicated, the great Text (xix, 25) explained, and a future State shown to have been the popular belief of the ancient Jews (2d ed. corrected, Lond. 1757, 8vo) — *An Appendix to the critical Dissertation on the Book of Job*, giving a further Account of the Book of Ecclesiastes; to which is added a Reply to some Notes of the late D— of B—I, in his new Edition of the Divine Legation, vol. ii, pt. ii, by the Author of the Critical Dissertation (Lond. 1760).

Peters, Hugh, an English divine, who came to this country in the colonial days, and is noted both as a preacher and politician, was born at Fowey, Cornwall, Eng., in 1590. He was educated at Trinity College, Cambridge, where he graduated in 1622; then entered the ministry, and preached successfully at St. Sepulchre’s, London, until he was silenced for nonconformity, and imprisoned. As soon as liberated he went to Rotterdam, and became pastor of the Independent Church in that place. In 1635 he resigned and sailed for New England, where he arrived Oct. 6, and was licensed Dec. 21, 1636, pastor of the First Church, Salem, as successor to Roger Williams, whose doctrines he disclaimed and whose adherents he excommunicated. He was also active in civil and mercantile affairs, suggesting coasting and foreign voyages, and the plan of the fisheries. In March, 1636, he was appointed by the General Court to assist in collecting and revising the colonial laws, and having been chosen to "represent the sense of the colony upon the laws of excise and trade," he sailed for England Aug. 3, 1641. He became in 1643 a preacher in the Parliamentary army, in which capacity he was present at the siege of Lynn and the capture of Bridgewater. For his services he was largely rewarded, and in 1655 was one of the committee of legal reform appointed by Parliament. In 1656 he was chaplain to the garrison at Dunkirk. After the Restoration Peters, being suspected of some complicity with the death of the king, was committed to the Tower, and indicted for high-treason Oct. 13, 1660. He was convicted and executed Oct. 16, 1660. During his imprisonment he wrote several letters of advice to his daughter, published (1712) under the title of "A dying Father’s last Legacy to an only Child." His private character has been the subject of much discussion both in England and America. He was charged by his enemies with gross immorality, and the most bitter epithets were applied to him by Bishop Burnet, Kennet, and others: but of late years he has been estimated more favorably. He published also God’s *Doings and Man’s Duty*, opened in a Sermon preached before the House of Commons, the Lord Mayor, and the Assembly of Divines (1646) — *Peters’s last Report of the English Wars, occasioned by the Importance of a Friend press ing an Answer to some Queries* (1646) — *A Word for the Army and Two Words for the Kingdom, to Clear the One and Cure the Other, forced in much Plainness and Brevity from their faithful Servant, Hugh Peters* (1647) — *A Good Work for a Good Magistrate, or a Short Cut to a Great Quiet* (1651) — *Some Notes of a Sermon preached on the 14th of October, 1660, in the Prison of Newgate, after his Condemnation* (1699). See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, i, 70; Dake, *Dict. of Amer. Biogr. s.v.*

Peters, Richard, D.D., a Protestant Episcopal clergyman of his name, was born in England, where he was educated as a clergyman of the Church of England, and came to Philadelphia in 1755. His services were soon engaged at Christ’s Church, for which he was licensed by the bishop of London. He shortly resigned, and then held an important Church
agency, and also became secretary to a succession of governors. In May, 1749, he became a member of the provincial council, but in 1762 he resigned all civil offices and was made one of the ministers of the United Church; he was also in 1762, and in 1766, re-elected the church. In 1767 he returned to England to receive his license in due form. On his return he resumed his duties. He resigned in 1775, and died July 10, 1776. He published a Sermon on Education (1751). See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, v. 88; Dorr, Hist. of the Ch. Church, vol. I.

Peters, Samuel Andrew, D.D., LL.D., an ecumenic Protestant Episcopal clergyman, was born at Hebron, Conn., Nov. 20, 1735, and passed A.B. in Yale, 1757, when he went to England for ordination. He returned in 1759, and in 1762 took charge of the Church at Hebron, where he continued for many years. During the Revolution, being a Tory, he retired first to Boston, and soon sailed to England, as his imprisonment and loyalty to the English cause made him very obnoxious. Of course his royal master rewarded his fidelity by a pension and a grant of confiscated lands. In 1781 he published a general history of Connecticut, which has been called "the most voluble and most licentious of lying narratives." Its narrations are independent of time, place, and probability. In 1794 he was chosen bishop of Vermont, but he was never consecrated. After being struck off the pension roll by William Pitt, he returned home in 1805, and spent his years in publishing works to connect the lands granted to Jonathan Carver, the Indian traveler. In 1817 he journeyed westward, and in 1818 returned to New York, where he lived in obscurity and poverty until his death, April 19, 1826. He was the "Parson Peter" of Trumbull's M'Pood. Peters published, A General History of Connecticut, by a Gentleman of the Province (Lond. 1781) — A Letter on the Possibility of Eternal Punishments, etc. (ibid. 1785) — and The History of Rev. Hugh Peters, etc. (ibid. 1807). See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, v. 191.

Peters, William, an English clergyman, who flourished in the latter part of the 18th century, distinguished himself especially as a painter. He was a man of wit, and possessed a lively imagination and great conversational powers, which made him a favorite. Having a passion for painting, he practiced it first as an amusement, and, by associating much with the eminent artists of the time, he greatly improved his manner, and produced many beautiful works which were greatly admired. He painted for the Shakespeare Gallery scenes from that author's dramatic works; also several pictures for MacKinnon's Gallery, as the Resurrection of Lazarus, the Three Guardsmen and the Spirit of a Child; the Chorus, etc., all of which were very popular. He executed many fancy subjects from his own imagination, which are pleasingly sentimental. He was much patronized by the nobility, and he sometimes painted subjects not strictly in accordance with just notions of propriety. His pictures are well composed, and his coloring rich and harmonious, with an admirable impacto, in which he imitated Reynolds. Many of his works were engraved by Bartolozzi, Thomas Wilson, Smith, Marshall, and others. He is generally called the Rev. W. Peters. The duke of Rutland was his chief patron, and presented him with a valuable living. The bishop of Lincoln gave him a prebendal stall in his cathedral. He died in 1814.

Petersen, Johann Wilhelm, a German writer noted for his theological studies, and his heresies in certain branches of Christian doctrine, was born July 1, 1649, at Osnabruck, was educated at Lubeck in the preparatory branches, and studied theology at the universities of Giessen, Rostock, Leipsic, Wittenberg, and Jena. He then lectured for a while at Giessen, preached at Lubeck and France, and finally returned to the university in Rostock. He had written a poetic satire on the Jesuits; they in turn had made it so uncomfortable for him at Lubeck that he went to Rostock, but also here, and at Hanover later, they followed him with their opposition and invectives, and in 1678 he gladly accepted the superintendency of the church. In 1678 he became superintendent at Lüneburg, but did not remain long, as differences sprang up between him and the pastors. In 1692 he was deposed, on the ground that he espoused chiliastic ideas. He now purchased a farm near Zerbst, and died in retirement, Jan. 31, 1727. His last years were spent in the advocacy of chiliastic-pietistic opinions, and he wrote much for that purpose. A list of all his writings is given in his autobiography (1717). This book is valuable, as it indicates the sources whence the pietism of Spener and Francke drew its strength. We must not be understood, however, to say that Spener's pietism depended on Petersen, but simply that Petersen and Spener had much in common, and that the former, by his influence and acceptance of pietistic views, strengthened Spener's hands. Petersen seems to have misapprehended Beza, a Manichean gone farther than he. Thus, for example, Petersen, misunderstanding Spener's doctrine concerning "better times to come" [see ESCHATOLOGY; SPENER], and the realization of God's kingdom on earth, announced the speedy approach of the millennial reign, and, for the German, even adopted the final restoration theories of Origen (q.v.), with which he became acquainted, as he tells us, in the writings of the English fanatic Jane Lead (q.v.). His wife adopted these views also, and became a propagator of this heresy and the notion of a universal apocalypse. But the day is done, though it pleased many by limiting the eternity of punishment, and some who had almost strayed from the Church beyond hope of regaining their former hold on Christ and his Church, yet met with almost universal rejection, because it obliged its advocates to embrace a physical process of redemption, or at least one which was not brought about by the Word of Christ. A train of thought which was the germ of the Terrestrial controversy of 1689-1710 might well lead farther. It had been usual so to identify the day of grace with the duration of earthly life as to allow no hope beyond it, and also to regard the term of grace as unexpired while life lasted. Though the original foundation of this opinion was a serious view of the importance of earthly life, it was yet capable of being made the basis of that levity which would demand a difference since the approach of death put a stop to this notion, Böse, with whom Rechenberg (q.v.) agreed, upheld the tenet that there is, even in this life, a peremptory termination of grace. This cannot depend upon so external a matter as time, but upon the inward maturity of the decision for or against Christ. Grace is the gift of God only: those who have already rejected it, and the justification formerly pronounced is withdrawn. See, however, the art. GRACE. To Petersen's adoption of a millennium and a universal restoration, he added, thirdly, faith in the continuation of supernatural inspiration. He himself led to this step by his admiration of Böse, who, with whom Rechenberg (q.v.) agreed, upheld the tenet that there is, even in this life, a peremptory termination of grace. This cannot depend upon so external a matter as time, but upon the inward maturity of the decision for or against Christ. Grace is the gift of God only: those who have already rejected it, and the justification formerly pronounced is withdrawn. See, however, the art. GRACE. To Petersen's adoption of a millennium and a universal restoration, he added, thirdly, faith in the continuation of supernatural inspiration. He himself led to this step by his admiration of Böse, who, with whom Rechenberg (q.v.) agreed, upheld the tenet that there is, even in this life, a peremptory termination of grace. This cannot depend upon so external a matter as time, but upon the inward maturity of the decision for or against Christ. Grace is the gift of God only: those who have already rejected it, and the justification formerly pronounced is withdrawn. See, however, the art. GRACE. To Petersen's adoption of a millennium and a universal restoration, he added, thirdly, faith in the continuation of supernatural inspiration. He himself led to this step by his admiration of Böse, who, with whom Rechenberg (q.v.) agreed, upheld the tenet that there is, even in this life, a peremptory termination of grace. This cannot depend upon so external a matter as time, but upon the inward maturity of the decision for or against Christ. Grace is the gift of God only: those who have already rejected it, and the justification formerly pronounced is withdrawn. See, however, the art. GRACE. To Petersen's adoption of a millennium and a universal restoration, he added, thirdly, faith in the continuation of supernatural inspiration. He himself led to this step by his admiration of Böse, who, with whom Rechenberg (q.v.) agreed, upheld the tenet that there is, even in this life, a peremptory termination of grace. This cannot depend upon so external a matter as time, but upon the inward maturity of the decision for or against Christ. Grace is the gift of God only: those who have already rejected it, and the justification formerly pronounced is withdrawn. See, however, the art. GRACE. To Petersen's adoption of a millennium and a universal restoration, he added, thirdly, faith in the continuation of supernatural inspiration. He himself led to this step by his admiration of Böse, who, with whom Rechenberg (q.v.) agreed, upheld the tenet that there is, even in this life, a peremptory termination of grace. This cannot depend upon so external a matter as time, but upon the inward maturity of the decision for or against Christ. Grace is the gift of God only: those who have already rejected it, and the justification formerly pronounced is withdrawn. See, however, the art. GRACE.
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differed from him much on doctrinal points. See Hurst's Hagelauoch, CH. Hist. 18th and 19th Cent. i, 159 sq.;
Hagenbuch, Hist. of Protestant Theology, ii, 154; Lebensbeschreibung (1719).
(J. H. W.)

Peterziano (or Preterziano), Simone, an Italian
painter, was, according to Lomazzo, a pupil of Titian,
and found some history paintings, as well as religious
works for the churches, both in oil and fresco. Lanzi
says: "On his Pietà in S. Fidela he inscribed himself
'Titiani Discipulus;' and his close imitation seems to
confirm the truth. He produced several works in fresco,
partially several histories of St. Paul in S. Barnaba.
He there seems to have aimed at uniting the expres-
sion, the foreshortening, and the perspective of the
Milanese to the rich coloring of Venetian artists,
noble works if they were thoroughly correct, and
if the author had been as excellent in fresco as in
oil painting." There is a fine picture by this master
of the Assumption of the Virgin in the Chiesa di
Berra.

Petebach Debary (פֶּטֶבַּך דֶּבָּרְיָא) is the title of
an excellent Hebrew grammar written in rabbinic char-
acters by an anonymous Spanish author, the first edition
of which appeared at Naples in 1492, and not, as is
generally believed, at Pesaro in 1507. In later editions,
with additions, appeared at Constantinople in 1515, and
the same, with corrections by Elias Levita (q.v.), at
Venice in 1545. Of the first edition of this valuable
grammar only two copies, one at the Vatican Library,
and one at Parnass, are extant. The Petebach Debary
has been edited with Ibn-Ezra's Moggion (Venice,
1546), and together with Haja ben-Sherira's work on
dreams, הָלְיוֹר בֵּנֶר שֶרְּרָא (Constantinople, 1515, and
often); and, lastly, with Moses Kimchi's (q.v.) gram-
matical work, The Journey on the Paths of Knowledge,
לַעֲקֹב הַסְּלֹא הַסְּקָנָה. See De Rossi, Dizionario storico
rifici autori Ebrei, p. 262 (Ger. transl, by Har-
burgers) ; Wolt. Bibl. Hebr. ii, 1412 sq.; Steinschneider,
Bibliographisches Handbuch, p. x, No. 76 sq. (Berlin,
1853). (B. P.)

Pethahiah (Heb. Pethachyahu,'בְּתֵחַ יָה, freed of
Jehovah; Sept. Φαθαίλα, Ezra x, 23; פַּטְחַיָּא, Neh. ix, 5; Φαθαίλα, xi, 24; Phethia, 1 Chron. xxiv, 16). The
name of three men.
1. The head of the nineteenth course in David's di-
vision of the priests (1 Chron. xxiv, 16). B.C. cir. 1020.
2. A Levite, who put away an idolatrous wife at the
injunction of Ezra (Ezra x, 23), and joined in the hymn
of praise and the covenant with Nehemiah (Neh. ix,
5). B.C. cir. 436.
3. A Hebrew, son of Meshezabehel, of the tribe of Ju-
dah, who acted as counsellor of Arthaxeres in matters
concerning the Jews (Neh. xi, 24). B.C. cir. 446.

Pethor (Heb. Pethor, פְּתֹר, opened; Sept. Φα-
θορ’; but in Deut. xxiii, 6 Sept. omita), the name of
a place in Mesopotamia, on the Euphrates, the native
country of Balaam, to which Balak sent him for to
come and curse Israel (Num. xxiv, 6; Deut. xxiii, 5).
It is supposed to have been near Tishana, on the
Euphrates, but this is altogether uncertain. See Ballas.
The name occurs in the census inscriptions (q.v.).
Pethuel (Heb. Pethuel, פְּתַעִל, stamp or engravi-
ing of God; but according to others, i. q. מַעָּל, Me-
thuel, i. e. folk of God; Sept. BeSheval), the father of
the prophet Joel (Joel i, 1). B.C. ante 800.

Petitionists, those who adhered to the party of
Peterziano, the Dominican, bishop of Carthage, in his con-
travesty with St. Augustine.

Petit, Samuel, a celebrated French scholar, was
born at Nismes in 1594. He studied at Geneva with
such success that at the age of seventeen he was ad-
mitted to the sacred ministry. Soon after he was
raised to the professorship of theology, and of Grock
and Hebrew, in that city. He died in 1645. He was
a man of vast and profound erudition. He published
Varia lectiones in S. Scripturam (in the Critici Sa-
vo vol. viii). His other works are, Miscellaneorum libri
ix: —Eclogae Chronologicae: —Diatribe de Jure, Princi-
pum Edicta, etc.: —Diatribe de Dissidiorum Causis,
Effecta et Remedii.

Petit-Dit-Dit, Matthew, a learned French pre-
late of note, was born in Lorraine in 1569. He was
early in life entered the Order of the Benedictines, and
later became abbot of Senones, and finally bishop of
Macon (in partibus infidelium). He died in 1728. He
is the author of several valuable works, among them,
Traité théologique sur l'autorité et l'illumination divine
(Avignon, 1726, sm. 8vo). This work, asserting the infal-
libility of the pope, has been attacked by various writ-
erists, Romanist as well as Protestant, especially by Len-
fant at the end of his Hist. of the Council of Con-
stance. He also published several critical, historical, and
chronological dissertations on the Scriptures (1689-1726).
His brother, Jean Joseph, who was a Jesuit, flourished
from 1664 to 1756. See Darling, Cyclop. Bibl. s. v.;
Allibone, Dict. of Brit, and Amer. Auth, s. v.

Petition, according to Dr. Watts, is the fourth part
of prayer, and includes a desire of deliverance from evil,
and a request of good things to be bestowed. On both
these accounts it may be said to be offered up for our
own good, not only for ourselves, but for our fellow-creatures also.
This part of prayer is frequently called intercession.
See Prayer.

Petitot, Jean, an eminent French painter in en-
amel, is noted especially as a Hugenot who spurned
all efforts for his conversion, and, notwithstanding the
personal intercession for his recall to Romanism on the
part of king Louis XIV, died as he lived, a pious Pro-
estant. Petitot was the son of a sculptor and architect,
and was born at Geneva in 1607. Being designed for
the trade of a jeweller, he was placed under the direc-
tion of Bordier, and in this occupation was engaged in
the preparation of enamels for the jewelry business.
He was so successful in the production of the metal
that he was advised by Bordier to attempt portraits. They
conspicuously made several trials, and though they still
wanted many colors which they knew not how to pre-
pare for the fire, their attempts had great success. After
some time they went to Italy, where they consulted the
most eminent chemists, and made considerable progress
in their art, but it was in England, whither they re-
moved after a few years, that they perfected it. In
London they were received by the most exalted and
famous Mayer, first physician to Charles I, and an in-
telligent chemist, who had by his experiments discovered
the principal colors proper to be used in enamel, and
the means of vitrifying them, so that they surpassed the
boasted enamelling of Venice and Limoges. Petitot
was introduced by Mayer to the king, who retained
him in his service and gave him apartments in White-
hall. He painted the portraits of Charles and the royal
family several times, and copied many pictures, after
Vandyck, which are considered his finest works. This
painter greatly interested him by his advice, and the
king frequently went to see him paint. On the death of
Charles, Petitot retired to France with the exiled
family. He was greatly noticed by Charles II, who in-
troucd him to Louis XIV. Louis appointed him his
painter in easel pictures, and wanted him a pension
and apartments in the Louvre. He painted the French king
many times, and, among a vast number of portraits,
those of the queens Anne of Austria and Maria Theresa.
He also occupied himself in making copies from the
most celebrated pictures of Mignard and Lebrun. Pe-
titot, dredging the effects of the revolution of the Edict
of Nantes, solicited leave, but for a long time in vain,
to return to Geneva. Finally the king, determined to
save his painter, employed Bossuet to endeavor to con-
vert him to Romanism; in this effort, however, that elo-
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quent prelate was wholly unsuccessful. At length Louis permitted him to depart, and, leaving his wife and children in Paris, Petitpied proceeded to his native place, where he was soon after joined by his family. Arrived now at thirty-two years of age, after a long number of friends and admirers that he was forced to remove from Geneva, and retire to Vevey, a small town in the canton of Vaud, where he continued to labour till 1691, in which year, while painting a portrait of his wife, he was suddenly attacked by apoplexy, of which he died. For his works of art, see Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, s.v.

Petit-Pied, Nicolas (1), a French canonist, was born in Paris Dec. 24, 1627. He was made doctor of the Sorbonne in 1638, and counsellor-clerk in the Châtelet in 1662. He was provided shortly after with the curacy of Saint-Martial in Paris, united latter to that of Saint-Pierre-des-Asces, and finally became under-chaplain and canon of the metropolitan church. In 1674, having wished, as dean of the counsellors, to preside in the Châtelet in the absence of the lieutenants, he found a violent opposition among the lay-counsellors, who pretended that the clergy had not the right to preside and to govern. By way of complaint against this, March 17, 1682, the authorities interposed a decree which gained for him the cause. The researches which he was obliged to make for the pursuit of this affair furnished him the occasion for composing an excellent Traité sur la dérogation des prérogatives ecclésiastiques dans l'administtration de la justice séculière (Paris, 1705, 4to). See Journ. des Savans, 1705; Moreiri, Dict. Hist.; Descript. Hist. de l'Église de Paris.—Hoefler, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxxiv, 719.

Petit-Pied, Nicolas (2), a French theologian, nephew of the preceding, was born in Paris Aug. 4, 1655. After having finished with distinction his ecclesiastical studies, he was received doctor of the Sorbonne in 1692, and his reputation caused him to be chosen in 1701 to teach the Holy Scriptures in that celebrated school. Having signed, July 20, 1702, with thirty-nine other doctors, the famous Cus de coœncrence, which was condemned at Rome Feb. 15, 1703, he would not retract, and was therefore exiled to Beaune and deprived of his pulpit. He hastened to join in Holland his friend Quesnel, and remained in that country until 1718, producing each year, for the support of Jansenism, new articles upon the government, defence, and upon other analogous matters now forgotten. The bull Unigenitus found in him a formidable adversary: he fought it in pamphlets, in memoirs, and in more extended works. On his return to France, Petit-Pied passed some time at Troyes, and afterwards went to Paris, where, June 1 and 6, 1719, the faculty of theology and the Sorbonne established him again in his rights as doctor. On the 15th of the same month he was again exiled, and on the 21st a lettre de cachet ordered the cancelling of the conclusion of the faculty in his favor. Petit-Pied had established his home and a new kind of Protestant Church in the village of Anières, near Paris. There he made a trial of the regulations and all the literary practised by the Jansenists in Holland. Renowned published astonishing things of him; people hastened there in crowds from the capital, and Anières soon became another Charenton. Petit-Pied showed himself from that time a more obstinate antagonist. M. de Loraine, bishop of Bayeux, selected him shortly after for his theologian, but on the death of that prelate, June 9, 1726, he retired again to Holland, whence he returned only in 1734. His zeal for Jansenism and the fertility of his pen were not inconsistent in this new exile; but from his return to Paris he led a more tranquil life, and contented himself with composing several works to defend the missal given to his diocese by Bossuet, bishop of Paris. Petit-Pied died in Paris Aug. 10, 1747. The list of all his works would be too long; Moreiri mentions eighty-one. We quote of his works, Examen théolo-

qique de l'instruction pastorale approvue dans l'assemblée du clergé... pour l'acquisition de la belle (Paris, 1718, 3 vols. 12mo)—Examen des fausssets sur le culte Chinois avancées par le P. Jousney (ibid. 1714, 12mo):—b. Lettres touchant la manière de pro-

tenter aux contrats des rentes rachetables des deux côtes (Lille, 1731, 4to). He also labored upon the work of Legros, Doctna Ecclesiae circa uram expositum et vindicatum (Utrecht, 1731, 4to). Sarcastic in his works, Petit-Pied was a milite, an inarticulate chantefable, an enthu-

sias, Pet. des Auteurs Eclec. vol. iii.; Journal de Dorausme, Colendrier ecclésiastique (ibid. 1757, 12mo); Nouv. ecclés. passim; Moreiri, Dict. Hist.—Hoefler, Nouv. Biog. Géné-

rale, xxxiv, 719.

Petosiris (Πέτοσίρης), an Egyptian priest and astro-

loger, who is generally named along with Nechepso,

an Egyptian king. The two are said to be the found-

ers of astrology, and of the art of casting nativities. Suidas states that Petosiris wrote on the right mode of worshipping the gods, astrological maxims, i.e. tnap bSptov (Bay) (which are often referred to in con-

nection with astrology), and a work on the Egyptian mysteries. But we may infer from a statement made by Vetius Valens, of which the substance is given by Marsham (Canon Chronicus [ed. Lips. 1676], p. 478), that Suidas assigns to Petosiris what others attributed partly to him and partly to Nechepso. For his ὁπρα-

ναι τοῦ ἀρχαίου, or Πρῶτος ικάριος, or Πρῶτος ἀρχάιος, he 

stipulates astrological principles for predicting the event of dis-

cases, and for his other writings, Fabricius (Bibl. Grec. iv. 160) may be consulted. To the list given by him may be added a translation into Latin by Beili of the astrological letter of Petosiris to Nechepso, entitled De Divinatione Moris et Vita (Bod. Opera [ed. Col. Agrripp. 1612], ii, 233, 234). His name, as connected with astrology, was in high repute early in Greece, and in Rome in her degenerate days. This we learn from the praise bestowed on him by Maneto (v. 10), who, indeed, in the prologue to the first and fifth books of his Apotelesmatica, professes only to expand in Greek the prose rules of Petosiris and Nechepso ("divini illi viri atque omni admiratigem digni"), and from the refer-

ces of Plut. (Nat. i, 23; vii, 49). But the best proof is the fact that, like our own Lilly, Petosiris became the common name for an astrologer, as we find in Aristophanes, quoted by Athenaeus (iii, 114, c) in the forty-
sixth epigram of Lucilius (Jacobs, Anthol. Graec. iii, 38), whence we learn the quantity, and in Juvenal (vi, 588). Marsham has a full dissertation on Nechepso and Petosiris in the work above quoted (p. 474-481).

Petra (in the earlier Greek writers Πηρα or Πή-

ra, but in the later αἱ Πηραί), was the capital of the Nabataean Arabs in the land of Edom, and seems to have given name to the kingdom and region of Arabia Petraea. As there is mention in the Old Testament of a stronghold which successively belonged to the Amor-

ites (Judges iii, 36), the Edomites (2 Kings xiv, 7), and the Moabites (Isa. xvi, 1; comp. in Heb. ch. xii, 11), and bore in Hebrew the name of סלע, which has the same meaning as Petra in Greek, viz. "a rock," that circumstance has led to the conjecture that the Petra of the Nabataeans had been the Selah of Edom. See STAM. This latter name seems, however, to have passed away with the Hebrew rule over Edom, for no further trace of it is to be found; although it is still called Sela by Isaias (xvi, 1). These are all the certain notices of the place in Scripture. Arce is said by Jose-

phus to have another name, Petra and Pheret, which we should probably read 'Arqat for 'Arqat (yet see Amer. Bib. Rev. for 1838, p. 556, note). See ARKAT.

1. History.—The earliest notice of this place under the name Petra by the Greek writers is connected with the fact that Antigonus, one of Alexander's successors, sent two expeditions against the Nabataeans in Petra (Diod. Sic. xix, 94-98). The first of these, commanded
PETRA

by Athenæus, and the second by Demetrius, changed the habits of the Nabathæans, who had hitherto been essentially nomadic, and led them to engage in commerce. In this way, during the following centuries, they grew up into the kingdom of Arabia Petraea, occupying very nearly the same territory which was comprised within the limits of ancient Edom. In the first expedition, Athenæus took the city by surprise while the men were absent at a neighboring market or fair, and carried off a large booty of silver and merchandise. But the Nabathæans quickly pursued him to the number of 8000 men, and, falling upon his camp by night, destroyed the greater part of his army. Of the second expedition, under the command of Demetrius, the Nabathæans had previous intelligence; and prepared themselves for an attack by driving their flocks into the deserts, and placing their wealth under the protection of a strong garrison in Petra; to which, according to Diodorus, there was but a single approach, and that made by hand. In this way they succeeded in baffling the whole design of Demetrius. For points of history not immediately connected with the city, see Eumenes; Nabathæans. Strabo, writing of the Nabathæans in the time of Augustus, thus describes their capital: "The metropolis of the Nabathaeanis is Petra, so called; for it lies in a place in other respects plain and level, but shut in by rocks round about, yet within having copious fountains for the supply of water and the irrigation of gardens. Beyond the enclosure the region is mostly a desert, especially towards Judea" (Geog. xvi, p. 906). At this time the town had become a place of transit for the productions of the East, and was much resorted to by foreigners (Diod. Sic. xix, 95; Strabo, I. c.). Pliny more definitely describes Petra as situated in a valley less than two miles (Roman) in amplitude, surrounded by inaccessible mountains, with a stream flowing through it (Hist. Nat. vi, 28). About the same period it is often named by Josephus as the capital of Arabia Petraea (War, i, 6, 2; 13, 8; etc.). Petra was situated in the eastern part of Arabia Petraea, in the district called under the Christian emperors of Rome Palæstina Terræ (Vet. Rom. Hist. p. 74, ed. Wessel; Malala, Chronogr. xvi, 400, ed. Bohn). According to the division of the ancient geographers, it lay in the northern district, Gebalene; while the modern ones place it in the southern portion, Esh-Sherah, the Mount Seir of the Bible. Petra was subdued by A. Cornelius Palma, a lieutenant of Trajan (Dion Cass. lxxviii, 14). Hadrian seems to have bestowed on it some advantage, which led the inhabitants to give his name to the city upon coins; several of these are still extant (Mommaet, Med. Antiquités, v. 587; Eckehel, Doctr. Num. ii, 503). It remained under the Roman dominion a considerable period, as we hear of the province of Arabia being enlarged by Septimius Severus, A.D. 195 (ibid. lxxv, 1, 2; Eutrop. viii, 16). It must have been during this period that those temples and mausoleums were made, the remains of which still arrest the attention of the traveller; for, though the predominant style of architecture is Egyptian, it is mixed with florid and overloaded Roman-Greek specimens, which are but slightly modified by the native artists. In the 4th century Petra is several times mentioned by Eusebius and Jerome; and in the Greek ecclesiastical Notities of the 5th and 6th centuries it appears as the metropolis of the Palestinian see of the bishops (Reland, Palest. p. 216, 217); the last named of the bishops is Theodorus, who was present at the Council of Jerusalem in A.D. 556 (Orient. Christ. iii, 720). From that time until the slightest notice of Petra is to be found in any quarter; and as no trace of it as an inhabited site is to be met with in the Arabian writers, the probability seems to be that it was destroyed in some unrecorded incursion of the desert horde, and was afterwards left unpeopled. It is true that Petra occurs in the writers of the era of the Crusades; but they applied this name to Kerak, and thus introduced a confusion as to the true Petra which is not even now entirely removed. It was not until the reports concerning the wonderful remains in Wady Mousa had been verified by Burckhardt that the latter traveller first ventured to assume the identity of the site with that of the ancient capital of Arabia Petraea. He expresses this opinion in a letter dated at Cairo, Sept. 12, 1812, published in 1819, in the preface to his Travels in Syria and Nubia; but before its appearance the eminent geographer Carl Ritter had suggested the same conclusion on the strength of Seezen's intimations (Erdbilddnisse, ii, 217). Burckhardt's view was more amply developed in his Travels in Syria, p. 481, published in 1822, and received the high sanction of his editor, Col. Leake, who produces in support of it the arguments which have since been relied upon, namely, the agreement of the ancient descriptions with this site, and their inapplicability to Kerak; the coincidence of the ancient speculations of the distances of Petra from the Halicarnassus gulf and from the Dead Sea, which all point to Wady Mousa, and not to Kerak; that Josephus, Eusebius, and Jerome testify that the Mount Hor where Aaron died was in the vicinity of Petra; and that to this day the mountain which tradition and circumstances point out as the same still rears its lonely head above the vale of Wady Mousa, while in all the district of Kerak there is not a single mountain which could in itself be regarded as Mount Hor; and even if there were, its position would be incompatible with the recorded Journal journeys of the Israelites (Leake's Preface to Burckhardt's Travels in Syria, p. vii—ix; Robinson's Palestine, ii, 570—579, 655—659).

2. Description of the present site.—The ruined city lies in a narrow valley, surrounded by lofty and, for the most part, perfectly precipitous mountains. Those which form its southern limit are not so steep as to be impassable; and it is over these, or rather through
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them, along an abrupt and difficult ravine, that
travellers from Sinai or Egypt usually wind
their laborious way into the scene of magni
cent desolation. The ancient and more in
teresting entrance is on the eastern side, through
the deep narrow gorge called the Siq. It is not
easy to determine the precise limits of the an
cient city, though the precipitous mountains
by which the site is encompassed mark with
perfect distinctness the boundaries beyond
which it never could have extended. These
natural barriers seem to have constituted the
real limits of the city; and they give an extent
of more than a mile in length, nearly from
north to south, by a variable breadth of about
half a mile. Several spurs from the surroun
ding mountains encroach upon this area; but,
with inconsiderable exceptions, the whole is fit
for building on. The sides of the valley are
valled up by perpendicular rocks from four
hundred to six or seven hundred feet high.
The northern and southern barriers are neither
so lofty nor so steep, and they both admit of
the passage of camels. A great many small
recesses or side valleys open into the principal
one, thus enlarging as well as varying almost
infinitely the outline. With only one or two
exceptions, however, they have no outlet, but
come to a speedy and abrupt termination among
the overhanging cliffs, as precipitous as the
natural bulwark that bounds the principal val
ley. Including these irregularities, the whole
circumference of Petra may be four miles or
more. The length of this irregular outline,
though it gives no idea of the extent of the
area within its embrace, is perhaps the best
measure of the extent of the excavations.
The valley of Wady Musa, which leads to the
ruins, in a general westerly direction, is about
one hundred and fifty feet broad at its entrance,
and is shut in by cliffs of red sandstone, which
gradually increase from a height of forty or
fifty feet to two hundred or two hundred and
fifty feet. The valley gradually contracts till at one
spot it becomes only twelve feet broad, and is so over
lapped by the perpendicular cliffs that the light of day
is almost excluded. This is the ravine or Siq of Wady
Musa, which extends, with many windings, for a good
English mile. This valley contains a wonderful necrop
olain the wadis. The wadis, or rocky waeis, and by
their mixture of Greek, Roman, and Oriental architec
ture remind the spectator of the remains found in the
valley of Jehoshaphat near Jerusalem. The entrance of
the ravine is spanned by a bold arch, perhaps a tri
umphal one, with finely sculptured niches evidently in
tended for statues. This, like the other remains of
this extraordinary spot, is ascribed by the natives either
to the Pharaohs or to the Jins, i.e. evil genii. Along
the bottom of the valley in which it almost vanishes,
winds the stream. In ancient times its bed seems to
have been paved; and it appears to have been, in
many places at least, covered in, so that the street passed
above it. In other wider portions of the ravine, espe
cially where it opens out into the city, it was spanned
by frequent bridges, its sides strengthened with stone
walls or quays, and numerous small canals derived from
it supplied the inhabitants with water. But now its
banks are overgrown with hyacinths, oleanders, and
other shrubs, and the upper portions of it are overhad
over by lofty trees.

Opposite the termination of the Siq, or narrow part
of the ravine, just where it turns at its junction with a
second ravine-like but broader valley, stands the chief
attraction of the whole place, the finest monument in
fact in all Syria. This is the Khazneh—well preserved,
considering its age and site, and still exhibiting its deli
cate chiselled work, and all the freshness and beauty of
its coloring. Like all the other wonders of the place, it
is carved out of the face of the perpendicular cliff, which
here rises about 150 feet high. It has two rows of six
columns over one another (one of the lower ones has
fallen), with statues between, surmounted by capitals
and a sculptured pediment, the latter divided by a little
round temple crowned with an urn. The Arabs imagine
that this urn contained treasure (khazneh, hence the name
of the entire structure), which they ascribe to Pharaoh.
The interior does not correspond with the magnificence
of the façade, being a plain, lofty hall, with a chamber
adjoining each of its three sides. It was either a maus
oleum or, more probably, a temple.

From this spot the cliffs on both sides of the valley
are pierced with numerous excavations, the chambers
of which are usually small, though the fronts are occa
sionally of some size and magnificence; scarcely two,
however, are exactly alike. After a gentle curve the
valley expands still more, and here on its left side lies
the theatre, entirely hewn out of the rock. Its diamete
ter at the bottom is one hundred and twenty feet and it
has thirty-three rows of seats, capable of accommodat
ing three thousand spectators. Strangely enough, it is
totally surrounded by tombs. One of the more north
erly of these is inscribed with the name of Q. Prefectus
Florentinus, probably the governor of Arabia Petra
under Hadrian or Antoninus Pius. Another has a
Greek inscription not yet deciphered. Travellers are
agreed that these excavations, some of the most strik
ing of which are in the cliff directly opposite the thea
tre, were mostly tombs, though some think they may
originally have served as dwellings. Indeed several
of them have loculi sunk in the floor as if for burial places. A few were doubtless temples for the worship of Baal, but subsequently converted into Christian churches. They extend all along the eastern cliffs.

The Theatre at Petra.

Proceeding still down the stream, at about one hundred and fifty paces from the theatre the cliffs expand rapidly, and soon recede so far as to give place to a plain about a mile square, surrounded by gentle eminences. The brook, which now turns again to the west, traverses the middle of this plain till it reaches a ledge of sandstone cliffs, through which it pierces, and is lost in the sands of the Arabah. This little plain was the site of the city of Petra, and it is still covered with heaps of hewn stones, traces of paved streets, and foundations of houses.

The chief public buildings occupied the banks of the river and the high ground, especially on the south, where their ruins sufficiently show. One sumptuous edifice remains standing, though in imperfect and dilapidated state. It is on the south side of the river, near the western side of the valley, and seems to have been a palace rather than a temple. It is called Khur Faris, or Pharaoh's palace, and is thirty-four paces square. The walls are nearly entire, and on the eastern side they are still surmounted by a handsome cornice. The front, which looks towards the north, was ornamented with a row of columns, four of which are standing. An open piazza behind the colonnade extended the whole length of the building. In the rear of this piazza are three apartments, the principal of which is entered under a noble arch, apparently thirty-five or forty feet high. It is an imposing ruin, though not of the purest style of architecture, and is the more striking as being the only proper edifice now standing in Petra.

A little east of this, and in a range with some of the most beautiful excavations in the mountain on the east side of the valley, are the remains of what appears to have been another triumphal arch. Under it were three passages, and a number of pedestals of columns, as well as other fragments, would lead to the belief that a magnificent colonnade was connected with it. In the same vicinity are the abutments of a massive bridge.

On an eminence south of this is a single column (of sarsen) called Zab Faris, i.e. hasty virilis Pharonis) connected with the foundation walls of a temple, whose pillars lie scattered around in broken fragments, some of them five feet in diameter. Twelve of these, whose pedestals still remain in their places, adorned either side of this stately edifice. There were also four columns in front and six in the rear of the temple. They are prostrate on the ground, and Dr. Olin counted thirty-seven massive frustas of which one of them was composed.

Still farther south are other piles of ruins—columns and hewn stones—parts, no doubt, of important public buildings. The same traveller counted not less than fourteen similar heaps of ruins, having columns and fragments of columns intermingled with blocks of stone in this part of the site of ancient Petra. They indicate the great wealth and magnificence of this ancient capital, as well as its unparalleled calamities.

These sumptuous edifices occupied what may be called the central parts of Petra. A large surface on the north side of the river is covered with substructions, which probably belonged to private habitations. An extensive region still farther north retains no vestiges of the buildings which once covered it. Public wealth was lavished on palaces and temples, while the houses of the common people were slightly and meanly built, of such materials as a few years, or at most a few centuries, were sufficient to dissolve.

The acropolis is thought to have occupied an isolated hill on the west. The whole ascent of the hills on the south, up which the toilsome passage-way out of this museum of wonders winds, is elaborately pierced with tombs, temples, or dwellings. At the north-west extremity of the cliff surrounding the plain is the Deir or cloister, the second most remarkable sculpture of the entire place, hewn likewise out of the face of the rock. A ravine somewhat like the Sils, with many windings, leads to the base, and the approach up to it is in places by a path five or six feet broad, cut with immense labor in the precipitous rock. Its façade is larger than that of the Khuzneh; but, as in that building (if such we may call it), the interior does not correspond, being merely a large square chamber, with a recess resembling the niche for the altar in Greek ecclesiastical architecture, and bearing evident signs of having been converted from a heathen into a Christian temple. The cliffs on the north-east side of the basin, which here extends up a considerable valley, are in like manner cut into temples, tombs, or other architectural forms of great variety.

Laboree and Linant also thought that they traced the outline of a naumachia or theatre for sea-fights, which would be flooded from cisterns in which the water of the torrents in the wet season had been reserved—a remarkable proof, if the hypothesis be correct, of the copiousness of the water-supply, if properly harnessed, and a confirmation of what we are told of the exuberant fertility of the region, and its contrast to the barren Arabah on its immediate west (Robinson, ii, 169). Stanley (Spr. and Pal. p. 95) leaves little doubt that Petra was the seat of a primeval sanctuary, which he fixes at the spot now called the "Deir" or "Convent," and with which fact the choice of the site of Aaron's tomb may, he thinks, have been connected (p. 96). As regards the question of its identity with Kadesh, see KADISH; and, for the general subject, see Ritter, xiv, 69, 997 sq.

Rock-hewn Temple at Petra.

The mountain torrents which at times sweep over the lower parts of the ancient site have undermined many foundations, and carried away many a chiselled stone, and worn many a finished specimen of sculpture into unshapely masses. The soft texture of the rock socons the destructive agencies of the elements.
PETRA

Even the accumulations of rubbish which mark the site of all other decayed cities have mostly disappeared; and the extent which was covered with human habitations can only be determined by the broken pottery scattered over the surface and mingled with the sand—the universal, and, it would seem, an imperishable memorial of populous cities that exist no longer. These vestiges, the extent of which Dr. Ginni took great pains to trace, cover an area one third as large as that of Cairo, excluding its large gardens from the estimate, and very sufficient, he thinks, to contain the whole population of Athens in its prosperous day.

The attention of travellers has, however, been chiefly engaged by the above-noted excavations, which, having more successfully resisted the ravages of time, constitute at present the great and peculiar attraction of the place. These excavations, whether formed for temples, tombs, or the dwellings of living men, surprise the visitor by their incredible number and extent. They not only occupy the front of the entire mountain by which the valley is encompassed, but of the numerous ravines and recesses which radiate on all sides from this enclosed area. They exist, too, in greater or less proportion among the precipices that shoot out from the principal mountains into the southern, and still more into the northern part of the site, and they are seen along all the approaches to the place, which, in the days of its prosperity, were perhaps the suburbs of the city of Petra. In the most pleasant of the views are found in the valley above the entrance of the Sik. These were excavations, instead of following all the sinuosities of the mountain and its numerous gorges, ranged in regular order, they probably would form a street not less than five or six miles in length. They are often seen rising one above another in the face of the cliff, and convenient steps, now much worn, cut in the rock, lead in all directions through the fissures and along the sides of the mountains, to the various tombs that occupy these lofty positions. Some of them are apparently not less than from two hundred to three or four hundred feet above the level of the valley. Conspicuous situations, visible from below, were generally chosen; but sometimes the opposite side prevailed, and the most secluded cliffs, fronting towards some dark ravine, and quite hidden from the gaze of the multitude, were preferred. The flights of steps, all cut in the solid rock, are almost innumerable, and they ascend to great heights, as well as in all directions. Sometimes the connection with the city is interrupted, and one sees in a gorge, or upon the face of a mountain, a noble rock-cut temple; or more properly in which, they are formed. The mountains that encompass the vale of Petra are of sandstone, of which red is the predominant hue. Their surface is a good deal burned and faded by the elements, and is of a dull brick color, the most beautiful and imposing results of ancient taste and skill which have remained to our times. The front of the mountain is wrought into facades of splendid temples, rivalling in their aspect and symmetry the most celebrated monuments of Grecian art. Columns of various orders, graceful pediments, broad, rich entablatures, and sometimes statuary, all hewn out of the rock solid rock, and still forming part of the native mass, transform the base of the mountain into a vast splendid pile of architecture, while the overhanging cliffs, towering above in shapes as rugged and wild as any on which the eye ever rested, form the most striking and curious of contrasts. In most instances it is impossible to assign these beautiful facades to any particular style of architecture. Many of the columns resemble those of the Corinthian order; but they deviate so far, both in their forms and ornaments, from this elegant model, that it would be impossible to rank them in the class. A few are Doric, which are precisely those that have suffered most from the ravages of time, and are probably very ancient.

But nothing contributes so much to the almost magical effect of some of these monuments as the rich and various colors of the cliff rock, and, as a consequence, of the objects properly in which, they are formed. The mountains that encompass the vale of Petra are of sandstone, of which red is the predominant hue. Their surface is a good deal burned and faded by the elements, and is of a dull brick color, the most beautiful and imposing results of ancient taste and skill which have remained to our times. The front of the mountain is wrought into facades of splendid temples, rivalling in their aspect and symmetry the most celebrated monuments of Grecian art. Columns of various orders, graceful pediments, broad, rich entablatures, and sometimes statuary, all hewn out of the rock solid rock, and still forming part of the native mass, transform the base of the mountain into a vast splendid pile of architecture, while the overhanging cliffs, towering above in shapes as rugged and wild as any on which the eye ever rested, form the most striking and curious of contrasts. In most instances it is impossible to assign these beautiful facades to any particular style of architecture. Many of the columns resemble those of the Corinthian order; but they deviate so far, both in their forms and ornaments, from this elegant model, that it would be impossible to rank them in the class. A few are Doric, which are precisely those that have suffered most from the ravages of time, and are probably very ancient.

But nothing contributes so much to the almost magical effect of some of these monuments as the rich and various colors of the cliff rock, and, as a consequence, of the objects
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capable—as brilliant and as soft as they ever appear in flowers, or in the plumage of birds, or in the sky when illuminated by the most glorious sunset. The red perpetually shades into pale, or deep rose or flesh color, and again approaches the hue of the lilac or violet. The white, which is often as pure as snow, is occasionally tinged with rosy shade. The blue is usually the pale azure of the clear sky or of the ocean, but sometimes has the deep and peculiar shade of the clouds in summer when agitated by a tempest. Yellow is an epithet often applied to sand and sandstone. The yellow of the rocks of Petra is as bright as that of sandstone. It is more easy to imagine that one describes the effect of tall, graceful columns exhibiting these exquisite colors in their succession of regular horizontal strata. They are displayed to still greater advantage in the walls and cellings of some of the excavations where there is a slight dip in the strata.


Petrarch, VICENZO, an Italian cardinal, was born at Naples Nov. 18, 1662. He occupied at the court of Rome several considerable positions, and was created cardinal in 1743, then bishop of Faenza. He enjoyed great influence with popes Innocent XII and Benedict XIII, who often consulted him upon grave affairs. He died at Rome March 24, 1747. He published De sacra Pontificiæ Apostolicae (Rome, 1712, 4to), and Commentaria ad Constitutiones Apostolicæ (Ven. 1729, 4 vols. fol.). See Notizie storiche del Regno di Napoli: Hoefler, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxvii., 750 sq.

Petrarch (Ital. Petrarco), FRANCESCO, one of the most celebrated of Italian writers of prose and poetry, deserves a place here because he was for many years a devout and consistent ecclesiastic, and exerted a far-reaching influence on the classical culture of Italy in the later medieval period known as the Renaissance (q. v.). Petrarch was born at Arezzo, in Tuscany, July 20, 1304. His father, a Florentine notary, had been exiled two years before, in the same disturbance which drove out the poet Dante; and he soon left Italy for Avignon, where the papal court then resided. The son was educated by the monks of St. Fossil and St. Martin, and at Montpellier, and then sent to study law at Bologna. Though Petrarch certainly loved the Eneid more than the Pandects, and copied ancient manuscripts more willingly than law papers, yet the subsequent course of his public life proves that he did not neglect professional pursuits, and that he prepared himself for being a useful man of business. Returning to Avignon soon after he became of age, he found himself in possession of a small inheritance, and indulged for some years in an alternation of classical studies and political composition, with much society (sombre, perhaps, but not the more pure on that account) as the clerical court offered. In the year 1327 he conceived an attachment to an Avignonese lady, young but already married. Some slight obscurity still hangs over his relation to this lady, but it is almost certain that she was no less a paragon of virtue than of loveliness. He met her on April 6, 1327, in the church of St. Clara in Avignon, and at once and forever fell deeply in love with her. The lady was then nineteen, and had been married for two years to a gentleman of Avignon, named Hugues de Sade. For ten years Petrarch lived near her in the papal city, and frequently met her at church, in society, at festivities, etc. He sang her beauty and his love, under the name of his “Laura,” in three sonnets whose mellifluous conceits ravished the ears of his contemporaries, and have not yet ceased to charm. The lady, whatever she was, knew how to keep Petrarch at a respectful distance, and for using the only opportunity he had of avowing his love in her presence she so severely reproved him that he never repeated the offence. About 1338 he retired for two or three years to dwell in the beautiful valley of Vaucluse, near Gargas. He himself said that his withdrawal to the retreat which he immediately caused was caused by no reason more sentimental or poetic than his disgust with the licentiousness of the papal court, and the disappointment of the hopes of preemption which the pope had held out to him. Long before this time Petrarch’s talents had attracted attention to him not only distinguished patronage, but frequent and active employment. A most brilliant honor awaited him at Rome in 1341, where, on Easter-day, he was crowned in the Capitol with the laurel-wreath of the poet. The ceremonies which marked this coronation were a grotesque medley of pagan and Christian representations. Petrarch was, however, as ardent a scholar as he was a poet; and throughout his whole life he was occupied in the collection of Latin MSS., even copying some with his own hand. To obtain these, he traveled elled frequently, as far as England or Flanders, as the case might be, and Spain. In 1353 Petrarch returned to Italy, and soon became the trusted counselor and diplomatic agent of several of his country’s rulers. He was sent on missions at home and abroad. He finally settled at Milan, where he remained ten years, and lived for some years at Parma, Mantua, Padua, Verona, Venice, and Rome. Though he had never entered holy orders, he was rewarded for his faithful services to the state by ecclesiastic benefices in the north of Italy. He might have risen to positions of great influence and rich returns if he had chosen, but he preferred the quiet life of a recluse. In 1370 Petrarch removed to Arquà, a little village prettily situated among the Euganean hills, where he spent his closing years in hard scholarly work, much annoyed by visions, troubled with epileptic fits, not over rich, but serene in heart, and displaying in his life and correspondence a rational and beautiful piety. He died July 18, 1374. Petrarch was not only far beyond his age in learning, but had risen above many of its prejudices and superstitions. He despised astrology, and the childish medicine of his times; but, on the other hand, he had no liking for the conceited scepticism of the medieval savans; and in his De sua insigni et multorum alias Ignorantia he sharply attacked the irreligious speculations of those who had acquired a shallow, free-thinking habit from the study of the Arabico-Aristotelian school of the University of Paris and the University of Rome, and whose works were the first in modern times in which the language was classically written. The principal are his Epistola, consisting of letters to his numerous friends and acquaintances, and which rank as the best of his prose works: De Vita Vitorum Iuliam: De Remediis utriusque Fortunae: De Vita Solitaria: Memorandarum libri io: De Contemptu Mundi, etc. Besides his sonnet epistles, he wrote numerous epistles in Latin verse, elegues, and an epic poem called Africa, on the subject of the Trojan war. It was this last production which obtained for him the laurel-wreath at Rome. Petrarch, whose life was thus active, is immortal in history by reason of more claims than one. He is placed as one of the most celebrated of poets in right of his “Rime,” that is, verses in the modern Italian tongue, of which he was one of the most celebrated composers and refiners. Celebrating in these his visionary love, he modelled the Italian sonnet, and gave to it, and to other forms of lyrical poetry, not only an admirable polish of diction and melody, but a delicacy of poetic feeling which has hardly been excelled in the most refined taste of fancy which, if it often degenerates into false wit, is so often delightfully and purely beautiful. But though Petrarch’s sonnets and canzoneti and “triumphs” could all be forgotten, he would still be honored as one of the benefactors of European civilization. No one but
Boccaccio shares with him the glory of having been the chief restorer of classical learning. His greatest merit lay in his having recalled attention to the higher and more correct classical authors; in his having been an enthusiastic and successful agent in reviving the study of the Greek classics in his having been, in his travels and otherwise, an indefatigable collector and preserver of ancient manuscripts. To his care we owe copies of several classical works which, but for him, would, in all likelihood, have perished. Collective editions of his whole works have been repeatedly published (Basle, 1485, 1554, and 1801 sq.). His life has employed many writers, among whom may be mentioned Bellutello, Beccadelli, Tommasini, De la Bastie, De Sades, Tiraboschi, Baldelli, Ugo Foscolo, Campbell, and Geiger. In July, 1674, a Petrarch festival was held at Padua, and a statue of the great poet by Ceccon was erected. The eulogy on this occasion was pronounced by Alcardi, in the aula magna of the university. See, besides the complete biographies, Longfellow, Poets and Poetry of Europe; Gibbon,Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, ch. lxv: Prescott, Miscellaneous, p. 416: For. Qu. Rev. July, 1843: Contemp. Rev. July, 1874: Revue des Deux Mondes, July 15, 1874: Ueberweg, Hist. of Phil. ii, 7, 8, 462: Revue Chrétienne, 1869, p. 143.

Tomb of Petrarch.

Petrarca, Astolfo, a painter of Siena, was born about 1590. He studied successively under Francesco Vanni, the younger Salimbieni, and Pietro Somi. He acquired distinction, and executed many works for the churches and public edifices of his native city, as well as for the private collections. He also opened an academy there, which was much frequented by the artists of Siena, and honored by the attendance of Borgognone, who stopped some months with Petrarca before he proceeded to Rome. Lanzio says that Petrarca seemed to have adhered more to the manner of Vanni than any other master. He frequently aims at pleasing, and not unfrequently chuses his models from the schools of Upper Italy. His Marriage Feast at Cana brings Paul the Veronese strongly to our recollection. Petrarca's Communion of St. Jerome, at the Agostinian, is painted much after the manner of Caracci. Petrarca excelled in painting children, and his pictures are generally adorned with choirs of angels. His cabinet pictures are ingeniously composed, and have a lively and pleasing effect. His pictures of the Four Seasons, at Volte, a seat of the noble family of Chigi, are admired for the playfulness and elegance of the groups of Cupid introduced. He died in 1658.

Petri, Laurent, one of the three principal Swedish Reformers, a brother of the following, was born at Örebro in 1498. After having followed at Wittenberg the teaching of Luther and Melancthon, on his return to Sweden he spread the principles of Reform in that country. Appointed by Gustavus Vasa professor of theology in the University of Upsala, of which he became rector in 1527, he was elevated in 1531 to the archiepiscopal chair of that city. He then undertook, with the aid of his brother Olaus and of Laurent Andrei, a Swedish translation of the Bible, based principally upon Luther's version, which was printed in 1541: it is known under the name of Gustavus's Bible, and it has contributed greatly to the development of the Swedish language. Sent in 1534 as ambassador to the czar of Russia, he held, in the presence of that prince, a conference upon religion with the patriarch of the Russian Church; the discussion took place in Greek; but the interpreter employed by the czar to translate into Russian the words of the interpolators often did not understand the abstract terms used by Petri, and then told what passed through his head, until one of the assistants, who understood Russian and Greek, disclosed the fraud by bursts of laughter. Petri, during the rest of his life, was occupied in revising his own and in organizing the new Church, of which he was one of the principal founders. He was very benevolent, and distinguished himself advantageously over his brother by his conciliatory spirit, which did not prevent him from addressing to Eric XIV, in 1567, a severe reprimand on the subject of the murder of the Sture.
Pietri died in 1575. We have of his works, Terra ac
justa ratione quatro regum Sueciae Christiano captiva,
Lucca regis ac eius heredibus vitati defunct (Stock-
holm, 1547, 4to)—Postilla sur les Evangiles (ibid. 1555,
1641, 8vo)—Refutation D. Beurei perpertoni ad articulam
de Casa Domini (Upsala, 1563)—Discipline de l'Eglise
Suedoiae (Stockholm, 1571, 4to): a work which, by a
decision of the Diet of 1575, obtained the rank of law:
Several Sermons on the Passion (ibid. 1575, 8vo)—several
other Sermons, and liturgical, polemical, and dogmatical
works. See Schimmeier, Lebensbeschreibung der drei
Schweizerischen Reformatoren, Andre, Olaus und Laurent
Pietri (Lubeck, 1768, 4to); Hallman, Lyferens bekrig-
st af den skibel af Lars Pietri (Leipzig, 1775); Aixou,
La Saute sous Gustave Vasa (Paris, 1861),
Bih. iv, 276.

Pietri, Olof-Phase, a Swedish theologian, was
born at Oeremo, in 1497: the son of a blacksmith.
He received his early education among the Carmelites of
his native town. He went to Wittenberg in 1512, with
whom he attended the University of Wittenberg,
where they embraced the doctrines of Luther. On
their return to Sweden, in 1519, they began, after hav-
ing as by a miracle escaped from the executioners of
Christian II, to propagate the doctrines of the Reformation.
Appointed in 1523 rector of the school of Strangnits,
Olof won to his opinions the archdeacon Laurent
Anders, and, through the mediation of the latter, Gusta-
vus Vasa appointed Peter preacher at Stockholm.
In his sermons and in diverse conferences he attacked
the old religion with a progressively increasing vigor.
The first among all Protestant ecclesiastics in Sweden, he was publicly
married in 1525. After having assisted at the Diet of
Yesteriis in 1527, where he had a dispute upon religion
with the professor of Upsala, Pierre Vialle, whom Gusta-
vus declared to have been inspired, he entered more
and more into the favor of the king, who consulted him
upon the most important affairs, and finally appointed
him his chancellor. In 1539 Pietri, tired of business,
relinquished his duties for those of first pastor of the
capital. The following year he was condemned to death
for not having revealed, in 1536, the conspiracy formed
against the life of the king by some citizens of the
Hanseatic villages, one of whom had confessed to him.
He purchased his pardon for a large sum. Three
years after the king reinstated him in his office of pastor, and
he held it for the rest of his life in Stockholm until 1562.
He joined to quite extensive and varied learning
great activity and a captivating eloquence, but he never spared his adversary, and often degenerated into
abuse of a bold and rash character. He may be called
the Luther of Sweden, while his brother Laurent, milder
and more moderate, was the Melanchthon. We have
of Pietri's works, in Swedish, treatises on Marriage of
Ecclesiastics (Stockholm, 1524, 1528, 4to)—the Difference
between the Evangelical Faith and the Romanism (ibid. 1527,
1605, 4to)—On the Duties of the Clergy and the Lay
(ibid. 1527, 4to)—On the Inconsistency of the Monastic
Monastic Life (ibid. 1528, 8vo)—Postilla sur les Evangelists
ibid. 1530)—Introduction to Sacred Scriptures
(ibid. 1538, 4to)—some Sermons, Odes that are still
sung in Sweden, and several other theological writings.
Pietri has left in manuscript some Memoirs upon the
history of his country, which remained unpublished
because Gustavus found them written with too much
independence; one copy of which, preserved in the Royal
Library of Paris, has been analyzed by Kerallo in the
Notes et Extraits des Manuscrits, vol. i.—Hoefer, Novi.
Bih. General, xxxix, 584. See also the references
under the preceding article.

Pietri, Pietro de', an Italian painter, was born in
Pomposa, district of Novara, in 1671. He studied under
Carlo Maratti at Rome, and painted some works for the
churches in that metropolis. Lanzi says he formed a
style of his own by engraving on that of Maratti a por-
tion of the manner of Cortona. He did not, however,
inhabit, and obtained the reputation of a master, on ac-
count of his infirm health and extreme modesty.
His best works are a picture of The Crucifixion, in
the church of SS. Vincino e Anastasio, and some frescos
in the tribune of S. Clemente. He was called at
Rome de' Pietri. Orlanti calls him a Roman, others
a Spaniard, but Lanzi says he was a native of Premia.
He died at Rome in 1716, in the prime of life.
There are a few etchings heretofore attributed to him,
but Bartsch gives them to another artist of the same
name.

Petrobrusians. The sect of the Petrobrusians,
or, as they are commonly but less correctly called, Pet-
robrusians, was the earliest of the anti-sacerdotal com-
munities which the profound discontent inspired by the
tyranny of Rome called into existence at the beginning
of the 12th century. They were the followers of the
eloquent Peter of Brusy, who about the year 1100 be-
gan to declaim against the corruptions of the Church
and the vices claimed to have come from the time
for twenty years most successfully, especially in Lan-
guedoc and Provence, and made many converts to his
own opinions. What these really were it is difficult to
state here, as there is no record among his friends.
From Peter of Orbec, who was his principal assistant,
we gather that his principal doctrines—which, with
one exception (his repugnance to the cross), were more
ably extended by his more powerful successor, Henry
the Deacon—were, though somewhat rationalistic, yet
upon the whole rather evangelical. At first the preach-
ing of Peter seems to have been confined to the incul-
ination of a system of general morality; but time and im-
portancy so favored him that he attacked the seeds of
dogmatic errors "per xx fere annos sata et aucta quinque
precipue et venenata virgulta." The capital charges
upon which he was imprisoned (1), he met by
baptism, alleging that no miraculous gifts were possible in
that ceremony, which he declared to be wholly void
when performed on the person of an irresponsible infant.
(2) He denied that any special sanctity resided in con-
secrated buildings; forbidding the erection of churches,
and directing that such churches as did exist should be
pulled down. (3) In particular he objected to the
worship of the cross, alleging that the accursed tree
should be held in horror by all Christians as the instru-
ment of the torture and death of the Redeemer. (4) He
refused to distinguish between idolatries and false cer-
er or not he retained the office of the communion as
a memorial rite is not known. (5) He was bitterly op-
posed to prayers, oblations, alms, and other good deeds
done on behalf of the dead. To these five capital
tenets, which form the subject of the Cluniac abbots'
refutation, must be added a total prohibition of chant-
ing and all use of sacred music. Puritanical as some of
these tenets seem, Peter of Brusy was no lover of asceticism. He
inculcated marriage, even of priests, as a high religious usage. The deleterious effects which this
practice had on the Romanists was so obvious to the
Romans as to have been stated by Leo XIII; in the
frameschul, li, 72; Hagenbuch, Hist. of Doct. (see Index).
See Peter of Brusy.

Petrocorius. Paulinus, sometimes confounded
with Paulinus of Nola (q. v.), was an Eastern ecclesi-
astic, and, according to his own reports, flourished in the
Western empire in the 6th century. He was intimate
with Perpetua, who was bishop of Tours from A.D. 461 to 481, and whom he calls his patron. It was at the desire of Perpetua that he put into versus the life of St. Martin of Tours; and in an epitaph addressed to that prelate he humbly tells him, with an amusing reference to the history of Balaam, that, in giving him confidence to speak, he had repeated the insect biting the mouth of the ass. He afterwards supplied, at the desire of the bishop, some verses to be inscribed on the walls of the new church which Perpetua finished about A.D. 478 (or, according to Oudin, A.D. 482), and to which the body of St. Martin was transferred. He sent with them some verses, De Vitae St. Martinii Vita Liber of Sulpicius Severus; and the fourth and fifth comprehended the incidents mentioned in the Dialogi I et III de Virtutibus Beati Martyr of the same author. The sixth book comprises a description of the miracles which had been wrought at the tomb of St. Martin under the eyes of Perpetua, who had sent an account of them to Paulinus:—De Visitazione Nepotuli suti, a description of the miraculous cure of his grandson already mentioned, also written in hexameter verse:—De Oratorium (an inap- propriate title, which should rather be Oratoriurn simply, or Ad Orantes), apparently a portion of the hexameter verses designed to be inscribed on the walls of the new church built by Perpetua:—Perpetuus Episcopus Epistola. This letter was sent to Perpetua with the verses De Visitazione and De Oratorium. The works of Paulinus Petrorocius were first printed by Franciscus Juretus (Par. 1585). After the first publication of the works they were inserted in several collections of the Christian poets, and in some editions of the Bibliotheca Pac- trum, generally, however, under the name of Paulinus of Nola. In the Lyons edition of the Bibliotheca Pac- trum (1677, fol.), vi, 297, etc., they are ascribed to their right author. They were again published by Christian- ian and Roman authors, 1788, 1893, with some notes of Juretus, Barthius, Gronovius, and Daunius. To the works of our Paulinus were subjoined in this edition the Eucharistia of Paulinus the Penitent, or Paulinus of Pella, and the poem on Jonath and the Ninevites, ascribed to Tertullian. See His. Lit. Litter. de France ii, 403, etc.; Cave, Hist. Litt. ad an. 461 (Oxon. 1740-1743, fol.), i, 449, Fabricius, Biblioth. M.L et Inf. Lat- tinat., v, 206, ed. Mauvi, Tillmont, Memoires, xvi, 404, Oudin, De Script. Hierat. et Script. Eclesi., vol. i, col. 1288, 1839.

Petro-Johannites, a name given to the part- tisans of Peter John Olives (A.D. 1279-1297), a monk of Bzéires, the founder of the Fraticelli schism among the Franciscans, and a disciple of the abbot Joachim. He followed in the steps of his master, and wrote a commentary on the Revelation, containing interpretations of a similar character to the prophecies of Joachim. From his birthplace he is called Peter of Strigmon, and from his monas- ter Petrus Biterrana. When pope Nicholas III issued the inquisitions of the rule of St. Francis (A.D. 1279), with the view of suppressing the fanat- icism which was rising among the "spirituals" of that order, a party was formed to resist it under the leadership of Olivi, and this party of Petro-Joh- annites, or strict Franciscans, became after his death the party out of which the Fraticelli took their rise. See Washing, Annal. Min. Fratric.; Oudin, De Scrip- toribus Eclesiastic., iii, 584; Baluze, Miscellanea., i, 218.

Petronilla, St., a Roman saint, is reputed to have been the daughter of the apostle Peter, and to have been at Rome with him. As the presence of the apostle himself at the Eternal City is still questioned, we need hardly discuss the presence of his daughter in that place. She is reputed to have become deprived of the use of her limbs by sickness. One day when some of his disciples sat at dinner with the apostle, they asked why it was that when he healed others his own child remained sick. Peter remained helpless. He implied that it was good for her to be ill, but, that his power might be shown, he commanded her to rise and serve them. This she did, and when the dinner was over lay down helpless as before. Years after, when she had become perfect by suffering, she was made well in answer to her earnest prayers. Now Petronilla was very beautiful, and a young noble, Valerius Flaccus, desired to marry her. She was afraid to refuse him, and promised that if he returned in three days she should then carry her home. She then earnestly prayed to be delivered from this marriage, and when the days came to celebrate the marriage he found her dead. Flaccus lamented sorely. The attendant nobles bore her to her grave, in which they placed her crowned with roses. She is commemorated in the Roman Church May 51.

Petronius, the name of two Romans somewhat involved in Jewish history.

1. Caius Petronius succeeded Aulius Gallus in the government of Egypt, and carried on a war in B.C. 22 against the Ethiopians, who had invaded Egypt under their queen Candace (q. v.). He was a friend of Herod, and sent corn to Judea during a famine (Josephus, Ant. xxv, 9, 2).

2. Publius Petronius was sent by Caligula to Syria as the successor of Vitellius (A.D. 40), in the capacity of governor, with orders to erect the emperor's statue in the Temple at Jerusalem; but at the intercession of the Jews he was prevailed upon to disobey the imperial command, and escaped punishment by the opportune death of the emperor (Josephus, Ant. xviii, 9, 2; War, ii, 10).

Petronius (St.) of Bologna, a Roman Catholic prelate sainted for his piety, flourished in the first half of the 6th century. He was a Roman by birth, and descendent of a noble family. He early entered the serv- ice of the Church, and soon rose to positions of influ- ence and distinction. He finally became bishop of Bologna, and distinguished himself by banishing the Arians from that city. He died A.D. 480. In the paintings of the Ethiopian saints he is painted in episcopal mitre with mitre and crosier. He has a thick black beard in an ancient representation, but generally is without it. His attribute is a model of Bologna, which he holds in his hand. His pictures are confined to Bologna; and there is in that city a beautiful church dedicated to his memory.

Petrus. See Peter.

Petrus Hispanus. See John XX.

Pettengill, Erastus, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Newport, N. H., July 7, 1805; was converted in Orford in 1824, and was bap- tized by Rev. Nathan Howe and joined the Methodist Episcopal Church. He was ordained a preacher in 1835, and labored that year on the Bethlehem charge under the direction of the presiding elder. He joined the New Hampshire Conference in 1836, and was sta- tioned at Bridgewater. His subsequent appointments were as follows: in 1837, Andover; in 1838, Vin- ton; in 1839, Bethel; in 1840-41, Lunenburg, Vt.; 1842- 43, St. Johnsbury; 1844-45, Barton; 1846, Newtown; 1847-48, Londonderry; 1849-50, Hartland; 1851-52, East Barnard; 1852-54, Norwich and Hartford; 1855, Union Village; 1856, Bellows Falls; 1857-58, Hardwick; 1859-60, Enosburg; 1861, Corinth; 1863-68, Williams-
PETTIBONE
town, 1864-66, Union Village; 1867-68, Barnard. While
laboring faithfully and with great acceptance on this
last appointment he was stricken with a fatal disease,
and after weeks of suffering, borne with great patience
and Christian fortitude, he died March 8, 1869, relying
upon the divine promise and trusting solely to the mer-
cies of Christ. See Minutes of A.M. Conf. 1870.

Pettibone, Roswell, a Baptist deacon and minister, was
born at Dwowel, L., Aug. 26, 1826. He had limited fa-
cilities for an early education, entered Middlebury Col-
lage in 1817, graduated in 1820, taught in the academy
there in 1821, studied divinity with Dr. Hopkins, and
was licensed by the Addison County Association in 1823.
He then commenced preaching in Milton, St.
Lawrence County, N. Y., in 1823, and was ordained
July 22, 1824; here he labored with great acceptability
and success till poor health induced him to seek a milder
climate, and in September, 1830, he went West, and
preached at Ann Harbor, Mich., through the winter, and
in the spring received a unanimous call to take
charge of the Church, but ill-health prevented his do-
ing so. During 1831 he was invited to the Church in
Evans' Mills, Jefferson County, N. Y., which he served
with great fidelity and success until, in November, 1857,
he was called to Canton, St. Lawrence County, N. Y.,
and installed Feb. 14, 1868. Here he labored until
April 1, 1854, when he became chaplain of Clinton State
Prison, where he died, Aug. 15, 1854. Mr. Pettibone
was pre-eminent in every relation and in the discharge
of every duty; in spirit and conduct a conservative con-
servative, and strongly attached to the Calvinistic doc-
trines of grace; very active in organizing different
benevolent societies and churches in his own and sister
310. (J. L. S.)

PETTIGREW, CHARLES, a prelate of the Protestant
Episcopal Church, was born about 1755, in Ireland,
whence his father immigrated about 1770. The family
was of Scottish origin, and possessed those marked char-
acteristics of Scotch genius which have distinguished
so many of the Presbyterian brethren who have come
to this country from Scotland. In 1778 Pettigrew be-
came a teacher at Edenton, but two years later he took
Holy orders, and was ordained pastor of the Protestant
Episcopal Church at Loudon. In May, 1794, at a con-
vention held at Tarboro, he was elected bishop. He
died at Bonaroon, Lake Scuppernong, where he settled
in 1774. Pettigrew took a leading part in founding the
University of North Carolina.

PEeto (or Pepto), SAMUEL, an English Noncon-
formist divine, the date of whose birth is not known,
flourished near the close of the 17th century. He was
educated for the Church Establishment at Catharine
Hall, Cambridge, and afterwards became rector of
Sandcroft, in Suffolk. When the Act of Uniformity was
passed in 1662 he was ejected from his living as a Non-
conformist. Afterwards he became pastor in a Dissent-
ing Church at Sudbury, where he passed the remainder
of his life. He died probably about 1766, at an advanced
age. His work entitled The Relation Unveiled (1669)
dealt with Scripture prophecies. The plan of the work
was to inquire: 1. When many Scripture prophecies had
their accomplishment. 2. What are now in process of
fulfillment. 3. What are still to be fulfilled. His other
works were: The Difference Between the Old and the New
Covenants (the preface of this work was written by Dr.
Owen): — The Voice of the Spirit: — Infant Baptism
Appointed by Christ: — Scripture Catechism: — Narra-
tive of the Wonderful and Extraordinary Figs of Thom.
Ipswich under the Influence of Witchcraft.

PETTY, JON, an eminently useful minister of the Primitive
Methodist Connexion, born in England, in 1807,
and died in 1868. His ability, piety, and devotedness
won for him some of the most important and responsi-
ble positions in the connection. For seven years he
was editor of the Primitive Methodist magazines, and
did good service in sustaining the efficiency and useful-
ness of these periodicals throughout the connection.
He was the author of several works having a large cir-
culation, of which the most important was The History
of the Primitive Methodist Connexion, a work performed
by request of the Conference, and with great thorough-
ness and ability. During the last three years of his
life he was governor of Elfinfield School, the principal
educational establishement among the Primitive Meth-
odists. In that position he was especially useful in
moulding the character and promoting the scholarship
of the students for the ministry. As a Christian, Mr.
Petty aimed at studying faith and holiness; and at
eminent personal holiness. As a scholar, "his learning
was varied, accurate, profound, sanctified." As a preach-
er, he evinced a deep insight into Christian life and
experience, and his style combined elegant simplicity
with intense earnestness. Among his last words were,
"O! what boundless stores of fullness there are in Jesus." (G. C. J.)

PETURSSON, HALLGRIMUR, a noted psalmist, was
born in Iceland in 1614. While Hallgrimur was yet a
boy, his father was appointed chorister at the cathedral
in Holle (the present episcopal residence in Iceland),
having been called thither by bishop Gudbrand Thor-
larsson, who is known as the first translator of the Bible
into Icelandic, and as the real founder of Protestanism
in Iceland. Hallgrimur got his elementary education
in the school of his father, but for some unknown reason
he was expelled from this school, whereupon he, aided
by some of his friends, went abroad, first to Glinskstad,
Sleswick, and later to Copenhagen. In Copenhagen
he worked for a blacksmith until Brynjolf Sveinsson (af-
fterwards bishop of Skalholt, in Iceland), about the year
1632, got him a place in the school of Our Virgin. Here
Hallgrimur made rapid progress, and in 1636 we find
him studying the so-called "master's lesson." In the year
1627 Iceland was visited by Mohammedan pirates from
Algeria, in the northern part of Africa, who at that time
extended their tyrannical rule of the sea from the shores
of the Mediterranean to the most western and northern
islands of the Atlantic. A number of Icelanders were
slain by them, while others were carried away as slaves.
By the interference of the Danish king, Christian IV,
some of the prisoners who had not already perished in
the land of the barbarians were ransomed, and in 1634
thirty-eight Icelanders were brought from Algeria to
Copenhagen, where they had to remain a few months
until merchant-ships in the spring of 1637 could take
them back to Iceland. While prisoners in Algeria they
had been forced to worship Mohammedan idols, and
when it was thought necessary during their stay in Copen-
hagen to instruct them in the principles of Christianity;
but, not understanding Danish, an Icelandic teacher had
to be found for them. Hallgrimur Petursson was se-
lected. Among those set free was a woman by name
Gudrid, who had formerly been the wife of an Iceland-
er in the Westmann Isles. Hallgrimur fell in love with
this woman so much that when the people were sent back
to Iceland in the spring, he left the school and returned
home with his beloved. The ship which carried them
landed at Kejafjord, in the southern part of Iceland, and
here Hallgrimur remained through the summer, doing
the work of a common laborer for the Danes. Gudrid
got a place to work on the farm Njardvik, not far from
Kejafjord, and here she gave birth to a son, whose father
was Hallgrimur. Soon afterwards he left the farm, and
lived for some time in the most abject poverty in a
lonely cottage at Sudurness, until the above-mentioned
Brynjolf Sveinsson, who meanwhile had become bishop
of Skalholt, persuaded him to enter the service of the
Church, ordained him for the ministry, and gave him
the poor parish of Hvalnes, in Guðjórs-Neset. He
entered the ministry in 1644, and remained in Hvalnes
until 1651, when he was removed to Saurbær, in Bor-
garfjord. At Saurbær he found some relief from his
poverty until Aug. 15, 1652, when the parsonage and all
Pezelians or Poschelians, a modern sect of a political-religious character, who derived their name from a priest of Brennan, called Petzel or Poschel. They held the natural and legal equality of all human beings, and maintained that there was a continual and inalienable property in the earth and its natural productions. Their enemies charged them with offering human sacrifices, particularly on Good Friday. They appear to have adopted the political principles of the Spencians, and probably their infidelity. Congregations belong to Upper Austria, but by the interference of the public authorities they have been dispersed. A similar sect seems to have taken part and spread somewhat in Switzerland, who are charged with the like enormities.

Kaspar, a German theologian of the Reformation period, was born Jan. 6, 1523, at Bautzen, and studied at the school in Goldberg and the University of Wittenberg, where he was the table and house companion of the Reformer Melaunthon, who afterwards became his father-in-law. A well educated and remarkably talented man, he became in 1548 a magistrate, in 1556 ordinary professor of mathematics, in 1569 professor of medicine. Some time after this he was introduced to the personal attention of the elector Augustus of Saxony, who was so pleased with Peucer that he put him in charge of the Saxon high school. Peucer, greatly interested in the theological development of his day, wrote several sermons (q.v.), and used his influence for its propagation in Saxony, and thus arrayed the strongly Lutheran elector against him. Peucer was imprisoned from 1573 until 1586. He died Sept. 25, 1602. He left a large number of medical, mathematical, historical, and other valuable philological writings. See Henke, Kaspar Peucer u. Nic. Krell (Marb. 1865); Calinich, Kempfy u. Untergang des Melanchthonismus in Kurwurzen (Leips. 1866); also the art. CRYPTO-CALVINISTIC CONTROVERSY.

Pulzthail (Heb. Püellathay, יֵּעַלָּה יָזָאָר, my wages; Sept. Φυλλαζε, son of Obed-edom, the last named of eight (1 Chron. xxvi. 6); he belonged to the family of Asaph of the division of Levi, and was one of the porters of the tabernacle in the reign of David. B.C. cir. 1020.

Peentingor, Konraod, a German writer noted for his antiquarian labors, was born at Augsburg in 1465; studied in German and Italian universities, and was employed in his native city by the authorities of the place and by the emperor as counsellor. He was a many-sided, educated man, and is celebrated not only as a writer, but also as a dialectic and musical poet, and was greatly esteemed by Luther when he first appeared against the Romanists. See Hagen, Deutschlands literarische Zustände im Zeitalter der Reformation, vol. 1.

Pevernage, Andrin, a Belgian writer, was born in 1541 at Courtray. At first music teacher in the collegiate church at Courtray, he abandoned this place to settle in Antwerp, where he passed the last ten or twelve years of his life in the capacity of simple musician of the cathedral. He established in his house weekly concerts, and there was heard the most beautiful music of the composers then in repose. He died at Antwerp July 20, 1589. We have of his works, Commentes sacrae (Antwerp, 1574—1591, 5 pts. 4to); some masses, religious fragments, and a collection compiled from different authors under the title of Harmonie celeste (Ibid. 1585, 1590, 4to). See Paquot, Mémoires.—Howler, Nouv. Bibliogr. Générale, xxxix., 776.

Pew (anciently pew; Old Fr. pay; Dusch, paye; Lat. podium, anything on which to lean; e.g. an erect; an enclosed seat in churches. The old French word pew meant a balcony, a gallery built on bulks or posts of timber; and it has been unnecessarily suggested that pew may only be a form of podium, a book-desk, or the Dutch pael by monks before sitting was permitted. In the early days of the Anglo-Saxon and some of the Norman churches, a stone bench afforded the only sitting accommodation for members or visitors. In the year 1819 the people are spoken of as sitting on the ground or standing. At a later period the people introduced
low, three-legged stools, and they were placed in no order in the church. Directly after the Norman conquest seats came in fashion. Church-seats were in use in England some time before the Reformation, as is proved by numerous examples still extant, the carving on some of which is as early as the Decorated Period, i.e. before A.D. 1400, and records as old as 1450 speak of such seats by the name of pews. They were originally plain fixed benches, all facing east, with partitions of wainscoting about three feet high.

Hendington, Oxfordshire.

After the Reformation seats were more appropriated, a curfew guarded the entrance, bearing the initial of the owner. It was in 1508 that galleries were thought of. As early as 1614 pews were arranged to afford comfort by being baized or cushioned, while the sides around were so high as to hide the occupants; probably under the influence of the Puritans, who, objecting to some parts of the service which they were compelled to attend, sought means to conceal their nonconformity. An early specimen of a pew of this kind exists in Cuxton Church, Kent. Up to a period some time after the Reformation the naves of churches, which were occupied by the congregation, were usually fitted with fixed seats, as they had been from the 14th century downwards, at the least: these seats varied in height from about two feet and a half to three feet, and were partially enclosed at the ends next the passages, sometimes with what are called bench-ends; sometimes these rose considerably above the wainscoting, and were terminated with carved finials or poppies, but they are more frequently ranged with the rest of the work, and were often straight at the top and finished with the same capping-mouldings; these end enclosures occupied about the width of the seat, and the remainder of the space was left entirely open. The partitions sometimes reached down to the floor, and sometimes only to a little below the seats: they were usually perfectly plain, but the wainscoting next the cross passages was generally ornamented with panellings, tracery, small buttresses, etc.: opposite to the seat at the back of each division or pew a board was frequently fixed, considerably narrower, intended to support the arms when kneeling. This mode of fitting the naves of churches was certainly very general, but it is difficult to ascertain when it was first introduced, the great majority of specimens that exist being of the Perpendicular style. See Standard.

In England pews were assigned at first only to the patrons of churches. A canon made at Exeter, in 1267, rebukes quarrelling for a seat in church, and decrees that none shall claim a seat as his own except noblemen and the patrons. Gradually, however, the system of appropriation was extended to other inhabitants of the parish, to the injury of the poor, and the multiplication of disputes. The law of pews in England is briefly this. All church-seats are at the disposal of the bishop, and may be assigned by him either (1) directly by faculty to the holders of any property in the parish; or (2) through the churchwardens, whose duty it is, as officers under the bishop, to seat the parishioners according to their degree.” In the former case the right descends with the property, if the faculty can be shown, or immemorial occupation proved. In the latter, the right can at any time be recalled, and lapses on the party ceasing to be a regular occupant of the seat. It appears that by common law every parishioner has a right to a seat in the church, and the churchwardens are bound to place each one as best they can. The practice of letting pews, except under the church-building acts, or special local acts of Parliament, and, much more, of selling them, has been declared illegal, except for the chapels of the Dissenters, who need the income of the pews for the payment of the pastor’s salary. In Scotland pews in the parish churches are assigned by the heritors to the parishioners, who have accordingly the preferable claim on them; but when not so occupied they are legally open to all. As is well known, pews in dissenting churches are rented as a means of revenue to sustain general charges. In some parts of the United States pews in churches are a matter of annual competition, and bring large sums. Latterly in England, and there has been some discussion as to the injuriously exclusive character of the “pew system,” and a disposition has been manifested to abolish pews altogether, and substitute movable seats available by all indiscriminately. Several pamphlets have appeared on the subject. The Times remarks that in dealing with this subject the first question is not the letting of pews, but the appropriation of seats. In most country churches the seats are more or less appropriated, but the pews are seldom rented. When we consider the matter from this point of view, does it not seem reasonable, as a matter of more order and decency, that those who regularly attend a church should have their appropriated places within it? If the churches are thrown completely open, they are thrown open not only to the parish, but to the whole world. In one of the best known of the London churches the incumbent lately complained from the pulpit that his parishioners could not obtain seats in the church which had been expressly built for them, and he announced his intention of altering the system. Another church, in Wells Street, which was especially built for the accommodation of a poor district, and in which all the seats are free, is usurped every Sunday by an aesthetic congregation of well-dressed people, who come to enjoy the excellent performance of the choir. Such a result would always take place where the preacher was popular or the ser-
vice attractive. Again, the existing churches would not hold more than a certain number of persons, and they are filled as it is. If more were invited to come, it would be only driving out the rich to make way for the poor, and there would be another national association for preaching the Gospel to the rich, or, rather, we should see the rich building proprietary chapels for themselves, in which the seats would be appropriated as before. But does any one suppose that the poor would thus force their way into the churches, and dispose of their present seats? What are the seats free or not, the result would be much the same. When the question of the appropriation of seats is decided, that of pew rents is comparatively simple. If the rich are to have a certain number of seats appropriated to them, which, as we have seen, is convenient and convenient than that they should pay a certain sum in respect of them? In the Roman Catholic churches on the Continent pew rents are seldom to be seen.

The reading pew, first mentioned in the rubric of 1602, was the reader's stall in the chancel. It had two desks—one on each side, for the Holy Bible and the older for the Prayer-book facing eastwards, as in Hooker's Church at Drayton Beauchamp. In 1571 Grindel called it "the pulpit, where prayers are said." Galamy applies the word to designate an open-air pulpit. George Herbert made his pulpit and reading pew of equal height, so as to be of equal honor and estimation, and agree like brethren. See Walcott, Sacred Archæol. s. v.; Chambers, Cyclop. s. v.; Parker, Glossary of Architecture, s. v.

Peyré, Isaac, a French Protestant writer, was born at Bordeaux in 1592. He fitted himself for military and diplomatic service, and at one time served the prince of Condé, whom he pleased by the singularity of his humor. Peyré finally turned priest. He was at the time a Protestant. He claimed that it had been revealed to him by St. Paul that Adam was not the first man, but that the first man was to be understood is explained by his theory by publishing in Holland, in 1655, a book entitled Præadimnitium sive exercitatio super versus 12, 13, 14, capitis xx Epistolae Pauli ad Romanos, which work was consigned to the flames, and he himself imprisoned at Brussels. On recantation and the interference of the prince of Condé, he was sent to Rome in 1655, where he published the reasons for his recantation, and abjured Calvinism and Præadimnitism before pope Alexander VII. He was not believed sincere by the people, and doubtless public opinion was just. The pontiff endeavored to expel him at Rome, but he finally returned to Paris, and again entered the service of the prince of Condé, acting as his librarian. He was not thought to be attached to any particular Church, notwithstanding that he had joined the Romanists. He, however, submitted to receive the sacrament. Some time after his return to Paris he retired to the "Séminaire des Vertus," where he died in 1676. He wrote, besides the above-mentioned articles, works upon Greenland and Iceland; also one upon the Restoration of the Jews, etc.

Peyton, Yelverton T., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Stafford County, Va., 1773, and died in 1815; entered the Baltimore Conference in 1818; and after filling some of the most important stations in the Conference, died in Baltimore Jan. 15, 1831. He was a devoted pastor, a faithful minister, and a very useful preacher. See Minutes of Annual Conference, ii. 118.

Fes, Bernard, a learned German Benedictine, was born at Ips. He early entered the monastery of Molk. For several years he, with his brother Jerome, collected chronicles, charters, and other documents of the Middle Ages, in Austria, Bavaria, and other parts of Germany. After having spent some time in France, where he was rewarded with countless letters of reference, he returned to his convent, whose library was confided to his care. He died March 27, 1735. We have of his works, Acta et vita Wilburgii virginum cum notis (Augsb. 1715, 4to); — Bibliotheca Benedictinæ-Maurianæ, seu de vitis et scriptis Patrum et congregatione S. Mauri (ibid. 1716, 8vo); — Theologiae monasteriorum et conventuum, seu Veitum monasteriorum præcapitum Phæm euctio (1721-1728, 5 vols. fol.); — Bibliotheca ascetica antiquo-novae (Ratisb. 1723-1740, 12 vols. 8vo).— Acta S. Truperti martyræ (Vienna, 1731, 4to); — some Notes to A. Nonnumbus Melilicins de scriptoribus ecclesiasticis, published by Fabriçius; several articles in different collections, etc. See Algemene Geschieden. Lexicon; Kropf, Biblioth. Melilicens; Hefner, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxxix, 789.

Pez, Hieronymus, a learned German Benedictine, brother of the preceding, was born at Ips in 1685. After having taken the Benedictine habit in the monastery of Molk, he began, with his brother, the search for unpublished historical documents concealed in the archives of libraries and universities of Austria and Bavaria. Placed later at the head of the library of his convent, he passed the last fifteen years of his life in the most profound retreat. He died Oct. 14, 1762. We have of his works, Acta S. Columbarii, Scotia regis (Krum. 1716, 4to); — Scriptores erem. Austriac., cum notis et lectionibus (Leips. 1720-1725, 2 vols. fol.), followed by a third volume, published in 1746 at Ratisbon; a very precious collection: — Historia S. Leopoldi, Austria marchionum, id nominis in, ex diplomatis adornata (Vienna, 1747, fol.). See Meusel, Script. Sacra, Schrock, Leben u. Pez (in the Leipziger Gelehrte Zeitung for 1762, p. 737. — Hefner, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxxix, 789.

Pezel, Christoph, a German theologian, was born March 5, 1539, at Plauen; studied at Wittenberg; was then three years canon in his native place, and in 1567 became court-preacher and professor of theology at Wittenberg. He was an advocate of Philochristus; he was deposed after the condemnation of Crypto-Calvinism in 1574; in 1576 was sent out of the country; in 1577 went to Siegen, where he taught for a while, and then became pastor at Herborn. In 1580 he was called to Bremen as pastor, and in 1584 was made master of the library of the University and gymnasium illustre. In 1589 he again assumed the pastorate, and became also superintendent, and as such contributed to the strengthening and development of Lutheranism. He died Feb. 25, 1604. Besides theological controversial writings, and of the so-called Wittenberg Catechism, he wrote Commentaria collecta emendatione explicatio adiuncta, symbols, orationes dominicae, doctrinae de persona et sacramentis (Wittenberg, 1571), he wrote also Milliæum Historicum, a much-used handbook of history, and edited Meinerchon's letters to Hardenberg. (J. H. W.)

Pezon, Paul, a Roman Catholic monastic of much celebrity, was born at Hennepin, in Bretagne, in 1599. He embraced the monastic life in the Cistercian abbey of Prieres in 1611; was appointed master of the novices and sub-prior in 1672; sub-prior of the college of the Bernardins at Paris in 1677; vicar-general of his order in 1690, and obtained the abbey of Charnay in 1697. He resigned it finally to give himself entirely to his studies, and became a doctor of the Sorbonne. He died in 1706. His most important publication is L'antiquité des temps révolus et défendus, contre les Juifs et les nouveaux chronologues (Amst. 1697, 12mo.) In this work the author maintains the priority of the Septuagint chronology against that of the Hebrew Bible. Pezon's book was extremely admired for the ingenuity and learning of it; yet created, as was natural, no small alarm among the religious. Maritanay, a Benedictine, and Le Quien, a Dominican, in a new system, and undertook the defence of the Hebrew text; Maritanay with great zeal and heat, Le Quien with more judgment and knowledge. Pezon published Defense de l'antiquité des temps in 1691 (4to), which, like the work itself, abounded in errors and inaccuracies, and was repudiated; but Maritanay brought the affair into another court; and, in 1698, laid the books and principles of Pezon
before M. de Harlai, archbishop of Paris. Harlai communicated the representation of this adversary to Persro, who, finding no difficulty in supporting an opinion common to all the fathers before Jerome, rendered the accusation of no effect. Other works of his are, Ésais d'un Commentaire Légitime et Historique sur les Prophéties et les Apocryphes Confusés par la Judicature et la Romains (1696, 2 vols. 12mo.): —


Paffe, Christoph Mathiæns, D.D., a German Protestant theologian, son of Johann Christoph Paffe (q. v.), was born Dec. 23, 1686, at Stuttgart. At the age of thirteen he was admitted to the university, and after having finished his theological studies, he received the means from the duke of Württemberg, in 1706, to go to other universities to perfect himself in the knowledge of the Oriental tongues. He visited with this design several universities of Germany, Hol\n
land, and England. Upon his return to Stuttgart in 1709, he accompanied the hereditary prince Charles-Alexandre de Ita, and remained three years in Turin, occupied especially in copying from the libraries the unpublished fragments of ancient ecclesiastical authors. He afterwards went with the prince to Holland, where he spent two years, and to Paris, where he spent five. In 1722 he placed himself in connection with the most renowned learned men. Appointed in 1716 professor of theology at Tübingen, he became in 1720 dean of the faculty and chancellor of the university; he also received several high ecclesiastical positions, and became among others, in 1727, abbe of Loch, which gave him the entree to the states of Württemberg. In 1724 he was gratified with the title of count-palatine, and was elected in 1731 member of the Academy of Berlin. In 1756 he became chancellor of the University of Giessen, dean of the faculty of theology, and general superintendent of the churches. Possessing extensive and varied knowledge, he carefully avoided the bitter tone of the theologians of his confession, and he even made, but without the least success, several attempts to unite the Lutheran and Calvinists in churches. He died at Giessen Nov. 16, 1760. Paff's erudition was immense, and his works so numerous that they fill a whole sheet of the German bibliographies. Among his numerous works and dissertations we mention, De genuinis Librorum Novi Testamenti ectsone (1714, 4to.); De Testimonio aliquot de la virtud de la Religion Protestante contra la Religion pretendue Catholique (Tub. 1718, 1719): — De Evangelii sub Anastatii superatore non corrupta (Tubing, 1717, 4to.): — reprinted, with several other dissertations of Paffe, in his Fröstiae Tübingenses (ibid. 1718, 4to.); — De litera
gia, missioulis, apostolae et libri ecclesiastiæ Ecclesiae orientalis et occidentalis eterris et modernis (ibid. 1718, 4to.):

— De origine juris eclesiastici verae ebus indole (ibid. 1719, 1720, 1756, 4to.): — Dissertationes Anti-Bohemia tres (ibid. 1719, 1720, 4to.): — Institutiones theologica dognatorum et moratorum (ibid. 1718, 4to.); Franc. 1721, 8vo.): — one of the first theological works written in Germany, and in which the rationalistic tendency is recognised: — Introductio in historia theologiam literariae (ibid. 1720, 8vo.): — ibid. 1724, 1725, 3 vols. 4to.): — De variorum biblioum ecclesiastucm Protestantismurn, auctorum Hassettum (ibid. 1720, 4to.): — Geographiae Schylerum sur la Vereeniging der protestie
den Kirchen abeste (Halle, 1728, 2 vols. 4to.): — a collection of writings tending to the reunion of the Protestant
turc'ches: — De titulii patriarachi ecumenici (Tubing, 1735, 4to.): — De ecclesia sanciunim non s actresses (ibid. 1747, 5to.): — De asserolis virginiun, doctorum et martyrum (ibid. 1750, 4to.). As an editor, Paffe published Epitome Institutioum dianeurum Laetanti (Paris, 1712, 8vo.), first edition complete: — S. Irenear fragmerta anecdoti (La Haye, 1715, 8vo.); a publication followed by a dispute

with Seip, Maffei, who had cast some doubt upon the authenticity of these fragments: — Ecclesia ecumenici libri symbolici (Tubingen, 1730, 8vo.). Finally, Paffe directed the publication of the new German translation of the Bible, which appeared at Tubingen (1729, fol.), a work on which, in connection with others, he actively labored. Paffe was a learned man of the very first rank, but of doubtful moral character. He was at the head of the so-called collegial system, which regards the Church as a collegium — as a corporation possessing corpor rights, the Church can make her own statutes and laws, and can insist upon their observance. The attitude of the Church towards her: an individual or similar to the position it occupies with respect to any other association. The magistratus politicus does not belong to her; the Church consisting solely of teachers and taught. It is only by transference, by virtue of silent or express compact, that the magistracy can receive rights originally inherent in the Church. Results were, however, at first, and till after the commencement of the 19th century, in favor of the territorial system. The Bible known among the German Protestants as "the Bible of Tubingen" was published under Paffe's direction in one of his volumes (ibid. 1729, 4to.). He was also for a time pastor at St. Leonard's Church in Stuttgart. He died in 1720. He was the author of about forty works and exegetical and dogmatic dissertations, but none of them are of much value in our day. A list of them may be found in Winer's Theo. Lit., a. v. See also Böck, Gruch. der Universaldai; Zeplein. Leben der Gelehrten, and Bibliotheca Bremensis (1720). (J. H. W.)

Paffe, Johann Christoph, a German Lutheran theologian, was born at Pufflingen in 1631, and was educated at the university in Tübingen, where he afterwards flourished as professor of theology. He was also a correspondent for a time at St. Leonard's Church in Stuttgart. He died in 1720. He was the author of about forty works and exegetical and dogmatic dissertations, but none of them are of much value in our day. A list of them may be found in Winer's Theol. Literatur, a. v. See also Böck, Gruch. der Universaldai; Zeplein. Leben der Gelehrten, and Bibliotheca Bremensis (1720). (J. H. W.)

Pfauser (Pfauser), Johann Sebastian, a German Roman Catholic divine, was born at Constance in 1520. He came by recommendation of the bishop of Trent to Vicenza as court-preacher of emperor Ferdinand I, but was consigned to the monastery of the Augustins, by the emperor, in his anti-Papal tendency. He was thereafter employed as confessor and preacher by the emperor's son, Maximilian, and all efforts to supplant him were unsuccessful until the Bohemian crown question arose, and it became necessary for the court to have the favor of all Ultramontane pretenses. In 1560 Pfauser became pastor at Laumin. He died in 1569. To the last Maximilian kept up a friendly correspondence with this good man.

Pfefferkorn, Johann (originally Joseph), a noted Jewish convert to Christianity, was born in Moravia in 1469. He embraced Christianity, and was christened Peter, and baptized at Cologne with his wife and children in 1506, when thirty-six years old. All the efforts of this man, who, with many faults, was certainly not wanting in merit, were early directed to the conversion of his brethren according to the flesh. The means he first made use of were highly laudable; for he treated them with gentleness, and even defended his former co-religionists against the calumnies of their enemies. But fanatical and misguided, his zeal afterwards was less well advised when he undertook the conversion of any Jew or hebrew book excepting the old Testament. With the aid of the Dominican monks, he prevailed on the emperor Maximilian to adopt his views, and in 1569 an edict was published which enjoined that all writings emanating from the Jews against the Christian religion.
PFEFFERKORN

should be suppressed and consigned to the flames; this edict was soon succeeded by another, July 6, 1610, en-
joining the destruction of every Hebrew book with the sole exception of the Old Testament. The execution of this edict was, however, suspended until the opinion of the Holy Synod of Luzern (Uetz) of February had been obtained. By reason of this delay, Prof. John Reuchlin, whose opinion in this matter was sought for, was en-
able to publish a voluminous treatise, in which he di-
vided the Jewish works into seven different classes, and afterwards proved which of these classes might be con-
sidered dangerous or injurious to the Christian religion.
Among the books which he thinks in part harmless and in part useful, and even valuable to theology, and which he would in consequence preserve, were not only the commentaries of Rashi, the Kimach, Ibn-Ezra, Germon-
ides, Nachmanides, etc., but the Talmud and the cal-
calistic book Sohar (q. v.). On the other hand, Reuch-
lin maintained that those only should be destroyed which contained blasphemies against Christ, such as the Nizzachon and Toledoth Jesu. He further pointed out the impossibility of suppressing books by an imperi-
al decree which were dispersed in all parts of the world, and might easily be reprinted in other places. The content soon grew warm between the adversaries of the books and their defenders; the former consisting of the Dominicans and their partisans, and the latter of all modern scholars and theologians. The affair was finally left by an appeal to pope Leo X. Hochstraaten, an inquisitor, and a man fully qualified for that cruel office, repaired to Rome, supported with remonstrances from several princes to bias, with money to bribe, and menaces to intimidate. He even threatened the pope with rejecting his authority and separating from the Church, unless Reuchlin, and the Jews whom he defend-
ed, were condemned. But all his efforts were in vain, and he was obliged to return, mortified and disgraced. The victory which his opponent had gained exposed him to the charge of being a Quaker. But he informed them "he was persuaded that Martin Luther, who then began to make a figure in Germany, would find them so much employment that they would permit him to end his days in peace" (Villers on the Reformation, p. 107). Soon, indeed (by reason apparently of the Reformation movement), an end was put to the whole dispute. When and where Pfefferkorn died is difficult to say. Of his works, which obtained such unenviable notoriety, we mention, Der Judenspiegel, or Spectaculum sive Judaeorum et Turcicorum et Allicum Adversus Juxta Iusti (Nurem-
burg, 1507) — Die Judenberichte, or Libellus de Judaeis et Christianis in Syriae sive Substantiae figuris figurae (Collog, 1508) — Das Osterbuch, or Narratio de ratione Paschae celebrandi infra Judaeos recepto (Collog. and Augsb. 1509) — Der Judenbrief, or Hostia Judaeorum (ibid. 1509) — In Libris et Libris dem Kaiser Maximilium, or In landum et honorem illustriissimi imperatoris Maximilianum, etc. (Collog. 1510) — Ein Brief an Geistliche und Welthliche in Betreff des Kaiserlichen Mandates der jüdischen Schriften zu vertiefen — Der Handspiegel, against Reuchlin (Mayence, 1513) — Die Brustglocke, against Reuchlin (Cologne, 1514) — Stirnblähen wider Reuchlin u. s. Jünger, or Defen-
sio contra famesos et crinimiales obscurorum verorum epistolae, dedicated to the pope and the college of cardinals (Cologne, 1515) — Ein midtliche Clag gegen den unredlichen Reuchlin (1521). (Where the Latin title is given, the work was also translated into Latin.) Comp. Fürst, Bibl. Jud. ill, 82; Wolf, Bibl. Hebr. i, 985 sq.; iii, 540 sq.; iv, 856 sq.; Meiners, Lebensbeschreibung der Männer aus den Zeiten der Wiederkunft des Judentums, i, 98; ibid. xiv, 218, and Appendix, note 2, p. 77 sq.; Le Geiger, Das Studium der hebr. Sprache in Deutschland, p. 58 sq. (Breslau, 1870); Kalkar, Israel u. d. Kirche, p. 90 sq.; Hasse, Histoire des Juifs, p. 730 (Taylor's transl.); H. Adams, Hist. of the Jews, ii, 47 sq. (Boston, 1812); Da Costa, Israel and the Gentiles, 494 sq. Johannes Pfefferkorn, in Geiger's Zeitschrift für Wissenschaft im Leben (1869), p. 286-289, 685 sq. stücke zur Confezation der jüdischen Schriften in Frank-

Pfefferkorn, S. Michael M., a German theologian, was born in the year 1646 at Lippe, near Eisenach, and was the son of a minister. Having received his preparatory education at Creutzburg and Gotha, he went to Jena, where in 1666 he was created magister. From Jena he went to Leipzig, and after having completed his studies, he was appointed professor at the Altenburg gymnasium. Having occupied several stations as an educator, he was called in 1676 to the pastorate of Fri-
emeck, near Gotha. For fifty years he faithfully dis-
charged his ministerial functions. He died March 3, 1732. Besides other works, he is the author of some very fine hymns which were found in their way among the old song-books, as "Was frag ich nach der Welt und allen ihren Schätzen" (Engl. transl. by Mills, "Can I this world esteem," in Hymns from the German, p. 101). See Brück-
ner, Kirchen- und Schulenatlas im Herzogthum Gotha (Gotha, 1781), iv, 80-82; Koch, Gesch. d. deutschen Kirchenleides, iv, 65 sq. (B. P.)

Pfeiffer, Augustus D.D., a learned German Lutheran divine, noted as an Orientalist, was born at Lau-
enburg Oct. 30, 1640, and was educated at Wittenberg. In 1673 he entered the ministry, and thereafter held several important pastorate. In 1681 he became arch-
deacon to the church of St. Thomas at Leipzig, in which city he also held the chair of Hebrew. In 1689 he was made superintendent of the churches at Lubeck, and died there Jan. 11, 1688. Pfeiffer was one of the most skilful philologues of his time. He is said to have known seventy languages. His library was rich in Hebrew, Arabic, Coptic, Armenian, Persian, and Chinese MSS., and he left many learned writings. His philological works were all collected under the title Opera omnia philologica (Utrecht, 1704, 2 vols. 4to.). His other publications were, Theologia Judaica atque Mohammediaca (Lipa, 1687, 12mo)—Antiquitates selectae, ab Ugo-
bono notis judaicae et alia excerta (Ugo e Bononiis, 1704); De Thermotheo (ibid. xxii, 545)—Distributio de potes Hebr. recognita (ibid. xxx, 889; transl. into Engl. by D. A. Taylor, with additions, in the Bibl. Repos. vols. vi-vi);—Manuchoe noræ et faculti ad accommodacionem, etc. (Ugo e Bononiis, 1705); Specimen de montalbensi Vr. Test. (ibid. xxxii, 657)—Specimen de roce cruzata (ibid. xxxii, 743)—Specimen de Paulinæ Graduvm (ibid. xxxii, 675). See Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. s. v.; Roter-
mund's Suppl. to Jocher, Gelehrten-Lexikon, s. v. Pipp-
ing; Memoria theologorum, s. v. (J. H. W.)

Pfeiffer, Christoph, a German divine, noted as a hymnologist, was born at Oels in the year 1688. For two years he was assistant-preacher at Dinsdorf, when he was called, March 28, 1719, by the duke H. Chr. von von Landekron, minister in the principality of Munsterberg, near Frank-
enstein, in the principality of Munsterburg. Having occupied this position for twenty-seven years, he was called to Stolz, where he spent the remainder of his life, and died Dec. 28, 1758. His picture in the church there has the following inscription under it:—Christoph Pfefferkorn, in the following epigraph: "Mors tua vita mea est, tusque, O dulcisissime Jesu, vulnera sunt animae Pharmaciae certa mena." Pfeiffer is the author of many hymns, several of which are found in our modern hymn-books. See Wezel, Hymnoop. (Herrnhut, 1736), iv, 837 sq.; Koch, Gesch. d. deutschen Kirchenleides, s. v. 742 sq. (B. P.)
PFEIFFER

Pfeiffer, Madame Isad., a German lady, whose maiden name was Reise, is noted as a traveller in the East, and as a valuable contributor to Palestinian topography. She was born in Vienna, Oct. 15, 1797. From her very childhood she longed to see the world, and ever read with delight books of travel. In her girlhood she travelled to some extent with her parents, and subsequently with her husband, to the death of her husband and the maturity of her sons she determined to undertake a journey to Palestine, that she might have the ineffable delight of treading those spots which our Saviour had hallowed by his presence. With the accumulated wealth of twenty years, she left Vienna in March, 1842. Her journey included Constantinople, Brussel, Berlij, Jerusalem, the river Jordan and the Dead Sea, Nazareth, Damascus, Balbec, the Libanus, Alexandria, Cairo, and the Desert to the Red Sea, then back by Malta, Sicily, Naples, Rome, etc., to Vienna, where she arrived in December of the same year. Upon her return she published anonymously the diary she had kept during her trip, under the title of Reise einer Wieserin in das Heilige Land (Journey of a Woman in the Holy Land). In 1845 Madame Pfeiffer visited Sweden, and in the year before last she made her first journey round the world. In 1851 she made a second expedition, visiting the United States, and upon her return published an account of all her travels. But of all her descriptions those of the Holy Land are far more interesting than any of the others; being doubtless to have been less hurried then while making her tours round the world. Throughout the whole of her arduous journeys Madame Pfeiffer displayed great courage, perseverance, and womanly tact. The mere fact of her having accomplished what no male traveller ever has done is conclusive evidence that she was possessed of great endurance and fortitude. She died Oct. 27, 1858.

Pfeiffer, Christoph Carl Ludwig von, a descendant of an old knightly family, was born Jan. 20, 1712, at Grünstadt, not far from Worms. When ten years of age he was left an orphan, and his uncle, the Rev. Justus S. von Pfeiff, of Magdeburg, took him into his house. Here he remained for six years, when, at the age of sixteen, he entered the University of Halle for the study of jurisprudence. In the year 1729 he went to Tubingen to continue there his studies, where he became a faithful follower of Christ. In 1732, at the age of twenty, he was appointed preceptor of the Upper Huntingdon government at Regensburg, and in 1737 he was appointed counsellor of law at Stuttgart. For thirty years he held the highest honors in Wurttemberg, until, in the year 1768, he removed to Prussia, where Frederick the Great lodged him. In 1768 he married a man of his own house. Pfeiffer died March 28, 1776. He was a very pious man, and the different stages of his life are best marked in his poetical productions and hymns, which number about 940. Not all of his hymns have found their way into hymn-books, especially as most of them are influenced by Zinzendorf and Bengel, whose ideas are more or less reproduced in them. Those, however, which are found in our hymn-books are really jewels of German hynology. A collection of his hymns has been published by the Rev. G. Knack, of Berlin (1800, 1808), under the title of Hymnengrundzüge. Between the years 1780 and 1781, he published a work on the Bible, and a MS. of a rhymed translation of Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, the Lord's Prayer, the apostolic epistles, etc. See Teichmann's biography in the Preface to his Christl. Haushoheits (Stuttgard, 1822) 

Pfiiffer, Johann Conrad, a German theologian, was born at Zurich, Switzerland, in 1747; studied theology at the university of his native place; in 1775 he was made dean of the Orphans' Church, and later was appointed the successor of his friend Lavater (q. v.), in the pastorate, and was also made the dean of St. Peter's Church. He died in 1792. Pfeiffer was a voluminous writer and much involved in controversy with the Rationalists, who then so very generally abounded in Germany. He was in close harmony with the theological views of Lavater, and with him attempted to give to his pens, like the Christian preacher and Christian, to lift Christianity from its Oriental vestments, and place it upon the ground of universal humanity. While the sceptics, and even Spalding among them, regarded modern Christianity rather as a purely comprehensible and abstract fact, and excluded every contribution of the imagination, Lavater and Pfeiffer, like Holtzstock (q. v.), thought it best to render aid by the Western imagination. They made Christianity not only accessible to the modern understanding, but to the modern feeling. Most valuable of all of Pfeiffer's publications are his Schriften der Christianen (1788-92), which have been freely used by Stier in his Words of Jesus (transl. by Strong and Smith, N. Y. 3 vols. 8vo). These sermons letters furnish a sort of Christian romance, in which the men and women of the time of Jesus wrote letters to each other, just as senti-mental men and women of the time. A great deal has been written, and Christianity was thus modernized to make it attractive and plain to the masses, and relieve it of the Oriental garb it wears in the Bible. (J. H. W.)

Pflug, Julius, a German theologian, noted in the Reformation history of his country's Church, was born at Merseburg near the opening of the Elbe. He was the son of a nobleman, and a favorite of the emperor Charles V, who sent him in 1541 as one of the collectors to the synod at Regensburg (q. v.), which resulted in the adoption of the Augsburg Interim (q. v.). Pflug was selected by the emperor as president of the approaching synod at Regensburg. About that time the chapter of the cathedral at Naumburg-Zeitz elected him bishop, but he was unable to assume his episcopal duties until after the battle at Mühlberg. In 1557 he presided at the Synod of Worms, and died in 1564. Pflug was a moderate Romanist, and though associated with Eck, shared none of his extravagant and extreme ideas. He earnestly desired peace, and though he may here and there have consented to measures rather equivocal and questionable, he probably sought only the peace and union of the Church. See Hare, Hist. of the P. B. Church, i. 117. Gesner, Gesch. des P. B., vol. viii; Alzog, Kirchengesch. ii, 309 sqq. (J. H. W.)

Pha'ma-tho'moab (φαμαθομοβ), a Grecian form (1 Esdr. v, 11) of the Heb. name (Ezra ii, 6; Neh. vii, 11) PHA'MATH-MOAB (q. v.).

Phar'ac'aret (φαρακρητ), a corrupt Grecian form (1 Esdr. v, 34) of the Heb. name (Ezra ii, 57; Neh. vii, 59) PHAKIRTEES (q. v.).

Phæd(o) (ο) Else, a noted ancient Greek philosopher, was a native of Elis, and of high birth. He was taken prisoner in his youth, and passed into the hands of an Athenian slave-dealer; and being of considerable personal beauty was compelled to prostitute himself. He was in the summer of B.C. 400 that Phædo was brought to Athens. A year would not suffice for his acquaintance with Socrates, to whom he attached himself. According to Diogenes Laertius he ran away from his master to Socrates, and was ransomed by one of the friends of the latter. Suidas says that he was accidentally present at a conversation between Socrates and the young man, and besought him to effect his liberation. Various accounts mention Alcibiades, Critias, or Cebes as the person who ransomed him. Cebes is stated to have been on terms of intimate friendship with Phædo, and to have instructed him in philosophy. Phædo was present at the death of Socrates, while he was still quite a youth. From the mention of his long hair it would seem that he was not eighteen years of age at the time, as at that age it was customary to cease wearing the hair long (Becker, Charidies, ii, 882). That Phædo was
on terms of friendship with Plato appears likely from the mode in which he is introduced in the dialogue which takes its name from him. Other stories that were current in the schools spoke of their relation as being that of enmity rather than friendship. Several philosophers were unengraced enough to reproach Phaedo with this condition, but he is named one of his dialogues after Phaedo. Phaedo appears to have lived in Athens some time after the death of Socrates. He then returned to Elia, where he became the founder of a school of philosophy, which appears to have resembled in tendency and character the Megarian school. Archiphrus and Moschus are mentioned among his disciples. He was succeeded by Pleistanus, after whom the Elean school was merged in the Eretrian.

Of the doctrines of Phaedo nothing is known, except as they made their appearance in the philosophy of Menedemus. Nothing can safely be inferred respecting them from the Phaedo of Plato. None of Plato's writings have come down to us. They were in the form of dialogues. There was some doubt in antiquity as to what the text was, which, and which is the best. Panetius attempted a critical separation of the two classes, and the Zopyrus and the Symm. were acknowledged to be genuine. Besides these, Diogenes Laertius (ii, 105) mentions as of doubtful authenticity the Nikaos, Mifos, Antonius h. Panaetius, and Photides Laos. In addition, the works of Suidas mentions the Symm, Alkibiades, and Kretola. It was probably from the Zopyrus that the incident alluded to by Cicero (De Fato, 5; Tuscul. Disq. iv, 57, § 40), Maximus Tyrt. (XXXI, 353), and others, was derived. Seneca (Ep. 94, 41) has a translation from a short passage from one of his pieces. See Fabricius, Bibliogr. Graec. ii, 717; Scholl, Gesch. der Griech. Lit. i, 470; Preller, in Erach and Gruber's Encykl. d. v.; Preller, Phaedo. Leben und Gesch. d. Schriften in the Rheinisches Museum für Philologie, 1846, p. 301 sq., now in his Kleine Schriften, ed. by B. Köhler.

Phaedrus, an Epicurean philosopher, and contemporary of Cicero, became acquainted with the great orator in his youth at Rome, and during his residence in Athens (B.C. 80) Cicero renewed his acquaintance with him. Phaedrus was at that time an old man, and was president of the Epicurean school. He was also on terms of friendship with Velleius, whom Cicero introduces as the defender of the Epicurean tenets in the De Nat. Deor. (i, 21, § 58). He occupied the position of head of the Epicurean school till his death, and was succeeded by Patroclus. Cicero (Ad Att. xiii, 39) mentions, according to the common reading, two treatises by Phaedrus, Φαίδρος παρατέουσα ἐλέκθεσις. The first title is corrected on MS. authority to Παρ. Στίχων. Some critics (as Petersen) suppose that only one treatise is spoken of, Περὶ Σωτ. καὶ Πάλαισιος. Others (among whom is Orelli, Onom. Tull. s. v. Phaedrus) adopt the reading οἰκεια, or, at least, suppose that two treatises are spoken of. An interesting fragment of the former work was discovered at Herculanum in 1816, and was first published, though not recognised as the work of Phaedrus, in a work entitled Herculaneumia, or Archeological and Philologial Dissertations; containing a Manuscript found among the Ruins of Herculaneum, &c, De Nat. Deor. Fragm. Hamb. 1835. Cicero was largely indebted to this work of Phaedrus for the materials of the first book of his De Hicurana Deor. Not only is the development of the Epicurean doctrine (c. 16, etc.) taken from it, but the erudite manner of the doctrine of other philosophers put in the mouth of Vel- lies is a mere translation from Phaedrus. See Fabricius, Bibliogr. Graec. iii, 608; Kirsche, Forschungen aus dem Gebiete der antiken Phil. 1, 27; Preller, in Erach and Gruber's Encycl._Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol. s. v.

Phædrus (Φαίδρος). See Chasurle-

Phæmenon (Φαιμένον, from φαίμειν, &c. op- pear) is that which has appeared. It is generally applied to some sensible appearance, some occurrence in the course of nature. But in mental philosophy it is applied to the various and changing states of mind. "How pitiful and ridiculous are the grounds upon which such men prefer to account for the very lowest and commonest phenomena of nature without recurring to a God and Providence!" Among the various phenomena which the human mind presents to our view, there is none more calculated to excite our curiosity and our wonder than that of communication which is carried on between the sentient, thinking, and active principle within us and the material objects with which we are surrounded" (Stewart, Elements, ch. i, sect. 1). In the philosophy of Kant, phæmenon means an object such as we represent it to ourselves or conceive of it, in opposition to noumenon, or a thing as it is in itself. "According to Kant, the facts of consciousness, in their subjective character, are produced partly from the nature of the things of which it is conscious; and hence, in their objective character, they are phænomena, or objects as they appear to us. The distinction is useful in things in ourselves, noumena, or realities in their absolute nature, as they may be out of relation to the mind. The subjective elements which the mind itself contributes to the consciousness of every object are to be found, as regards intuition, in the forms of space and time; and as regards thought, in the ideas of substance, unity, plurality, and the rest. To perceive a thing in itself would be to perceive it neither in space nor in time; for these are furnished by the constitution of our perceptive faculties, and constitute an element of the phenomenum object of intuition only. To think of a thing in itself would be to think of it neither as one nor as many, nor under any other category; for these, again, depend upon the constitution of our understanding, and constitute an element of the phenomenum object of thought. The phenomenum is the product of the inherent laws of our own mental constitution, and, as such, is the sum and limit of all the knowledge to which we can attain" (Mansel, Lect. on Phil. of Kant, p. 21, 22). The definition of phæmenon is, "that which can be known only along with something else" (Ferrrier, Inst. of Metaphys. p. 819). See McCoa, Intuition; Jour. Specul. Philos. vol. iv, iii and iv; vol. i. No. 2, art. iv; June, 1872, art. v. See Now- mén

Phænemos, the capital of Trachonitis, in the north-east of Palestine; the Xos of the Peutinger Table; one of the episcopal cities of Arabia (S. Paolo, Geogr. Sac. p. 297), twenty-seven Roman miles from Damascus, thirty-seven from Kenaita. It is now the village of Msiefah, on the northern edge of the Lejaah, as was proved by an inscription (Burckhardt, Travels, p. 117 sq.); Porter, Damascus, ii, 112 sq.).—Van de Velde, Memoir, p. 380.

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

Phagophania. See Phagiphania.

Phagor. See Peor.

Phaitēr [rather Phæstur] (Φαιτῆρ v. r. Phaistō), a corrupt Greekized form (1 Esdr. ix, 44) of the Heb. name (Ézra, 29; Lam. 4:6). Pha'eus, a 'false Philaeus.' Phaloilus [rather Phaldeus] (Φαλλὸς), a corrupt Greek form (1 Esdr. ix, 44) of the Heb. name (1 Kgs. viii, 4; Pedaiah (q. v.).

Phal's [rather Phaleus] (Φαλλος), an incorrect
PHALEC 57 PHALLUS

Græciam (1 Esdr. v, 29) of the Heb. name (Exra ii, 44; Neh. vii, 47) Padon (q. v.).

Phælec (Φαλέκ), a Græcized form (Luke iii, 35) of the name of the patriarch Pælec (q. v.).

Phallism, or Phallic Worship. See PHALUS.

Phallic (Gen. xxvi, 9). See PHALLUS.

Phallus (Gr. μαλακτικός, membrum virile), a representation of the male generative organ, as the symbol of the fertility of nature, was carried among the ancient Greeks in the processions of the Dionysia, and men disguised as women, called Ἰβυφαλλοῦς, followed immediately behind it. The phallus, which was called among the Romans fasces, was so monstrously used that the law decreed that it must not be hung around the necks of children to avert evil influences. The Satyrica sigma of Pliny probably referred to the phallus, and he says that these were placed in gardens and on heathens to protect against the fascinations of the envious. From Pallas, also, we learn that smuts were accustomed to place figures of the phallus before their forges for the same purpose. This symbol, which distinguishes itself by its indecency, conveyed to the ancient heathens, as the Linga (q. v.) does to the modern Hindis, a profound and sacred meaning. Diodorus Siculus, referring to its use by the priests of the Mosaic account, relates the belief of the Jews held among the Greeks, tells us that by this they would signify their gratitude to God for the populosity of their country. "It was an object of common worship throughout the nature-religion of the East, and was called by a manifold name: Linga, Jons, Polleur, etc. Originally it had no other meaning than the allegorical one of that mysterious union between the male and female which throughout nature seems to be the sole condition of the existence of animated beings; but at a later period, more particularly when ancient religions had established the hot-bed of mankind—natural and unnatural vices, its worship became an intolerable nuisance, and was put down by the senate on account of the more than usual immorality to which it gave rise. Its origin has caused much speculation, but no certainty has been arrived at by investigators. The Phœnicians traced its introduction into their worship to Adonis, the Egyptians to Osiris, the Phrygians to Attys, the Greeks to Dionysus. The common myth concerning it was the story of some god deprived of his semen, who lived on this fluid which in autumn loses its fruit-catching influence. The procession in which it was carried about was called Phallagogia, or Peraphila, and a certain hymn was sung on that occasion, called the Phalleus mictis. The bearers of the phallus, which generally consisted of red leather and covered the hot-bed of mankind, were the Phallophori. Phalli were on those occasions worn as ornaments around the neck, or attached to the body. Aristotle traces the origin of comedy to the ribaldry and the improvised jokes customary on these festivals. Phalli were often attached to statues, and of a prodigious size; sometimes they were even movable. At a procession of Ptolemy Philadelphus a phallus was carried about made of gold, and one hundred and twenty yards long. Before the temple of Venus at Hierapolis there stood a phalli, one hundred and eighty feet high, upon which a priest mounted annually, and remained there in prayer for seven days. The phallus was an attribute of Pan, Priapus, and to a certain extent also of Hermes' (Chambers). The believers in the development theory of course have a way of their own in explaining the development of phallic worship. They teach that it is the most ancient and universal of the beliefs of the human race, and that it has prevailed among all known nations of antiquity, and has been handed down in both dead and living forms to the present day. Some have even asserted the existence not only in Egypt, Greece, and Rome, but also in Syria, Persia, Asia Minor, Italy, Spain, Germany, France, Ireland, and Scandinavia, among the mound-builders of North America, in Mexico, Central America, Peru, and Hayti, and in the islands of the Pacific Ocean, and in Africa. They even see its traces among the Jews; and in the use of certain symbols in Christianity. Thus, e. g., Westropp teaches: "The origin of the idea is coeval among primitive nations with that of the family, and rests in part upon the natural veneration of the father as the generator, the priest, and the ruler. Mañque derives much of its importance from a veneration of the principles at the foundation of the phallic worship. Its ceremony was attended with rites which marked their significance, and one of its symbols, the wedding-ring, is employed at the present day. Circumcision was in its inception a purely phallic ordinance. Although the O. T. narrative requires that it was instituted as a covenant between Jehovah and Abraham, the rite had been practiced by the Egyptians and Phenicians long before the birth of the Hebrew patriarch. Serpent symbolism was associated with the phallic emblems, but that the serpent's signification has not been clearly established. The serpent was used among most archaic nations as a symbol of wisdom and health, and yet its meaning often included the notion of life and an emblem of the spirit." Mr. Wake, another essayist of the same school, treats of the phallus as a symbol of the whole of mankind, a sign of the origin of the Mosaic religion, which was borrowed by the compiler of the Pentateuch from some foreign source, probably from the mysteries of Mithra, a Persian deity. The tree of the knowledge of good and evil he identifies with the fig-tree, which was highly venerated by many primitive peoples. Its leaves, it will be remembered, were sewed into aprons by Adam and Eve after their transgression. The keraub which guarded the tree of life is interpreted as a symbol of the Deity himself, in the form of the sacred bull of antiquity—a form under which the keraub is described by Ezekiel (Oh, I and xx). The story of the Deluge is also regarded as a myth, with decided evidences of a phallic character. In many of the incidents interwoven into the history of the Hebrews, and in many of their religious observances, Mr. Wake discovers testimony of the influence of the phallic superstition. Abraham was a Chaldaean, and by tradition declared to have been learned in astronomy, and to have taught the science to the Phenicians. "He had higher notions of the relation of man to the Divine than his ancestors," says the writer, but there is no demonstration that the science between the Babylonian faith and that of his Syrian neighbors. The Jewish patriarchs erected pillars and planted groves, both of which were customs connected with phallic worship. Throughout the rule of the Judges, and especially after the establishment of the monarchy, the priests were the custodians of the purer religion of their nation to the idolatrous practices of their neighbors, which involved worship of phallic statues and omphallic emblems "in high places." The religion of Baal, openly denounced by the prophets, was a sort of phallicism, and was conducted with revel and abominable ceremonies, which the Jews too often imitated. Mr. Wake even holds that the basis of Christianit y is more purely phallic than that of any other religion. "In the recognition of God as the universal Father, the great Parent of mankind, there is a development of the fundamental idea of phalism. In the position assigned to Mary as the mother of God the paramount principle of the primitive belief is again predominant. The nimbus, the aureole, the cross, the fish, and even the spires of churches, are symbols retained from the old phallic worship." The Mardi Gras festival is cited as having a phallic origin, and, in the beginning, a reference to some event connected with the occurrences in the Garden of Eden. In fact, says Dr. Wilder, also of this class of writers, "There is not a fast or festival, preoccupation of any religious symbols, existing at the present day which has not been taken bodily from phalism, or from some successive system of paganism" (comp. Ancient Symbol Wor-
The name is derived from the Egyptian word Pfrē, or Phrē, signifying the sun (Wilkinson, Anc. Egyptians, i, 43). This identification, respecting which there can be no doubt, is due to the duke of Northumberland and the general Fox. (Rawlinson) They must necessarily have manifested sensual tendencies of the very nature of phallicism, and that only in their lowest estate such worship was extensively indulged in. Abund it is to point to circumcision as in anywise connected with phallic worship. The Jews practiced it as a rite of admission to the fold to distinguish him, and also as a sanitary precaution which physicians approve of in our day. We do not wonder that such ridiculous and extravagant hypotheses lead to the proposition recently made by one of the same school of thinkers as those quoted, that "there would also now appear good ground for believing that the ark of the covenant, held sacred by the Jews, contained nothing more nor less than a phalus, the ark being the type of the Argha or Yoni (Linga worship of India)" (Sellen, in Anthropol. Society of London, 1860-4, p. 327 sqq., 12th paper). (J. H. W.)

Phal'ti (Heb. Palti, פָּלְתִי, my deliverance; Sept. Φαλίτε, the son of Laish of Galilim, to whom Saul gave Michel in marriage after his maid servant had driven David forth as an outlaw (1 Sam. xxv, 44). B.C. cir. 1061. In 2 Sam. iii, 15 he is called PHALTI'EL. Ewald (Gesch. iii, 129) suggests that this forced marriage was a piece of policy on the part of Saul to attach Phal'ti to his house. With the exception of this brief mention of his name, and the touching little episode in 2 Sam. iii, 16, nothing more is heard of Phal'ti. Michel is there restored to David. "Her husband went with her along weeping behind to Bahurim," and there, in obedience to Abner's abrupt command, "Go, return," he turns and disappears from the scene. See DAVID.

There was another person of the same Heb. name (Num. xxxii, 9, 11, V. V. "Palti," [q. v.]).

Phal'tiel (Heb. Paltiel, פָּלְתִיאֵל, deliverance of God; Sept. Φαλτίλη, Saul's son-in-law (2 Sam. iii, 15); elsewhere called Phal'ti (q. v.).

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

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

Phantasiodoceta is a term used by Theophylact in his commentary on the 4th chapter of John. See PHANTASISTS.

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

Phannu'el (Φαννύελ, probably a Graecized form of the same Heb. name with Penuel, pænæl, face of God), a descendant of the tribe of Asher, and father of the prophetess Anna (Luke ii, 36). B.C. cir. 80.

Phar'acin (Φαράκιν or Φαρακίν, a name mentioned in the Apocrypha (1 Esdr. vi, 31) as that of a Hebrew whose "home" returned among the servants of the Temple from the captivity with Zerubbabel; but it does not occur in the parallel lists of Ezra and Nehemiah.

Ph'araz (vulg. pron. Pharroh) (Heb. Paroah', פָּרָו, Sept, New Test., and Josephus Paroah, but seldom in classical writers), the common title of the ancient kings of Egypt, as Ptolemy of its later kings, and Caesar of the emperors of Rome. (The following account includes the whole of Scriptural interest, with special reference to their identification.)

Readers of Scripture will remark that Pharaoh often stands simply as a proper name (Gen. xii, 15; xxi, 21; xlii, 36; xl, 2 sqq.; xlv, 1 sqq.; and so generally throughout the Pentateuch, and also in Cant. i, 9; Isa. xxix, 11; xxx, 2). "King of Egypt" is sometimes subjoined to it (1 Kings iii, 1; 2 Kings xvii, 21; xviii, 21); and sometimes also the more specific designation, or real proper name of the king, as in 2 Kings xii, 33, Pharaoh Hophra (Jer. xlv, 30). Josephus (Ant. viii, 6, 2) says that while every king of Egypt from Menes to the time of Solomon took this title, no king of Egypt used it afterwards, and affirms the latter fact to be apparent from the sacred writings. This, however, is not quite correct. Several Egyptian kings were after the period in question called by foreigners Pharaoh, sometimes simply, sometimes in connection with a second name (2 Kings xviii, 21; xxi, 29); but the alteration from the time of Solomon which undoubtedly took place is remarkable, and probably points to an important change in the dynastic history of Egypt.

Some writers suppose Pharaoh to have been the name given in the Bible to the native kings of Egypt. There were, however, probably before Solomon's time several introductions of foreign dynasties, and some of them, if we accept the usual period ascribed to the rule of the Shepherds, of long duration; yet Scripture gives the title to all alike before this period, and Josephus states that all who professed to assume it. Yet it is probable that it was the title of such kings as had the sole direction of affairs while Egypt was an independent state, and that the title of "melek," or king, marked such as ruled conjointly with other kings of Egypt, or who governed as viceroys under a foreign ruler, as was the case after the conquest of the Assyrian conqueror, as is very probably a satisfactory explanation for the long
period down to the reign of Solomon. Most likely throughout it "Pharaoh" marks the monarch who ruled alone in Egypt, or over its inferior and tributary kings when there were such. This may seem intimate in the speech of one of them to Joseph: "I am Pharaoh, and there is no one greater than I. But I with the tenth part in all the land of Egypt" (Gen. xii, 44). Wilkinson's explanation, however, scarcely accounts for the period subsequent to the Pharaoh who gave his daughter to Solomon. Shishak, who seems to have succeeded him, was evidently the supreme ruler of Egypt, and not only in the southern part, but also in the north, which he extended into the territory of the Hittites. Such a practical disregard of it even while acknowledging its nominal authority. There is a passage of Manetho preserved by Josephus which seems to point strongly to the Pharaoh that the ancient internal constitution of Egypt was its government by subordinate kings under a supreme ruler (Josephus, Ant., ii, 17). Such, he expressly tells us, was its state during the oppression of the Shepherds: "These tyrannized over the kings of the Thebais and of the other parts of Egypt." The general idea of ancient government was that of a supreme monarch over tributary kings; and the great probability is that the Shepherds followed this analogy, and, merely depositing the ruling Pharaoh, left the minor dynasties undisturbed. The Pharaohs are supposed to have been at the times invested with the highest sacerdotal dignity (Hengstenberg, Egypt, p. 55; Wilkinson, i, 240). From the circumstantial evidence it is clear that the Pharaohs, when the land was closed in the ovals, the title priest prelates that of king, and for other reasons, Wilkinson argues, as we think conclusively, that Egypt was originally governed by hierarchical and not regal power (i, 10). See Egypt, ii, 2. The Pharaoh of Abraham's time. (a) Pharaoh's visit to Egypt during a famine in Canaan (Gen. xiii, 10). Which of the ancient kings of Egypt is to be understood by this Pharaoh it is perhaps impossible to determine with certainty. Wilkinson supposes him to have been Apepi; Africanus calls him Ramsesmenes; and some have taken him to be one of the Shepherd kings. We have, in truth, no materials in Scripture or elsewhere for fixing the name and place of this king in the dynasties of Egypt. In regard to the date also of Abraham's visit to Egypt, there is, we think, unquestionably the view according to which the Scriptures lead us to think that foreigners regarded that country. Whatever may have been the internal administration of the government, into which Scripture does not enter at all, the general view given us of Egypt in the Bible is that of a country united under one monarch. The earliest apparent reference to a different state of things occurs in Kings vii, 6, where we read of "kings of Egypt," apparently of equal authority. Isaiah predicts great troubles arising probably from a similar condition of things (ch. xix, 3). Again in Josephus, Wilkinson, Egypt, i, 178; Rawlinson's Herodotus, i, 51, note 4, and 391). All ancient history with which we are acquainted (Herodotus, Diodorus, and Manetho) assumes the political unity of Egypt. The titles of the Pharaohs seem to establish it. They are always called on the monuments "Lords of Upper and Lower Egypt" (Wilkinson, ii, 73; 2d ser., i, 261). This unity of Egypt from the earliest times is now generally acknowledged (Hengstenberg, Egypt, p. 84). The power and greatness of Egypt from the remotest times point to such a unity. Its high position in the world and in the history of the world is further exemplified by the fact that the country has never again for so long a period had an independent government. In fact, the object of the independent kings of Egypt was to exhibit the same condition which all the petty states of antiquity did, in which every man was of necessity a soldier (Hume, Essays, ii, xi). Whereas in Egypt soldiers formed a different class from the rest of the community, he never wore arms except in actual service, while private citizens at no time carried offensive weapons (Wilkinson, i, 402). Indeed, it is impossible to imagine any country less adapted by geographical configuration for divided rule than Egypt from the Cataract to the sea. One level valley, only divided east and west by its river, shut in from the rest of the world by the Libyan and Arabian mountains and the Syrian deserts, it must of necessity form a single state.

This view of the political position of the Pharaohs is not inconsistent with the theory, for which there is very strong proof from Manetho and elsewhere, that for long periods of Egyptian history there may have been subordinate dynasties of kings ruling throughout Egypt. There may also have been, but probably for much shorter periods, a number of monarchs of the sufficient power to extend their influence far beyond the limits of Egypt. A change of dynasty seems here to have caused the change of title, and was probably more or less connected with such changes in after periods. The Persian monarchs, finally, administering the affairs of Egypt through tributary native kings, took the title of Pharaoh as indicative of their sovereignty (Trevor, Egypt, p. 331). With them this ancient name of royalty passed away forever.

The political position of the Pharaohs in Egypt is of great moment in understanding the history of that country. If it were that the Pharaoh was the supreme internal constitutional ruler, it marks the general unity of Egypt under a single monarch. If it were given indifferently to every king of Egypt at those times, which seem unquestionably to have reigned, and may have been of long duration, as in some division of the country, the occurrence of the title does not necessarily mark the political unity of the land. According to the first view, for instance, the Pharaoh of Abraham or Joseph would be the supreme ruler of the whole of Egypt, with, it might happen, various dynasties of subordinate kings under him; according to the latter, he might be only king of a portion of Egypt, with other dynasties of equal rank ruling contemporaneously elsewhere. To use the former view appears the preferable one for many reasons. The unity of the country is supported in Scripture; it is, we think, unquestionably the view according to which the Scriptures lead us to think that foreigners regarded that country. Whatever may have been the internal administration of the government, into which Scripture does not enter at all, the general view given us of Egypt in the Bible is that of a country united under one monarch. The earliest apparent reference to a different state of things occurs in Kings vii, 6, where we read of "kings of Egypt," apparently of equal authority. Isaiah predicts great troubles arising probably from a similar condition of things (ch. xix, 3). Again in Josephus, Wilkinson, Egypt, i, 178; Rawlinson's Herodotus, i, 51, note 4, and 391). All ancient history with which we are acquainted (Herodotus, Diodorus, and Manetho) assumes the political unity of Egypt. The titles of the Pharaohs seem to establish it. They are always called on the monuments "Lords of Upper and Lower Egypt" (Wilkinson, ii, 73; 2d ser., i, 261). This unity of Egypt from the earliest times is now generally acknowledged (Hengstenberg, Egypt, p. 84). The power and greatness of Egypt from the remotest times point to such a unity. Its high position in the world and in the history of the world is further exemplified by the fact that the country has never again for so long a period had an independent government. In fact, the object of the independent kings of Egypt was to exhibit the same condition which all the petty states of antiquity did, in which every man was of necessity a soldier (Hume, Essays, ii, xi). Whereas in Egypt soldiers formed a different class from the rest of the community, he never wore arms except in actual service, while private citizens at no time carried offensive weapons (Wilkinson, i, 402). Indeed, it is impossible to imagine any country less adapted by geographical configuration for divided rule than Egypt from the Cataract to the sea. One level valley, only divided east and west by its river, shut in from the rest of the world by the Libyan and Arabian mountains and the Syrian deserts, it must of necessity form a single state.
PHARAOH

was hateful to the Egyptians as of great value to their enemies the Shepherds. On the other hand, Abraham's possessions, especially the camels, may have been purchased by him from the nomad tribes with the proceeds of Pharaoh's liberality, and the trade which we hold with the Arab world consis ts of this Arab race hardly consists of her having been reduced to bondage while they were in the ascendant. Indeed, it appears that the Shepherd kings (q.v.) were not on good terms with the Hebrews, as their interests were rival. The date at which Abraham visited Egypt (Gen. xiv. 13) is probably the most certain (though not altogether accurate) is about B.C. 2051, which would not accord with the time of Salatis, the head of the fifteenth dynasty, B.C. 2006, according to our reckoning, but rather with that of Biutoth of the second (Thiniteic) dynasty, and that of Sebeus (the sixteenth, or (Elephantinian) dynasty, as well as with that of Tancheres of the fifth (Elephantinian) dynasty, but anterior to all the other dynasties. 2. The Pharaoh of Joseph.—Between the Pharaoh of Abraham and the Pharaoh of Joseph there was an interval of two hundred years. During this period there may have been various changes of dynasty, art, and religion in Egypt of which we derive no information from Scripture; while the notice of the former king and of the state of the country in his time is so brief that it leaves us at any point upon this point. Of the political position and character of the latter, and the condition of Egypt in his time, Scripture gives us very important information from his intimate connection with Joseph and the chosen people of God. Wilkinson identifies this Pharaoh with Osirin, one of the kings of the sixteenth dynasty of Tanites, whose reign he supposes to have exceeded forty-three years (Egypt, i. 42, 43). Bunsen prefers to identify him with Osirin, of the seventeen dynasty of Memphite, according to classical writers (Trevor, Egypt, p. 254). Osburn thinks him to have been Apophis (ibid. p. 216), as Eusebius states, changing the date so as to fit the identification obviously simply upon a comparison of the Hebrew and Egyptian chronologies. Whether he was one of the dynasties of the Shepherd kings is a question on which authorities differ, according to their views of the date of the Shepherd rule, and their interpretation of the scriptural account of this king. Wilkinson is decided of opinion that he was not a Shepherd king (i. 14; 2) in which Trevor agrees. Josephus says that he was a Shepherd. We are decidedly of opinion from the incidental notices of Scripture that he was not a Shepherd dynasty. If we are to accept Manetho's account, we must suppose that these Shephens (the fourteenth) of Egypt, ruled with the greatest tyranny and cruelty over the Egyptians, disregarded the old laws of the country, and demolished its temples (Josephus, Ap. i. 14). Their rule was not one of policy and conciliation, but of brute force and terror, an idea strongly corroborated by the administration which the Bible tells us all shepherds were held in Egypt, and by the testimony which the monuments bear to the determination and scorn in which they were universally held (Wilkinson, ii. 16; iv. 120). The Shepherds being such, it seems to us quite inconsistent with the Biblical narrative to suppose that Joseph's Pharaoh was a Shepherd king. Thus we find that the Egyptian prejudice against shepherds was carefully and jealously respected by this king. The Israelites coming into Egypt were by him located in the border-land (Hengstenberg, loc. cit. 43), a position where they would serve as a barrier against the shepherd-hating Egyptians (Gen. xli, 84). We cannot suppose a Shepherd king to act thus. He would not thus consult a native prejudice hostile to his own enemies, while his own Shepherd garrisons occupied the strongholds of Egypt. Again, Pharaoh's court and household, so far as we know them, were composed of native Egyptians. Such was Potiphar, the captain of the king's bodyguard, probably the most trusted officer of Pharaoh (Gen. xxxix. 1); while the chief butler and baker of his court are the two who were on the same trial with Joseph before the court of the Pharaoh (Trevor, p. 256). The officials of Pharaoh's prime minister, Joseph, are also native Egyptians, whose feelings of caste towards foreigners were carefully consulted (Gen. xliii. 32; see Rawlinson's Herodotus, bk. ii, c. 41, note 9). In the midst of this universal dependence, there is, however, a freedom, and the lands of Egypt passed into the possession of Pharaoh, the property of the native Egyptian priests alone was religiously respected, and they received, without any return, an ample maintenance from Pharaoh's stock for themselves and their families (Gen. xlvi. 22). When Pharaoh sought to bestow upon Joseph marks of the highest honor for his preservation of the country, one of these marks was the betrothal on him in marriage of Asenath, the daughter of Potipheh, priest of On or Heliopolis, who is thus distinguished as one of the highest and most honored personages in the land (Gen. xlii. 45). These considerations lead us to conclude that this Pharaoh was a native Egyptian, not a Shepherd king, and that he ruled after the expulsion of the Shepherds; or during the time of Joseph, over a people long accustomed to tyranny was still vivid in the national mind. Rawlinson (Herod. bk. ii, c. 108, note 2) seems to think that horses were unknown in Egypt till the time of Amosis (B.C. 1510), and would thus give a low date for this monarch, in whose time horses were in use for ordinary purposes as well as for war (Gen. xlii. 17). The testimony of Herodotus on which he comments seems, however, opposed to this view. According to the chronology which we adopt, the period of Joseph's deliverance from prison was B.C. 1688; which will, according to the account in Scripture, give the reign of Ahab, the fourth king of the fifteenth (shepherd) dynasty. But as the Shepherd kings do not seem to have been friendly to the Hebrews, and for the other reasons enumerated above, we presume that these foreigners were not at this time (if indeed they ever were) in possession of the whole of Egypt. We therefore incline to identify the Pharaoh in question with one of the eighth (Memphitic) dynasty, whose names are unrecorded, but who were contemporaneous with the twelfth (Diospolitic) as well as with the twelfth (Sebastic) dynasty, according to the Table of Dynasties in Scripture which seems to attribute a very considerable antiquity to this period. In Joseph's time the territory allocated to the Israelites was called Goshen (Gen. xlv. 10). In the time of Moses this ancient name appears to have been almost forgotten, and to have yielded to that of the land of Rameses (Gen. xlv. 11). The religion of Egypt during the reign of this Pharaoh appears to have been far less corrupt than it subsequently presents itself in the time of Moses. The Scriptures give us several indications of this; and these of no indistinct kind. Thus Joseph speaks to his master's wife as if she recognised the same God that he did (Gen. xxxix. 9). His language to the chief butler and baker in the prison conveys a similar idea (xvi, 6), as does his address to Pharaoh when called before him (xli, 16-82). Pharaoh in his speech to his servants and to Joseph speaks of God precisely as Joseph had done, and as if he recognised but one God (xlii, 88, 89). Joseph, without any fear of injurious consequences to himself, and in an extraordinary thing, allowed the identity of his religion with that of the sons of Jacob (xlii, 28). Joseph's steward, probably a native Egyptian, evidently recognises their God (xliii. 28). No doubt corruption had now been introduced into the pure religion derived from Noah, which was the national religion of Egypt we see probably a caste who had already
given a superstitious coloring to religion, introduced new rites of worship, and paved the way for a total change in religious belief. But this latter condition does not appear to have been reached in the time of Joseph. Symbolic worship, if now, as is most likely, in common use, had still to a very great extent left undestroyed the notion of one supreme God ruling over all the nations, nor was there reason to suppose that Potipherah, the father-in-law of Joseph, and priest of On, was an upholder of the idolatry of a later time. The sun, now introduced into Egyptian worship, was by him in all likelihood explained as the sign and symbol of deity, but not as partaking of deity itself, and the sun was the deity of any other nation. An alteration by man of the worship ordained by God, but at the same time the religion of Egypt may have been comparatively true and pure, though it had now introduced that symbolism which quickly degenerated into the grossest idolatry the world has ever seen. Symbolic worship was now probably regarded as a high proof of religious wisdom (Rom. i, 22); a short time proved it to be utterly folly.

The government of Pharaoh seems to have been of an absolute kind (Gen. xii, 40-48; see Wilkinson, i, 43). That at this time Egypt was governed by several independent dynasties seems inconsistent with the language and conduct of Pharaoh in making by his own mere will Joseph to be ruler "over all the land of Egypt," only inferior to himself through necessity. But the language is evidently that of a courtly assumption, and may very naturally be applied only to that region over which he ruled. The evidence is very strong from the monuments and other sources that even under the Shepherd rule there were kings in other parts of Egypt largely if not wholly independent of them. The appointment of regents decorated with royal titles is thought to have been characteristic of this dynasty (Trevor, Egypti, p. 258). This Pharaoh's personal character seems to have been that of a wise and prudent monarch, anxious for the welfare of his people, and superior to popular prejudice against strangers. Wilkinson thinks he was pacific in his policy, and his conduct in receiving a blessing from the aged Jacob shows a humility of mind and a respect for worth which contrasts very favorably with the conduct of other despotic kings. The situation of his capital was on the land of Goshen (Gen. xiv, 10), and the civilization and flourishing condition of Egypt during his reign were very great (Wilkinson, i, 43). Whether he were the same monarch whom we find ruling Egypt at the time of Jacob's death and the removal of Israel from the land of Egypt is not so certain as is supposed (Gen. i, 4, 5). It has been thought by some that Joseph's using the intercession of Pharaoh's household to procure a favor from the king indicates a less intimate acquaintance than we should expect between him and that king who ruled at the time of the famine. But local customs, probably connected with the habits of Egyptian mourning, may account for this, without supposing a different king (Hengstenberg, Egypti, p. 71).

3. The Pharaoh of the First Persecution of the Israelites.—The interval which elapsed between the Pharaoh of Joseph's time and the Pharaoh who commenced the persecution of Israel is much affected by opinion as to the length of the sojourn in Egypt. See CHRONOLOGY. According to our view, the interval between Jacob's removal to Egypt and the birth of Moses was a little over one hundred and five years. The unknown quantity is the period from the commencement of the persecution to the birth of Moses. It was the same Pharaoh that began to afflict Israel who reigned when Moses was born (Acts vii, 20), and the persecution must have continued a considerable time previous to allow for the events mentioned in the first chapter of Exodus. These included the building of two considerable cities and other labor, for which a period of several years seems to be required. The name and dynasty of this king have been differently given (Journ. American Oriental Soc., iv, 147, 178). Lord F. W. Fairholt suggests him to have been Amenmes or Ame, the first of the eighteenth dynasty of Theban or Djosseplait kings, and supports his view of the change of dynasty at this time, and the accession of kings from the distant province of Thebes, from the scriptural account of him as a new king that knew not Joseph (Gen. xi, 44, 47, 48). Lord Brutus, in an able paper given by Wilkinson (i, 78), argues that the new king was Ramesses I, who was also, according to him, the head of a new dynasty, and as such ignorant of the history of Joseph, while it was for Ramesses I to extirpate the power of any of the ancient cities. According to the fragment of Manetho preserved by Theophilus, the new king was Tuthmosis (Bunson, Egypt, i, 665). He is very commonly supposed to have been the king who crushed the power of the Shepherds in Egypt. From a picture on the walls of a very interesting tomb at Thebes it is the意ent of the great buildings' 3 king Thothmes III, Trevor (Egypti, p. 72) thinks it likely that it was during his dynastic, the eighteenth, that the oppression of Israel occurred, and that most likely Amosis, the first of the eighteenth dynasty, was the Pharaoh that first of all known to a disregard of the services of Joseph, and a forgetfulness of the old affection that used to be entertained in Egypt and by its kings for the great preserver of their country. According to Manetho's story of the Exodus—a story so contradictory to historical truth as scarcely to be worthy of mention—the Israelites left Egypt in the reign of Menepthah, who was great-grandson of the first Rameses, and son and successor of the second. This king is held by some Egyptologists to have reigned about the time of the rabbinal date of the Exodus, which is virtually the same as that which has been supposed to be obtainable from the genealogies. There is, however, good reason to place these kings much later; in which case Rameses I would be the oppressor; but then the building of Rameses could not be placed in his reign without a disregard of Hebræan chronology. But the argument that there is no a truer known king Rameses loses much of its weight when we bear in mind that one of the sons of Aâme, head of the eighteenth dynasty, who reigned about two hundred years before Rameses I, bore the same name, besides that very many names of kings of the Shepherd period, perhaps of two whole dynasties, are unknown to Manetho. Let this one fact, which is certainly not to be disregarded, we must weigh the general evidence of the history, which shows us a king apparently governing a part of Egypt, with subjects inferior to the Israelites, and fearing a war in the country. Let the Pharaoh of the Exodus, he seems to have dwelt in Lower Egypt, probably at Avaris. (When Moses went to see his people, and slew the Egyptian, he does not seem to have made any journey, and the burying in sand shows that the place was in a part of Egypt, like Goshen, encompassed by sandy deserts.) Compare this condition with the power of the kings of the latter part of the eighteenth and of the nineteenth dynasties: rulers of an empire, governing a united country from which the head of their line had driven the Shepherds. The view that the turbulent and opinion may account for this, without supposing a different kingdom is far less probable, especially if it be supposed that the Pharaoh of Joseph was a Shepherd king. The expulsion of the Shepherds at the commencement of this dynasty would have been in contradistinction to the gradual oppression of the Israelites. But it must be remembered that what we have just said of the power of some kings of this dynasty is almost as true of their reigns.
predecessors. The silence of the historical monuments is also to be weighed, when we bear in mind how numerous are the names of the office of Pharaoh, and how many are the events of the oppression to be recorded even if the exodus were not noticed. If we assign this Pharaoh to the age before the eighteenth dynasty, which our view of Hebrew chronology would probably oblige us to do, we have still to decide whether he were a Shepherd or an Egyptian. If a Shepherd, he must have been of the sixteenth or the seventeenth dynasty; and that he was Egyptianized does not afford any argument against this supposition, since it appears that foreign kings, who can only be assigned to one of these two lines, had Egyptian names (see Konigreich, Tafel xviii, xix, 275, 285). According to our view of the Hebrew chronology, the birth of Moses occurred B.C. 1738. The scheme of Egyptian chronology which we have adopted places the beginning of the sixteenth (Shechemitic) dynasty B.C. 1755, and it would therefo.re be under the reign of one of the first kings of this dynasty, whose names are unknown, that the persecution of the Israelites began.

4. The Pharaoh of Moses' Exile.—It is often supposed that the Pharaoh who ruled Egypt at the birth of Moses is the same Pharaoh who ruled it when Moses fled into Midian (Exod. ii, 15). There is nothing in the narrative of Scripture to lead us to this conclusion, though it may possibly have been the case. The probabilities, however, seem to point the other way. We have allowed about eight years of his reign to have elapsed prior to the birth of Moses, who at the period of flight was forty years of age (Acta vii, 23). The monarch, therefore, if the same, must have reigned forty-eight years, which is an unusual length. (The entire 16th dynasty of thirty-two kings seems to have lasted but 112 years.) The genealogy with which Moses was regarded by this Pharaoh seems to indicate that he did not stand towards him in the relation of his grandfather by adoption. The view is further confirmed by the intimation in Exod. iv, 19, which suggests that the Pharaoh to which Moses was added to the list of the eight Moabites, whose life nearly to the time of his return into Egypt, a period of forty years. If this were so, it is impossible for this king to have been the monarch who began the persecution of Israel. We prefer, therefore, to regard him as different, and as probably chosen by adoption, to continue the succession of a childless family.

We would make the year during his reign at the flight of Moses to have been B.C. 1698, and his attempt upon the life of the great lawgiver is the only event of his reign recorded in Scripture.

5. The Pharaoh of the Exodus.—The Pharaoh in whose reign the deliverance of the Israelites was achieved would appear to have succeeded to the throne not very long before the return of Moses to Egypt after his forty years' sojourn in Midian (Exod. iv, 19). His relationship to his predecessor is not told us, but he was probably of the same dynasty, and carried on the traditional policy of a grudging oppression of the Israelites. We do not read of any effort of his to reduce the numbers of that nation; he seems rather to have looked on their numbers as an additional source of grandeur and power to Egypt by an enforced system of labor. The name of this Pharaoh is very variously related. Wilkinson supposes him to have been Thothmes III, the fourth or fifth monarch, according to him, of the eighteenth dynasty of Theban or Diospolitan kings; while Manetho, according to Africannus, makes him the son of a man of the line of the monarchs; and lord Prudhoe would have him to have been Ptolemy, the last of that dynasty (Wilkinson, Egypt, i, 31, 41, 81). Ptolemy, the priest of Mendis, agrees in opinion with Manetho (Bunsen, Egypt, i, 90). Various reasons are given in the Journal of Sacred Literature (new ser. i, 490) for supposing him to have been Setos II. Respecting the time of this king, we can only be sure that he was reigning for about a year or more before the exodus, which we place B.C. 1698. His acts show us a man at once impious and superstitious, although his reign is short. Of his姓名 he seems to have thought that his magicians could work the same wonders as Moses and Aaron, yet even then he begged that the frogs might be taken away, and to the end he prayed that a plague might be removed, promising a concession to the Israelites to the extent as soon as he was respite failed to keep his word. This is not strange in a character principally influenced by fear, and history abounds in parallels to Pharaoh. His vacillation only ended when he lost his army in the Red Sea, and the Israelites were finally delivered only when the red sea was dried up (Exod. x, 17). The exordium there has been considered matter of uncertainty, as it is not so stated in the account of the exodus. Another passage, however, appears to affirm it (Ps. cxxi, 15). It seems to be too great a latitude of criticism exercised in this case to find out a conflict; it shows that the overthrow, but not the death of the king, especially as the Hebrew expression "shook off" or "threw in" is very literal, or that it is only a strong Semitic expression. Besides, throughout the preceding history his end is foreshadowed, and in, perhaps, positively foretold in Exod. ix, 15; though this passage may be rendered, "For now I might have stretched out my hand, and might have smitten thee and thy people with pestilence; and thou wouldest have been cut off from the earth," as by Kallisch (Commentary, ad loc.), instead of as in the A. V. Although we have already stated our reasons for abandoning the theory that places the exodus under the nineteenth dynasty, it may be well to notice an additional and conclusive argument for rejecting as unhistorical the tale preserved by Manetho, which makes Menepthah, the son of Itamot, the Pharaoh in whose reign the Israelites left Egypt. This tale was commonly current in Egypt, but it must be remarked that the historian gives it only on the authority of tradition. M. Mariette's recent discoveries have added support to this view. In this story the secret of the success of the rebels was that they had allotted to them by Amenophis, or Menepthah, the city of Avaris, formerly held by the Shepherds, but then in ruins. The people to whom this place was given were not united; in the eastern or quarries east of the Nile is enough of itself to throw a doubt on the narrative, for there appear to have been no quarries north of those opposite Memphis, from which Avaris was distant nearly the whole length of the Delta; but when it is found that this very king, as well as his father, adorned the great temple of Avaris, the story is seen to be essentially false. Yet it is not improbable that some calamity occurred about this time, with which the Egyptians wilfully or ignorantly confounded the exodus: if they did so ignorantly, there would be an argument that this event took place during the Shepherd period, which was probably in aftertimes an obscure part of the annals of Egypt. The character of this Pharaoh finds its parallel among the Assyrians rather than the Egyptians. The impiety of the oppressor and that of Sennacherib is remarkably similar, though Sennacherib's are more resolute in his resistance than Pharaoh. This resemblance is not to be overlooked, especially as it seems to indicate an idiosyncrasy of the Assyrians and kin-
dred nations, for national character was more marked in antiquity than it is now in most peoples, doubtless because isolation was then general and is now special. These nations all worshipped their gods in a simple way, highly reverencing their gods, and even those of other nations, the most powerful kings appearing as suppliants in the representations of the temples and tombs. In the Assyrian sculptures, on the contrary, the kings are seen rather as protected by the gods than as worshippers earlier; so that the amount of bow in such a country the famous decree of Darius, which Daniel disobeyed, could be enacted. Agath, the Egyptians do not seem to have supposed that their enemies were supported by gods hostile to those of Egypt, whereas the Assyrians considered their gods as more powerful than those of the nations they subdued. This is important in connection with the idea that at least one of the Pharaohs of the oppression was an Assyrian.

The idolatry of Egypt appears to have arrived at its height in the time of this monarch. We see evidences of a great difference between the religious system of this period and of the time of Joseph's Pharaoh. At both periods indeed we read of the "Magician and wise men of Egypt," but it by no means follows that because the names are the same the part discharged by them was identical in the two periods. Besides, we read in the later period (Exod. vii. 21) of an order to all sorcerers. They were apparently unknown in the earlier. These men supported their authority and doctrine by claims to miraculous power (ver. 11), whether we suppose them to have executed their feats merely by a skilful system of jugglery and sleight of hand, or, as many think, by diabolical aid. The authority of the God of Israel, acknowledged by the earlier Pharaoh, is by this king scornfully renounced, and the vast system of polytheism, embracing the famous worship of sacred animals, is firmly established as the religion of Egypt (v. 2; xii. 12; vii. 25). This was the suitable time chosen by God, when a great monarch ruled over the greatest empire of its time, which had brought to full development the idolatry by it widely propagated, to read a lesson to the Gentile world on the feebleness of idols as compared to him.

Before speaking of the later Pharaohs we may mention a point of weight in reference to the identification of the great kings. The reports of the campaigns of the Pharaohs of the eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth dynasties have not been found to contain any reference to the Israelites. Hence it might be supposed that in their days, or at least during the greater part of their time, the Israelites were not yet in the Promised Land. There is, however, an almost equal silence as to the Canaanitish nations. The land itself, Kenaan or Kanaan, is indeed mentioned as invaded, as well as those of Kheta and Amaar, referring to the Hittites and Amorites; but the latter two must have been branches of those nations seated in the valley of the Orontes. A recently discovered record of Thothmes III, published by M. de Rougé in the Recueil Archéologique (Nov. 1864, p. 344 sq.), contains many names of Canaanitish towns conquered by that king, but not in our lists of the Canaanitish isAmmon. These Canaanitish names are, moreover, on the Israelites' borders, not in the heart of the country. It is interesting that a great battle is shown to have been won by this king at Megiddo. It seems probable that the Egyptians either abstained from attacking the Israelites from a recollection of the fate of the nation of Syria, or that they were on friendly terms. It is very remarkable that the Egyptians were granted privileges in the law (Deut. xxiii. 7), and that Shishak, the first king of Egypt after the exodus whom we know to have invaded the Promised Land, was of foreign extraction, if not actually a foreigner.

6. Pharaoh, the Father-in-Law of Mered. — In the genealogies of the tribe of Judah, mention is made of the daughter of a Pharaoh married to an Israelite; "Bithiah, the daughter of Pharaoh, which Mered took" (1 Chron. iv. 17), apparently his sister, Zebulun perhaps a daughter of Bithiah, suggests that this part of the genealogies may refer to about the time of the exodus. This marriage may tend to aid us in determining the age of the sojourn in Egypt. It is perhaps less probable that an Egyptian Pharaoh would have given his daughter in marriage to an Israelite, than that a Shepherd king would have done so, before the oppression. But Bithiah may have been taken in war after the exodus, by the surprise of a caravan, or in a foray. Others, however, bring down this event to the times of or near those of David. It was then the policy of the Pharaohs to ally themselves with the great families whose power lay between Egypt and Assyria, as we know from the intermarriages of Hadad and Solomon with the Egyptian dynasty. The most interesting feature connected with this transaction is the name of the daughter of Jehovah, given to the daughter of Pharaoh. It exhibits the true faith of Israel as exerting its influence abroad, and gaining proselytes even in the royal house of idolatrous Egypt. See Mere0.

7. Pharaoh, a Protector of Hadad. — With the exception of the preceding Pharaoh, whose date is doubtful, there is a long silence in Jewish history as to the kings of Egypt. During the period of the judges, and throughout the reigns of Saul and David, they had apparently neither entered into alliance nor made war on the Israelites. If such an event had happened, it is probable that some mention would have been made of it. It does not follow from this that during this period they had made no wars nor effected any conquests to the east of Egypt, for the seaboard of Canaan, which Israel did not during this time occupy, seems to have been a usual passage for the Egyptian armies in their eastern wars. But the silence of Scripture points to the probability that for this long period Egypt did not occupy the commanding position of the earlier or the later Pharaohs. Intestine divisions and dynastic quarrels during the period may have hindered their Egyptian armies within their proper borders, satisfied if they were not assailed by foreign nations. In the reign of David we incidentally find notice of a Pharaoh who received with distinction Hadad the Edomite fleeing from Josiah, and in this connection we have notice of a great Egyptian army which had invaded Edom (1 Kings xi. 22). We find this Pharaoh ruling from about the twentieth year of David's reign to its close, i.e. from about B.C. 1038 to B.C. 1018. His reign perhaps came to an end soon after David's death, as Solomon's father-in-law is thought to have been another Egyptian Pharaoh. His treatment of Hadad, a bitter enemy of David, and with strong reason so, was certainly an unfriendly act towards the latter, but it does not seem to have been attended by any ulterior consequences. No war ensued between Egypt and Israel, and Pharaoh made no attempt to restore Hadad to the throne of Edom. When this latter, upon David's death, sought to return home, evidently with the intention of disturbing the reign of Solomon in its commencement, Pharaoh was apparently opposed to his return, very probably from a disinclination to favor any step which might involve the partition of his empire, or that of his powerful kingdom of Israel, then at the height of its greatness. Probably in the first part of this account the fugitives took refuge in an Egyptian mining-station in the peninsula of Sinai, and so obtained guides to conduct them to Egypt. This is received in accordance with the Egyptian policy, but with the especial favor that seems to have been shown.
about this time towards the eastern neighbors of the Pharaohs, which may reasonably be supposed to have led to the establishment of the twenty-second dynasty of foreign extraction. For the identification of this Pharaoh we have chronological indications, and the name of his wife. Unfortunately, however, the history of Egypt at this time is extremely obscure, neither the monuments nor Manetho giving us clear information as to the kings. It appears that towards the latter part of the twentieth dynasty the high-priests of Amen, the god of Thebes, gained great power, and at last supplanted the Ramesse family, at least in some of the twenty-first dynasty, and Manetho's twenty-first dynasty, seems to have ruled in Lower Egypt. The feeble twentieth dynasty was probably soon extinguished, but the priest-rulers and the Tanites appear to have reigned contemporaneously, until they were both succeeded for the Babylonia of the twenty-second dynasty, of whom Sheshonk I, the Shishak of the Bible, was the first. The monuments have preserved the names of several of the high-priests, perhaps all, and probably of some of the Tanites; but it is a question whether Manetho's Tanitic list is a correct account of the succession, and we have no means of testing the accuracy of its numbers. It may be reasonably supposed that the Pharaoh or Pharaohs spoken of in the Bible as ruling in the time of David and Solomon were Tanites, as Tanis was nearest to the Israelitish territory. We have therefore to consider this royal family of Tanites as the royal family of Scripture, with the list of this dynasty. Shishak must have begun to reign in the twenty-fifth year of Solomon (B.C. 989). The conquest of Edom probably took place some fifty years earlier. It may therefore be inferred that Hadad fled to a king of Egypt who may have ruled at least twenty-five years, probably ceasing to govern before Solomon married the daughter of a Pharaoh early in his reign; for it seems unlikely that the protector of David's enemy would have given his daughter to Solomon, unless he were a powerless king, which it appears was not the case with Solomon's father-in-law. This would give a reign of twenty-five years, or 25 ± 2 years separated from the close of the dynasty by a period of twenty-four or twenty-five years. According to Africanus, the list of the twenty-first dynasty is as follows: Siamun, 26 years; Psusennes, 46; Nefertari, 16 years; Ptolemais, 14; Amenemhet, 9; Oschor, 6; Pianches, 9; Psusennes, 14; but Eusebius gives the second king 41, and the last 35 years, and their numbers make up the sum of 150 years, which Africanus and he agree in assigning to the dynasty, although the sum seems to be too long. If we take the numbers of Eusebius, Oschor would probably be the Pharaoh to whom Hadad fled, and Psusennes II the father-in-law of Solomon; but the numbers of Africanus would substitute Psusennes I, and probably Pianches. We cannot, however, be sure that the returns did not overlap, or were not separated by intervals, and the numbers are not to be considered trustworthy until tested by the monuments. The royal names of the period have been searched in vain for any one resembling Tahpmes, the alleged Tahpmes. Nor can we find a name similar to that of Solomon, emblematic of the union of Christ and his Church, founded on any other than the marriage of Solomon with a daughter of the true faith. To what extent this good influence may have spread in the family of Pharaoh can be only matter of conjecture. It had prevailed to any great extent it may have partly led to the change of dynasty which we have reason to believe took place in Egypt during the reign of Solomon. This tendency towards truth, if it existed in the royal house, was not shared by the priesthood or people of Egypt, who were firmly wedded to their debased system of idolatry.

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

The names of Egypt mention of Pharaoh in the Bible are Shishak, probably Zerah, and So. The first and second of these were of the twenty-second dynasty, if the identification of Zerah with Thutmose accepted, and the third was doubtless one of the two Shebekas of the twenty-second dynasty. This line of Egyptian royalty was a line of kings of foreign origin, who retained foreign names, and it is noticeable that Zerah is called a Cushite in the Bible (2 Chron. xiv, 9; comp. xvi, 8). Shebek was probably also a foreign name. The title "Pharaoh" is probably not once given to these kings in the Bible, because they were not Egyptians, and did not bear Egyptian names. The Shepherd kings, it must be remarked, adopted Egyptian names, and therefore some of the earlier sovereigns called Pharaohs in the Bible may be conjectured to have been of Shepherd origin, though they were of the twenty-second dynasty, and therefore not of Egyptian origin.

9. Pharaoh, the Opponent of Semmacheri.—It is not at all certain that the name used for so many centuries for the supreme ruler of Egypt was ever again correctly used by itself to designate a pharaoh of Egypt. The pharaoh of whom we read in the reign of Hezekiah as the rival of the Assyrian Semmacheri (2 Kings xviii, 21; Isa. xxxvi, 9), is, indeed, simply called Pharaoh, but this title is not given him by the sacred historian, but by the Assyrian general Rabshakeh. Pharaoh is still, indeed, the generic title of Egyptian royalty (Isa. xix, 11), when no individual king is intended, but when particular kings are meant the Scriptures join to Pharaoh a second title, as Pharaoh-Necho, Pharaoh-Hophra. This may have been Josephus’s reason for his statement (Ant. viii, 6, 9) that after the father-in-law of Solomon no king of Egypt used this name. The Jewish historian was too well acquainted with Scripture not to have known of the title in connection with a second name, and he therefore means to say that it was never again used by itself as the title of Egyptian royalty. It is, indeed, as far as can be ascertained, that we are now speaking reigned in the fourteenth year of Hezekiah, i.e. about B.C. 715, and was the contemporary of Tirhakah king of Ethiopia, and of Semmacheri king of Assyria. This latter synchronism depends, however, on the identity of the person mentioned in the text, which some suppose to have been corrupted, and that it was Sargon and not Semmacheri who invaded Judaea in the fourteenth year of Hezekiah (Journ. of Sues, Ed. Oct. 1868; Jan. 1868). The comparison of Pharaoh in the above passages to a broken reed is remarkable, as the common hieroglyphics for “king,” restricted to Egyptian sovereigns, Su-tes, strictly a title of the ruler of Upper Egypt, commence with a bent reed, which is an ideographic symbolical sign proper to this word, and is sometimes used alone without any phonetic complement. This Pharaoh can only be the Sethos whom Herodotus mentions as the opponent of Semmacheri, and who may reasonably be supposed to be the Set of Manetho, the last king of his twenty-third dynasty. Tirhakah, as an Egyptian, whether then reigning or not, like So, apparently not called Pharaoh. See TIRHAKAH.

10. Pharaoh-Necho.—He was king of Egypt during the reigns of Josiah, Jehohaz, and Jehoiakim, kings of Judah (2 Kings xxiii, 29-34). We do not read of him until the last year of Josiah’s reign, B.C. 609. How long before this he may have been king in Egypt we have no information. However, he was a king of Egypt the Bible gives us no help in ascertaining. It mentions him as still reigning in the fourth year of the reign of Jehoiakim, i.e. B.C. 606 (Jer. xvi, 2), and from 2 Kings xxiv, 7 it seems probable that he continued to reign for a considerable time after this. In the Bible his name is written Nebi, 722, and Nekh, 722, and in hieroglyphics Nekh. This king was of the Satric twenty-sixth dynasty, of which Manetho makes him either the fifth ruler (Africanus) or the sixth (Eusebius). Herodotus calls him Nebes, and assigns to him a reign of sixteen years, which is confirmed by the monuments. According to this historian, he was the son of Psammetichus I; this the monuments do not corroborate. Dr. Brugsch says he married Nit-Akert, Nitocris, daughter of Psammetichus I and queen Shepenetep, who appears, like her mother, to have been the heiress of an Egyptian royal line, and supposes that he was the son of Psammetichus by another wife (Hist. d’Egypte, p. 252; comp. 248). If he married Nitocris, he may have been called by Herodotus by mistake the son of Psammetichus.

The father of Necho had already distinguished himself by the siege and capture from the Assyrians of the strong town of Ashdod, which had been taken from the Egyptians in the reign of Sargon (Herod. ii, 157; Isa. xx, 1). In the decline of the Assyrian empire Egypt ventured once more beyond her eastern coast and indulged in the hope of universal dominion. Necho in the commencement of his reign prepared to carry out to completion his father’s ambitious designs, and it was in this endeavor that he came into contact with the kingdom of Judah, and so finds a place in Scripture history. Claiming an oracle from the true God, he advanced an Egyptian army against the town of Carchemish on the Euphrates, then apparently under the dominion of the king of Assyria (2 Chron. xxxvi, 21; 2 Kings xxiii, 29). There seems to be no doubt that Necho’s claim to this oracle was sincere, and that he really thought himself commissioned to go to war with Assyria. How far this may indicate a true knowledge of God on Necho’s part it is difficult to determine. Yet it can scarcely be understood as more than a conviction that the war was destined, for it ended in the destruction of Necho’s army and the curtailment of his empire. Josiah, however, influenced perhaps by an alliance with Assyria, or dreading the rising ambition of Egypt, disputed the march of Pharaoh’s army. In vain the latter, evidently most unwilling to come into collision with Josiah, entertained the idea of making use of the oracle of him whom he would appear, in common with Josiah, to have recognised as the true God. At Megiddo (now Leijjah), a town not far from the coast-line of Palestine, so frequently the passage of great armies in antiquity, the old wars of Pharaoh, the new wars of Egypt, and his death on this occasion formed the subject of lamentations among his people long after it took place. Without pausing upon his march, or returning back to attack Jerusalem, Pharaoh seems to have passed on with all haste to accomplish his original design of capturing Carchemish, which commanded one of the ordinary fords of the Euphrates, and thus of meeting and conquering the king of Assyria in his own dominions. In this great expedition he was entirely successful. He took Carchemish, and retained possession of the countries between Egypt and the Euphrates until the rising power of Babylon under the great Nebuchadnezzar met and overthrew the Egyptian army four years afterwards at Carchemish, and forced them back into their own land. Returning from the Euphrates, he treated Judah as a conquered country, and exercised over it the same absolute authority which the Babyloni-ans did immediately after him. Sending for Jehovah to Riblah in the land of Hamath, on the Orontes, a favorite camping-ground for the great armies of that period (Robinson, Bibl. Res. iii, 646), he placed himself in a strong position for a time, and the famous league of five kings of Egypt the Bible gives us no help in ascertaining. It mentions him as still reigning in the fourth year of...
homeward, Necho entered as a conqueror into Jerusalem, placed the brother of Jehoshaz on the throne, and put him to death. To this time he then returned to Egypt, carrying with him the dethroned king of Judah, who died in the land of his captivity. The expedition of Necho, which Scripture describes as having been made against the king of Assyria, Josephus says was directed against the Medes and Babylonians, who had at this time, according to him, captured Nineveh (Ant. x, 5; see Rawlinson's Herod. i, 418. Herodotus mentions this battle, relating that Necho made war against the Syrians, and defeated them at Magdolus, a lake which he took Cadytas, "a large city of Syria" (ii, 159). The name of the lake Magdolus is Megiddo, and not the Egyptian town of that name (see Menden), but the identification of Cadytas is difficult. It has been conjectured to be Jerusalem, and its name has been supposed to correspond to the ancient title, "the Holy," λαός τάφριν, but it is elsewhere mentioned by Herodotus as a great coast-town of Palestine near Egypt (iii, 5), and it has therefore been supposed to be Gaza. The difficulty that Gaza is not beyond Magdolus has been removed by Herodotus, who thought to have confounded Megiddo with the Egyptian Magdolus, or we may understand the term "coast" here used in a wide sense. (See Sir Gardner Wilkinson's note to Herod. ii, 159, ed. Rawlinson.) It seems possible that Cadytas is the Lititite city Ketesh, on the Orange river. The chief strength of Syria of those captured by the kings of the eighteenth and nineteenth dynasties. The Greek historian adds that Necho dedicated the dress he wore on these occasions to Apollo at the temple of Branchides (L.c.).

The power of Egypt under Necho at this period of his reign was very great. From the composition of the army which he led to Carchemish and left there inarrison (Jer. xlv, 9), we gather that Ethiopia and Libya were at this time a part of his dominions. Eastward of Egypt his power extended to the Great River, and the Lydians, if not his subjects, were in strict league with him. This was the period of the fall of Assyria, and Egypt for a time succeeded to its rule on the west of the Euphrates (Wilkinson, i, 157). This was that time of boasting in its military successes which Jeremiah describes in ch. xlvi, and he takes occasion from it to predict the approaching overthrow of Egypt. When this land "rose up like a flood, and he said, I will go up, and will over the earth," the prophet in plain words spoke of approaching defeat in battle and utter humiliation. The year of Necho was the year of the siege of Jerusalem, and Egypt only lasted about four years. In the fourth year of Jehoiakim, Nebuchadnezzar, having conquered Nineveh, had leisure to turn his arms against Egypt. At Carchemish, which Necho had wrested from the Assyrians, the Babylonian army conquered that of Egypt. Whether Necho was present at this contest does not appear. Its issue was that he was driven out of Asia and came into it no more (2 Kings xxiv, 7). It would seem to have been at a later period, however, that the utter humiliation of Egypt described by Jeremiah took place. In the third war of Carchemish one of those decisive conflicts which changed for a period the history of the world. The strength of Necho's armies seems not to have lain in the native Egyptians, but in foreigners, whether subjects, allies, or mercenaries. They were Ethiopians, Libyans, and Lydians who fought with Nebuchadnezzar. Wilkinson places the death of Necho shortly before the captivity of Jehoiakim (i, 167). It is not certain, however, that Jehoiakim was carried away captive by Nebuchadnezzar. The book of Kings makes no mention of such an occurrence. Josephus states that he was put to death at Jerusalem (Ant. x, 6, 3). The second book of Chronicles only says (xxxi, 6) that he was put into fetters for the purpose of being brought to Babylon. If Josephus's account is true, this purpose was not put into execution. Necho is famous in history for other besides his military exploits. The celebrated canal of Suez, according to Herodotus (ii, 158; see Rawlinson's Herod. i, 418), is said to have been constructed by him.

He is also stated by this historian to have circumnavigated Africa, a performance the credibility of which is disputed by him for the very reason that makes it to modern readers all but certainly true (Herod. ii, 62; see Wilkinson, i, 160; Sir C. Lewis, Astronomy of the Ancients, p. 317). See Necho.

1.3. Pharaoh-Hophra. This is the last of the Pharaohs of whom mention is made in the Bible. He is introduced to our notice in connection with the closing period of the Jewish monarchy, as attempting to ward off from Canaan the armies of Nebuchadnezzar for their sins at the hands of Nebuchadnezzar (Jer. xxxvii, 7). He was on the throne of Egypt in the ninth year of the reign of Zedekiah (2 Kings xxxv, 1), i.e. about B.C. 590, continued to reign when Jerusalem had been taken by the Babylonians, B.C. 587, and he was to continue reigning until a signal destruction should fall upon him, and he was to suffer the loss of life at the hands of his enemies (Jer. xlviii, 80), a prediction fulfilled about five years subsequently in the invasion of Egypt by Nebuchadnezzar on the advice of Joaahaz (Jer. xlii, 9, 7). He ascended the throne about B.C. 587, and reigned for a period of nineteen years; but Euebius, according to Syncellus, makes his reign to have lasted twenty-five years (Bunson, Egypt, i, 640). This Pharaoh is generally considered to have been the "Pharaoh of Pharaohs" mentioned in the Book of Daniel (Dan. ii, 44). Josephus (Ant. x, 7, 3) expressly states that Nebuchadnezzar on hearing of the march of the Egyptians broke up from before Jerusalem, met the Egyptians at the river of Pharoa-Hophra, routed them, drove them out of Syria, and then returned to the siege of Jerusalem. Some, however, think that the Babylonians retreated from before the Egyptians, who on this occasion took Gaza, Sidon, and Tyre (Trevor,
Looking simply to the scriptural account, the case appears to stand thus: On hearing of the rebellion of Zedekiah, Nebuchadnezzar despatched a force against Jerusalem, but without accompanying it himself. This force, however, was within the city, but was not able to meet the Egyptian army in the field. This is the partial siege which is spoken of in Jer. xxxvii, 5-11, in which nothing is said of Nebuchadnezzar's presence. On the approach of Pharaoh-Hophra the Chaldean army, made up to the conflict, retired before him, and he advanced unopposed. This was probably in the eighth year of Zedekiah. That Pharaoh came to Jerusalem we are not told. Probably on hearing of the raising of the siege he judged it unnecessary, and took the easier coast-line towards Syria (Jer. xliii, 1). Nebuchadnezzar, made aware of the retreat of his army, now advanced with his entire force (Jer. xxxix, 1), laid siege to Jerusalem in the ninth year of Zedekiah, and took it in the eleventh year. That the Egyptians and Babylonians met on this occasion in battle is not stated in the Bible. We think it probable from Jerr. xxxvii, 7, that on hearing of Nebuchadnezzar's approach with the entire army of Babylon, the Egyptians retired without a contest and left Jerusalem to its fate (see Ralwin's Herodotus, i. 429). It seems possible that Hophra continued to reign as king of Egypt after the overthrow of Zedekiah (Jer. xxxviii, 10), and he and his land were the refuge of those Jews who, contrary to God's command to remain in their own land after the general captivity, preferred a course of their own. They expected peace beneath the shadow of Egypt, trusting in the power of Pharaoh, who seemed till then to have enjoyed great prosperity. But in this they were to be disappointed. Pharaoh was himself to be delivered "into the hands of those who sought his life," of which Herodotus gives an account (ii, 169); at the very entry of Pharaoh's pavilion at Taphaneis the Babylonian Nebuchadnezzar was to set his throne and spread his pavilion (Jer. xliii, 10); and henceforth Egypt was to descend in the scale of nations, and to become the least among kingdoms. Herodotus relates how he attacked Sidon, and fought a battle at sea with the king of Tyre, until at length an army which he had despatched to conquer Cyrene was routed, and the Egyptians, thinking he had purposely caused its overthrow to gain entire power, no doubt by substituting mercenaries for native troops, revolted, and set up Apries as king. Apries, however, only supported by the Carian and Ionian mercenaries, was routed in a pitched battle. Herodotus remarks in narrating this, "It is said that Apries believed that there was not a god who could cast him down from his eminence, so firmly did he think that he had established himself in his kingdom." He was taken prisoner, and Apries for a while treated him with kindness, but when the Egyptians blamed him, "he gave Apries over into the hands of his former subjects, to deal with as they chose. Then the Egyptians took him and strangled him" (Herod. ii. 161-169). The Scripture passages, which agree with the account Herodotus gives of the death of Apries, make it not improbable that the invasion of Nebuchadnezzar was the cause of that disaffection of his subjects which ended in the overthrow and death of this Pharaoh. The invasion is not spoken of by any trustworthy profane historian excepting Berosus (Cory, Anc. Freq. 2d ed. p. 37, 38), but the silence of Herodotus and others can no longer be a matter of surprise, as we now know from the Assyrian records in cuneiform of conquests of Egypt either unrecorded elsewhere or only mentioned by second-rank writers. See Herodotus, i. 429.

Pharaoh-Hophra was succeeded by two independent monarchs, the first of whom, Amonis, had a very prosperous reign; but in the reign of his son, Psammetichus, or Psammetichus, according to the Greeks, the Persian power took possession of Egypt, when Egypt was desolated to insignificance, and the ancient title of Pharaoh was transferred from the kings of Egypt to their conquerors (Trevor, Egypt. p. 831; Wilkinson, Egypt. i, 169-198). No subsequent Pharaoh is mentioned in Scripture, but there are predictions doubting referring to the misfortunes of later princes until the second Persian conquest, when the prophecy "There shall be no more a prince of the land of Egypt" (Is. lxx, 18) was fulfilled. See Egypt. Pharaoh's Daughters. Three Egyptian princesses, daughters of Pharaohs, are mentioned in the Bible. Our account of them includes whatever notices are extant in other writers. 1. The preserver of Moses, daughter of the Pharaoh who first oppressed the Israelites. She appears from her conduct to have been disposed to have been heir to the throne, something more than ordinary adoption amounting to be expressed in the passage in Hebrews respecting the faith of Moses (xi, 23-26), and the designation "Pharaoh's daughter" perhaps here indicating that she was the only daughter. She probably lived for at least forty years after she saved Moses, for it seems to be implied in the above passage of Hebrews that she was living when he fled to Midian. Aratapanus, or Artabanus, a historian of uncertain date, who appears to have preserved traditions current among the Egyptian Jews, calls this princess Memphis, and her father Memmis, and her mother Pelamnotha, and relates that she was married to Che nephres, who ruled in the country above Memphis, for that at that time there were many kings of Egypt, but that this one, as it seems, became sovereign of the whole country (frag. Hist. C, iii, 27, sq.). Palamnotha may be supposed to be a corruption of Amenophis, the equivalent of Amen-heap, the Egyptian name of four kings of the eighteenth dynasty, and also, but incorrectly, applied to one of the nineteenth, whose Egyptian name, Menepthah, is wholly different from that of the others. No one of these, however, had, as far as we know, a daughter with a name resembling Memmis, nor is there any king with a name like Che nephres of this time. These kings Amenophis, moreover, do not belong to the period of contemporary dynasties. The relation is apparently of little value, excepting as showing that one quite different from that given by Manetho and others was anciently current. See Pharaoh. 2. Bithiah, wife of Mered, an Israelite, daughter of a Pharaoh of an uncertain age, probably about the time of the exodus. See Bithiah, Pharaoh. 3. A wife of Solomon, most probably daughter of a king of the twenty-first dynasty. She was married to Solomon early in his reign, and apparently treated with distinction. It has been supposed that the Song of Solomon was written on the occasion of this marriage; and the idea is, we think, sustained by sound criticism. She was at first brought into the city of David (1 Kings iii, 1), and afterwards a house was built for her (vii, 8; ix, 24), because Solomon would not have her dwell in the house of David, which had been rendered holy by the ark having been there (2 Chron. vii, 11). See Pharaoh, Solomon's Wife. The wife of one Pharaoh, the king who received Hadad the Edomite, is mentioned in Scripture. She is called "queen," and her name, Taph penes, is given. Her husband was most probably of the twenty-first dynasty. See Pharaoh 7, Taphpenes. Pharaoh'nith (Pharaoh'nith) v. v. Pharaoh-nith; Josephus, Pharaonith; Pesheito, Pharaoh; Vulg. Pharaoh, one of the cities of Judea fortified by Baccides during his contests with Jonathan Maccabaeus (1 Macc. ix, 50). In both MSS. of the Sept. the name is joined to the preceding —Thimmath-Pharaoh'nith; but in Josephus, the Syrian, and Vulg., the two are separated. (Gechiiciste, iv, 378) adheres to the former. Pharaoh doubtless represents an ancient Pirathon, though hardly that of the Judges, since that was in Mount Ephraim, probably at Ferata, a few miles west of Na blius, too far north to be included in Judea properly so-called.
PHARES, the name of two persons.

1. (Heb. פֶּרֶץ, פֶּרֶץ, a breach, as explained Gen. xxxviii, 29; Sept. and N. T. Φάρης; A. V. "Peres," 1 Chron. viii, 38; Luke iii, 38; 1 Esdr. v, 5), twin son with Zarah, or Zerach, of Judah, by Tamar his daughter-in-law. B.C. cir. 1890. The circumstances of his birth are detailed in Gen. xxxviii. Pharez seems to have kept the right of primogeniture over his brother, as, in the genealogical lists, his name comes first. Yet his filiation was far more numerous and illustrious than that of the Zar- 
hites. Its remarkable fertility is alluded to in Ruth iv, 12: "Let thy house be like the house of Pharez, whom Tamar bare unto Judah." Of Pharez's personal history or character nothing is known. We can only speak of him therefore as a stemarch, and exhibit his genealogical 
relations. At the time of the sojourn in the wilder-
ness "the families of the tribe of Judah were: of Shelah, the family of the Shelumites, or Shilonites; of Phares, the family of the Phrazites; of Zerah, the family of the Zarhites; of Jeconiah (Gen. iv, 18), the family of the Heronites, of Hamul, the family of the Hamulites" (Numb. xxvi, 20, 21). After the death, therefore, of Er and Onan without children, Pharez oc-
cupied the rank of Judah's second son, and, moreover, from the time of David sprang two new families, those of the Hezonrites and Hamulites. From Heron's sec-
ond son Ram, or Aram, sprang David and the kings of Judah, and eventually Jesus Christ. See GENEOLOGY OF JESUS CHRIST. The house of Caleb was also incor-
porated into the house of Hezron [see Caleb], and so were reckoned among the descendants of Pharez. An-
other line of Pharez's descendants were reckoned as sons of Manasseh by the second marriage of Hezron with the daughter of Machir (1 Chron. iv, 21, 22). In the census of the house of Judah contained in 1 Chron. iv, drawn up apparently in the reign of Hezekiah (iv, 41), the houses enumerated in ver. 1 are Pharez, Hezron, Carmi, Hur, and Shobal. Of these all but Carmi (who was a Zarhite, Josh. vii, 1) were descendants of Pharez. Hence it is not unlikely that, as is suggested in the margin of the A. V., "Carmi" is an error for "Chelubai." Some of the sons of Shelah are mentioned separately at ver. 21, 22. See PAHATH-MOAR. In the reign of Da-
vid the house of Pherez seems to have been eminently distinguished. The chief of all the captains of the host for the first month, Jashobeam, the son of Zabdiel (1 Chron. xii, 37), was famous for his valor (xi, 11). And called "the chief among the captains" (ibid. and 2 Sam. xxiii, 8), was of the sons of Perez, or Pharez. A considerable number of the other mighty men seem also, from their patronymic or gentile names, to have been of the same house, those, namely, who are called Bethlehemites, Paltites (1 Chron. ii, 53, 47), Tekoites, Netophathites, and Ithrites (ii, 58; iv, 7). Zabad, the son of Abhiail, and Joab and his brothers, Ahishai and Asahel, we know were Phrazites (i, 51, 86, 54: xi, 41). The house itself was the head of the family.

We have no means of assigning to their respective fami-
lies those members of the tribe of Judah who are inci-
dentally mentioned after David's reign, as Adnah, the chief 
captain in Judah in Jehoshaphat's reign, and Je-
hohanan and Amasiah, his companions (3 Chron. xxvii, 14-16); but that the family of Pharez continued to thrive and multiply we may conclude from the num-
bers who returned from captivity. At Jerusalem alone 468 of the sons of Perez, with Athaiah, or Uthai, at their head, were dwelling in the days of Zerubbabel (1 Chron. iii, 18, 25, 31; Neh. xi, 4, 5, 6, 16), Zerubbabel himself of course being of the family (1 Esdr. v, 5). Of the lists of the returned captives in Ezra ii, Neh. vii, in Nehemiah's time, the returned so far have been from the sons of Phares, judging as before from the names of their an-
cestors, or the towns to which they belonged: the chil-
dren of Bani (Ezra ii, 19; comp. 1 Chron. ix, 3); of Bigvai (v, 11; comp. Ezra vii, 14); of Assir (vi, 15; comp. 1 Chron. ii, 26, 54); of Josiah, or Hariph (i, 18; Neh. vii, 24; comp. 1 Chron. ii, 51); of Bethlehem and Netophah (i, 21, 22; comp. 1 Chron. ii, 54); of Kirijath-
aim (xii, 20; comp. 1 Chron. ii, 50, 58); of Harim (ii, 52; comp. 1 Chron. iv, 9); and, judging from their po-

tition, many of the intermediate ones also (comp. also 
the lists in Ezra x, 25-43; Neh. x, 14-27). Of the 
builders of the wall named in Neh. iii the following were of the house of Pharez: Zaccur, the son of Imri (ver. 2, by comparison with 1 Chron. ix, 4, and Ezra viii, 14, where the name is written in MSS., to be "Zaccur" for "Zabud"); Zadok, the son of Baana (ver. 4, by comparison with 2 Sam. xxiii, 29, where we find that Baana was a Netophathite, which agrees with Zadok's place here next to the Tekoites, since Beth-
lehem, Netophah, and Tekoa are often in close juxta-
position, comp. 1 Chron. ii, 54; iv, 4, 6; Ezra ii, 21, 22; 
Neh. vii, 26, and the situation of the Netophathites 
close to Jerusalem, among the Benjaminites, Neh. xii, 28, 
29, compared with the mixture of Benjaminites with Phrazites and Zabulites in Neh. iii, 2-7); the Tekoites (ver. 5 and 4, by comparison with 1 Chron. vi, 54, 5); Je-
hoada, the son of Pasah (ver. 6, comp. with 1 Chron. 
iv, 12, where Pasah, a Chelubite, is apparently de-
scended from Ashur, the father of Tekoa): Rephaihah, 
the son of Hur (ver. 8, comp. with 1 Chron. ii, 20, 50; 
for other cases of Zaccur and Zaccur in 1 Chron. 
iv, 4, 12, from 44, from Zaccur); Hanun (ver. 13 and 30, with 
the inhabitants of Zanoah (comp. with 1 Chron. iv, 18); 
perhaps Malchiah, the son of Rechab (ver. 14, comp. 
with 1 Chron. i, 55); Nebemiah, son of Azub, ruler of 
Beth-zur (ver. 16, comp. with 1 Chron. ii, 45); and 
perh. Baruch, son of Zabbai, or Zaccai (ver. 29), if for 
Zaccai we read Zaccur as the mention of the other, 
or second, piece, makes probable, as well as his proximity 
to Meremoth in this second piece, as Zaccur was to 
Meremoth in their first pieces (ver. 2, 4).

2. (Sept. פַּרְשִׁיָּה רַבַּיָּה; A. G hence an obscure form (1 Esdr. viii, 20) for the Pharex (q. v.; the Heb. text (Ezra viii, 3).)

Pharisa (Pharisa, ϕαρίσας, a recessive form (1 Esdr. v, 83) of the name Phira (q. v.; the Heb. text (Neh. vii, 57).

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

1. Name of the Sect, and its Signification. —The name 
Paraissie = Pharisee is the Greek form of the Hebrew 
פַּרְשִׁיָּה (parah, passive participle of פְּרָשָׁה, to separate, plu. פְּרָשָׁהּ, Aramaic פְּרָשַׁה, and properly denotes one who is separated, i.e., by special practice; or, as the dictionary defined A. ruch (a. v.) defines it, "one who sepa-
rated himself from Levitical impurity and Levitically 
impure food") (comp. also Talmud, Chapgath, 18 b; Sab-
bat, 18 a). The derivation of it from פַּרְשִׁיָּה, in the 
sense of unfolding, explaining, and the assertion that 
the followers of this sect were called Pharisees = interpreters of the Bible, is a contradiction to the Sadducees, who 
adhered to the letter of the Scriptures, as well as the 
more generally received notion that they were so called 
because they separated from the rest of the people, be-
lieving themselves to be more holy, are at variance 
with the most ancient and most trustworthy authorities 
upon this subject. Besides, to take פַּרְשִׁיָּה as meaning 
interpreter is contrary to its grammatical form, which, 
if transitive, ought to be פַּרְשִׁיָּה. Of course the separa-
tion from that which was Levitically impure necessa-


and that the names by which they were designated among themselves are ḫōnēm, ṣages, or, more modestly ḥēḏiḏēm, disciples of the sages, but more generally ḥāḏēmēḵēm, associates. By the term Ḥāḏēmēḵēm, or its equivalent Ḥāḏēmēḵēm, i.e. associates, is therefore meant all those Jews who separated themselves from every kind of Levitical impurity, and united together to keep the Mosaic laws of purity. As it was natural that all the students of the law would, as a matter of course, be the first to join this association, the apellation Ḥāḏēmēḵēm, member, associate, or ḥāḏēmēḵēm, Pharisee, became synonymous with student, disciple, lawyer, scribe, while those who refused to unite to keep the laws were regarded as ṣaḥ ṣaḥ, country people, common people, illiterates, irreligious.

II. The Qualifications for Membership of the Pharisaic Association.—The most essential conditions which were enacted from every one who wished to become a Ḥāḏēmēḵēm or member of the Pharisaic association were two. Each candidate was required to promise in the presence of this second tithes that he would consecrate the sacred tithes on the produce of the land, and refrain from eating anything which had not been tithed, or about the tithing of which there was any doubt; and (ii) He would scrupulously observe the most essential laws of purity which so materially affected the eating of food and all family affairs.

To understand these laws, which may seem trivial and arbitrary, as well as to see the extraordinary influence which they exercised upon the whole religious and social life of the Jewish nation in all its ramifications, the following facts must be borne in mind:—The Mosaic law enjoins that besides the priestly heave-offering (אָשֶׁר) every Israelite is annually to give to the Levites a tithe of all the produce (Numb. xviii., 19-34), which the Jewish canons call the first tithes (תְּרוּת הַנַּחֲלוֹת), and that a second tithes (תְּרוּת הַנַּחֲלוֹת), as it is termed in the same canons, is to be taken annually from the produce to Jerusalem, either in kind or specie, and consumed by the owner in the metropolis in festival celebration (Deut. xxi., 5-8), and that every third year this second tithes is to be given to the poor (Deut. xvi., 24, 29), whence it is denominated the poor tithes (תְּרוּת הַיִּשְׁרָאֵל) in the ancient canons. Moreover, as each seventh year was a Sabbath or sabbatical year, which yielded no harvest, it was fixed that in the first, second, fourth, and fifth years of the septennial cycle the second tithes is to be eaten by the owner in Jerusalem, while in the third and sixth years it is to be distributed among the poor, and the poor tithes. When it is remembered that these tithe laws, which were originally enacted for Palestine, were in the post-exilic period extended to Egypt, Ammon, Moab, and to every land in which the Jews had possessions, that they had more of a religious than civil import, that the portion of produce reserved as tithes was holy, that the eating of holy things was a deadly sin, and that the non-separation of the tithes rendered the whole produce unlawful, thus affecting every article of food, the paramount importance of the first condition which the Pharisees, who were the conservators of the divine law, extracted from the candidates for fellowship will readily be understood (comp. Mishna, Bekoroth, 30 b).

Of equal importance, and equally affecting the whole fabric of social and religious life, are the Mosaic laws upon the sabbath, of which the second condition was exacted. These laws, which so rigidly enforce the secluding of unclean food and defiling objects, even without the amplifications and expansions which obtained in the course of time, extend to and affect almost every action in public life and every movement in family intercourse. The non-offering of some number of animals prescribed as food, but their very carcasses are branded as unclean, and he who touches them is temporarily defiled, and pollutes every one and every thing wherewith he comes in contact (Lev. v., 2; xi.). A man has an issue not only defiles everything upon which he lies, sits, or which he holds, but his very clothing (Ex., 1-18). The same is the case with a man who comes in contact with a corpse (Numb. xix., 14-22), with a woman in menstruum and childbirth (Lev. xi., 1-8; xv., 19-31), and with a husband after conjugal intercourse (Ex., 18). Individuals thus defiled were forbidden to come into the sanctuary (Numb. xix., 20), and were visited with the severe punishment of excision if they ate the flesh of peace-offering (Lev. vii., 20, 21). Now the slightest reflection upon the workings of these laws will show that thousands upon thousands were daily unclean according to the Mosaic institutions, that these thousands of unclean men and women legally defiled myriad of people and things by contact with them, either unwittingly or unwittingly, and that it therefore became absolutely necessary for those who were conscientiously desirous of discharging their religious duties in a state of legal purity to adopt additional sanitary measures as would preclude the possibility of violating these laws. Hence the Jewish canons ordained that since one does not know whether he has been defiled by contact with any unclean person or thing, every Ḥāḏēmēḵēm or member of the Pharisaic association is to wash his hands before eating his ordinary food, second tithes, or the heave-offering; to immerse his whole body before he eats the portions of holy sacrifices; and to bathe his whole body before touching the water ab-solvent from sin, even if it is only his hands which are unclean. If one immersed himself for ordinary food, and designed it only for ordinary food, he could not eat second tithes; if he immersed for second tithes, and meant it only for second tithes, he could not eat of the heave-offering; if he immersed for the heave-offering, and meant by it the heave-offering, he was required to eat the portions of the holy sacrifice; if he immersed for the holy sacrifice, and meant for it the holy sacrifice, he could not as yet touch the water ab-solvent from sin; but he who immersed for the more important could share in the less important (Mishna, Choshap, ii., 4, 5). This gave rise to four degrees of purity, and to four divisions in the Pharisaic associations, so that every Ḥāḏēmēḵēm or member belonged to that rank whose prescriptions of purity he practised. Each degree of purity required a greater separation from the above-named Mosaic defilements. The individuals who immersed in the purification vessels were termed the fathers of impurity, that is the portion touched by them was designated the first generation of impurity, what was touched by this again was called the second generation of impurity, and so on. Now ordinary food, the first degree of holiness, became impure when touched by the second generation; heave-offering, the second degree of holiness, became defiled when touched by the third generation; the flesh of sacrifices, the third degree of holiness, when coming in contact with the fourth generation, and so on. These degrees of purity had even to be separated from each other, as the lower degree was impure in respect to the higher one. The same removal, both from defilement without and the different gradations within, was required of each member of the Pharisaic order corresponding to the degree to which he belonged. Hence "the garments of an Ḥāḏēmēḵēm, Am ha-aretz ['man of earth,' or a patronym, a simon, as he is termed in the T. T., who neglected to pay the second tithes and of the laws of Mosaic purity], defile the Ḥāḏēmēḵēm [i.e. him who lived according to the first degree of purity], the garments of a Pharisee defile those who eat the heave-offering [i.e. the second degree], the garments of those who eat the heave-offering defile those who eat the sacred sacrifices [i.e. the third degree], and the garments of those who eat the sacred sacrifices defile those who touch the water ab-solvent from sin [i.e. the fourth de-
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...gree" (comp. Mishna, Cheqiqah, ii, 7, with Tarkoroth, vi, 4).

The above-mentioned two conditions extracted from candidates for membership of the Pharisaic association are thus expressed in the Mishna: "He who takes upon himself to be conscientious, tithes whatever he eats, and whatever he sells, and whatever he buys, and does not become the guest of an Am ha-Arets [i.e. a non-Pharisee]; and he who takes upon himself to become a member of the Pharisaic association must neither sell to an Am ha-Arets moist or dry fruit, nor buy of him moist fruit, nor become the guest of an Am ha-Arets, nor receive him as guest, in his garments, into his house" (Demai, ii, 2, 5; comp. Mass. xxxii, 28; Luke xvii, 12). In accordance with these regulations that Christ enjoins that an offender is to be regarded "as a heathen man and publican" (Matt. xvii, 18), that the apostle Paul commands "not to eat with a sinner" (1 Cor. vi, 11), and it is for this reason that Christ was upbraided by the Pharisees for associating and eating with publicans and sinners (Matt. ix, 9-11; xi, 11; Mark ii, 16; Luke v, 30; viii, 34), with the neglecters of tithes and the transgressors of the laws of purity, which was not only in violation of the then prevailing Pharisaic and rabbinic law, but contrary to the Mosaic enactments. But he came to teach that "not that which goeth into the mouth [i.e. untainted food or edibles handled by Levitically unclean persons] defileth a man, but that which cometh out of the mouth, this defileth a man" (Matt. xi, 15); and that it is not outward washing but inward purity which is acceptable. For this reason "he sat down to meat with a Pharisee, and did not first wash before dinner" (Luke xi, 37-40); which, as we have seen, was in contravention of the very first degree of purity among the association. It must, however, be remarked that the Jews were not peculiar in their laws of purity and defilement. Other nations of antiquity had similar statutes. Thus, among the ancient Indians, one who had an issue was obliged to bathe and pray to the sun (Menon, ii, 181); among the Hierrapolitans in Syria every inmate of the house in which a death took place was thirty days unclean, and could not go to the temple during that time (Lucian, De Syr. deca, 58); the Greeks, too, were defiled by contact with a corpse, and could not resort to the temple (Theophrast. Charact. 16; Euphr. Iphig. Taur. 367; Diog. Laer, viii, 32); both the Pharisees and the Greeks regarded a woman in childbirth as unclean (Kleuker, Zmd-Avetein, iii, 222, 223; Euphr. Iphig. Taur. 367); and "no Egyptian would salute a Greek with a kiss, nor use a Greek knife, spitas, coldroons, nor taste the meat of an ox which had been cut with a Greek knife. They drank of bronze ves- als, rinsing them perpetually. And if any one acciden- tially touched a pig he would plunge into the Nile without stopping to undress" (Herodot. ii, 87, 41, 57).

III. The Temet and Practices of the Pharisees.—To state the doctrines and statues of the Pharisees is to give a history of orthodox Judaism; since Pharism was after the return from the Babylonian captivity, and is to the present day, the national faith of the orthodox Jews, developing itself with and adapting itself to the ever-shifting circumstances of the nation. See Kansas. Of the other two sects, viz. the Essenes and the Sadducees, the former represented simply an intensified form of Pharism [see Essenes], while the latter were a very small minority. See Sadducees. The Pharisees, as the erudite Geiger has conclusively shown, were the democratic party, the true representatives of the people; the one high voice that was endeavoured to develop by making them realize, both in their practices and lives, that "God has given to all alike the kingdom, priesthood, and holiness" (2 Macc. ii, 17); in opposition to the small caste of the priestly aristocracy of Sadducees, a royal nation in the spiritual, temporal, and civil office, and who, by virtue of their hereditary rights, tried to arrogate everything to themselves, and manifested little sympathy with the people at large.

Hence the Pharisaic enactments were such as to make the people realize that they were a people of priests, a holy nation; that by becoming a diligent observer of the law, and by preparing one's self for the office of a rabbi or teacher, every such person, though not literally of the priestly caste, may be a priest in spirit, and occupy quite as important and useful a position as if he were actually of the Aaronic order, and even arrange his mode of life so as to make his example of those who minister in holy things. Thus the very name הרפיה, i.eusia, which in olden times denotes a priestly frater- nity (Hos. iv, 17; vi, 9), and was so used by the Jews on the Maccabean coins ( Política בקוני בידם), was adopted by the Pharisees for their lay association. Their social meals were invested with a solemn character to resemble the social meals of the priests, made up from the sacrifices in the Temple. If the priests took care that the sacrifices which they offered up, and portions of which constituted their social meal, especially on the Sabbath and festivals, should be clean and without blemish, the Pharisees also took the utmost precaution that their meals should be free from the different degrees of defilement: they washed before partaking thereof, recited prayers before and after the repast, had a cup of blessing, and offered incense. It is only from this point of view that some of the differences between the Pharisees and the Sadducees can be explained; as, for instance, the difference of opinion as to the connection of priests with Sabbath purposes, called בקוני מיצא, mixture, adopted by the former and rejected by the latter. In consequence of the rigorous laws about the observance of the Sabbath (Exod. xxv, 29; Jer. xxxvii, 21, with Neh. xiv, 15, etc.), it was enacted that no Israelite is to walk on the Sabbath beyond a certain distance, called a Sabbath-day's journey, nor carry anything which was not also done on the Sabbath, or priestly party, who celebrated their meals on the Sabbath in different places, could go from one place to another, and carry to and fro anything they liked, because they regarded these meals as constituting part of their priestly and sacrificial service, which set aside the sanctity of the Sabbath. But the Pharisees, who made their Sabbath repast resemble the priestly social meals, had to encounter difficulties arising from the rigorous Sabbatic laws. The distance which they had sometimes to walk to join a company in the social meal was a disadvantage: they experienced discon- venience from one place to another of the things requisite for the solemnities was contrary to the enactments about the sanctity of the day. Hence they contrived the ideal connection of places (_PKJ), which was effected as follows: Before the Sabbath commenced (i.e. Friday afternoon), an article of food was deposited by each member in the court selected for the social gathering, so that it might thereby become the common place for all; the streets were made to form one large dwelling-place with different gates, by means of beams laid across on the tops of the houses, and doors or gates put in the front; and meals were put in a house at the end of the distance permitted to walk, in order to constitute it a domicile, and thus another Sabbath-day's journey could be undertaken from the first terminus. By this means the Pharisees could evade the law, and, like the priests, meet together at any place to celebrate their social meals on the Sabbath, and carry anything that was wanted for its sacred festival, as they had three common meals on the Sabbath (בראשית וברל). On the Friday evening the entrance of the Sabbath was greeted with a cup of wine, or the cup of blessing, over which every member recited benedictions (בראשית גלע), expressing the holiness of the day as well as the holiness of Israel, whom God sanctified to himself and made a people of priests, a royal nation in the spiritual, as well as in the temporal, meal was eaten. The second meal was eaten on noon of the Sabbath, and the third began with the setting sun, and in the middle of it the Sabbath departed.
When lights were kindled a blessing was again pronounced over a cup of wine (פָּנֵי הַכְּלָבָּה), and burning incense was offered up to accompany this holy day, which was regarded as a departing friend. The paschal meal was the model for these social and sacred repasts. But the light in which this very model sacrifice is to be viewed was a point of dispute between the priestly party or the Sadducees and the Pharisees. Because the paschal lamb formed the social meal of the day, the priestly party maintained that it is not to be regarded as a sacrifice for the congregation, urging in support of their notion the fact that the lambs were not numerically fixed like the other sacrifices in the Temple, but were negotiated according to the number of families, and that they must therefore be simply as family sacrifices, to be eaten by the respective owners, and must not be set aside the sanctity of the Sabbath, i.e. ought not to be offered on the 14th of Nisan, if the first day of the Passover falls on the Sabbath. Hillel, however, or the Pharisaic party whom he represented, succeeded in carrying their point, and in putting the sacred but private offerings of the Passover on an equality with the Temple sacrifices, and it was ordained, in opposition to the priestly party, that they are to set aside the firstborn of the lamb on the Sabbath; instead of making the social family meal of the lamb, which the Pharisees constituted, as sacred as the fraternal meal of the priest, consisting of the sacred sacrifices offered in the Temple (Jerusalem Tosefta, cap. vi.; Babylon Tosefta, 66 a; Geiger, Jüd. Zeitschr., 1, 384; Breslau, 1885, ii. 42 sq.). Having carried this point, the Pharisees also gave to their meal of the Sabbath and other holy days a sacrificial character after the model of the Passover.

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

Practically, Josephus represents the Pharisees as leading a temperate life, renouncing both excessive riches and immoderate pleasure, and striving above all to acquire a knowledge of that law and to practice those precepts which would fit them for the life to come (Ant. xviii, 1, 3); the same may be seen in the following declaration of the Talmud: "The more flesh on the body the more worms [when it is dead], the more riches the more cares, the more wives the more witchcrafts, the more handmaids the more unchastity, the more servants the more slavery, in the divine law the better the life, the more schooling the more knowledge, the more counsel the more intelligence, the more benevolence the more satisfaction; he who acquires a good name acquires it for himself in this world, but he who acquires knowledge of the divine law acquires for himself life in the world to come" (44b, ii. 17). In aiding the people to realize their high vocation, and to prepare themselves for the kingdom of heaven by obedience to the divine law, the Pharisees endeavored to facilitate that obedience by putting a mild interpretation upon some of the Mosaic enactments, and to adapt them to ever-changing circumstances. Thus they explain the expression פָּנְבָּה, carcass, in Lev. vii, 36, literally, and maintain that the statute in the verse in question only declares the flesh of an animal which was torn and died a natural death to be defiling by contact, but not the skin, bones, etc., and that, except the human corpse and the dead bodies of a few reptiles in which the skin and flesh are to a certain extent identical, the skin and bones of all animals, whether clean and living or unclean and dying accidentally, do not defile, but may be made up into parchement, different utensils, etc. The haughty and aristocratic Sadducees, on the other hand, who stood on their priestly dignity, and cared little for the comfort of the people, took the term פָּנְבָּה in the unnatural sense of an animal approaching the condition of being a carcass, i.e. being so weak that it must soon expire, and maintained that an animal in such a condition must be slaughtered before it breathes its last; that its flesh must then be considered as clean and therefore defiling, while the fat, skin, bones, etc., may be used for divers purposes (Jerusalem Megilla, 9 b; Babylon Sabbath, 106 a). It requires but little reflection to perceive how materially and diversely these different views must have affected the whole state of religion, when it is remembered that according to the Sadducees the touching of any book written upon the parchment made from the skin of an unclean animal, or contact with one of the numerous utensils made from the leather, bones, veins, etc., of such a carcass, levitated and not legally slaughtered, imparted defilement. Hence the Pharisees, with a due regard for the interests of the people, and following the requirements of the time, explained the right of retaliation, "eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot," etc. (Exod. xxii, 23, etc.), as requiring pecuniary compensation. While the Sadducees took it literally (Baba Kama, 80 b; 84 a. b; Megillah Ta'amim, cap. iv, Josephta). The same consideration for the spiritual and temporal well-being of the people led the Pharisees to enact that in cases of danger, when the prescribed prayers cannot be offered, they are to offer a short prayer as follows: "Lo thy will in heaven above, and give peace of mind to those who fear thee on earth, and whatsoever pleaseth thee do. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who hearest prayer!" (Berakhot, 29 b). What a striking resemblance between this and some parts of the Lord's prayer! It was this humane and pious care for the interests of the people that made the Pharisees so popular and beloved, and accounts for the remark of Josephus that they had such influence with the multitude that if they said anything against a king a high-priest they were at once believed (Ant. xiii, 10, 6).

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

a. In regard to a future state, Josephus presents the idea of the Pharisees in such a light to his Greek readers that, whatever interpretation his ambiguous language might possibly admit, he obviously would have produced the impression on Greeks that the Pharisees believed in the transmigration of souls. Thus his statement respecting them is, "They say that every soul is imperishable, but that the souls of good men only pass over (or transmigrate) into another body—篾箩 commemorate τίς ἐνωμὸν—are without the souls of bad men are chased away by eternal punishments" (War, ii, 8, 14; comp. iii, 8, 5; Ant. xviii, 1, 8; and Böttcher, De Infersa, p. 619, 656).

There are two passages in the Gospels which might countenance this idea: one in Matt. xiv, 2, where Herod the tetrarch is represented as thinking that Jesus was John the Baptist risen from the dead (though a different color is given to Herod's thoughts in the corresponding passage, Luke ix, 7-9); and another in John ix, 2, where the question is put to Jesus whether the blind man himself had sinned, or his parents, that he was born blind? Notwithstanding these passages, however, there does not appear to be sufficient ground for doubting that the Pharisees believed in a reurrection of the dead very much in the same sense as the early Christians. This is most in accordance with Paul's statement to the chief priests and council (Acts xxxiii)
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6) that he was a Pharisee, the son of a Pharisee, and that he was called in question for the hope and resurrection of the dead—a statement which would have been peculiarly disingenuous if the Pharisees had merely been engaged in the occupation of souls; and it is likewise almost implied in Christ's teaching, which does not insist on the doctrine of a future life as anything new, but assumes it as already adopted by his hearers, except by the Sadducees, although he condemns some unspiritual conceptions of its nature as erroneous (Matt. xii. 38; Mark xii. 25; Luke xx. 34-36). On this head the Mishna is an illustration of the ideas in the Gospels, as distinguished from any mere transmigration of souls; and the peculiar phrase "the world to come," of which αἰώνιον ἡμῶν was undoubtedly only the translation, frequently occurs in it (ಂದีವ ೧೨, ೧೨, אובדך, ii. 7; iv. 16; comp. Mark x, 80; Luke xviii, 80).

This phrase of Christianity, which is anterior to Christianness, but which does not occur in the O.T., though fully justified by certain passages to be found in some of its latest books, is essentially different from Greek conceptions on the same subject; and generally, in contradistinction to the purely temporal blessings of the Mosaic legislation, the Christian idea that this world is a state of probation, and that every one after death will have a new account—account, account, account—will be expressed by Pharisees in language which it is impossible to misunderstand: "This world may be likened to a court-yard in comparison of the world to come; therefore prepare thyself in the antechamber that thou mayest enter into the dining-room" (Abod. iv. 16). "Everything is given to man on security, and a net is spread over every living creature; the shop is open, and the merchant credits; the book is open, and the hand records; and whoever chooses to borrow may come and borrow: for the collecting are continually going around daily, and obtain payment of man, whether with his consent or without it; and the judgment is true justice; and all are prepared for the feast" (iii. 16).

"Those who are born are doomed to die, the dead to live, and the quick to be judged; to make us know, understand, and be informed that he is God; he is the Former, Creator, Intelligent Being, Judge, Witness, and Suing Party, and will judge thee hereafter. Blessed be he; for in his presence there is no unrighteousness, forgetfulness, respect of persons, nor acceptance of a bribe; for no bribe is taken." Know also that everything is done according to the account, and let not thine evil imagination persuade thee that the grave is a place of refuge for thee: for against thy will wast thou formed, and against thy will wast thou born; and against thy will dost thou live, and against thy will wilt thou die; and against thy will must thou hereafter render an account, and receive judgment in the presence of the Supreme King of kings, the Holy God, blessed is he" (iv. 22).

Still it must be borne in mind that the actions of which such a strict account was to be rendered were not merely those referred to by the spiritual prophets Isaiah and Micah (Isa. i, 16, 17; Mic. vi. 8), nor even those enjoined in the Pentateuch, but included those fabulously supposed to have been orally transmitted by Moses on Mount Sinai, and the whole body of the traditions of the elders. They included, in fact, all those ceremonial "works," against the efficacy of which, in the deliverance of the human soul, Paul so emphatically protested. See Resurrection.

5. In reference to the opinions of the Pharisees concerning the freedom of the will, a difficulty arises from the very prominent, and unceasing, respect for the human rights, which accounts of Josephus, whereas nothing vitally essential to the peculiar doctrines of the Pharisees seems to depend on those opinions, and some of his expressions are Greek, rather than Hebrew. "There were three sects of the Pharisees, which had different conceptions respecting human affairs, of which one was called Pharisees, the second Sadducees, and the third Essenes. The Pharisees say that some things, and not all things, are the work of fate; but that some things are in our own power to be and not to be. But the Essenes declare that fate rules all things, and that nothing happens to man except what is foreordained by God; and the Sadducees, on the other hand, take away fate, holding that it is a thing of naught, and that human affairs do not depend upon it; but in their estimate all things are in the power of ourselves, as being ourselves the causes of our good things, and meeting with evils through our own inconsiderability" (Ant. xviii, 1, 8; comp. War. ii, 8, 14). On reading this passage, and the others which bear on the same subject in Josephus's works, the suspicion naturally arises that he was biased by a desire to make the Greeks believe that, like the Greeks, the Jews had philosophical sects among themselves. At any rate his words do not represent the opinions as they were really held by the three religious parties. We may feel certain that the influence of fate was not the point on which discussions respecting free-will turned, though there may have been many differences of opinion as to the interposition of God in human affairs was to be regarded. Thus the ideas of the Essenes are likely to have been expressed in language approaching the words of Christ (Matt. x, 25, 80; vi. 22, 34), and it is very difficult to believe that the Sadducees, who accepted the teaching of the Pentateuch and other parts of the O.T., excluded God, in their conception, from all influence on human actions. On the whole, in reference to this point, the opinion of Gritz (Geschichte der Juden, iii, 599) seems not improbable, that the real difference between the Pharisees and Sadducees was at first practical and political. He conjectures that the wealthy and aristocratic Sadducees in their wars and negotiations with the Egyptians entered into matters of policy and calculations of prudence, while the zealous Pharisees, disdaining worldly wisdom, laid stress on doing what seemed right, and on leaving the event to God; and that this led to differences in formal theories and metaphysical statements. The precise nature of those differences we do not certainly know, as no writing of a Sadducee on the subject has been preserved by the Jews, and on matters of this kind it is unsafe to trust unreservedly the statements of an adversary.

c. In reference to the spirit of proselytism among the Pharisees, there is indisputable authority for the statement that it prevailed to a very great extent at the time of Christ. "Everything is done according to the account, and let not thine evil imagination persuade thee that the grave is a place of refuge for thee: for against thy will wast thou formed, and against thy will wast thou born; and against thy will dost thou live, and against thy will wilt thou die; and against thy will must thou hereafter render an account, and receive judgment in the presence of the Supreme King of kings, the Holy God, blessed is he" (iv. 22).

Still it must be borne in mind that the actions of which such a strict account was to be rendered were not merely those referred to by the spiritual prophets Isaiah and Micah (Isa. i, 16, 17; Mic. vi. 8), nor even those enjoined in the Pentateuch, but included those fabulously supposed to have been orally transmitted by Moses on Mount Sinai, and the whole body of the traditions of the elders. They included, in fact, all those ceremonial "works," against the efficacy of which, in the deliverance of the human soul, Paul so emphatically protested. See Resurrection.
PHARISEE

attempts to produce conversions, although unknown to Greek philosophers, existed among the Pharisees (De Waard, Theo van, Ant. Hellen. 10). But, at any rate, the then existing regulations or customs of synagogues afforded facilities which do not exist now either in synagogues or Christian churches for presenting new views to a congregation (Acts xvii, 2; Luke ix, 16). Under such auspices the proselytizing spirit of the Pharisees inevitably stimulated a thirst for inquiry, and accustomed the Jews to theological controversies. Thus there existed precedents and favoring circumstances for efforts to make proselytes, when the greatest of all missionaries, a Jew by race, a Pharisee by education, a Greek by birth, preaching the resurrection of Jesus to those who for the most part already believed in the resurrection of the dead, confronted the elaborate ritual-system of the written and oral law by a pure spiritual religion; and thus obtained the co-operation of many Jews themselves in breaking down every barrier between Jew, Pharisee, Greek, and Roman, and in endeavoring to unite all mankind by the brotherhood of a common Christianity. See PHREATY.

PHARYNX. The pharynx, Clivus, and general character of the Pharynx. —The name does not occur either in the O. T. or in the Apocalypse; but it is usually considered that the Pharynx was essentially the same with the Assyrians (e. g. chasdim = godly men, saints) mentioned in 1 Macc. ii, 42; vii, 13-17; and in 2 Macc. xiv, 17. The Psalms find allusion to the Assyrians in Ps. lxxxix, 2; xcvii, 10; cxlvii, 9, 16; cxlix, 9, where chasdim is translated "saints" in the A. V. (see Fürst, Handwörterbuch, i, 420 s.). After the return from the Babylonian captivity the priesthood formed the centre of the new religious life, and the pious in Israel who were anxious to practice the commandments of the Lord naturally attached themselves to the divinely-appointed and time-honored tribe of Levi. Besides the keeping pure from intermarriage with heathen, gross and vital importance was attached to the setting aside of the soil and Temple taxes (Neh. x, 33, 86, etc.; Ecclus. vii, 81; xiv, 20; Tobit i, 6; v, 13; Judith xi, 18; 1 Macc. iii, 49), to the due observance of the Sabbath (Neh. x, 81; xii, 19), the three pilgrim festivals, viz. the Passover (2 Chron. xxx, xxxv; Ezra vi, 19-22); Pentecost (Tobit ii, 1), and Tabernacles (Neh. viii, 14), as well as the Sabattic year (Neh. x, 31; 1 Macc. vi, 49, 53), and to the abstention from unclean food. He who allied himself with the national party with the solemn resolve to keep these important laws divine inspiration was called "one who had separated himself unto them from the impurity of the country people" (Ezra vi, 21), or "one who had separated himself for the law of the Lord from the country people" (ix, 1; x, 11; Neh. ix, 2; x, 26). Hence the phrase וָדָּו, "separated from," obtained during this period a party signification. This name became the standing appellation for those who had thus separated themselves for the service of God, and continued to be the conservators of their ancestral religion, as may be seen from the taunt of the anti-national party, who warned them to join the Greek party, telling them in the words of the Maccabees that "since we have separated from them (נימה וָדָּו, the mixed, Ezra ix, 1), or (נימה) the mixture (Neh. xiii, 3)." Hence the period before Alcimus was afterwards called the mixed (נימה), while his own was called the pure (Ezra xiv, 8-36). Afterwards, when the priestly party, or the Sadducees, who were at first the centre of the national movement, assumed a haughty position, stood upon their sacerdotal dignity, cared little for the real spiritual and temporal wants of the people, but only sought their own aggrandizement and preservation, alloying themselves for the purpose, Emperor Hadrian, in exposing antinational sentiments, the real national portion of the people united themselves more firmly than ever, independently of the priests, to keep the law, and to practice their ancestral customs; and it is this party whom the opposite section called by the Aramaic name שָדַּו, "separated," instead of its original Hebrew equivalent מֵם, מֵם, מֵם, מֵם, מֵם, מֵם, מֵם, מֵם, מֵם, מֵם, מֵם, מֵם, מֵם, מֵם, מֵם, מֵם, מֵם, מֵם, מֵם, מֵם, מֵם, מֵם, מֵם, מֵם, מֵם, מֵם, מֵמ. In the time of queen Alexandra (q. v.) the Pharisees attained almost supreme power. By the appearance of piety and thorough knowledge of the law, which they well knew how to affect (so as even to pass for prophets, Josephus, Ant. xvii, 2, 4), the Pharisees at an early day secured the popular favor (Josephus, Ant. xiii, 10, 5; xiii, 15, 5; xiii, 16, 2; War, i, 5, 2; comp. Luke vi, 20), and that of the women (Josephus, Ant. xvii, 2, 4, where, however, only the wives of king Herod are spoken of; but comp. Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. p. 230 sq.), and thereby acquired considerable political influence, which became very manifest even during the time of the Antiochus (Josephus, Ant. xiii, 10, 6; xiii, 16, 2; War, i, 5, 2). This influence became greatly increased by the extension of the Pharisees over the whole land (Luke v, 17), and the majority which they composed in the Sanhedrim (comp. Acts v, 34; xxii, 6 sq.). In political controversies they usually sided for the Hasmoneans, and sometimes carried them to an extreme, trusting to their combined influence for success. (Their number reached more than six thousand under the Herods, Josephus, Ant. xvii, 2, 4.) Many of them must have suffered death for political agitation (Josephus, Ant. xvii, 2, 4). In the time of Christ they were divided doctrinally into several schools, among which those of Hillel and Shammai were most noted, the former being more moderate, the latter more strict, in their observances. Of the history of the Pharisees after the resurrection of Christ and the foundation of the Christian Church little need be said. Their opposition to the Gospel continued as eager as before, and, though they are seldom mentioned by name in the Acts of the Apostles, that opposition is frequently brought before us when "the council" is spoken of (Acts iv, 15; v, 27; vi, 12; xxii, 30; comp. xxii, 6). That "council" is the Sanhedrim, and of the seventy-two doctors of which it was composed, the more influential part appears to have consisted of Pharisees. We see then the same spirit of enmity to Christian truth manifested by it as had been displayed during the life of the Redeemer. In the history of Paul we find the one version is only a more marked illustration than ordinary of the manner in which the whole body would have "persecuted the Church of God and wasted it." It is not to be imagined that this enmity would abate as the infant Church grew stronger. Every Jew that we know of human nature and religious bigotry leads to the opposite conclusion; and in the terrible fanaticism with which, when Titus besieged Jerusalem, the Jewish people rushed upon their fate, in the unflinching zeal which they displayed, in the desperate efforts which they made to avert the destruction which was "the wrath come upon them to the uttermost," and in the awful frenzy with which they sacrificed themselves amid their falling palaces and burning Temple, it is impossible not to recognize the last convulsive outburst of Pharisaic heroism and despair.

With the definitions and explanations of such an extensive and gorgeous ritual as that of the Mosaic law, with the application and adaptation thereof to all the vicissitudes of the commonwealth, with the different degrees of honor and reverence which were accorded to performance or neglect of each precept and rite, with the diverse dispositions and idiosyncrasies of the multitude about the respective merits of outward observances and a corresponding inward feeling, the Pharisees would
have been superhuman if they had escaped the extravagances which in the course of time have more or less developed themselves in the established religions based upon a more spiritual code and a less formal ritual. Thus the enactment that "the flesh of quadrupeds, even of the game hunted or pursued by the light of candles or on the eve of the Sabbath," which is the duty of every Jew; or "the interdict to eat an egg which had been laid on any feast-day, whether such day was or was not the day after the Sabbath," has its parallel in other and later systems. The Christian Church, without any basis for it in the N. T., has at times employed a casuistry which may fairly compete with that of the Pharisees, who had to define an inspired code of minute rites and ceremonies. From Peter Lombard to Gabriel Biel the question was warmly discussed among all the Catholic doctors. What is to be done with a mouse which has eaten of the consecrated wafer? The Established Church of England has deduced from the words "Let all things be done decently and in order" (1 Cor. xiv, 40) the petty regulation that "no man shall cover his head in the church on the day of the Holy Sacrifice, except he have some infirmity, in which case let him wear a nightcap or cap" (Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiastical, xviii); has enacted that "no minister, when he celebrates the communion, shall wittingly administer the same to any but to such as kneel, under pain of suspension" (ibid. xxvii); that "upon Wednesdays and Fridays weekly, though they be not holy-days, the minister, at the accustomed hours of service, shall resort to the church or chapel, and, warning being given to the people by tolling of a bell, shall say the litany prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer. Moreover we warn every householder dwelling within half a mile of the church to come or send one at the least of his household fit to join with the minister in prayers" (xv); and that "no ecclesiastical person shall wear any coif or wortignightcap, but only plain nightcaps of black silk, satin, or velvet;... in private houses and in their studies the said persons ecclesiastical may use any comely and scholar-like apparel, provided that it be not cut or pinted; and that in public they go not in their doublet and hose, without coats or cassocks; and that they wear not any under-garment" (xvi). This, however, only shows the tendency of all ritualism to degrade the human intellect by minute regulations. That the multitudinous and detailed rites and ceremonies imposed by the Mosaic law, and amplified by the requirements of time, should have given rise among many Pharisees to formalism, outward religiousness, self-complacency, ostentation, superstition, and hypocrisy, was to be expected, judging from the general tendency of gorgeous ritualism in more modern days. A learned Jew charges against them rather the holiness of works than hypocrisy: holiness ("Werkheilig, nicht Scheinhelligkeit," Herzfeld, Geschichte des Volkes Israel, iii, 359). At any rate they must be regarded as having been some of the most intense formalists whom the world has ever seen; and, looking at the average standard of excellence among mankind, it is nearly certain that men whose lives were spent in the ceremonial observances of the Manna would cherish feelings of self-complacency and spiritual pride not justified by intrinsic moral excellence. The supercilious contempt towards the poor publican, and towards the lowest and the most humble of his brethren, that his feet with tears, would be the natural result of such a system of life. We are therefore not surprised that our Saviour saw these pernicious features in the ranks of Pharisaism, and that he found occasion to expose and to reprove most unsparingly their externalism (Matt. xxviii, 27; Luke vii, 59) and hypocrisy (Matt. xxiii, 13). But to conclude from this that all the Pharisees were either self-righteous and superstitious, or a set of hypocrites, is as unjust as it would be to brand every sect in modern churches with the impieties and extravagances of individual members who are either denounced by their own more enlightened and spiritually-minded brethren, or exposed by the opposing sections. The language which the Pharisees themselves employed to denounce the proud, the formalists, the self-righteous, and the hypocrites, was quite as strong as that which our Saviour used. In confirmation of this, we need only give the poignant Talmudic classification of the Pharisees. "There are seven kinds of Pharisees," says the Talmud: 1. The Shechekelites Pharisee (תלמוד), who, simply keeps the law for what he can profit thereby, just as Shechem submitted to the rise of circumcision that he might thereby obtain Dinah, the daughter of Jacob (Gen. xxxix, 19); 2. The Tumbling Pharisee (תלמוד), who, in order to appear humble before men, always hangs down his head, and scarcely lifts up his feet when he walks, so that he constantly tumbles; 3. The Bleeding Pharisee (תלמוד), who, in order not to look at a woman, walks about with his eyes closed, and hence injures his head frequently, so that he has bleeding wounds; 4. The Mortar Pharisee (תלמוד), who wears a cap in the form of a mortar to cover his eyes, that he may not see any impurities and indecencies; 5. The What-do-I-know-do-Pharisee (תלמוד), who, not knowing much about the law, as soon as he has done one thing, asks, 'What is my duty now? and I will do it' (comp. Mark x, 17-22); 6. The Pharisee from Fear (תלמוד), who keeps the law because he is afraid of a future judgment; and 7. The Pharisee from Love (תלמוד), who obeys the Lord because he loves him with all his heart" (Babylon Soin, 22 b; comp. Jerusalem Berachoth, cap. ix). It must also be admitted that it was among the Pharisees the glorious ideas were developed about the Messiah, the kingdom of heaven, the immortality of the soul, the world to come, etc. It was the Pharisees who, to some extent at least, trained such men as the immortal Hillel, "the just and devout" (Josephus), who gave the consultation for the cases of those in doubt, and who, taking up the infant Saviour into his arms, offered up thanks to God (Luke ii, 25-35); Zacharias, "who was righteous before God" (l, 6); Gamaliel, the teacher of Saul of Tarsus; Paul, the great apostle of the Gentiles, day and night laboured in vigilance in the Pharisaic ground, and used the arguments of the Pharisees in vindication of his conduct and doctrines. Thus, when Jesus was charged by the Pharisees with allowing his disciples to break the Sabbath by plucking ears of corn in the field on the holy day, he quoted the very maxim of the Pharisees themselves, "the Sabbath is made for man, and not man for the Sabbath" (Mark ii, 27; comp. Joma, 86 b), and his proof is deduced according to the Pharisaic exegetical rule denominated הוהי הוות, analogy. When David was hungry, he ate of the priestly bread, and also gave some to those who were with him. Accordingly, if Jesus be hungry may also give bread to others, which is otherwise only allowed to the priests. Now the priests perform all manner of work on the Sabbath without incurring the guilt of transgression; why, then, should one who is hungry not be allowed to do the same? (Matt. xii, 1-7). We only add that the apostle Paul, who must have known the denominations of Christ against the Pharisees, never uttered a disrespectful word against this sect, but, on the contrary, made it a matter of boast that he belonged to them (Acts xxii, 5; xxvi, 5; Phil. iii, 5). Yet candor must acknowledge that great moral devolutions in practice often coexist with much that is beautiful in theory.
and the undeniably well-grounded rebukes of our Saviour against the Pharisees of his time prove an enormous depravity on their part. He denounced them in the bitterest language; and in the sweeping charges of hypocrisy which he made against them as a class, he might, even at first sight, seem to have departed from that spirit of meekness, which is the very life of the great commandment. But the imitation of improper motives, which is one of the most characteristic and original charms of his own precepts. See Matt. xv, 7, 8; xxiii, 5, 13-15, 28; Mark vii, 6; Luke xi, 42-44; and comp. Matt. vii, 1-5; xi, 9, xii, 19, xxii, 37-42. Indeed, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that his repeated denunciations of the Pharisees mainly exasperated them into taking measures for causing his death; so that in one sense he may be said to have shed his blood, and to have laid down his life in protesting against their practice and spirit. (See especially verses 68 and 54 in the 11th chapter of Luke, which follow immediately upon the narration of what he said while dining with a Pharisee.) Hence to understand the Pharisees is, by contrast, an aid towards understanding the spirit of our Lord. If any conception is more fundamental to us than that of the Pharisaic spirit is, it is a very clear demonstration of the importance and the wide and fundamental truth that we shall best apprehend the genius of Pharisaism by developing the contrast somewhat in detail (see Delitzsch, Jesus und Hülle [Erlangen, 1866]).

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

(2.) While it was the aim of Jesus to call men to the law of God itself as the supreme guide of life, the Pharisees multiplied minute precepts and distinctions to such an extent, upon the pretence of maintaining it in its integrity, that he was simply overwhelmed and burdened on every side by instructions so numerous and trifling that the law was almost, if not wholly, lost sight of. These "traditions," as they were called, had long been gradually accumulating. Their object may in the first instance have been a good one. The law had been given under circumstances very different from those in which the Jewish people found themselves more and more placed as the Christian era approached. The relations of life had been far simpler; the influence exerted over Israel by neighboring nations less refined; while the national authorities, except in times when the offices of the Prophet and the Prophetess were thrown aside, had united in keeping all admixture of foreign elements at a distance. That was no longer possible; and it became almost necessary therefore to explain the application of the law to the changed and ever-changing conditions of the times. Doliocrate's Christiainum und Judendum, p. 750). Commenting upon the law therefore was unavoidable; and many of the comments given were no doubt really what they were designed to be, "a fence to the law." But these "fences" too soon assumed, as indeed it was natural that they should, an importance superior to that of the law itself, while at the same time they were continually increasing in number, till at last a complete system of casuistry was formed, in which the most minute incidents of life were embraced, and which rendered the law itself almost invisible. So that the case was impossible. Of the trifling character of these regulations innumerable instances are to be found in the Mishna, but, as it is not quite clear that the Talmudical was the same as the Pharisaic theology, we omit these, and remind our readers only of some of those mentioned by the Rabbi, to show what the washings before they would eat bread, and the special minuteness with which the forms of this washing were prescribed; their bathing when they returned from the market, their washing of cups and pots, braziers, vessels, and couches (Mark vii, 2-4); such were their fastings not only at the seasons which the law prescribed, but twice in the week (Luke xvi, 12)—on Thursday, when, according to their tradition, Moses had ascended Mount Sinai, and on Monday, when he had come down from it (Eisenmenger, Esedteckes Judendum, i, 811); such were their tilthings, not only of the property which the law provided should be tilled, but even of the most insignificant herbs—mint and anise and cummin (Matt. xxiii, 23; comp. Luke xvii, 12); and such, finally, were those minute and vexatious extensions of the law of the Sabbath, which must have converted God's gracious ordinance of the Sabbath's rest into a burden and a pain (Matt. xii, 1-13, Mark iii, 1-6; Luke xiii, 10-17, etc.).

(3.) It was a leading aim of the Redeemer to teach men that true piety consisted not in forms, but in substance, not in outward observances, but in the inward spirit; not in small details, but in great rules of life. The whole system of Pharisaical piety led to exactly opposite conclusions. Under its influence "the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith," were undervalued and neglected (Matt. xxiii, 23; Luke xi, 42), the idea of religion as that which should have its seat in the heart disappeared (Luke xi, 38-41); the most sacred obligations were evaded (Mark vii, 11); vain and trifling questions took the place of serious inquiry into the most important truths of the law; the most solemn truths were handled as mere matters of curious speculation or means to entrap an adversary (Matt. xxii, 36, etc., Luke xxii, 20, etc.).

(4.) The lowness of piety was, according to the teaching of Jesus, an inseparable concomitant of its reality, but the Pharisees sought maintenance, and thus the attention and to excite the admiration of men. They gave alms in the most ostentatious manner; they often prayed standing at the corners of the streets; they disfigured their faces when they fasted (Matt. vi, 2, 6, 16); they drew attention to their religious zeal they made broad their phylacteries and enlarged the borders of their garments (Matt. xxiii, 5). Blind to the true glory of ministering to others rather than being ministered to, they sought their glory in obtaining the chief seats in the synagogues, the first places at the tables to
which they were invited, greetings of honor in the markets, and the title of Rabbi, Rabbi (Matt. xxiii, 6; Luke xix, 7). Indeed, the whole spirit of their religion was summed up in the one sentiment, but in a proud self-righteousness at variance with any true conception of man's relation either to God or his fellow-creatures.—God, I thank thee that I am not as other men are, extortioners, unjust, adulterers, or even as this publican.” (Luke vii, 11).

(3.) It was a natural consequence of all this, that with such views of the principles and spirit of religion its practicaloughness must be overthrown, and it was so. Christ inculcated compassion for the degraded, helpfulness to the friendless, liberality to the poor, holiness of heart, universal love, and the hatred of the truth. The Pharisees regarded the degraded classes of society as classes to be shunned, not to be won over to the right (Luke vii, 9; xv, 2; xviii, 11), and frowned from them such as the Redeemer would fain have gathered within his fold (John vii, 40). Instead of having compassion on the friendless, they made them a prey (Matt. xxiii, 18).

With all their pretences to piety, they were in reality avaricious, sensual, and dissolute (Matt. xxiii, 25; John vii, 7). They looked with contempt upon every nation but their own (Luke x, 29). Finally, in spite of all their pretences to the highest degree of the dispensation whose truths they professed to teach, and thus bringing men to the hope of Israel, they devoted their energies to making converts to their own narrow views, who, with all the zeal of proselytes, were more excited by universal opposition to the truth than they were themselves (Matt. xxii, 15).

In view of these facts, while acknowledging much that was just and commendable in their doctrines (Matt. xxiii, 2, 5), we are compelled to acquiesce in that general judgment which has made the name of “Pharisee” a proverb of ecclesiastical reproach—a character too often reproduced under Christianity itself.

V. Literature.—Besides the Mishna, the Talmud, and the Midrashim, which embody the sentiments of the Pharisees, we refer to Bruckner, Hist. Crit. Philosophiae, ii, 744-760; Milman, Hist. of the Jews, ii, 71; Ewald, Geschichte des Volkes Israel, iv, 415-419; Biedermann, Phariseer und Sadud effectisten (Zur. 1854); Wellhausen, Die Phariseer und die Sadduzier (Greifsw. 1874); and the Jahrboekter des Heils, p. 5, etc., of Grafner, who has insisted strongly on the importance of the Mishna, and has made great use of the Talmud generally. Grossmann has endeavored to present a harmony of the Jewish-Alexandrine doctrines with those of the Palestine Pharisees in his work, De Pharis. Jud. Alexandr. (Hal. 1846), ii, 4; but it is very improbable that the Pharisees shared it with the Jewish-Hasidim of Alexandria in their principles, when the latter were adherents of Plato, and diligent students of Homer and Hesiod (Grossmann, De Philos. Sadducei, iii, 8). See also the following works by modern learned Jews: Herzfeld, Geschichte des Volkes Israel (Northhausen, 1857), ii, 258, etc.; Jost, Geschichte des Juden- und seiner Secten (Leipzig, 1857), i, 197, etc.; Grätz, Geschichte der Juden (2d ed. ibid. 1868), iii, 73, etc., 454, etc., and, above all, Geiger, Uebersetzungen der Bibel (Breslau, 1867), p. 105, etc., also in the Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft (Leipzig, 1862), xvi, 714, etc., and in his Jüdische Zeitschrift für Wissenschaft und Leben (Breslau, 1863), ii, 11, etc.; and reprinted separately (Breslau, 1868). See Sects, Jewish.

Pharmacy, a name applied to the arts of the magician and enchantor in the early ages of the Christian Church. The Council of Ancyra forbade pharmacy, that is, the magical art of inventing and preparing medicaments to do mischief:; and appointed five years' penalite for any one that receives a magician into his house for that purpose. But there can be no canons condemning such arts under the same character of pharmacy and witchcraft, and assigns thirty years' penalite to them.

Tertullian plainly asserts that never did a magician or enchantor escape unpunished in the Church. Those who practiced the magical art were sometimes termed pharisei, and their magical potions pharism.

Phra'ash (Exa viii, 8). See Pharaoh.

Phar'par (Heb. Parpar, יְפָרָפָר, nākāf; Sept. Φαρ'φαρ v. r. Φαρφαρ, Ἀφάφαρ; Vulg. Pharpar), one of the two rivers of Damascus mentioned in the well-known exclamation of Naaman, “Are not Abana and Pharpar, rivers of Damascus, better than all the waters of Israel?” (2 Kings v, 12). The name does not occur elsewhere in Scripture, nor is it found in ancient classic authors. (Ba'al). It was the river of Damascus (Onomast., s. v. Farfar). Pliny says that “Damascus was a place fertilized by the river Chrysoorrhoeus, which is drawn off into its meadows and eagerly imbued” (v, 16); and Strabo says of this river that “it commences from the city of Barada in Damascus, and is almost entirely drained by watercourses; for it supplies with water a large tract of country” (xvi, 755). But none of these writers speak of any second river. Various opinions have been entertained regarding the Pharpar. Benjamin of Tudela states that, while the Abana rises in the district of Zebdany, the Pharpar, which lies between the gardens and the orchards in the outskirt (Early Travels, Bohn, p. 90). He evidently refers to the two branches of the same river. The river Barada takes its rise in the upland plain of Zebdany, at the distance of the lowest peak of Anti-Lebanon. Its principal source is a fountain called Ain Barada. It cuts through the central chain in a sublime gorge, and flows in a deep wild glen down the eastern declivities. Its volume is more than doubled by a large fountain called Fijeh, which gushes from a cave in the side of the glen. The river laterly becomes a mere stream and enters the desert plain of Damascus about three miles west of the city. The main stream flows though the city; but no fewer than seven large canals are taken from it at different elevations to irrigate the surrounding orchards and gardens. The largest of these is called Nahr Taura, “the river Taura,” and is probably that which Benjamin of Tudela identified with the Pharpar (l. c.). The Arabic version of the Bible reads Taura for Pharpar in 2 Kings v, 12; but the words of Naaman manifestly imply the existence of two rivers. In Keil, it is supposed that because the Barada has two great fountains, Naaman alluded to these; and Dr. Wilson would identify the Barada with the Pharpar, and Ain Fijeh with the Abana (Lands of the Bible, ii, 371, 373); but in reply we say that Naaman speaks of two “rivers,” not “a river.”

A short distance south of the city of Damascus flows the river Awaj. It has two principal sources—one high up on the eastern side of Hermon, just beneath the central peak; the other in a wild glen a few miles southward, near the romantic village of Beit Jann. The streams unite near Sasa, and the river flows eastward in a deep rocky channel, and falls into a lake, or rather large marsh, called Bahret Hijaneh, about four miles south of the lake into which the Barada falls. Although the Awaj is eight miles distant from the city, yet it flows across the whole plain of Damascus; and large ancient canals drawn from it irrigate the fields and gardens almost up to the walls. The total length of the Awaj is nearly forty miles; and in volume it is about one fourth that of the Barada. The Barada and Awaj are the only rivers of any importance in the district of Damascus; and there can be little doubt that the former is the Abana, and the latter the Pharpar. The identity of the Awaj and Pharpar was suggested by Munro in 1833 (Summer Remains, ii, 54), and confirmed by Dr. Robinson (Bible Researches, Sacred and Secular, p. 187); but its sources, course, and the lake into which it falls, were first explored by Dr. Porter in the year 1852 (ibid. Jan. 1854, and April, 1854, p. 829). He then heard, for
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the first time, the name Barbar applied to a gjen on the east side of Hermon, which sends a small tributary to the Awa{j; and it seems highly probable that we have in this name a relic of the ancient Pharrar. The Arabic may be regarded as equivalent to the Hebrew (see Five Years in Damascus, i, 299; Bibiloth. Sac. l. c. p. 54). The mountain region round the sources of the river was occupied in a remote age by the warlike Mascu-tities (1 Chron. vii, 7); subsequently it formed part of the district of Abilene (Luke iii, 1; Josephus, Ant. xix, 5, i). Farther down, the river Pharrar divided the territory of Damascus from Jumea (q. v.). The whole district through which the river flows is now called Wady el-Ajam, "the valley of the river, the"; the scenery is bare and mountainous, but some parts of it are extremely fertile, and it contains upwards of fifty villages, with a population of 18,000 souls (see Jour. of Soc. Lit. 1858; Kutter, Pal. and Syria, i, 182 sq.). See DAMASCUS.

The tradition of the Jews of Damascus, as reported by Schwartz (Palest, p. 54, also p. 20, 27), is curiously subversive of our ordinary ideas regarding these streams. They call the river Fijak (that is, the Barada) the Pharrar, and give the name Aman or Karmon (an old Turkish name) to a stream which Schwartz describes as running from a fountain called el-Barady, a mile and a half from Beth Djan (Bie Jenn), in a north-east direction, to Damascus (see also the reference to the Nubian geographer by Gesenius, Theaur. p. 1192 a).

Pharr, Walter Smiley, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Chenango County, N. C., April 28, 1790. He was educated at Hampden Sidney College, Prince Edward Co., Va.; studied theology under the care of Moses Hoge, D. D.; was licensed by Hanover Presbytery, and ordained by Concord Presbytery Nov. 18, 1820. His first charge was Watawah Church, S. C., and he subsequently preached for Prospect, Raucans, and Mallard Creek churches, in North Carolina, all within the bounds of Concord Presbytery. He died Dec. 27, 1866. Mr. Pharr was a sound theologian, a plain and successful preacher and pastor, much beloved and confided in by all who knew him. See Wilson, Preb. Hist. Almanac, 687, p. 450. (J. L. S.)

Pahra'ite (Heb. with the art. קַרְסֵת, "םִּיִּתְמַר"); [Sept. ψαριτας v. r. φαριτης], the patronymic of a family among the Hebrews (Numb. xxvi, 20), the descendants of Phares (q. v.).

Pharsalia (Pharsalio, Josephus, Pharsale, Prototype, v. 16, 7; Pharsallia, Pliny, xiv, 19; xxi, 5), a city in the plain of the Jordan, built by Herod the Great in the year 10 B.C., as a brother city of Sebaste (Josephus, Ant. xxvi, 5; 22, ii, 9; xvii, 1; xxi, 2; War, ii, 9, 1). It is now Tell Faiiz, a small hill with ruins at its base. The site is inhabited by a few people who cultivate their gardens. These are irrigated by a brook, the fountain of which is an hour more to the west, hidden as it were under the high cliffs below Damascus, and under the shade of a dense jungle (see Robinson, Researches, ii, 305). Brocardus and Mar. Samedo (Soc. Fidel. Cruc. Iii, xiv, 3) identify this little stream, now called Ain Faiiz, with the brook Cherith (see Reland, Palest, p. 958; Bachim, Heb. Geogr. I, i, 125-130).—Van de Velde, Memoir, p. 389.

Pharsa'nah [some Pasa'nah] (Heb. vii, 51). See Pasa'am.

Pharsalos (Pharsalos), a town on the coast of Asia Minor, on the confines of Lydia and Pamphylia, and consequently ascribed by the ancient writers sometimes to one and sometimes to the other. It was one of the towns to which the Romans wrote controlling all Jewish exiles, and which had taken refuge given up to Simon the high-priest (1 Macc. xvi, 23). Its intercourse with commerce was considerable in the 6th century B.C., for at the reign of Amasia it was one of a number of Greek towns which carried on trade somewhat in the manner of the Hanaecan confederacy in the Middle Ages. They had a common temple, the Hellenium, at Naukratis, in Egypt, and nominated procerus for the regulation of commercial questions and the administration of contracts, like the proctors of the Middle Ages, who presided over the courts of piezopudr (piez poudres, peddler) at the different stables. In later times Phasis was distinguished as a resort of the Pamphylian and Cilician pirates. Its port was a convenient one to make, for the lofty mountain of Solyma (now Tshakhatlu), which backed it at a distance of only five miles, is nearly eight thousand feet in height, and constitutes an admirable landmark for a great distance. Phasis itself stood on a rock of fifty or one hundred feet elevation above the sea, and was joined to the mainland by a low isthmus, in the middle of which was a lake, now a picturesque marsh. On the eastern side of this were a closed port and a roadstead, and on the western a larger artificial harbor, formed by a mole run out into the sea. The remains of this may still be traced to a considerable extent below the surface of the water. The masonry of the pier which protected the small eastern port is nearly perfect. In this sheltered position the pirates could lie safely while they sold their booty, and also refit, the whole region having been incised with creeks and canals, with wood as to give the name of Pityusa to the town. For a time the Phasitae confined their relations with the Pamphylians to the purposes just mentioned; but they subsequently joined the piratical league, and suffered in consequence the loss of their independence and their town lands in the war which was waged by the Roman consul Publius Servilius Isauricus in the years B.C. 77-75. But at the outset the Romans had to a great extent fostered the pirates, by the demand which sprang up for domestic slaves upon the change of manner brought about by the spoliations of Carthage and Corinth. It is said that at this time many thousand slaves were passed through Delos—which was the mart between Asia and Europe—in a single day; and the proverb grew up there, καπιτού, καρπαμιους ιδιου πως παραιτορος. But when the Cilicians had acquired such power and audacity as to sweep the seas as far as the Italian coast, and interrupt the supplies of corn, it became time to interfere, and the expedition of Servilius commenced the work which was afterwards completed by T Pompey the Great (see Smith, Dict. of Class. Geog. v. v.).

It is in the interval between the growth of the Cilician piracy and the Servilian expedition that the incidents related in the First Book of Maccabees occurred. After naming Ptolemy, Demetrius (king of Syria), Antigonus (king of Macedon), Ariarathes of Pontus, and Clearchus (Parthia) as recipients of these missives, the author adds that the consul also wrote: εις τας των Κωστα σαμαρίας και Σαμαρίας (Grotius conjectures Lamatos), and one MS. has Μινασιας κα Καμαριας των αληθινων των ημων και των Αληθιων των αληθων και των δινων και των δανων και εις την Καισαριανα και εις την Καλεντα και εις την Καλεντα και εις την Αλεξανδρειαν και εις την Παλαιαν και εις την Ἴλιου πολιν και εις την Ελευθεραν και εις την Κεραν και εις την Κεραν και εις την Κεραν και εις την Κεραν και εις την Κεραν και εις την Κεραν. It will be observed that all the places named, with the exception of Cyprus and Cyrene, lie on the highway of marine traffic between Syria and Italy. The Jewish slaves, whether kidnapped by their own countrymen (Exod. xxxi, 16), or obtained by raids (2 Kings v, 2), appear in early times to have been transmitted to the western coast of Asia Minor by this route (see Ezek. xxviii, 13; Joel iii, 6).

The existence of the mountain Solyma, and a town of the same name, in the immediate neighborhood of Phasis, renders it probable that the descendants of some of these Israelites formed a population of some importance in the time of Strabo (i, 174, 175, 176). Strabo, xiv, c. 8; Livy, xxxvii, 23; Mela, i, 14; see Beaumont, Karamania, p. 53-56.

Phas'iron (Pharos) : Vulg. Phaistorum v. r. Phaistos.
the name of the head of an Arab tribe, "the children of Phasiron" (I Macc. ix, 66), defeated by Jonathan, but of whom nothing more is known.

Phas'aron (Φασαρών, v.r. Φασαρίος and Φασαρίς; Vulg. Phasarius), a Grecized form (1 Esdr. v, 25) of the Heb. name Pashur (v. r.).

Ph. 'b. See Pherecydes.

Phelan, William, D.D., a somewhat noted Irish deacon of the Established Church, was born at Clonmel in 1789, and was educated at Trinity College, Dublin, where he was admitted sizar in 1806. In 1814 he was made second master of the endowed school of Derry: in 1817 he was elected fellow of his college, and in 1820 lecturer. In 1824 he became rector of Killiman, Armagh, and in 1825 of Ardtray. He died in 1830. His Remains were published, with a biographical memoir, by the bishop of Limerick (2d ed. Lond. 1832, 2 vol. 8vo).

See Darling, Cyclop. Bibliogr. a. v.

Phelet. See Beth-Phelet.

Phelipeaux, Jean, a French theologian, was born at Angiers in the 17th century. He studied in Paris, and there took his degree of Doctor of Theology, even to the doctorate. Bossuet, having heard him dispute in the Sorbonne, formed so favorable an opinion of him that he placed him in the position of preceptor to his nephew, the abbe Bossuet, the future bishop of Troyes. Both were created doctors in 1687, when the affair of Quietism was agitated; they followed it with singular ardor, and with a kind of passion the expression of which Bossuet was more than once obliged to moderate. Phelipeaux wrote, June 24, 1688, "No better and more persuasive piece of news can be sent us than that of the disgrace of the relatives and friends of M. de Cambra," His pupil showed no less animosity. "He is a wild beast," said he, Nov. 25, in speaking of Fénélon—"he is a wild beast, that must be pursued until he is overthrown and unable to do any harm." Phelipeaux, entirely occupied with this affair, wrote numerous memoirs, and besieged the court of Rome with solicitations, at the same time carrying on a secret correspondence with M. de Noailles, archbishop of Paris. On his return to France (1699) he became canon, official, and grand-vicar of Meaux. He died at Meaux July 3, 1708. After his death was published the Relation de l'origine du progress et de la condamnation du Quiskima répondu en France, avec plusieurs anecdotes curieuses (a. l. 1782-1783, 2 pt. 12mo). All that is said in it against the manners of Madame Guyon is corroborated by no proof, and was refuted in 1788 by the abbe de la Plute, in a work called Les Accords de Satan. As for Fénélon, the design of the author was to injure his reputation; "he will work," says De Baumetz, "reveals the most marked partiality and the most odious rage." Besides, it was suppressed by a decree of the council. See Moncri, Grand Dict. Hist.; De Baumetz, Hist. de Fénè- lon; Barbié, Dict. des Anonymes, 3d edit., No. 16,096—Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxxix, 921.

Philemon (φιλόμων), a cock, which in the Greek Church corresponds to the chasseur in the Latin Church. This ecclesiastical vestment is worn by the priests, and that worn by the patriarch is embroidered with crosses and crowns. This is supposed to have been the sort of garment which Paul left at Troas, and his anxiety for its restoration is to be attributed, we are told, to its sanctity as an ecclesiastical robe.

Phelps, Elisabeth Stuart, an American lady, noted as the author of a number of moral and religious story-books, was born at Andover, Mass., in 1815. She was the daughter of Dr. Moses Stuart, the celebrated professor of O.T. exegesis at the Andover divinity school, and wife of Dr. Austin Phelps. She died at Boston, Nov. 18, 1862. We have not space here for a list of her writings, but those interested will find it in Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, a. v.

Phelps, Joseph T., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Anne Arundel County, Md., Sept. 21, 1818; was converted at sixteen, and in 1840 became a member of the Baltimore Conference, and for eighteen years travelled in Maryland, Virginia, and Pennsylvania. His last appointment in the Baltimore Conference was Harper's Ferry. In 1858 he took a supernumerary relation, and moved to Ohio. At the ensuing Conference he was, at his own request, located. In 1860-61 he was employed by the presiding elder on Clarkfield Circuit, and in 1868 he was admitted into the North Mississippi Conference, and travelled in the following circuits: Sullivan, one year; Republican, two years; Perkins, two years; and Centerton, one year. His last appointment was Republican. "He was a man of general intelligence, of godly presence, and unassuming manner. He was a very good and acceptable preacher, a true Christian gentleman, and success attended his ministerial labors." He died near Replied, Seneca County, Ohio, April 23, 1870. See General Minutes of the Ann. Conferences.

Phelps, Servis W., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in 1846. After completing his study in this college, he went to the school of Dr. Ed. G. W. May, in a farm near his birthplace, where he was converted, he joined the New York Conference in 1868. He was first appointed to New Bremen, and then to Barnee's Corner, where, under his ministrations, more than fifty persons were added to the church. His health suddenly failed him, and he died Jan. 11, 1869, after a brief illness, at home, with a good grace. His death was a great loss to his church. See Minutes of the Ann. Conferences.

Phelps, Thomas, a Wesleyan preacher and missionary, was born at Rudford, Gloucestershire, England, in 1817. He was of humble parentage, and did not enjoy more than the usual advantages of a common-school education. In 1849 he was selected as a laborer in the Jamaica mission. He promptly accepted the work, and though more or less disabled by severe attacks of tropical fever, he yet continued faithful in the discharge of his duties. He died peacefully at Port Morant, Aug. 18, 1852. "Phelps' amiable disposition, and his habits of industry and punctuality, secured for him the love and esteem of the brethren with whom he was associated, and his brief ministry was not without fruit. His pulpit labors were acceptable; and his diligent attention to other pastoral duties obtained for him the love of the people among whom he was stationed." See Wesleyan Magazine (Sept. 1853), p. 869.

Phelpeaux, Georges-Louis, a French prelate, was born in 1729 in the château d'Herbiet, diocese of Orleans. He entered holy orders, became commendatory abbe of the royal abbey of Thouroul, and was appointed in 1757 archbishop of Bourges, and in 1770 chancellor of the Order of the Holy Ghost. He distinguished himself as much by the activity of his pastoral zeal as by his inexhaustible benevolence. He founded several colleges in the principal cities of his diocese, instituted bureaus of charity, and succeeded in considerably diminishing mendicity. See Biblioth. de l'Église, Hist. de G.-J. Phelpeaux (1778, 8vo); Fauchet, Orison Funèbre de G.-J. Phelpeaux—Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxxix, 924.


Phenl'ia. See PHINEAS.

Phenolion. See PHENOL. HON.

Phenomenon. See PHENOMENON.

Pherecydes (φερεκύδης), an ancient Greek philosopher, was a native of the island of Ithyr, one of the Cyclades. He is mentioned in the Bacchic Eclogues of B.C. 299, and is said by Diogenes Laertius to have been a rival of
Thebes, and to have learned his wisdom from the sacred books of the Phoenicians, or from the Egyptians and Chaldeans. He is also reputed to have been a disciple of Plato, and to have taught Pythagoras. He wrote a cosmogony in a kind of prose much resembling poetry, under the title Εἰκώνοι, the meaning of which is doubtful. In a manner rather poetic than philosophic, he endeavored in this work to show the origin of all things from the eternal principles: Time, or Kronos; Earth, the feminine and passive mass; and Εἴκοσι, or Zeus, as the formative principle. He taught the doctrine of the existence of the human soul after death; but it is uncertain whether he held the doctrine of the transmigration of souls, afterwards promulgated by his disciple Pythagoras. Of his work only fragments are extant, which have been collected and elucidated by Stuart (Ges. 1798; 2d ed. Leipzig, 1824). See Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol. s. v.; Butler, Hist. of Anc. Phil. vol. ii; Cudworth, Intel. System of the Universe (see Index in vol. iii). Pherecydes (1 Esdr. viii. 69) or Pherecydes (judgment v. 19; 2 Esdr. i. 21), different modes of rendering (Φερεκοίς) the name Pheri-ces (q. v.).

Philaia (Φιλαία), Lake, a small body of water described by Josephus, and believed by him to supply the fountain at Banias (War. iii, 10, 7). It is present-day Birt el-Rim, east of Banias; first examined by Irby and惠尔登 (1808), and named the time of Strabo, is identified on various maps. It was changed into Philae by Thomson (Bibl. Sacra, iii, 199-192). See also Ritter, Erdkunde, xxxv, 154 sq., 174 sq.; Wilson, Lands of the Bible, ii, 190; Lynch, Official Report, p. 110; Robinson, Later Bibl. Res. p. 399—Van de Velde, Memoir, p. 340.

Phlibotense is a local name of the Gnostics (q. v.), and is probably a corruption of Phlibotius, which was acquired from Valentinus, the founder of the sect, who was a native of Phlibotis, on the coast of Egypt (see Ephesiinus, Harra, xxvi, 3; xxxi, 2).

Ph'chol (Heb. פֵּכֹל, פֵּכּוֹל, of doubtful meaning [see below]; Sept. פֶּכַּל v. פֶּכַל; Josephus Φιλοκλος), the proper, or, more probably, the titular name of the commander of the troops of Abimelech, the Philistine king of Gerar in the patriarchal period. See Abimelech.

If Abimelech of the time of Isaac was the son of the Abimelech of the time of Abraham, we may conclude that the Phichol who attended on the second Abimelech (Gen. xxii. 22) was the successor of the one who was present with the first at the interview with Abraham (Gen. xxvi. 26), and mentions him on the second occasion only. On the other hand the Sept. introduces Ahuzzath, Abimelech's other companion, on the first also. By Gesenius the name is treated as Hebrew, and as meaning the "mouth of all." By Ewald (p. 227) it is derived from a root בָּר, to be strong. But Hitzig (Philadeler, § 57) refers it to the Semitic פֵּכֹל, a tamunak, pointing out that Abraham had planted a tamarisk in Beersheba, and comparing the name with Elah, Berosus, Tappuach, and other names of persons and places signifying different kinds of trees; and with the name פָּקַל, a village of Palestine (Josephus, Ant. xii, 5, 2), and פָּקָל in Greece. Stark (Cata, etc. p. 367) would cautiously avoid such speculations. The natural conclusion from these mere conjectures is that Phichol is a Philistine name, the derivation and meaning of which are lost to us.

Philadelphia (strictly Philadelphia) (Φιλαδελφις, brotherly love), one of the seven cities of Asia Minor to which the admonitions in the Apocalypse were addressed (Rev. i, 11; ii, 7). The town stood about twenty-five miles south-east from Sardis, in N. lat. 39° 39', E. long. 29° 30', in the plain of Hermus, about midway between the two branches of the river and the termination of Mount Tmolus. It was the second in Lydia (Polyen. v. 2; Pliny, Hist. Nat. v. 80), and was built by king Attalus Philadelphia, from whom it took its name. In B.C. 183 the place passed, with the dominion in which it lay, to the Romans. The soil was extremely favorable to the growth of vines, celebrated by Virgil (Geo. iv. 91) for the great wine-producing region, extending for 500 stadia in length by 400 in breadth. Its coins have on them the head of Bacchus or a female Bacchant. Strabo compares the soil with that in the neighborhood of Catana, in Sicily; and modern travellers describe the appearance of the country as resembling a billowy sea of disintegrated lava, with here and there vast trap-dikes protruding. The original population of Philadelphia seems to have been Macedonian, and the national character to have been retained even in the time of Pliny. There was, however, as appears from Rev. iii, 9, a synagogue of Helleneizing Jews there, as well as a Christian Church—"a circumstance to be expected when we recollect that Antiochus the Great introduced into Phrygia 200 families of Jews, bringing them from Babylon and Mesopotamia, for the purpose of counteracting the seditious temper of the Phrygians; and that he gave them lands and provisions, and exempted them from taxes (Josephus, Ant. xii, 3, 4). The locality continued to be subject to constant earthquakes, which, at the time of Strabo, had overcome even the town-walls of Philadelphia useless; but its inhabitants held pertinaciously to the spot, perhaps from the profit which naturally accrued to them from their city being the staple of the great wine-district. The expense of the repairation was constant, and there is not perhaps the poverty of the members of the Christian Church (οἶκος ... ἐν τοιαυτῷ τῷ νόμῳ, Rev. iii, 8), who no doubt were a portion of the urban population, and heavily taxed for public purposes, as well as subject to private loss by the destruction of their own property. Philadelphia was not of sufficient importance in the Roman times to have law-courts of its own, but belonged to a jurisdiction of which Sardis was the centre. It continued to be a place of importance and of strength down to the Byzantine age; and of all the towns in Asia Minor is the smallest. It was taken by Bajazet I in A.D. 1492. Furious at the resistance which he had met with, Bajazet put to death the defenders of the city, and many of the inhabitants besides (see G. Pachym. p. 290; Mich. Duc. p. 70; Chalcond, p. 83.}

Philadelphia still exists as a Turkish town, under the name of Allah-asker, "city of God," i.e. Hightown. The region around is highly volcanic, and, geologically speaking, belongs to the district of Phrygia Catoeacumene, on the western edge of which it lies. The situation of Philadelphia is high, and is especially when viewed from the north-east, for it is principally built on four or five hills, extremely regular in figure, and having the appearance of truncated pyramids. At the back of these, which are all of nearly the same height, rise the 2000 ridges of Ida; and though the country around is barren and desolate, the city itself is wanting neither in wood nor verdure. The climate of Philadelphia is pleasant and healthy. It is elevated 952 feet above the level of the sea, and is open to the salutary breezes from the Catoeacumene — a wild desert tract of highly volcanic country extending as far to the east as Petra. This district is even yet famous for the growth of the vine, which delights in a light sandy soil; and, though incapable of extensive cultivation, has a few fertile soils. Close to Philadelphia the soil is rich in fruits as well as in wine abundant. The Cogamos abounds in fresh-water water, which are considered delicacies, and highly prized accordingly. The revenues of the city depend on its corn, cotton, and tobacco. The cotton grows in small patches about the town; but not used for making cloth. The town itself, although spacious, is presently built and kept, the dwellings being remarkably mean, and the streets exceedingly filthy. Across the summits
of the hill behind the town and the small valleys between them runs the town-wall, strengthened by circular and square towers, and forming also an extensive and long quadrangle in the plain below. The ancient walls are partly standing and partly in ruins; but it is easy to trace the circuits which they once enclosed, and within which are to be found innumerable fragments of pillars and other remains of antiquity. The missionaries Fisk and Parsons, in 1822, were informed by the Greek bishop that the town contained 5000 houses, of which he assigned 200 to the rest of the Greeks in the town. On the same authority it is stated that there are five churches in the town, besides twenty others which were too old or too small for use. Six minarets, indicating as many mosques, are seen in the town; and one of these mosques is believed by the natives to be the church in which assembled the primitive Christians addressed in the Apocalypse. There are few ruins; but in one part there are still found four strong marble pillars, which supported the dome of a church. The dome itself has fallen down, but its remains may be observed, and it is seen that the arch was of brick. On the sides of the pillars are inscriptions, and some architectural ornaments in the form of the figures of saints. One solitary pillar of high antiquity has often been noticed as reminding beholders of the remarkable words in the Apocalyptic message to the Philadelphia Church: "Him that overcometh will I make a pillar in the temple of my God; and he shall go no more out!" (Rev. iii, 12). It is believed that the Christian inhabitants of Philadelphia are on the increase. The city is the seat of a Greek bishop, and the last incumbent of the see did much to spread among his clergy a desire for theological learning; but education is in a very low state, and Mr. Arundell states that the children had been allowed to tear up some ancient copies of the Gospels. See Smith, Sipt. Ecclesiarmm Asia, p. 138; Arundell, Seven Churches; Richter, Wahrh"afften, p. 518; Schubert, Morgenland, i. 383-387; Missionary Herald, 1821, p. 233; 1839, p. 210-212; Chandler, Travels, p. 810.

It has been supposed by some that Philadelphia occupied the site of another town named Callaetes, of which Herodotus speaks, in his account of Xerxes' march; but the position and fertility of that spot do not correspond. At the same time the Persian king, in his two days' march from Cydara to Sardis, must have passed very near the site of the future Philadelphia (Strabo, iii. c. 6; Herod. vii. 1). See Asia Minor.

Philadelphia, or "the Philadelphia Society," is the name of a sect which was founded in 1693, and claimed to have for its object the advancement of piety and divine philosophy. It originated with Jane Leade (q. v.) and John Pond- er (q. v.). Another of the Philadelphia was the learned physician Francis Lee, who edited the "Theosophical Transactions" of the society. Another eminent member was Dr. Lot Fisher, who caused all the works of Jane Leade and her associates to be translated into Dutch. A fourth principal founder was Thomas Bromley, author of The Sabbath of Rest, and of some works on Biblical subjects. The Philadelphia Society contributed largely to the spread of that mystical piety which is so conspicuous in the works of the good and learned William Law, and which affected in no small degree the early stages of Methodism. Mrs. Leade herself, however, combined much fanaticism with her piety, professing (like Swedenborg in a later generation) to hold intercourse with spirits. This fanaticism imparted itself to many members of the Philadelphia Society, and imaginary apparitions of good and evil angels became for a time a prominent feature of their religious life. In other respects their mysticisms was that of the ordinary character, making the contemplative life the basis of religious knowledge and practice. A small work entitled The Principles of the Philadelphia Society, published in 1697, gives a curious exposition of their mysticisms. See Eberhardt, Kirchenvater, Dogmengesch. iv. 163; Mosheim, Eccles. Hist. vol. iii.; Math. Rev. April, 1665, p. 806; Ilgen, Zeitschr. f. Hist. Theol. 1865, ii, 171; Amer. Presb. Rev. Jan. 1866, p. 51. (J. H. W.)

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

Philanthropy (φιλανθρωπία), a term compounded of φίλος, loving, and άνθρωπος, man, signifies the love of mankind. It differs from benevolence only in this—that benevolence extends to every being that has life and sense, and is of course susceptible of extension to any being that has reason and the power of doing good, whereas philanthropy cannot comprehend more than the human race. It differs from friendship, as this affection subsists only between a few individuals, while philanthropy comprehends the whole human species. It is a calm sentiment, which perhaps hardly ever rises to the warmth of affection, and certainly not to the best of passion.

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

In the history of education philanthropy has ac-
squired a special meaning. The influence exercised by
Kroussac was not less great on education than on pol-
tics, and was as visible in the pedagogies of Germany
and Switzerland as in the men of the French Revolu-
tion. It is to the brilliant and one-sided advocacy, by
the author of Émile, of a return to nature in social life
and in the training of the young, that Basleow owed
his novel and enthusiastic educationalism, which he put
to the practical test in the institution which was opened
under his auspices at Desseau in 1774, and which was
called a 'school of the poor'. The same kind were found in different parts of Germany, but the only one which still survives is Salzmann's Insti-
tute at Schneepenthal, near Gotha, opened in 1784. These
philanthropists are of interest to us because they sought
the religious and moral training of the young on an en-
tirely original plan. Until the days of these Philan-
thropists the Church had had the sole educational
care of the rising generation, but these came forward
to assume this responsibility, and to treat the child in a
peculiar and altogether novel manner. The religious
fervor was to be the guide of all of them, and the zeal for any given
study, and, instead of influencing the heart, religion be-
came an intellectual acquisition. As philanthropists
agreed no less with the absolutism of Russia than with
the liberty of Switzerland, so, in the general private de-
vo tional exercises, nothing should be done which would
not be approved of by every worshipper of God, whether
he were a Christian, Jew, Mohammedan, or a deist.

"In the temple of the Father of all, crowds of dissenting
fellow-citizens will worship as brethren, and afterwards
they will, with the same fraternal disposition, go, one
to bear the holy mass, the other to pray with real
brethren, 'Our Father,' the third to pray with real
brethren, 'Father of us.' While the former education had
viewed the minds of children as vessels into which a
certain amount of knowledge and faith was to be
infused, whether it was easy or difficult, philanthro-
pism viewed these vessels as the chief thing, and the
amount of knowledge as only secondary. In other
words, knowledge was regarded merely as a means of
training the human mind; and the aim was the nat-
ural development of all man's powers and faculties" (Kahni, Hist, of Ger, Prot, p. 472). See the Quart.
Rev. Jan. 1875, art. vi: Blackie, Hist, of Europ. Morals,
p. 236, 293; Wuttke, Christian Ethics (see Index in vol.
vi).}

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

Philaret Of Moscow, a modern Russian prelate of
much celebrity, was born of pious parents at Kholmogors
in 1792. His lay name was Vassilij Drozdov. He received his education in the Greek Seminary of
Moscow. He commenced his public career as tutor
of the Greek and Latin languages. His oratorical gifts
being soon observed, he was appointed preacher in 1806
at the Sergiev monastery of Troitska, and after having
removed to St. Petersburg, entered the monastic life,
and assumed the name of Philaret. He was the chief
archbishop of the Church, which, only the white clergy can enter. In
1810 he was translated to the Academy of Alexander
Newrakj as bachelor of theological science; in 1811 he was
made archimandrite, and in 1812 became rector of the
St. Petersburg Theological Academy. In 1817 he was
raised to the bishopric, and was appointed, successively,
bishop of Tver, Jaroslav, and Moscow. In the episco-
pal see of Moscow, to which he was appointed in 1821,
he remained until his death, Nov. 19, 1867. As the sen-
or Russian prelate, the eminent orator and professor,
the theological justly renowned in the Christian world,
the strict supporter of the Church, and the true states-
man, Philaret, from his tenderest youth until the last
day of his prolonged life, was animated by a burning
and constant love for Russia. In the fulfilment of the
mission which fell to his lot, he elevated himself by his
spirit above the time, and did not allow himself to be
captivated by any narrowness of mind. All that knew
him know likewise that in the height of his intelligence
he considered the relative importance of all the mani-
festations in the Christian world, whether within or
without the Church. Without the establishment of the
same Church, the appellation of heretics to such of the Christian dis-
senters as had come into existence since the ecumeni-
cal councils, and consequently had not been condemned
by them. He was exempt from fanaticism in his ad-
ministrations, and yet he knew the limits and measures
of that which stood below. His indomitable intellect,
sound counsels, and thorough acquaintance with the
religious and social life of the people made him the friend
of the crowned heads of Russia; and he was by them
selected as confidential adviser in all important ques-
tions concerning the good of his country. Alexander
I even told him who was to be the successor to his throne before the future emperor knew of it. In the
late Crimean war his words and sacrificing example re-
vived a patriotic feeling throughout the land; and to
him is ascribed the manifesto which led to the abdica-
tion of the anti-Christian tsar. For over twenty-
five years he was not present at the Holy Synod, yet all
important documents concerning spiritual affairs were
submitted to him; and his vivid words called out symp-
athy with the poor co-religionists in the island of
heretics (Crete). In 1830 he received from the emperor Alexander I for his oratory. Sermons, lect-
ures, etc., of his have been printed in large numbers
and translated into foreign languages. The synodal
printing establishment at Moscow alone printed 360
of his compositions, the number of the books of his
Metropolitan Philaret was really one of the greatest
scholars of his Church. Almost all the now living
communicants of the orthodox Russo-Greek Church have learned its doctrines from the Catechism arranged
by him. His greatest work is his History of the Rus-

sian Church, in which a summary of the history of
the Church was brought out in 1872. This history was
really the first work of importance in Russian ecclesiastical annals. It was published from 1850 to 1859, and, by order of the Holy
Synod, was introduced into the ecclesiastical seminaries
(institutions ranking between the ecclesiastical schools
and ecclesiastical academies). Within ten years four
editions were published. The author divides the his-
tory of the Russian Church into five periods: the first
with the inroads of the Mongolians in 1237; the
second embraces the time of the suzerainty of
Russia by the Mongolians 1298 to 1409; the third extends to
the establishment of a patriarchate, 1587; the fourth to
the abolition of the patriarchate in 1719; the fifth com-
prises the administration of the Church of the Holy
Synod. (The value of the German translation is con-
siderably enhanced by the fact that Philaret's treatise
on the "Liturgy of the Russian Orthodox Church"
and the "Catechism of the Orthodox Christian Doctrine,
and the Catechism of the Orthodox Christian Doctrine.)
Philaret published, besides this history of the Russian Church, the following works: A System of Christian Doctrine (5 vols., 1807); History of Russia:—Cyril and Methodius, the Apostles of the Slavs;—The Liturgy of the Russian Church before the Invasion of the Mongolians;—A Work on the Church Fathers (3 vols., and an extract from it as a text-book):—A Commentary to the Epistle to the Galatians;—An Outline of the Theological Literature of Russia (3 vols.);—Sermons, Homilies, and Addresses (4 vols.), of which a detailed account is given by Otto in his Russian Literature. Of his personal appearance and kindness of heart Dean Stanley makes mention in his East. Ch. Lectures, p. 926. As a preacher and theologian, Philaret is one of the first men of the present Church of Russia, "whose striking manner renders his sermons impressive even to those who cannot follow the language." See Meth. Qu. Rec. July, 1873, p. 436 sq.; Union Rec. March, 1869; Appleton's Annual Cyclop., 1867; art. Moscow; Theological Literaturblatt (Bonn, 1873, Jan. and April); Zion's Herald (Boston), April 2, 1888; Otto, Russian Literature, p. 824 sq.; Dixon, Free Russia, p. 29 sq. (J. H. W.)

Philaret, Theodoros Romannoff, third patriarch of Russia, a near relative by his mother of the last czar of the blood of Rurik, was born in the 16th century. This relationship caused him, in 1599, to be made a摩托 from his last name by his contemporaries. In 1605 to 1615 he held the episcopal chair of Rostov by Dmitri, he was in 1610 sent on an embassy to Poland, where he was retained, against the law of nations, a prisoner for nine years. On his return to Moscow, in 1619, he found his son czar, who appointed him, June 34, of this year, patriarch, and shared with him his sovereignty, so that all the usages were given in their name, and in all solemnities each had a throne, one as high as the other. This interference of the patriarch in political affairs was fatal to Russia. Michael Romanoff had been called to the throne on the express condition of reigning with the consciousness of the chamber of the boyars and of the states-general, which, from 1613 to 1619, had come to be regarded as a legislative assembly. Philaret exiled the most distinguished boyars, and reduced the states-general to a merely consultative relation. Into spiritual affairs he carried the same retrograde spirit. Without caring for the advice of Oriental patriarchs, he ordained, in 1620, that every member of a Christian congregation who should support the Russian religion must be baptized again, a regulation which is still in force. He died at Moscow Oct. 29, 1621. The pastoral epistles here collected were written in the Ancienne Bibliothèque Russe, vol. xvi. See Chronique de Nikon; Hist. of the Patriarch Philaret (in Russian) (Moscow, 1802, 8vo); Satieitchef and Solovitch, History of Russia; Eugenie, Dict. Hist. a. v.; Philaret, archb. of Kharkof, Hist. de l'Église Russe; Dolgoroukow, La Vérité sur la Russie, ch. vi.—Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxxix, 838.

Philaster (Philastrius), a noted heresiologist of the ancient Church, flourished in the first quarter of the 4th century. He was probably a native of Italy, and came on the stage of theological activity when the Arian controversy was waxing hot, and he was soon interested in it as a most ardent orthodox presbyter seeking the conversion of strayed sheep of the flock. He travelled far and near, seeking everywhere the conversion of the Arians, both high and low. Thus, e.g., he went to Milan to convince bishop Auxentius, who was one of the leaders of the Arians. He was so well liked by the clergy that he was finally elected bishop of Brescia (Brixia), and as such took part in the Council of Aquileia in 361. He died July 18, 387. Philaster's greatest work is his Liber de haeresibus (in 156 chapters) (edited by Bechler in Abr. Hist. 1787, by Dahlmann, Bibliotheca, vii, 475-521; and ed. by Ehrler in vol. i of his Corpus haresiologic, p. 5-185). There is an affinity of Philaster with Epiphanius, but it is usually accounted for on the ground of the dependence of the former on the latter. This seems to have been the opinion of Augustine (Epistola 222 ad Quodvultdeum). But Lipsius derives both from a common source, viz. the work of Hippolytus against thirty-two heresies, and he refers to the silence of Epiphanius (who mentions Hippolytus only once) by the unscrupulousness of the authorship of the age, which had no hesitation in deckin itself with borrowed plumes. Philaster was very liberal with the name of heresies, and connected it with 156 systems, 29 before Christ, and 128 after. He includes peculiar opinions on all sorts of subjects: "haeresia de stellis celo affixa, heresia de poecato Cain, heresia de Psalterii in-equalitate, heresia de animalibus quatuor in propheticis, heresia de anima in animis, heresia de animis hinc et chisedech accerato, heresia de uxoribus et concubinis Salomonis." Philaster's writings first appeared in print at Basle in 1528, edited by Sichardus; they were reprinted in 1559 at Basle, and at other places. In 1677 they were inserted in the Bibliotheca Patrum Maximus, v. 701 sq. But the best edition is by Fabricius (Hamb. 1721), with a Vita Philastri. See Schröck, Kirchen-gesch. ix, 352-353; Schaff, Ch. Hist. iii, 881 sq.; Alzog, Patrologie, § 63. (J. H. W.)

Philæus of Thumitas, an Eastern prelate, flourished in the 3d century as bishop of Thumitas, in Egypt. He was of noble family, and in his native place filled the highest offices of the State. In 305 he was made bishop of the first church of the episcopal chair of Thumitas, and was prominent in ecclesiastical life. On account of his faith, he was persecuted at Alexandria, and died as a martyr about 307 or 311. He left a work in praise of martyrdom. See Fabricius, Bibl. Graec., vii, 806; Möhler, Patrologie, l, 678 sq.; Routh, Rel. Sac. iii, 881 sq.

Philemon (Φιλήμων, affectionate), a Christian to whom Paul addressed his epistle in behalf of Onesimus. (Col. i. 2). He was a native probably of Colossæ, or, at all events lived in that city when the apostle wrote to him; first, because Onesimus was a Colossian (Col. iv. 9); and, secondly, because Archippus was a Colossian (ver. 17), whom Paul associates with Philemon at the beginning of his letter (Phil. i. 2). Wieseler (Chronologie, p. 452) argues, indeed, from Col. iv. 17, that Archippus was a Laodicene; but the συμφραγισμός in that passage on which the point turns refers evidently to the Colossians (whom Archippus was one therefore), and not to the Church at Laodicea spoken of in the previous verse, as Wieseler inadvertently supposes. Thoelert (Proem. in Epist. ad Phile) states the ancient opinion in saying that Philemon was a citizen of Colossæ, and that his house was pointed out there as late as the 5th century. The legendary history supplies nothing on which we can rely. It is famous that Philemon was a very rich man, and of Colossæ (Constit. Apost. vii, 46), and died as a martyr under Nero. From the title of the fellow-worker (συμφραγισμός) given him in the first verse, some (Michaelis, Einfld., ii, 1274) make him a deacon, but without proof. But, according to Pseudo-Dorotheus, he had been bishop in Gaza (see Witsius, Miscel. Leidens., p. 198 sq.). The Apphia mentioned in the epistle was nearly connected with Philemon, but whether or not she was his wife there are no means of determining (comp. esp. Hofmann, Introd. in Epist. ad Colos, p. 32 sq.; Bertholdt, Einfl. iv, 881 sq.). It is apparent from the letter to him that Philemon was a man of property and influence, since he is represented as the head of a numerous household, and as exercising an expensive liberality towards his friends and the poor in general. He was inducted to the apostle Paul as the medium of his personal participation in the Gospel. All interpreters agree in assigning that significance to συμφραγισμός in Phil. 19. It is not certain under what circumstances they became known to each other. If Paul visited Colossæ when he passed through Phrygia on his second missionary journey (Acts x. 1), it is not unlikely that, and at that time, Philemon heard the Gospel and attached himself to the Christian party. On the contrary, if Paul never visited that city in per-
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son, as many critics infer from Col. ii. 1, then the best view is that he was converted during Paul's protracted stay at Ephesus (Acts xix. 10), A.D. 57. That city was the religious capital of Western Asia Minor. The apostle labored there with such success that "all they who dwelt in Asia heard the word of the Lord Jesus." Phrygia was a neighboring province, and among the strangers who repaired to Ephesus, and had an opportunity to hear the preaching of Paul, may have been the Colossian Philemon. It is evident that on becoming a disciple, he gave no common proof of the sincerity and power of his faith. His character, as shadowed forth in the epistle to him, is one of the noblest in the New Testament. Picturizel objects says he has been known to us. He was full of faith and good works, was docile, confiding, grateful, was forgiving, sympathetic, charitable, and a man who on a question of simple justice needed only a hint of his duty to prompt him to go even beyond it (v. 5, N. Y. text). Any one who studies the epistle will perceive that it ascribes to him these varied qualities; it bestows on him a measure of commendation which forms a striking contrast with the ordinary reserve of the sacred writers. It was through such believers that the primitive Christianity evinced its divine origin, and spread so rapidly among the nations. See PHEIL.

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

I. Authorship.—That this epistle was written by the apostle Paul is the constant tradition of the ancient Church. It is expressly cited as such by Origen (Homil. 19 in Jerem. i. 185, ed. Huet.); it is referred to as such by Tertullian (Nov. Marv. v. 21); and both Eusebius (Hist. Eccles. iii. 25) and Jerome (Procem. in Ep. ad Philem. 442) attest its universal reception as such in the Christian world. The latter, indeed, informs us that some of his day deemed it unworthy of a place in the canon, in consequence of its being occupied with subjects which, in their estimation, it did not become an apostle to write about, save as a mere private individual; but this he, at the same time, shows to be a mistake, and repudiates the legitimacy of such a standard for estimating the genuineness or authority of any book. That this epistle should not have been quoted by several of the fathers who have quoted largely from the other Pauline epistles (e.g. Ireneaus, Clement of Alexandria, and Cyprian), may be accounted for partly by the brevity of the epistle, and partly by their not having occasion to refer to the subject of which it treats. We need not urge the existence of Ignatius, Chad, etc., in evidence of that apostolic father's knowledge and use of the epistle; though it is difficult to regard the similarity between them and the language in v. 20 as altogether accidental (see Kirchhofer, Quellenmanual, p. 285). The Canon of Muratori, which commences from the 2d century (Credner, Geschichte des Kanons, p. 66), enumerates this as one of Paul's epistles. Tertullian says that Marcion admitted it into his collection. Sinope, in Pontus, the birthplace of Marcion, was not far from Colossae where Philemon lived, and the letter would find its way to the neighboring cities at an early period. It is so well attested historically, that, as De Wette says (Eisdireitung ins Neue Testament), its genuineness on that ground is beyond doubt.

Nor does the epistle itself offer anything to conflict with the above view. In the most cursory glance it appears a composition more strongly marked within the same limits by those unstudied asonances of thought, sentiment, and expression, which indicate an author's hand, than this short epistle as compared with Paul's other productions. There are two coincidences between this epistle and that to the Colossians with great force, as evincing the authenticity of both (Hora Paulina, c. 14); and Eichhorn has ingeniously shown how a person attempting, with the Epistle to the Colossians before him, to forge such an epistle as this in the name of Paul, would have had to undertake a very different arrangement of the historical circumstances and persons from what we find in the epistle which is extant (Eisdireitung ins N. T. iii. 302).

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

II. Person Addressed.—The epistle is inscribed to Philemon; and with him are joined Apphia (probably his wife), Archippus (his son or brother), and the Church which is in their house, though throughout the epistle it is Philemon alone who is addressed. Philemon was a personal friend and apparently a convert of the apostle (ver. 19, 18); one who had trusted himself for the cause of the Gospel and the comfort of those who had embraced it (ver. 2-7). His residence was probably at Colossae (comp. Col. iv. 9, 17); but whether he held any office in the Church there remains uncertain. In the Apostolic Constitutions (vii. 46) he is said to have been ordained as bishop. The commission of this epistle has been maintained as having been given by any other testimony, and is expressly denied by the author of the commentary on St. Paul's epistles ascribed to Hilary. See PHILEMON.

Wieseler is of opinion that Philemon was a Laodicean; and that this epistle was as mentioned (Col. iv. 16) as sent by the apostle to the Church in Laodicea. His ground for this is that the epistle is addressed to Archippus as well as Philemon, and he assumes that Archippus was bishop of the Church at Laodicea; partly on the authority of Theodore, who says he resided at Laodicea; partly on that of the Apostolic Constitutions (vii. 46), which say he was bishop of the Church there; and partly on the connection in which the reference to him in Col. iv. 17 stands with the reference to the Church at Laodicea, and the injunction given to the Colossians to convey a certain case to Philemon. It seems possible that the epistle was written to Philemon because of his office, which it is argued would have been sent to himself had he been at Colossae. But the authorities cited have no weight in a matter of this sort; nor can the mere juxtaposition of the reference to Archippus with the reference to the Church at Laodicea affect the matter any more than the reference to the residence of the former; and as for the injunction to counsel Archippus, it is more likely that it would be given by the apostle in a letter to the Church to
which he belonged than to another Church. On the other hand, supposing Philenom to have been at Laodi
dica, it is not credible that the apostle would have reques
ted the Colossians to send to Laodicea for a letter addressed so exclusively to him personally, and relating to matters in which they had no immediate interest, without at least giving Philenom some hint that he intended the letter to be so used. The letter to the Church at Laodicea was doubtless one of more general character and interest than this. See LABOCHRAX.

III. Time and Place of Writing.—This is generally held to be one of the letters (the others are Ephesians, Colossians, Philemon, Colossians, which can be written during his first captivity at Rome. The arguments which show that he wrote the Epistle to the Colossians in that city and at that period involve the same conclusion in regard to this; for it is evident from Col. iv. 7, 9, as compared with the contents of this epistle, that Paul wrote the two letters at the same time, and forwarded them to their destination by the hands of Tychicus and Onesimus, who accompanied each other to Colossae.

A few modern critics, as Schulp, Schott, Böttger, Meyer, maintain that this letter and the others assigned usually to Paul were written during the latter years of his stay in Rome during the last two years that Paul was imprisoned at Cæsarea (Acts xxiii. 85; xxiv. 27). But this opinion, though supported by some plausible arguments, can be demonstrated with reasonable certainty to be incorrect. See COLLOSIANS, EPISTLE TO THE.

The time when Paul wrote may be fixed with much precision. The apostle at the close of the letter expresses a hope of his speedy liberation. He speaks in like manner of his approaching deliverance in his Epis
tle to the Philippian (ii, 23, 24), which was written during the same interval of time previously referred to, and that he had good reasons for such an expectation, and that he was not disappointed in the result, we may con
tinue that this letter was written by him early in the year A.D. 58.

IV. Design and Effect.—Our knowledge respecting the occasion and object of the letter we must derive from declarations or inferences furnished by the letter itself. For the relation of Philenom and Onesimus to each other, the reader will see the articles on those names. Paul, so intimately connected with the master and the servant, was anxious naturally to effect a reconciliation between them. He wished also (waiving the δινηκος, the matter of duty or right) to give Philenom an opportu
nity of manifesting his Christian love in the treatment of Onesimus, and his regard, at the same time, for the personal convenience and wishes, not to say official author
ty, of the master. He includes what he had in his confidence with Onesimus (δαιμενος, in ver. 12) to induce him to return to Colossae, and place himself again at the disposal of his master. Whether Onesimus as
tented merely to the proposal of the apostle, or had a desire at the same time to revisit his former home, the epistle does not enable us to determine. On his depart
ture Paul put into his hand this letter as evidence that Onesimus was a true and approved disciple of Christ, and entitled as such to be received, not as a servant, but above a servant, as a brother in the faith, as the repre
sentative and equal in that respect of the apostle himself, and worthy of the same consideration and love. It is instructive to observe how entirely Paul identifies himself with Onesimus, and pleads his cause as if it were his own. He intercedes for him as his own child, prayerfully and earnestly; would be angry, demanding, and for him not only a remission of all penalties, but the re
ception of sympathy, affection, Christian brotherhood; and, while he solicits these favors for another, consents to receive them with the same gratitude and sense of obligation as if they were bestowed on himself. See ONESIMUS.

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

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

VII. Commentaries.—The following are the special exegetical helps on this epistle: Jerome, Commentarius (in Opp. vii. 471); also Pseudo-Hieron. id. (libd. xi); Chrysostom, Commentaries (in Opp. xi. 898; also ed. Raphael, in the latter's Annotations, ii); Alcin, Exploratio (in Opp. ii. 11); Calvin, Commentary (in Opp.; also in English, by Pringle, in the latter's Comment. on Tim.) and by Edwards, in the Bib. Repov. 1866; Brentz, Commentary, etc. (in Opp.); Majest, Erasmo (Vitam, 1655, 8vo); Danæus, Commentary (Genev. 1579, 8vo); Hieronymus, Commentarius (includ. Tim. and Tit.) (Tigur. 1592, fol.); Feuardent (R. C.), Commentarius (Paris, 1688, 8vo); Rollock, Commentarius (Genev. 1652, 8vo); Attewell, Commentary (London, 1619, 1623, fol.); Gentili, Commentarius (Naples, 1618, 4to); and in Dutch, in his Werken, Amst. 1670, p. 729); Rapine (R. C., Exposition [French] (Paris, 1652, 8vo); Jones, Commentary [inclad. Heb.] (London, 1655, fol.); Himmel, Commentary (Gen. 1684, 4to); Vincenz, Commentary (Tiryn. 1647, 8vo); Crucius, Verklaarding (Harlem, 1649, 8vo); Habert (R. C.), Exposition [inclad. Tim. and Tit.] (Paris, 1656, 8vo); Francencke, Observationes (Hal. 1657, 4to; Lips. 1665, 12mo); Taylor, Commentary (London, 1653, fol.); Humfrey, Exploratio (London, 1647, 8vo); Fecht, Expositio (Ros. 1696, 4to); Schmid, Paraphrasis (Hamb. 1704, 4to, and later); Smid, Genesis, Romans, etc. (Oxf. 1724, fol.); Lavater, Predigt. St. Gall. 1758, 2 vols. 8vo); Klotzsch, De occasione, etc. (Yiberg. 1792, 4to); Nie- meyer, Programm. (Hal. 1692, 4to); Wildschut, De dogmata, etc. (Tr. ad Rh. 1895, 8vo); Buckminster, Sermons (in Sermons, Bost. 1815); Hagenbach, Interpretatio (Basil. 1692, 4to); Parry, Exposition (London, 1834, 12mo); Rothe, Interpretatio (Brem. 1844, 8vo); Koch, Commentary (Zur. 1846, 8vo); Kühne, Auslegung (Leips. 1856, 8vo); Elliott, Commentary (London 1880, 8vo); of sch. Revised Translation (Amer. Bible Union, 1869, 12mo); Bleek, Vorlesungen [inclad. Ephes. and Coloss.] (Berlin, 1865, 8vo); Lightfoot, Notes [inclad. Coloss.] (London, 1875, 8vo). See EPISTLE.

Phile'rus (Φίλερος, beloved), an apostate Christian, possibly a disciple of Hymenæus, with whom he is associated in 2 Tim. ii. 17, and who is named without him in an earlier epistle (1 Tim. i. 90). A.D. 58-64, Waterland (Importance of the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity, ch. iv, in his Works, iii. 459) confines in a few lines the substance of many dissertations which have been written concerning their opinions, and the sentence which they have upon at least one of them. "They appear to have been persons who believed the Scriptures of the O. T., but misinterpreted them, allegorizing away the doctrine of the resurrection, and resolving it all into figure and metaphor. The delivering over unto Satan seems to have been a form of excommunication declaring the person reduced to the state of a heathen; and in the apostolical age it was accompanied with supernatural or miraculous effects upon the bodies of the persons so delivered." Walsh is of opinion that they were of Jewish origin; Hammond connects them with the Gnostics; Vitringa (with less probability) with the Sadducees. They understood the resurrection to signify the knowledge and profession of the Christian religion, or regeneration and conversion, according to Walsh, whose dissertation, De Hymenaeo et Phileto, in his Miscellanea Sacra, 1744, p. 81-121, seems to exhaust the subject. Among writers who preceded him may be named Vitringa, Observ. Sacr. iv, p. 922-930; Buddæus, Ecclesia Apostolica, v, 297-305. See also, on the heresy, Burton, Hampton Lectures, and dean Elliott's notes on the pastoral epistles; and Potter on Church Government, ch. iii, v, with reference to the sentence. The names of Philebus and Hymenæus occur separately among those of Cæsar's household whose relics have been found in the Columbaria at Rome. See Hymenæus.

Phil'ipp (Φίλιππος, lover of horses), the name of several men mentioned in the Apocalypse and Josephus. Those named in the N. T. will be noticed separately below.

1. The father of Alexander the Great (1 Mac. i, vi, 2), king of Macedonia, B.C. 359-336. See AskLExANDER (the Great).

2. A Phrygian, left by Antiochus Epiphanes as governor at Jerusalem (B.C. cir. 170), where he behaved with great cruelty (2 Mac. v. 25), and was finally expelled. The Jews in caves (2 Mac. vii. 1), and the taking of the earliest measures to check the growing power of Judas Maccabæus (viii. 8). He is commonly (but it would seem incorrectly) identified with,
3. The foster-brother (εἰκέρωσκος, ix, 29) of Antonius Epiphanes, whom the king upon his death-bed appointed regent of Syria and guardian of his son Antonius V, to the exclusion of Lyssias (B.C. 164; 1 Mac. vi, 14, 15, 55). He returned with the royal forces from Persia (vi, 35) and assumed the government, and occupied Antioch. But Lyssias, who was at the time besieging the "Sanctuary" at Jerusalem, hastily made terms with Judas, and marched against him. Lyssias stormed Antioch, and, according to Josephus (Ant, xii, 5, 7), put Philip to death. In 2 Mac. Philip is said to have fled to Brut. Philometor on the death of Antiochus (2 Mac. ix, 29), though the book contains traces of the other account (xiii, 23). See ANTONIUS (Epiphanes).

4. Philip V, king of Macedonia, B.C. 220-173. His wide and successful endeavors to strengthen and enlarge the Macedonian dominion brought him into conflict with the Romans when they were engaged in the critical war with Carthage. Desultory warfare followed by hollow peace lasted till the victory of Zama left the Romans free for more vigorous measures. Meanwhile Philip had consolidated his power, though he had degenerated into an unscrupulous tyrant. The first campaigns of the Romans on the declaration of war (B.C. 200) were not attended by any decisive result, but the arrival of Flamininus (B.C. 198) changed the aspect of affairs. Philip was driven from his commanding position, and made unsuccessful overtures for peace. In the next year he lost the fatal battle of Cynoscephalae, and was obliged to accede to the terms dictated by his conquerors. The remainder of his life was spent in vain endeavors to regain some of his former power, and was embittered by cruelty and remorse.

In 1 Mac. viii, 5 the defeat of Philip is coupled with that of Perseus as one of the noblest triumphs of the Romans, and defeated them. In 247 Philip was again consul, with his son of the same name as himself, and their consularship was continued to the following year, when Philip celebrated with great splendor the thousandth anniversary of the building of Rome. An immense number of war and peace were brought forth and set in order in the amphitheatre and circus. In the next year, under the consuls of Eumelians and Aquilinus, a revolt broke out among the legions on the Danube, who proclaimed emperor a centurion named Carvillus Marinus, whom, however, the soldiers killed shortly after. Philip, alarmed at the state of these provinces, sent his brother Decius as commander, but Decius had no sooner arrived at his post than the soldiers proclaimed him emperor. Philip marched against Decius, leaving his son at Rome. The two armies met near Verona, where Philip was defeated and killed, as some say by his own troops. On the news reaching Rome, the pantotropians killed his son also, and Decius was acknowledged emperor in 249.

Eutropius states that both Philises, father and son, were numbered among the gods. It is doubtful whether Philip was really a Christian, but it seems certain, as stated by Eusebius and Dionysius of Alexandria, that under his reign the Christians enjoyed full toleration, and were allowed to preach publicly. Gregory of Nyssa states that during that period all the inhabitants of Neo-Caesarea, in Pontus, embraced Christianity, overthrew the idols, and raised shrines to the God of the Christians. It appears that Philip during his five years' reign governed with mildness and justice, and was generally popular.
PHILIP THE APOSTLE

otic Gospels, his name is as uniformly at the head of the second group of four as the name of Peter is at that of James (see Matt. xvi, 17), and the facts recorded by John give the reason of this priority. In those lists again we find his name uniformly coupled with that of Bartholomew, and this has led to the hypothesis that the latter is identical with the Nathanael of John i, 45, the one being the personal name, the other, like Barjona or Bartheus, a patronymic. Donaldson (Jasbar, p. 9) looks on the two as brothers, but the precise mention of τοῦ ἰδοὺ διδάσκοντος τοὺς εκ τοῦ, and its omission here, is, as Alford remarks (on Matt. x, 8), against this hypothesis.

He was one among the first company of disciples who were with the Lord at the commencement of his ministry, at the marriage of Cana, on his first appearance as a prophet in Jerusalem (John ii). When John was cast into prison, and the word of declaring the glad tidings of the kingdom required a new company of preachers, we may believe that he, like his companions and friends, received a new call to a more constant discipleship (Matt. iv, 18-22). When the Twelve were specially set apart to their office, he was numbered among them. The first three Gospels tell us nothing more of him; most of his actions with his characteristic fulness of personal reminiscences, records a few significant utterances. The earnest, simple-hearted faith which showed itself in his first conversion, required, it would seem, an education; one stage of this may be traced, according to Clement of Alexandria (Strom. iii, 26), in the history of Matt. viii, 21. That Church father assumes that Philip was the disciple who urged the plea, "Suffer me first to go and bury my father," and who was reminded of a higher duty by the command, "Let the dead bury their dead; follow thou me." When the Galilean crowds had halted on their way to Jerusalem to hear the preaching of Jesus (John vi, 5-9), and were faint with hunger, it was to Philip that the question was put, "Whence shall we buy bread that these may eat?" "And this he said," John adds, "to prove him, for he himself knew what he would do." The answer, "Two hundred pennyworth of bread is not sufficient for them that every one may take a little," shows how little he was prepared for the work of divine power that followed. It is noticeable that here, as in John i, he appears in close connection with Andrew. Bengel and others suppose that this was because the charge of providing food had been committed to Philip, while Chrysostom and Theodore of Mopsuestia rather suppose it was because this apostle was weak in faith.

Another incident is brought before us in John xii, 24, when Philipweek before the passion the Passover at Jerusalem was some Gentile proselytes (Hellenes) who had heard of Jesus, and desired to see him. The Greek name of Philip may have attracted them. The zealous love which he had shown in the case of Nathanael may have made him prompt to offer himself as their guide. He brings them to Jesus, and they do not take him at once to the presence of his Master. "Philip cometh and telleth Andrew, and again Andrew and Philip tell Jesus." The friend and fellow-townswoman to whom probably he owed his own introduction to Jesus of Nazareth is to introduce these strangers also.

There is a connection not difficult to be traced between this fact and that which follows on the last recurrence of Philip's name in the history of the Gospels. The desire to see Jesus gave occasion to the utterance of words expressive of the depth of his faith. He did not seize on the presence of his Father with him, in the voice from heaven which manifested the Father's will (ver. 28). The words appear to have sunk into the heart of at least one of the disciples, and he brooded over them. The teaching of this day enlightened this disciple, and his faith led him to feel that one thing was yet wanting. They heard their Lord speak of his Father and their Father. He was going to his Father's house. They were to follow him there. But why should they not have even now a vision of the divine glory? It was part of the childlike simplicity of his nature that no reserve should hinder the expression of the expression of the desire, "Lord, show us the Father, and it shall be ours" (xiv, 8). And the answer to that desire belonged also specially to him. He had all along been eager to lead others to see Jesus. He had been with him, looking on him from the very commencement of his ministry, and yet he had not known him. He had thought of the glory of the Father as consisting in something else than the Truth, Righteousness, Love that he had witnessed in the Son. "Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me?" (John xiv, 9) He has not seen the Father; and how sayest thou, then, Show us the Father?" (John xiv, 9). No other fact connected with Philip is recorded in the Gospels.

The close relation in which we have seen him standing to the sons of Zebedee and Nathanael might lead us to think of him as one of the twelve chief fishermen of Tiberias who see Jesus in the Ascension (Acts i, 13) and on the day of Pentecost.

2. Traditions and Notices. Besides the above all is uncertain and apocryphal. Philip is mentioned by Clement of Alexandria as having had a wife and children, and as having sanctioned the marriage of his daughters instead of binding them to vows of chastity (Strom. iii, 52; Euseb. H. E. iii, 80); and he is included in the list of those who had borne witness of Christ in their lives, but had not died what was commonly looked on as a martyr's death (Strom. iv, 78). There is nothing improbable in the statement that he preached the Gospel in Phrygia (Theodoret, in Pau. cxvi; Niceph. H. E. ii, 31); Polykrate in (Euseb. H. E. ii, 31), bishop of Ephesus, speaks of him as having lived aseep in the Phrygian Hierapolis, as having had two daughters who had grown old unmarried, and a third, with special gifts of inspiration (καὶ Αἰγίν Πολυκράτεις τοῦ Ἐφησοῦ), who had died at Ephesus. There seems, however, in this mention of the daughters of Philip, to be some confusion between the apostle and the evangelist. Eusebius in the same chapter quotes a passage from Caius, in which the four daughters of Philip, prophetesses, are mentioned as living with their father at Hierapolis, and as buried there with him; and the same passage is connected with Acts xxvi, 8, as if they referred to one and the same person. Polykrate in like manner refers to him in the Easter Controversy, as an authority for the Quattordiceman practice (Euseb. H. E. v, 24). It is noticeable that even Augustine, in Strom. 368, who had declared Philip uncertain as to the direction of the two Philip, Epiphanius (xxvi, 18) mentions a Gospel of Philip as in use among the Gnostics. See Gospels, Sperchius. The apocryphal "Acta Philippi" are utterly wild and fantastic, and if there is any grain of truth in them, it is probably the bare fact that the apostle, a confessor, was laboring in Phrygia, and died at Hierapolis. He arrives in that city with his sister Mariamne and his friend Bartholomew. The wife of the proconsul is converted. The people are drawn away from the worship of a great serpent. The priests and the proconsul seize on the apostles and put them to the torture. John suddenly appears with words of counsel and encouragement. Philip, in Spite of the warning of the Apostle of Love reminding him that he should return good for evil, curses the city, and the earth opens and swallows it up. Then he is taken up for ever and removed from the sight of the vindictive anger, and those who had descended to the abyss are raised out of it again. The tortures which Philip had suffered ended in his death, but, as a punishment for his offence, he is to remain for forty days excluded from Paradise. The light of this light, which was shed up on the spot where his blood had fallen, and the juice of the grapes is used for the Eucharistic cup (Tischendorf, Acta Apostolica, p. 75-94). The book which con-
tains this narrative is apparently only the last chapter of a larger history, and it fixes the journey and the death as after the eighth year of Trajan. It is uncertain whether the other apocryphal fragment professing to give an account of his labors in Greece is part of the same work, or has been in his possession. He is described as having the Gospels in his hands, and as wearing a sacerdotal vestment. He lives in Athens clothed, like the other apostles, as Christ had commanded, in an outer cloak and a linen tunic. Three hundred philosophers dispute with him. They find themselves baffled, and send for assistance to Asia, the high-priest at Jerusalem. He puts on his pontifical robe, and goes to Athens at the head of seven hundred warriors. They attempt to seize on the apostle, and are all smitten with blindness. The heavens open; the form of the Son of Man appears, and all the idols of Athens fall to the ground; and so on through a succession of marvels, ending with his remaining two years in the city, establishing a Church there, and then going to preach the Gospel in Parthis (ibid. p. 95-104).

Another tradition represents Scythia as the scene of his labors (Abian, Hist. Apost. in Fabricius, Cod. Apoc. N. T. i. 789), and throws the guilt of his death upon the Jews (John iv.). It falls between the two days which had witnessed the presence there of Christ and his disciples (ver. 40), even perhaps the craving for spiritual powers which had been roused by the strange influence of Simon the Sorcerer. The scene which brings the two into contact with each other, in which the magician has to acknowledge a power over nature greater than his own, is interesting rather as belonging to the life of the heresarch than to that of the evangelist. See Simon Magus. It suggests the inquiry whether we can trace through the distortions and corruptions of the Apocryphal and the pseudo-apocryphal traditions, the influence of that phase of Christian truth which was likely to be presented by the preaching of the Hellenistic evangelist.

This step is followed by another. He is directed by an angel to take the road that led down from Jerusalem to Gaza on the way to Egypt. See Gaza. A chariot passes by in which there is a man of another race, whose complexion or whose dress showed him to be a native of Ethiopia. From the time of Psammetichus there had been a large body of Jews settled in that region, and the eunuch or chamberlain at the court of Candace might easily have come across them and their sacred books, might have embraced their faith, and become by circumcision a proselyte of righteousness. He had been on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem. He may have inquired of his slave what he had heard there. The narrative which follows is interesting as one of the few records in the N. T. of the process of individual conversion, and one which we may believe Luke obtained, during his residence at Cesarea, from the evangelist himself. The devout proselyte reciting the prophecy which he does not understand—the evangelist-preacher running at full speed till he overtakes the chariot—the abrupt question—the simple-hearted answer—the unfolding, from the starting-point of the prophecy, of the gradations of the glad tidings of Jesus—the craving for the means of admission to the blessings of the Messias, and what he was, at any rate, well reported of as full of the Holy Ghost, and wisdom,
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work of teaching instead of entering on the life of home (xxi, 6, 9). He is visited by the prophets and elders of Jerusalem. At such a place as Cesarea the work of such a man must have helped to bridge over the everwidening gap which threatened to separate the Jewish and the Gentile churches. One who had preached Christ to the hated Samaritan, the swarthy African, the despised Philistine, the men of all nations; who passed through the seaport of Palestine, might well welcome the arrival of the apostle of the Gentiles. A.D. 55.

The traditions in which the evangelist and the apostle who bore the same name are more or less confounded have been given under PHILIP THE APOSTLE. According to another, relating more distinctly to him, he died bishop of Tralles (Acta Sanct., June 6). The house in which he and his daughters had lived was pointed out to travellers in the time of Jerome (Epist. Paules, § 8). (Comp. Ewald, Geschichte, vi, 175, 206—214; Baumgarten, Apostelgeschichte, § 15, 16.) The later martyrologies, on the contrary, make him end his days in Cesarea (Acta Sanct., June 6).

Philippus Hieron (Φίλιππος Ἴηρών), a son of Herod the Great by Mariamne, the daughter of Simon the high-priest. He was the first priest of Herodias, who was taken to Rome by his brother Herod Antipas (Matt. xiv, 3; Mark, vi, 17; Luke iii, 19). A.D. 25. Having been disinherited by his father, Philip appears to have lived a private life. He is called Herod by Josephus (Ant. xvii, 1, 2; 4; xviii, 5, 1; War, i, 26, 4; 30, 7). See Hieron.

Philippus the Tetarch (Φίλιππος ὁ τετάρχης), governor of Batanea, Trachonitis, and Auranitis (Luke iii, 1); the second to appear to have been regarded by Luke as included in Ituraea. Philip was the son of Herod the Great by his wife Cleopatra, and own brother of Herod Antipas; at his death his tetrarchy was annexed to Syria. From him the city Cesarea Philipi took its name (John xxi, 14). Philip’s death is recorded in Matt. xvi, 4; Mark vi, 15; Luke i, 5; War, i, 26, 4; ii, 6, 3). Philip ruled from B.C. 4 to A.D. 54. See Hieron.

---

Philip (St.) Benozzi (San Filippo Benatti, or Besizzi) stands at the head of the Order of the Servi, or Serviti, at Florence. He was not the founder of the order, having joined it fifteen years after its establishment, but he is its principal saint. See Serviti.

Philip of Cesarea is a pseudo-name of one Theophilus of Cesarea, who flourished in the second half of the 2d century, and kept the account of the council held in the city after which he is named in A.D. 166. See Théophile.

Philip of Coptic, a Christian writer of the 2d century, flourished as bishop of the Church at Gortyna, in Crete, and was spoken of in the highest terms by Dionysius of Corinth in a letter to the Church at Gortyna and the other churches in Crete (apud Euseb., Hist. Eccles. iv, 25), as having inspired his flock with manly courage, apparently during the persecutions of Marcus Aurelius. Philip wrote a book against Marcion (q. v.), which was highly esteemed by the ancients, but is now lost; Thlithemi speaks of it as extant in his day, but his exactness as to whether books were in existence or not is not great. He also states that Philip wrote "Ad Diocres Epistolas" and "Variae Tractatus," but these are not mentioned by the ancients. See Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. iv, 21, 23, 25; Jerome, De Viris Illustr. c. 90; Thlithemi, De Scriptor. Eccles. c. 19; Cave, Hist. Lat. ad ann. 172 (ed. Oxford, 1740—1748), i, 74; Lardner, Works (see Index).—Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. s. v.

Philip of Moscow, a Russian prelate of much distinction, flourished in the second half of the 16th century. Of his early history we know scarcely anything. He held several of the most important ecclesiastical trusts of Russia to the satisfaction of both clergy and government, and was finally, during the reign of Ivan the Terrible, made guardian of the Russian Church. Philip soon came into collision with his royal master because of the personal cruelties in which the czar indulged, and for his honesty of purpose and frankness of declaration, Philip suffered martyrdom. "It is a true history of the Russian Church, and an account of the hierarchy of all churches, that its one martyred prince should have suffered, not for any high ecclesiastical pretensions, but in the simple cause of justice and mercy. 'Silence,' he said, as he rebuked the czar, 'lays sin upon the soul, and brings death to the whole people. . . . I am a stranger and a pilgrim upon earth, as all my fathers were, and I am ready to suffer for the truth. Where would my faith be if I kept silence? . . . Here we are offering up the bloodless sacrifice to the Lord; behind the altar flows the innocent blood of Christian men.' As he was about to be led to the place of execution, one word was 'Pray.' As he received his executioner in the narrow cell of his prison in the convent of Luer, he only said, 'Perform thy mission.'" See Stanley, Hist. of the Eastern Church, p. 487. (J. H. W.)

Philip (St.) of Nerei. See Nerei, Filippo.

Philip of Opod. Suidas (α. Φίλιππος) has this remarkable passage: "—, a philosopher who divided the Leges (α. De Legibus) of Plato into twelve books (for he is said to have added the thirteenth himself), and was a hearer of Socrates and of Plato himself; devoted himself to the contemplation of the heavens (φιλόσοφος της μεταφυσικής). He lived in the days of Philip of Macedon. Suidas then gives a long list of works written by Philip. It is evident that the passage as it stands in Suidas is imperfect, and that the name of the author of the numerous works which he mentions has been lost from the commencement of the passage. It appears, however, from the extract occupying its proper place in the Lexicon according to its present heading, that the defect existed in the source from which Suidas borrowed. Kuster, the editor of Suidas (not in loc.), after long investigation, was enabled to supply the omission by comparing a passage in Diogenes Laertius (iii, 87), and to identify the "philosopher" of Suidas with a Sphilippus of the Locricn town of Opus, near the channel which separates Eubea from the mainland. The passage in Laertius is as follows: "Some say that Philip the Ommian transcribed his (Plato's) work, De Legibus, which was written in wax (i.e. on wooden tablets covered with a coat of wax). They say also that the ' ἐν διαδικασία (the thirteenth book of the De Legibus) is his," i.e. Philip's. The Epinomis, whether written by Philip or by Plato, is usually included among the works of the latter. Diogenes Laertius elsewhere (iii, 46) enumerates the disciples of Plato. See Fabricius, Bibl. Graec. i, 106.

Philip the Presbyter, an Eastern ecclesiastical of the 5th century, was, according to Gennadius (De Viris Illustrib. c. 62), a disciple of Jerome, and died in the reign of Marcian and Avitus over the Eastern and Western empires respectively, i.e. A.D. 446. Philip wrote, 1. Commentaries in Jobum; 2. Epistola, of which Gennadius, who had read them, speaks highly. These Epistola have perished; but a Commentarius in Jobum addressed to Nectarius has been several times printed, sometimes separately under the name of Philip (Basil, 1527, two editions) and sometimes together with other Epistles under the name and among the works of the Veniable Bede and of Jerome. Vallarsi and the Benedictine editors of Jerome give the Commentarius in their editions of that father (v, 478, etc., ed. Benedict.; vol. xi,
col. 565, etc., ed. Vallarsi), but not as his. The *Prologo* or *Præfatio ad Nectarium* are omitted, and the text differs very widely from that given in the Cologne edition of Bede (1612, fol. 447, etc.), in which the work is given as Bede's, without any intimation of its doubtfull authorship. Cave, Oudin, and Vallarsi agree in accreditating the work to Philip, but Vallarsi is not so decided in his opinion as the other two. See Genadinius, l.c., Cave, *Hist. Lit. ad ann. 440* i. 484; Oudin, *De Script. Ecles.* vol. i, col. 1165; Vallarsi, *Opera Hieron.* vol. ii, cols. 825; etc.; vol. xi, col. 565; Fabrizzii, *Biblioth. Med. et Inflan. Lat. viii.* 295, ed. Mansi.

Philip of Side (ὁ Σίδηρος, or ὁ Σίδηρης, or ὁ ὅριον Σίδηρος), a Christian writer of the first half of the 5th century, was born probably in the latter part of the 4th century. He was a native of Side, in Pamphylia, and according to his own account in the fragment published by Dodwell (see below), when Rhodon, who succeeded Didymus in charge of the catechetical school of Alexandria, transferred that school to Side, Philip became one of his pupils. If we suppose Didymus to have retained the charge of the school till his death, A.D. 396, at the advanced age of eighty-six, the removal of the school cannot have taken place long before the close of the century, and we may infer that Philip's birth could scarcely have been earlier than A.D. 380. He was a teacher of Side, a historiographer, who was tutor to Socrates the ecclesiastical historian, and was indeed so eminent that Philip regarded his relationship to him as a subject of exultation (Socrates, *Hist. Ecles.* vii. 27). Having entered the Church, he was ordained deacon, and had much intercourse with Chrysostom; and in the titles of some MSS. he is styled his Syneculus, or personal attendant, which makes it probable that he was, from the early part of his ecclesiastical career, connected with the Church at Constantinople. Liberatus (Breviar. c. 7) says he was ordained deacon by Chrysostom, and in a letter, written in the time of his intimacy with that eminent man, does not say he was ordained by him. Philip devoted himself to literary pursuits, and collected a large library. He cultivated the Asiatic or diffuse style of composition, and became a voluminous writer. At what period of his life his different works were produced is not known. His Ecclesiastical History was, as we shall see, written after his disappointment in obtaining the patriarchate; but as his being a candidate for that high office seems to imply some previous celebrity, it may be inferred that his work belongs to the period of Julian's attacks on Christianity; a work which is omitted from Bede's chronicle. Socrates (Hist. Ecles. vii. 40) tells us that the work was finished before the emperor's death of A.D. 382.

One of these, *De Schola Catechetica Alex- andrina Successione,* on the succession of teachers in the catechetical school of Alexandria, was published from a MS. in the Bodleian Library at Oxford, by Dodwell, with his *Disquisitiones in Irenum* (Oxf. 1689, 8vo), and has been repeatedly reprinted. It is given in the ninth volume of the *Bibliotheca Patrum* of Galland, p. 401. Another fragment in the same MS., *De Constantino Max- timo,* is to be found in the *Littera Augustae,* printed for publication by Cruysius, but has never, we believe, been actually published. The third fragment, *Τά γεύμαμα ἐν Πισίδι Μητροπόλις Χρυσανθίων Εὐλαμπίων καὶ Ιωάννου,* is to be found in the *Acta Disputationum de Christo,* in *Pars et inter Christianos, Gentiles, et Judaeos habiuit,* (or was) in the Imperial Library at Vienna. Philip was present at the disputa-


2. *Philippus, l. c.*

*Philippus* in *Bibli.*

Philippus the Solitary, a Greek monk, flourished in the time of the emperor Alexius I. Comnenus. Nothing further seems to be known than what is gathered from the indications of his extant works. He wrote, *Diótoros,* *Dióspros,* *Ammasia Fidei et Vite Christiane,* written in the kind of measure called "ver- sus politici," and in the form of a dialogue between the soul and the body. It is addressed to another monk, Callinicus, and begins with these two lines:

*Πέντε καφή: τίνα δισμαία: τίνα υμιρία, φίλε μοι:
Ο 'Αθεός σε εκκαλείται Έλλεν τον ομφαλόν.*
The work, in its complete state, consisted of five books; but most of the MSS. are mutilated or otherwise defective, and some of the texts have been interlarded by a later hand. Michael Peleus, not the older writer of that name, who died about A.D. 1078, but one of later date, wrote a preface and notes to the Dipotra of Philip. A Latin prose translation of the Dipotra by the Jesuit Jacobus Pontanus, with notes by another Jesuit, J. de Saulcy, was completed by Philip. "(See plate in J. G. Van Gelden's "Josephus," 1802.) But it was made from a mutilated copy, and consisted of only four books, and these, as the translator admits in his Prefatio ad Lectorem, interpolated and transposed ad libitum. Philip wrote also, The Canon of the Gospels, and The Acts of the Church, in which he considered the original manuscripts of the books of the New Testament as intermixed, and those derived from Scripture and Epiphanies. The other work, consisting of five chapters, De Fide et Ceremoniis Armatorum, Jacobitarum, Chalzitarorum et Romanae seu Francorum, was published, with a Latin version, but without an author's name, in the Acta Sacra Vaticana (Paris, 1693, vol. ii, col. 261, etc.), but was, on the authority of MSS. assigned, by Combe- ses, in a note, to Demetrius of Cyzicus, to whom it appears rightly to belong (comp. Cave, Hist. Litt. Dissertatio i, p. 6; Fabricius, Bib. Gr. xi, 414). The Chat- tistriani (XarkevëpoC) were a sect who paid religious homage to the image of the cross, but employed no other images in their worship. The work of Demetrius appears under the name of Philip in the fourteenth (posthymous) volume of the Bibliotheca Patrum of Galland, but the editors, in their Prolegomena, to the volume, c. 15, observe that they knew not on what authority Galland had assigned it to Philip. Among the pieces given as Appendices to the Dipotra, are some verses in praise of the work and its author, by one Constantine, perhaps the person addressed in No. 2, and by another, by Constantine (now lost), "ταν τε θεόν ζητοντες, μετανοητε, οἱ του παλαιοτιμονον και Βιορον τω γρηγορεται, Βελτηνον του Μον Κωνσταντιονου και Βελτην του γρηγορεται," Versus Domini Constantini et Vestri Grammatici. See Lambecius, Commentar. de Biblioth. Casserara, lib. a. vol. v, col. 76- 9; and 141, coll. 213, 214, 215, and 228, ed. Kollar; Cave, Hist. Litt. ad ann. 1086, ii, 163; Oudin, De Scriptor. Eccles. vol ii, col. 861.

Philippus, or Philip, a missionary to Persia and the Indies, was born at Avignon in 1688, and died in 1761.

Philippus, or Philip, a missionary to Africa, was born at Kirkcaldy, Fifeshire, Scotland, April 14, 1775. His father, who was teacher of an English school, gave him an elementary education; and his mother, who was described as a "woman of earnest and devoted piety," endeavored, with all the powerful insinuating influence of maternal permission, to imbue his infant mind with the fear of God and a reverence for his Word. Circumstances occasioned his removal while yet a boy to reside in the home of an uncle who was a minister of the Kirk; but in this his love of God rapidly developed itself in the leading features of intellectual and moral individuality that distinguished him through life. In his nineteenth year he removed to Dundee, where, having completed his term of appren-
Philippopolis or Philippians. See Puth. Philipp' (φιλίππος, plur. of Philip), a celebrated city of Macedonia, visited by the apostle Paul, and the seat of the earliest Christian Church formally established in Europe. The double miracle wrought there, and the fact that “to the saints in Philippi” the great apostle of the Gentiles addressed one of his epistles, must ever make this city holy ground. The following account of it combines the ancient notices with modern investigations.

1. Apostolic Associations.—St. Paul, when, on his first visit to Macedonia in A.D. 49, he set out from Siloëm, embarked at Troas, made a straight run to Samothrace, and from thence to Neapolis, which he reached on the second day (Acts xvi, 11). The Philippian of Paul's day was situated in a plain, on the banks of a deep and rapid stream called Gangites (now Aniga). The ancient walls followed the course of the stream for some distance; and in this section of the wall the site of a gate is seen, with the ruins of a bridge nearly opposite. In the narrative of Paul’s visit it is said: “On the Sabbath we went out of the gate by the river (εξ ουδομον της πυλης παρα νοτανωμον), whatever hour we were not compelled to be” (ver. 13). It was doubleless by this gate they went out, and by the side of this river the prayer-meeting was held. As Philippi was a military colony, it is probable that the Jews had no synagogue, and were not permitted to hold their worship within the walls. Being on the river’s edge, very few persons however are seen on the bridge, but on the opposite side a vast and rich plain stretched out, reaching on the south-west to the sea, and on the north-west far away among the ranges of Macedonia. On the south-east a rocky ridge, some sixteen hundred feet in height, separated the plain from the bay and town of Neapolis. Over it ran a paved road connecting Philippi with Neapolis. Though the distance between the two was nine miles, yet Neapolis was to Philippi what the Piraeus was to Athens; and hence Paul is said, when journeying from Greece to Syria, to have “sailed away from Philippi,” that is, from Neapolis, its port (xx, 6).

Philippi was in the province of Macedonia, while Neapolis was in Thrace. Paul, on his first journey, landed at the latter, and proceeded across the mountain-road to the former, which Luke elsewhere calls “the first city of the division of Macedonia” (πρωτη της μετοχης της Μακεδονιας πυλης, Acts xvi, 12). The word πυλη does not, as represented in the A. V. signify “chief.” Thessalonica was the chief city of all Macedonia, and Amphipolis (αμφιπόλης) was that Philippi was situated (see Wieseler, Chron. des Apost. Zeit., p. 87). Πυλη simply means that Philippi was the “first” city of Macedonia to which Paul came (Alford, ad loc.; Conybeare and Howson, Life of St. Paul, i, 811, note). In descending the mountain-path towards Philippi the apostle had before him a vast and beautiful panorama. The whole plain, with its green meadows, and clumps of trees, and wide reaches of marsh, and winding streams, lay at his feet; and away beyond it the dark ridges of Macedonia.

On the second visit of Paul and Silas to Philippi, Paul was successful. They found an eager audience in the few Jews and proselytes who frequented the prayer-place on the banks of the Gangites. Lydia, a trader from Thyatira, was the first convert. Her whole house followed her example. It was when going and returning from Lydia’s house that “the damsel possessed with a spirit of divination” met the apostles. Paul cast out the spirit, and then those who had made a trade of the poor girl’s misfortune rose against them, and took them before the magistrates, who, with all the haste and roughness of a provincial law, ordered them to be scourged another twenty, and then thrown into prison. Even this gross act of injustice redounded in the end to the glory of God; for the jailer and his whole house were converted, and the very magistrates were compelled to make a public apology to the apostles, and to set them at liberty, thus declaring their innocence.

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

When Paul passed through Philippi a third time he does not appear to have made any considerable stay there (ver. 6). He and his companion are somewhat loosely spoken of as sailing from Philippi; but this is because in the common apprehension of travellers the sea does not figure as a road, or city, and in the next you reached at Piraeus might in the same way be said to set out on a voyage from Athens. On this occasion the voyage to Troas took the apostle five days, the vessel being probably obliged to coast in order to avoid the contrary wind, until coming off the headland of Sarpelon, where the wind changed and he was enabled to sail with an E. or E.N.E. breeze, which at that time of year (after Easter) might be looked for.

The Christian community at Philippi distinguished itself in liberality. On the apostle’s first visit he was hospitably entertained by Lydia, and when he afterwards went to Thessalonica, where his reception appears to have been of a very mixed character, the Philippians sent him supplies more than once, and were the only Christian community that did so (Phil. iv, 16). They also contributed readily to the collection made for the relief of the poor at Jerusalem, which Paul conveyed to them at his last visit (2 Cor. viii, 1-6). It would seem as if they sent further supplies to the apostle after his arrival at Rome. The necessity for these appears to have been urgent, and some delay to have taken place before their arrival in collecting them. Epaphroditus, who carried them, risked his life in the endeavor to make up for lost time (μη χανοντας ἑγγενες παραβουλουσαντος την ψυχην, ινα ανακτηση την ομορφια της προς μι λογος, Phil. ii, 8). The delay, however, was not so much the cause of which the apostle at the time, who fancied his beloved flock had forgotten him (see iv, 10-17). Epaphroditus fell ill with fever from his efforts, and nearly died. On recovering he became homesick, and wandering in mind (ἀσβοϊντος) from the weakness which is the sequel of fever; and Paul, although he sent Timothy to the Philippian Church, thought it desirable to let Epaphroditus go without delay to them, who had already heard of his sickness, and carry with him the letter which is included in the canon—one which was written after the apostle’s imprisonment at Rome had lasted a considerable time. Some domestic troubles connected with religion had already broken out in the community. Euodias and Syntyche, who appear to be husband and wife, are exhorted to agree with one another in the matter of their common faith; and the former is implied to extend his sympathy to certain females (obviously familiar both to Paul and to him) who did good service to the apostle in his trials at Philippi, and who in some way or other appear to be the occasion of the disagreement between the pair. Possibly a claim for a certain woman on the part of the latter caused the spiritual matters may have caused some irritation; for the apostle immediately goes on to remind his readers that the peace of God is something superior to the highest intelligence (ὑπηρεσιας πνευματι νους).
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It would seem, as Alford says, that the cruel treatment of the apostle at Philippi had combined with the change of scene and the scene of worship and has set up a bond more of than ordinary love between him and the Philippian Church. They alone, of all churches, sent subsidies to relieve his temporal necessities (Phil. iv. 10, 15, 18: 2 Cor. xi. 9; 1 Thess. ii. 2; Alford, Greek Text, Prooem., ii. 29). The apostle felt their kindness; and the love of those in Philippi was not the only epistle which is still in our canon. This epistle indicates that at that time some of the Christians there were in the custody of the military authorities as sedi- tious persons, through some proceedings or other connected with the hill. This is a golden mine of information. The plot against the apostle is the same as those at Scopae Hyde, which was certainly in this immediate neighborhood. Before the great expedi- tion of Xenocrates, the Thessalians had a number of settlements on the main, and this among the number, which produced them eighty talents a year as rent to the state. In the year B.C. 468 they ceded their possessions on the continent to the Athenians; but the colonists, 10,000 in number, who had settled on the Strymon and pushed their encroachments eastward as far as this point, were crushed by a simultaneous effort of the Thracian tribes (Thucydides, i. 190; ii. 102; Herod. i. 199; Pausa- nias, i. 29, 4). From that time until the rise of the Macedonian power, the mines seem to have remained in the hands of native chiefs; but when the affairs of Southern Greece became thoroughly embroiled by the policy of Philip, the Thessalians made an attempt to possess themselves of this valuable territory, and sent a colony to the site, then going by the name of "the Springs" (Kynides). Philip, however, aware of the importance of the position, expelled them and founded Philippi, the last of all his creations. The mines at that time, as was not wonderful under the circumstances, had become almost insignificant in their produce; but their new owner contrived to extract more than a thousand talents a year from them, with which he minted the gold coinage called by his name. The proximity of the gold-mines was of course the origin of so large a city as Philippi, but the plain in which it lies is one of extraordinary fertility. The position too was on the main road from Rome to Asia, the Via Egnatia, which from Thessalonica to Constantinople followed the same course as the existing post-road. The usual course was to take ship at Piraeus and land at Dyrrachium, from whence a route led across Epirus to Thessalonica. Ignatius was carried to Italy by this route, when sent to Rome to be cast to wild beasts. See Strabo, Fragment. lib. vii.; Thucyd. i. 100; iii. 102; Herod. i. 76; Dio. Cass. i. 60 sq.; Appian, Bell. Civ. i. 101 sq.; Faus. i. 29, 4.

The battle of Philippi, in which the Roman republic was overthrown, was fought on this plain in the year B.C. 42 (Die. Cass. xvi.; Appian, l. c.). In honor, and as a memorial of his great victory, Augustus made Philippi a Roman "colony," and its coins bear the legend "Colonia Augusta Jul. Philippiensis" (Combeare and Howson, i. 312). The emperor appears to have founded the new quarter in the plain along the banks of the Gargelles. As a colony (kolonias, Acts xvi. 12) it enjoyed peculiar privileges. Its inhabitants were

"Coln of Philippi.

Roman citizens, most of them being the families and descendants of veteran soldiers, who had originally settled in the place to guard the city and province. They were governed by their own magistrates, called Duumviri or Pretors (in Greek στρατηγοὶ; ver. 20), who exercised a kind of military authority, and were independent of the provincial governor.

3. Present Site.—Philippi (now called by the Turks Felibejik) is cut off from the interior by a steep line of hills, anciently called Symbolum, connected towards the N.E. with the western extremity of Hemus, and towards the S.W., less continuously, with the eastern extremity of Pangeus. Between the foot of Symbolum and the site of Philippi two Turkish cemeteries are passed, the gravestones of which are all derived from the ruins of the ancient city, and in the immediate neighborhood of the one first reached is the modern Turkish village Berbekeli. This is the nearest village to the ancient ruins. Near the second cemetery are some ruins on a slight eminence, and also a khan, kept by a Greek family. Here is a large monumental block of marble, twelve feet high and seven feet square, apparently the pedestal of a statue, as on the top a hole exists which was obviously intended for its reception. This hole is pointed out by local tradition as the crib out of which Alexander's horse, Bucephalus, was accustomed to eat its oats. On two sides of the block is a mutilated Latin inscription, in which the names of Caius Ylbius and Cornelius Quattus may be deciphered. A stream employed in turning a mill bursts out from a sedgy pool in the neighborhood, and probably finds its way to the marshy ground mentioned as existing in the S.W. portion of the plain. After about twenty minutes' ride from the khan, over ground thickly strewn with fragments of marble columns, and slabs that have been employed in building, a river-bed sixty-six feet wide is crossed, through which the stream rushes with great force, and immediately on the other side the walls of the ancient Philippi may be traced. Their direction is adjusted to the course of the stream; and at only three hundred and fifty feet from its margin there appears a gap in their circuit, indicating the former existence of a gate. This is, no doubt, as above seen, the gate out of which the apostle and his companion passed to the "prayer-meeting" on the banks of a river, where they made the acquaintance of Lydia, the Thyatiran seller of purple. The locality, just outside the walls, and with a plentiful supply of water for their animals, is exactly the one which would be appropriated as a market for itinerant traders, "quorum ohiphion fenunque supellex," as will appear from the parallel case of the Egerian fountain near Rome, of whose desecration Juvenal complains (Sat. iii, 18). Lydia had an establishment in Philippi for the reception of the dyed goods which were imported from Thyatira and the neighboring towns of Asia, and were dispersed by means of pack-animals among the mountain clans of the Hemus and Pangeus, the agents being doubtless in many instances her own coreligionists. High up in Hemus lay the tribe of the Satra, where was the oracle of Dionysus—not the rustic deity of the Attic vine-growers, but the prophet-god of the Thracians (ὑ Θρατίς μάντης, Eurip. Hec. 1257). The "damsel with the spirit of divination" (καιδήσα ἱκουσά πετιμί πυθών) may probably be regarded as one of the hierodules of this establishment, hired by Philippiant citizens, and frequenting the country-market to practice her art upon the villagers who brought produce for the consumption of the town. The fierce character of the mountaineers would render it imprudent to admit them within the walls of the city; just as in some of the towns of North Africa the Kabyles are not allowed to enter, but have a market allotted to them outside the walls for the sale of the produce they bring. Over such an assemblage only a summary jurisdiction can be exercised; and hence the proprietors of the slave, when they considered themselves injured, and hurried Paul and Silas into the town, to the σύγα—the civic market where the magistrates (ἀρχηγοί) sat—were at once turned over to the military authorities (στρατηγοί), and these, naturally assuming that a stranger frequenting the extra-mural market must be a Thracian mountaineer or an itinerant trader, proceeded to inflict upon the ostensible cause of a riot (the merits of which they would not attempt to understand) the usual treatment in such cases. The idea of the apostle possessing the Roman franchise, and consequently an exemption from corporal outrage, never occurred to the rough soldier who ordered him to be scourged; and the whole transaction seems to have passed so rapidly that he had no time to plead his citizenship, of which the military authorities first heard the next day. But the illegal treatment (ἐγκνύμ) obviously made a deep impression on the mind of its victim, as is evident not only from his refusal to take his discharge from prison the next morning (Acts xvi, 37), but from a passage in the Epistle to the Church at Thessa-
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In his (1 Thess. ii, 2), in which he reminds them of the circumstances under which he first preached the Gospel to them (προσοντός καὶ ὑψώσιντος, καὶ τοῖς δικαίως, in 2 Philip). Subsequently at Jerusalem, under parallel circumstances of tumult, he warns the officer (to the) surprise of the latter of his privilege (Acad. xxii, 55).

Philip is now an unhanded ruin. The remains are very extensive, but present no striking feature except two gateways, which are considered to belong to the temple of Cleopatra (position of a theatre can be traced; also the walls, gates, some tombs, and numerous broken columns and heaps of rubbish. The ruins of private dwellings are visible on every part of the site; and at one place is a mound covered with columns and broken fragments of white marble, where a palace, temple, or perhaps a forum once stood. Inscriptions both in the Latin and Greek languages, but more generally in the former, are found. See Clarke, Tertul., vol. iii; Leake, Northern Greece, vol. iii; Cousinhy, Voyages dans la Macédoine, and especially Hacket, Journey to Philippi, in the Bible Union Quarterly Review, August, 1862, 365, and Smith, Dict. of Class. Grec. s. v.; Lewin, St. Paul, i, 206 sq. See MACEDONIA.

Philippian (Φιλιππιαν), the titular title of an inhabitant of Phillipi. (Phil. iv, 15).

PHILIPPIANS, EPISTLE TO THE, the sixth in order of the Pauline letters in the N. T. The following article treats the subject from the Scriptural as well as the modern point of view.

I. The canonical authority, Pauline authorship, and genuineness of this epistle were unanimously acknowledged up to the end of the 18th century. Marcion (A.D. 140), in the earliest known canon, held common ground with the Church teaching the authority of this epistle (Tertullian, Ad. Marcion, iv, 5; v, 20): it appears in the list of the Twelve (Ignatius, Ad. Polycarp, c. 6, 3), among the "acknowledged" books in Eusebius (H. E., 25): in the lists of the Council of Laodicea, A.D. 365, and of Hippo, 393; and in all subsequent lists, as well as in the Peshito and later versions. Even contemporary evidence may be claimed for it. Philippian Christians who had contributed to the collections for Paul's support at Rome, who had been eye and ear witnesses of the return of Epaphroditus and the first reading of Paul's epistle, may have been still alive as Philippians when Polycarp wrote (A.D. 167) his letter to the Philippian Christians concerning his own imprisonment and Paul's epistle as a well-known distinct veneration to the Philippian Church. It is quoted as Paul's by several of the early Church fathers (Irenaeus, iv, 18, § 4; Clem. Alex. Pa- dop., i, § 32, and elsewhere; Tertullian, Ad. Marc. v, 26; De Res. Carm. ch. xxii). A quotation from it (Phil. ii, 6) is found in the Epistle of the Churches of Lyons and Vienne, A.D. 177 (Eusebius, H. E., v, 2). The tes- timonies of later writers are innumerable. See CAJON.

It is only in very recent times that any doubt has been suggested to the genuineness of this epistle. Schaff, in his Der Ap. Paulus, v, 293 (1874), for instance, objects to the passage iii, 1-7, 10, 11, 15 is an interpolation; but he ad- duces no reason for this but the purely gratuitous one that the connection between ii, 30 and iv, 10 is disturbed by this intervening section, and that by the excision of this the epistle becomes "more rounded off, and more a genuine occasional letter"—as if any sound critic would reject a passage from an ancient author because in his opinion the author's composition would be improved thereby! Baur goes farther than this, and would re- ject the whole of the Gnostic composition of this later age (Paulus, p. 458 sq.). But when he comes to point out "the Gnostic ideas and expressions" by which the epistle is marked, they will be found to exist only in his own imagination, and can only by a perverse in- sensibility be forced upon the words of the apostle. Thus in the statement that Christ is "μόνος ἐστὶν, τὸ διὰ τοῦτο ἐστὶν, τὸ σου ἐργαζόμενος ἐν τοῖς ἐπίσκοποις..." (ἀπ. ii, 5, 6), Baur finds an allusion to the Gnostic notion of Sophia, in which "existed the outgoing desire with all power to penetrate into the essence of the supreme Father." But not only is this to give the apostle's words a meaning which they do not bear (for however we translate ἐργαζόμενος, we evidently express the very opposite of what he says in the past, not an aim for the future), but it is manifest that the entire drift of the passage is not to set forth any speculative doctrine, but to adudge a moral inference. This is so manifest that even Baur himself admits it, and by doing so he positions his own position; for it is on the supposition that what the apostle refers to is a fact, and not a mere speculative fancy, that any moral con- clusion can be drawn from it. Equally futile is the at- temt to find Docetism in the use of the term μορφή—a term used by the apostle in reference to the divine nature—or of the terms φύσις, φύσιμα, and εἰκοσι- μεν, all of which occur elsewhere in Paul's writings, and are here used to denote simply that Jesus Christ pre- sented himself to the view of men actually as one of themselves (Lusennius, Pauli ad Phil. Ep. cont. Basiliam, p. 56). But this does not militate against the view that what the apostle refers to is a fact, and not a mere speculative fancy, that any moral con- clusion can be drawn from it. Equally futile is the at- temt to find Docetism in the use of the term μορφή—a term used by the apostle in reference to the divine nature—or of the terms φύσις, φύσιμα, and εἰκοσι- μεν, all of which occur elsewhere in Paul's writings, and are here used to denote simply that Jesus Christ pre- sented himself to the view of men actually as one of themselves (Lusennius, Pauli ad Phil. Ep. cont. Basiliam, p. 56). But this does not militate against the view that what the apostle refers to is a fact, and not a mere speculative fancy, that any moral con- clusion can be drawn from it. Equally futile is the at- temt to find Docetism in the use of the term μορφή—a term used by the apostle in reference to the divine nature—or of the terms φύσις, φύσιμα, and εἰκοσι- μεν, all of which occur elsewhere in Paul's writings, and are here used to denote simply that Jesus Christ pre- sented himself to the view of men actually as one of themselves (Lusennius, Pauli ad Phil. Ep. cont. Basiliam, p. 56). But this does not militate against the view that what the apostle refers to is a fact, and not a mere speculative fancy, that any moral con- clusion can be drawn from it. Equally futile is the at- temt to find Docetism in the use of the term μορφή—a term used by the apostle in reference to the divine nature—or of the terms φύσις, φύσιμα, and εἰκοσι- μεν, all of which occur elsewhere in Paul's writings, and are here used to denote simply that Jesus Christ pre- sented himself to the view of men actually as one of themselves (Lusennius, Pauli ad Phil. Ep. cont. Basiliam, p. 56). But this does not militate against the view that what the apostle refers to is a fact, and not a mere speculative fancy, that any moral con- clusion can be drawn from it. Equally futile is the at- temt to find Docetism in the use of the term μορφή—a term used by the apostle in reference to the divine nature—or of the terms φύσις, φύσιμα, and εἰκοσι- 

A question has been raised as to whether the extant Epistle to the Philippians is the only one addressed by Paul to that Church. What has given rise to this question is the expression used by the apostle (iii, 1), τὰ αὐτὰ γράφειν ἐπίμοι, κ.τ.λ., where the writing of the same things to those is supposed to refer to the identity of what he is now writing with what he had written in a previous letter. It has also been supposed that Polycarp knew of more than one extant epistle to the apostle to the Philippians, from his using the plural (τὰ ἐπιστολὰς γράφειν ἐπιστολὰς) in reference to what he had written to them. To this, however, much weight cannot be attached, for there can be no doubt that the Greeks used ἐφαρμάκει for a single letter, as the Latin- ins used litterae (see a multitude of examples in Stephani's Thesaurus, a. v.). That Polycarp knew of only one extant epistle of Paul to the Philippians has been supposed by some to be proved by the passage in the 11th chap- ter of his letter, preserved in the Latin version, where he says, "Ego autem nolui talis sententiae divini, in quibus laborsit beatus Paulus qui est in principio epistola ejus," etc. But, as Meyer points out, "epistola" here is not the genitive singular, but the nominative plural; and the meaning is not "who are in the beginning of his epistle," which is entirely false, but (with allusion to 2 Cor. iii, 1) "who are in the be- ginning [i. e. from the beginning of his preaching the Gospel among you—a common use of ἔκαθα, which was the expression probably used by Polycarp] his epistle too," it is the meaning of a single epistle, for this passage has no bearing on this question; for if Meyer's construction be correct, it shows that Polycarp did use ἐπιστολαῖ for a single epistle. Meyer, indeed, trans- lates "who are his epistles," but if the allusion is to 2 Cor. iii, 1, we must translate in the singular, the whole Church collectively being the epistles and not each member an epistle. But though the testimony of Poly-
carp for a plurality of epistles may be set aside, it is less easy to set aside the testimony of the extant epistle itself. To refer to a preceding νερος ἐν εὐρωπι seems somewhat difficult, for nowhere previously in this epistle has the apostle expressly enjoined on his readers νερος ἐν εὐρωπι, and one does not see what on this hypothesis is the propriety of such expressions as δεσποιν και δεσποινικ; and to lay the stress on the γεάταις, as Wieseler proposes (Chronologie des Ap. Zeit, p. 458), so as to make the apostle refer to some verbal message previously sent to the Philippians, the substance of which he was now about to put into writing, seems no less so; for not only does the absence of the first give no allusion to any oral message, but in this case the writer would have said και γεάταις. A large number of critics follow Pelagius in the explanation, "εδειμ τερητερα γενερα δεσποινικ;" but it may be doubted if so important a clause may be legitimately dragged in to complete the apostle's meaning, without any authority from the context. Hence many have concluded that the apostle alludes to some written communication previously sent by him to the Philippians (so Hähnelin, Flatt, Meyer, Bleek, Schenkel, etc.). But, besides the lack of all evidence of such lost epistles in Clement of Alexandria, the apostle himself never pronounced in a high degree doubtful and precarious. Hence we conclude that αὐταρία refers to the γεάταις, which is the pervading thought of the epistle (i, 4; ii, 17, etc.), and which seems to have been the more dwelt upon as the object of the apostle's anxiety, the latter very naturally has suggested the contrary feeling (hence δεσποινικ). See Elliott, ad loc. Ewald (Senderschriften des Ap. Paulus, p. 481) is of opinion that Paul sent several Ap. to the Philippians; and he refers to the texts ii, 12 and iii, 18 as partly proving this. But some additional confirmation or explanation of this conjecture is requisite before it can be admitted as either probable or necessary.

There is a break in the sense at the end of the second chapter of the epistle, which every careful reader must have observed. It is indeed quite natural that an epistle written amid exciting circumstances, personal dangers, and various distractions should bear in one place at least a mark of interruption. Le Mouy (1885) thought it was ancienly divided into two parts. Heinrichs (1810), fully endorsed by Paulus (1817), has conjectured from this abrupt recommencement that the two parts are two distinct epistles, of which the first, together with the conclusion of the epistle (iv, 21-28), was intended for public use in the Church, and the second exclusively for the apostle's special friends in Philippi. It is not necessary to accept this view for the purpose of the present essay. The existence of the apocryphal theology, or what illustration of the meaning of the epistle could be derived from it. It has met with a distinct reply from Krause (1811 and 1818); and the integrity of the epistle has not been questioned by recent critics.

II. Time and Place of Writing.—The constant tradition that this epistle was written at Rome by Paul in his captivity was impugned first by Oeder (1792), who, disregarding the fact that the apostle was in prison (i, 7, 13, 14) when he wrote, imagined that he was at Corinth (see the articles on CORINTH PHILIPPI). This opinion was adopted by Schulz (1799), by Röteger (1807), and by Liliell (1814), in whose opinion the epistle was written during the apostle's confinement at Cæsarea (Acts xxiv, 23). But the references to the "palace" (prætorii; i, 15), and to "Cæsarea's household" (iv, 22), seem to point to Rome rather than to Cæsarea; and there is no reason whatever for supposing that the apostle felt in Cæsarea that extreme uncertainty of life connected with the approaching decision of his cause which he must have felt towards the end of his captivity at Rome to express in his epistle (i, 19, 20; ii, 17; iii, 10); and, further, the dissemination of the gospel described in Phil. i, 12-18 is not even hinted at in Luke's account of the Cæsarean captivity, but is described by him as taking place at Rome (comp. Acts xxiv, 28 with xxviii, 30, 31). Even Reuss (Gesch. d. N. T. 1860), who assigns to Cæsarea three of Paul's epistles, which are all addressed to the Philippians, supposes that the epistle to Rome, is decided in his conviction that the Epistle to the Philippians was written at Rome.

Assuming then that the epistle was written at Rome during the imprisonment mentioned in the last chapter of the Acts, it may be shown from a single fact that it could not have been written long before the end of the two years. The distress of the Philippians on account of Epaphroditus' sickness was known at Rome when the epistle was written; this implies four journeys, separated by some indefinite intervals, to or from Philippi and Rome. From Paul, wrote the epistle, the activity and the writing of the epistle. The Philippians were informed of his imprisonment, and sent Epaphroditus; they were informed of their messenger's sickness, and sent their message of consolation. Further, the absence of Luke's name from the salutations, where he was well known implies that he was absent from Rome when the epistle was written: so does Paul's declaration (ii, 20) that no one who remained with him felt an equal interest with Timothy in the welfare of the Philippians. By comparing the mention of Luke in Col. iv, 14 and 15 with the narrative of the Acts, we are led to the inference that he left Rome after those two epistles were written and before the end of the two years' captivity. Lastly, it is obvious from Phil. i, 20 that Paul, when he wrote, felt the act of his position to be of greater importance than ever, and that came more precarious as the two years drew to a close. Assuming that Paul's acquittal and release took place in 58, we may date the Epistle to the Philippians early in that year.

III. Personal Circumstances of the Writer at the Time.

1. Paul's connection with Philippi was of a peculiar character, which gave rise to the writing of this epistle. That city, important as a mart for the produce of the neighboring gold-mines, and as a Roman stronghold to check the rude Thracian mountaineers, was distinguished as the scene of the great battle fatal to Brutus and Cassius, B.C. 42. More than ninety years afterwards Paul entered its walls, accompanied by Silas, who had been with him since he started from Antioch, and by Timothy and Luke, whom he afterwards attached to himself. The former at Derbe, the latter quite recently at Troas. It may well be urged that the patience of the zealous apostle had been tried by his mysterious repulse, first from Asia, then from Bithynia and Mysia, and that his expectations had been stirred up by the vision which hastened his departure with his co-laborers. These new-found friends must have offered an aspect little different from that which Paul's spirit brought him to the European shore at Neapolis, whence he took the road, about ten miles long, across the mountain ridge called Symbolum to Philippi (Acts xvi, 12). There, at a greater distance from Jerusalem than any apostle had ever penetrated, these new-found friends renewed the energy of Paul was again employed in laying the foundation of a Christian Church. First seeking the last sheep of the house of Israel, he went on a Sabbath-day with the few Jews who resided in Philippi to their small Synagogue on the bank of the river Ganges. The missionaries sat down and spoke to the entourage in Greek. One of them, Lydia, not born of the seed of Abraham, but a proselyte, whose name and occupation, as well as her birth, connect her with Asia, gave heed unto Paul, and she and her household were baptized, perhaps on the same Sabbath-day. Her house became the residence of the missionaries. Many days they resorted to the Synagogue, and the result of their short sojourn in Philippi was the conversion of many persons (xvi, 40), including at last their jailer and his household. Paul was endeavor to Paul, not only by the hospitality of Lydia, to the deep sympathy of the converts, and the remarkable miracle which set a seal on his preaching, but also by the successful exercise of his missionary activity after a long suspense, and by the
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happy consequences of his undaunted endurance of igno.
mines which remained in his memory (Phil. i, 30).

a long interval. Leaving Timothy and Luke to watch

the conduct of the Church, he went to Thessalonica (1

Thees. ii, 2), whither they were followed by the

alms of the Philippians (Phil. iv, 16), and thence

southwards. Timothy, having probably carried out simi-

lar directions to those which were given to Titus (1, 5)

in Crete, set out for Philippi. We know not whether

Luke remained at Philippi. The next six years of his

life are a blank in our records. At the end of that pe-

riod he is found again (Acts xx, 6) at Philippi.

After the lapse of five years, spent chiefly at Corinth

and Ephesus, Paul, escaping from the incessant worship-

pers of the Ephesian Diana, went to Macedonia (Phil.

A.D. 54), on his way to Greece, accompanied by the

Ephesians Tychicus and Trophimus, and probably visi-

ted Philippi for the second time, and was there joined

by Timothy. His beloved Philippians, free, it seems,

from the controversies which agitated other Christian

churches, became still dearer to Paul on account of the

sacrifice which they afforded him when, emerging from a

season of dejection (2 Cor. vii, 5), oppressed by weak

bodily health, and anxious for the steadfastness of the

churches which he had planted in Asia and Achaia, he

wrote to establish their minds at both Philippi and Thess.

alonia.

On returning from Greece, unable to take ship there

on account of the Jewish plots against his life, he went

through Macedonia, seeking a favorable port for em-

barking. After parting from his companions (Acts xx, 4),

he escaped, as a refugee among his faithful Philippia-

nians, where he spent some days at Easter, A.D. 55, with

Luke, who accompanied him when he sailed from Ne-

apoli.

Finally, in his Roman captivity (A.D. 57), their

care of him revived again. They sent Epaphroditus, be-

ning their alms as the apostle's securer, and ready
to render his personal service (Phil. ii, 25). He

stayed some time at Rome, and while employed as the

organ of communication between the imprisoned apso-

te and the Christians, and inquirers in and about Rome,

he fell dangerously ill. When he was sufficiently recov-

ered, Paul sent him back to the Philippians, to whom

he was very dear, and with him our epistle. See Pitu-

lippi.

2. The state of the Church at Rome should be consid-

ered before entering on the study of the Epistle to the

Philippians (Phil. iv, 13). We have seen (Acts xx, 32),

mention about A.D. 56 from the Epistle to the Romans,

and more about A.D. 58 from Acts xxviii. Possibly the

Gospel was planted there by some who themselves re-

ceived the seed on the day of Pentecost (Acts ii, 10).

The missionaries of the Gospel were successively sent

to Judsea, partly also from Jews who were such by birth,

with possibly a few converts direct from heathenism.

In A.D. 55 this Church was already eminent for its

faith and obedience: it was exposed to the machina-

tions of schismatical teachers; and it included two con-

flicting parties, the one insisting on the apostolic au-

thority and also to tender his personal service (Phil. ii, 25).

He stayed some time at Rome, and while employed as the

organ of communication between the imprisoned apostle

and the Christians, and inquirers in and about Rome,

he fell dangerously ill. When he was sufficiently recov-

ered, Paul sent him back to the Philippians, to whom

he was very dear, and with him our epistle. See Phil-
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2. The state of the Church at Rome should be consid-

ered before entering on the study of the Epistle to the

Philippians (Phil. iv, 13). We have seen (Acts xx, 32),

mention about A.D. 56 from the Epistle to the Romans,
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Gospel was planted there by some who themselves re-

ceived the seed on the day of Pentecost (Acts ii, 10).

The missionaries of the Gospel were successively sent

to Judsea, partly also from Jews who were such by birth,

with possibly a few converts direct from heathenism.

In A.D. 55 this Church was already eminent for its

faith and obedience: it was exposed to the machina-

tions of schismatical teachers; and it included two con-

flicting parties, the one insisting on the apostolic au-

thority and
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undeviating closeness. For the preparations for the de-
parture of Epaphroditus, and the thought that he would
soon arrive among the warm-hearted Philippians, filled
Paul with recollections of them, and revived his old
feelings towards those fellow-heirs of his hope of glory
who were so deep in his heart (i. 7) and so often in his
prayers (i. 4).

Full of gratitude for this work of friendly remember-
ance and regard, Paul addressed to the Church in
Philippi this epistle, in which, besides expressing his
thanks for their kindness, he pours out a flood of elo-
quence and pathetic exhortation, suggested partly by his
own circumstances, and partly by what he had learned of
their state as a Church. That state appears to have
been on the whole very prosperous, as there is much
commendation of the Philippian in the epistle, and no
censure is expressed in any part of it either of the
Church as a whole, or of any individuals connected with
it. At the same time the apostle deemed it necessary
to put them on their guard against the evil influences
to which they were exposed from Judaizing teachers
and false professed of Christ. These cautions he in-
terposes between the exhortations suggested by his
own state, and by the news he had received concerning
the Philippians, with which his epistle commences and
with which it closes. We may thus divide the epistle
into three parts. In the first of these (i., ii.), after the
uniformity of his exhortations to the humbled in spiri-
tual pride and the firm faith of Paul concerning the
righteousness of his Lord and Saviour (Phil. ii. 6-11),
the apostle refers to his own condition as a prisoner at
Rome; and, lest they should be cast down at the thought
of the unmerited indignities he had been called upon to
suffer, he assures them that these had turned out rather
to the furtherance of that great cause on which his heart
was set, and for which he was willing to live and labor,
though, as respected his personal feelings, he would rath-
er depart and be with Christ, which he deemed to be
"far better" (12-24). He then passes by an easy transi-
tion to the main address of the epistle to the Philippian,
calling upon them to maintain steadfastly their profession,
cultivate humanity and brotherly love; to work out
their own salvation with fear and trembling, and con-
closing by an appeal to their regard for his reputation
as an apostle, which could not but be affected by their
conduct, and a reference to his reason for sending Ep-
aphroditus instead of Timothy, as he had originally
designed (i. 25; ii. 30).

In part second he strenuously cautions them, as already observed, against Judaizing teachers,
whom he stigmatizes as "dogs" (in reference, profane
practices, and godless habits), "evil-workers," and "the
counsel;" by which latter term he means to intimate, as Theophylact
remarks (ad loc.), that the circumcision in which the Jews
so much gloried had now ceased to possess any spiritual
significance, and was therefore no better than a useless
mutilation of the person. On this theme he enlarges,
making reference to his own standing as a Jew, and in-
timating that, if under the Christian dispensation Jew-
ish descent and Jewish privileges were to go for any-
thing, no one could have stronger claims on this ground
than he himself, as having been born a Jew (31, 32); but
he had once valued these, he now counted them "all
but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ"
(iii. 1-12). A reference to his own sanctified ambition
, to advance in the service of Christ leads him to exhort
the Philippian to a similar spirit; from this he passes
to caution them against unnecessary contention, and
against those who walk disorderly, concluding by re-
minding them of the glorious hopes which, as Chris-
tians, they entertained (ver. 13-21).

In the third part we have a series of admonitions to individual members of the Church at Philippi (iv. 1-8), followed by some
general exhortations to cheerfulness, moderation, prayer,
and good conduct (ver. 4-9); after which come a series of allusions to the apostle's circumstances and feelings,
his thanks to the Philippians for their reasonable aid,
and his concluding benedictions and salutations (ver. 10-20).

VI. Characteristic Features of the Epistle.—Strangely
full of joy and thanksgiving amid adversity, like the
apostle's midnight hymn from the depth of his Philip-
pian dungeon, this epistle went forth from his prison
at Rome. In most other epistles he writes with a sus-
tained exhortation to inward, or with some external
motivation; he is striving to supply imperfect, or to correct
erroneous teaching, to put down scandalous impurity,
or to heal schism in the Church which he addresses.
But in this epistle, though he knew the Philippian
intimacy, and was not blind to the faults and tenden-
cies to fault in his own people, he made no effort to
be so characteristic of the whole Church as to call for gen-
ceral censure on his part or amendment on theirs. (Of all
his epistles to churches, none has so little of an official
character as this. He withholds its title of "apostle"
in the inscription. We lose sight of his high authority
as a Church leader, and of the subordinate position of the worshippers by the river-side; and we are admitted to see the free action
of a heart glowing with inspired Christian love, and to
hear the utterance of the highest friendship addressed
to equal friends conscious of their earthly weakness,
but, in Christ, for eternity. Who that bears in mind the condition of Paul in his Roman
prison can read unmoved of his continual prayers for his distant friends, his constant sense of their fellowship
with him, his joyful remembrance of their past Chris-
tian companionship, his warm-hearted affection for
them yearning after them all in Christ, his eagerness to com-
municate to them his own circumstances and feelings,
his carefulness to prepare them to repel any evil from
within or from without which might dim the bright-
ness of their spiritual graces? Love, at once tender and
watchful—that love which "is of God"—is the key-note
of this epistle; and in this epistle only we hear no un-
dertone of any different feeling. Just enough, and no
more, is shown of his own harassing trials to let us see
how deep in his heart was the spring of that feeling,
and how he was refreshed by its sweet and soothing
flow.

VII. Commentaries.—The following are the exegetical
helps specially on this entire epistle: a few of the most
important are indicated by an asterisk (* prefixed: Vir-
torius, In Ep. ad Phil. (in Mai, Script. Vet., ed. III. i. v.)
Pseudo-Hieronymus, Commentarius in Opp. (Stygposos,
xi. 1011); Chriscyotom, Homilia (in Graec. Lat. in Opp.
in xi. 208; also in Ersami Opp. viii. 319; in Engel (includ-
ing other epistles) in Lib. of Fathem, xiv. 1845, 8vo);
Zwingli, Annotationes (Tigur. 1581, 4to; also in Opp. in
1594, 4to); Hunsinger, Commentarius in Ephesios (Paris, 1634, 8vo); also in Opp. in
xi. 1011; Calvin, Commentarius in Opp. often; separatel
ly in Eng. by Becket, Lond. 1684, 4to; by Johnston [includ.
Col.], Edinb. 1642, 12mo; by Pringle [includ. Col. and Thess.], Edinb. 1851, 8vo); Major, Expositio (includ. Col. and
Thess.) (Yttsemb, 1554, 1661, 8vo); Ridley, Expositio
(Richmond's Fathers, ii); Welser, Commentarius [includ.
Thess.] (Norib. 1661, 8vo); Salbont, Commentarius [includ.
other epistles] (Antw. 1651, 8vo; also in Opp. Col.
Agr. 1668, 8vo); Musculus, Commentarius in Col. (Thess.
1578, 1584, 4to); Erasmus, Commentarius in Col. and
Thess. (Morg. 1580, 8vo); Olevian, Notae [includ. Col.]
(Gener. 1580, 8vo); Steuart (Roman Cath.), Commentarius (Incol. 1595, 4to); Zanchius, Commentarius [includ.
Col. and Thess.] (Neost. 1659, 8vo; also in Grotius, ed.
Weichart, Expositio (Lips. 1619, 4to); Aigir, Lectura (Lond. 1618,
4to); Batus, Commentarius (Rost. 1627, 4to); Velasques
(Rom. Cath.), Commentarius (Laud. 1628-83; Antw. 1657, 1651; Ven. 1646, 2 vols. fol.); Schottan, Commentaria
Francken. 1567, 4to); Crell, Commentarius in Opp. iv.
1501; Mellchv., Commentationes (Altorf. 1641, 4to); Con-
ceixus, Commentarius (in Opp. v.); Dailé, Exposition (2d
ed. Gen. 1659-60, 2 vols. 8vo; in Eng. by Sherman,
Lond. 1841, 4vo); Scheid, Disputationes (Argent. 1668,
4to); Breitkopf, Annalredervstoffe (Helm. 1668, 1708, 4to); Hazenot, Erklärung (Leyd. 1718, 4to); Van Til, Ver-
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breezing (incl. Rom.) Harlem, 1721, 4to; in Lat. (incl.
cl. 1 Cor., Eph., and Col.) Amst. 1726, 4to; Busching,
Introductio (1744, 4to); Storr, Dias. exotica (Tubb.
1785, 4to; also in Opuscul. I, 501-67); Am Ende, Annota-
tiones (fasc. I, ii, Torg. 1799-82; Vitch. 1798-1803, 8vo).
Paul de la Perouse, Herzogtum Neubel, (Nuremb. and Alt. 1800, 8vo; Krauss, An dierische hom. script., etc. (Regiom. 1811, 4to; also in Opuscul. p. 1-22).
Hoog, De Philip. cons. (Lond. 1825, 8vo); *Rhein.
wald, Commentar. (Bert. 1827, 8vo); Ascanier, Lectures (Lond. 1837, 8vo); Berti, Quaestiones (Glas. 1831, 8vo).
Schinz, D. Christian, G. zu Phil. (Zur. 1838, 8vo).
Eastburn, Lectures (N. Y. 1838, 8vo); Passavant, Ausle-
gung (Basle, 1834, 8vo); Baynes, Commentary (Lond. 1834, 12mo); Matthies, Erklär. (Greisf. 1835, 8vo);
*Seiger, Exegese (incl. Col.) (Paris 1857, 8vo); *Van Hengel, Commentarii (L. B. 1858, 8vo); Höflmann,
Commentarii (Lips. 1899, 8vo); Anon, Erklär. (Hanov.
1839, 8vo); Neat, Discourse (Lond. 1841, 8vo); Bitillett,
Commentaire (Gen. and Par. 1841, 8vo); Hall, Exposi-
tion (Lond. 1845, 8vo); Neander, Erläuter. (Bert. 1849, 8vo; in Eng. by Mrs. Coman, N. Y. 1851, 12mo); Robertson,
Lectures (Lond. 1849, 12mo); B. Crusius, Commentar. (Jen. 1845, 8vo); Köhler, Auslegung (Kiel, 1855, 8vo).
Toller, Discourses (Lond. 1855, 12mo); *Weiss, Ausle-
gung (Bert. 1856, 8vo); *Eliocott, Commentary [incl.
Col. and Phil.]. (Lond. 1856, 8vo); Jastho, Erklär. (Hildes. 1858, 8vo); *Exell, Commentary (Lond. 1859, 8vo)
1861, 8vo); Shulte, Commentary (London, 1861, 8vo);
Schlenker, Erläuter. (incl. Eph. and Col.) (Leipzig, 1862, 8vo); Newland, Coutes (Lond. 1862, 8vo); Vaughan,
Lectures (2d ed. Lond. 1864, 8vo); Todd, Exposition (Lond. 1864, 8vo); *Lightfoot, Commentary (Lond. 1868,
1870, 8vo); Johnston, Lectures (Lond. 1875, 8vo.
See Eriple.

Philippine Islands, situated in 5° 30'–19° 42° N. lat., and 117° 14'–126° 4' E. long., in the great
Indian Archipelago, to the north of Borneo and Celebes, are
more than 1000 islands, and include an area of
about 150,000 square miles. The population
is over 6,000,000, three fourths of whom are sub-
ject to Spain. The remainder are governed, accord-
ing to their own laws and customs, by independent native
princes. Luzon, in the north, has an area of 5,100
square miles, and Mindanao, or Magindanao, in the
south, fully 25,000. The islands lying between Luzon
and Mindanao are called the Bisayas, the largest of
which are: Samar, area 13,020 square miles; Mindoro,
12,910; Panay, 11,540; Leyte, 10,680; Negros, 9,900;
Masbate, 1,290; Negros Oriental, 1,380; Cebu, 610; Cebu
island, then another thousand lesser islands of which little is known. To
the south-west of the Bisayas lies the long, narrow is-
land of Panay or Palawan, formed of a mountain-chain with
low coast-lines, cut with numerous streams, and
exceeding in fertility. The forests abound in ebony, log-
wood, gum-trees, and bamboo. To the north of Luzon
lie the Batanen, Babeehe, and Babuyan islands, the first
two groups having about 8000 inhabitants, the last un-
peopled. The Suluood islands form a long chain from Mindanao to Borneo with an
enormous and
volcanic structure as the Philippine islands, and all are
probably fragments of a submerged continent. Many
active volcanoes are scattered through the islands;
Mayon, in Luzon, and Buhayan, in Mindanao, often
caus ing great devastation. The mountain-chains run
north and south, and never attain a greater elevation
than 7000 feet. The islands have many rivers, the
coasts are indented with deep bays, and there are many
lakes in the interior. Earthquakes are frequent and
destructive. The soil is extremely fertile, except where subjected to the
frequent fluctuations of numerous lakes, which expand during the rainy season into
lagoon seas. Rain may be expected from May to December,
and from June to November the land is flooded. Violent hurricanes are experienced in the north of Lu-
zon and west coast of Mindanao. Especially during the
changes of the monsoons, storms of wind, rain, thunder
and lightning prevail. The weather is very fine, and
heat moderate, from December to May, when the tem-
perature rapidly rises and becomes oppressive, except
for a short time after a fall of rain. The fertility of the
soil and the humid atmosphere produce a richness of
vegetation which is nowhere surpassed. Blossoms and fruit
hang together on the trees, and the cultivated fields
yield a constant succession of crops. Immense forests
spread over the Philippine Islands, clothing the moun-
tains to their summits; ebony, iron-wood, cedar, sapan-
wood, gum-trees, etc., being laced together and gar-
landed by the banyan or palasan, which attains a
length of several hundred feet. The variety of fruit-
trees is great; including the orange, citron, bread-fruit,
mango, cocoa-nut, guava, tamarind, rose-apple, etc.;
other important products of the vegetable kingdom be-
ing the banana, plantain, pine-apple, sugar-cane, cot-
ton, tobacco, indigo, coffee, cocoa, cinnamon, vanilla,
cassia, the areca-nut, ginger, pepper, etc., with rice,
 wheat, maize, and various other cereals. Gold is found
in river-beds and detrital deposits, being used, in the form
of dust, as the medium of exchange in Mindanao. Iron
is plentiful, and fine coal-beds, from which four-foot-
thick, have been found. Copper has long been worked
in Luzon. There are also limestone, a fine variegated
marble, sulphur in unlimited quantity, quicksilver, ver-
million, and saltpetre—the sulphur being found both
native and in large deposits of iron, arsenic, and
iron. Except the wild-cat, beasts of prey are unknown.
There are oxen, buffaloes, sheep, goats, swine, hares,
squirrels, and a great variety of monkeys. The jun-
gles swarm with lizards, snakes, and other reptiles; the
rivers and lakes with crocodiles. Huge spiders, taran-
tulas, white ants, mosquitoes, and locusts are plagues
which form a cut-off to the beautiful fireworks, the brilli-
ant queen-beetle (Elater noctiluca), the melody of
myriads of birds, the turtle-doves, pheasants, birds-of-
paradise, and many lovely species of parakeets, with
many others. There are also distant fruits growing from the branches, and alongside of them are the
nests of humming-birds dangling in the wind." The caverns
along the shores are frequented by the swallow, whose
edible nest is esteemed by the Chinese a rich delicacy. Some of them are also teeming by multitudes of half-
immense size. Buffaloes are used for tillage and draught; a small horse for riding. Fowls are plentiful,
and incredible numbers of ducks are artificially hatched.
Fish is in great abundance and variety. Mother-of-
pearl, coral, amber, and tortoise-shell are important ar-
ticles of commerce. Practically all the sugar made
from tobacco, cigars, indigo, Manila hemp, coffee, rice, dy-
woods, hides, gold-dust, and beeswax.

Native Population.—The Tagals and Bisays are the
most numerous native races. They dwell in the cities
and cultivated lowlands; 2,500,000 being converts to
Roman Catholicism, and a considerable number, espe-
cially of the Bisays, Mohammedans. The mountain
districts are inhabited by a negro race, who, in features,
 stature, and savage mode of living, closely resemble the
Asians of the negro Pappus, and are probably the
aborigines driven back before the inroads of the Ma-
laya. A few of the negroes are Christian, but they are
chiefly idolaters, or without any manifest form of reli-
gion, and roaming about in families, without fixed
dwelling. The Mestizos form an influential part of the
population; by their activity engrossing the greatest part
of the trade. These are mostly of Chinese fathers and
native mothers.

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

The Sooloo Islands have a population of 150,000; are governed by a sultan, whose capital is Sung, in 6° 1' N. lat., and 120° 55' 51" E. long., who also rules over the greatest part of Pargao, the northern corner only being subject to Spain. Lombok has a population of 2,000,000, one fifth part being independent; the Bisaya Islands, 2,000,000, of whom three fourths are under Spanish rule. The population of Panyay amounts to 750,000, and that of Zebu to 150,000. Of the numbers in Mindanao nothing is known; the districts of Zamboanga, Maguindanao, Cotabato, and Caraga, with their inhabitants, being all that is subject to Spain. The greater part of the island is under the sultan of Mindanao, resident at Selang, in 7° 9' N. lat., and 124° 38' E. long., who, with his feudal chieftains, can bring together an army of 150,000 men. He is friendly toward the Spaniards. Besides Manila, there are very many large and important cities, especially in Luzon, Panyay, and Zebu. The great centres of trade are Manila, in Luzon, and Iloilo, in Panyay. The Philippine Islands were discovered in 1521 by Magellan, who, after visiting Mindanao, sailed toward the west, where, taking part in a war, he was wounded, and died at Maest-Ara 26, 1521. Some years later the Spanish court sent an expedition under Villalobos, who named the islands in honor of the prince of Asturias, afterwards Philip II. For some time the chief Spanish settlement was on Zebu; but in 1581 Manila was built, and has since continued to be the seat of government. See Semper, Die Philippinen u. ihre Bewohner (Würz, 1869); and his Reisen im Archipiel der Philippinen (Leips, 1867-73, 8 vol., 8vo); Earl, Papuan, ch. vi; Aegypten, Aug. 15, 1573.

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

They are sometimes called Brasileira, or Tervera, from their tendency to suicide, which they consider meritorious, and which they accordingly court, sometimes burying themselves alive, sometimes starving themselves to death. Accusations of laxity of morals have been brought against them, of renouncing marriage, and living in spiritual brotherhood and sisterhood, the truth of which has never been clearly established; for when the empress Anne (A.D. 1730-1741) sent commissioners to inquire into the state of their monasteries, they shut themselves up, and burned themselves alive within their own walls, rather than give any evidence on the subject. See Platon, Greek Church (see Index). (J. H. W.)

Philippists is the name of that sect or party among the Lutherans who were the followers of Philip Melanchoth. He had strenuously opposed the Ulquists, who arose in his time; and the dispute growing still hotter after his death, the University of Wittenberg, which espoused Melanchthon's opinion, were called by the Flats, who attacked it, Philippists. They were strongest in that university and the opposite party, who are called by the University of Jena. The Philippists were in the end accused of being Calvinists at heart, and were much persecuted by the ultra-Lutheran party. See the different works on the Reformation (q. v.), and the long treatise in Herzog's Real-Encyclopaedia, xi, 159. See also ADIAPOCHIST CONTROVERSY; MELANCTHON.

Philipp, Dirk, one of the most eminent co-laborers of Simon Menno (q. v.), was born in 1504 at Lomen, the capital of Friesland, of Romanish parentage. He was carefully and piously reared, and had unusual educational facilities in his time. When the Anabapists came to Friesland, Philipp, who was then a de-voted Romanist, soon became interested in the new doctrines; and after his brother Ubbo, a common mechanic, had embraced the modern teachings and become a preacher, Dirk also found pleasure in them; forsook the Church of Rome, and was rebaptized. As a preacher of the new doctrines he was stationed at Applingemum (Groningen), where he lived so contented in that station until the Anabaptists advocated the extreme socialistic views. About the year 1583 or 1585 these two brothers came out boldly against the Münster ideas of the Anabaptists, and thus prepared the way for the revolution which Menno shortly after effected. After 1586 the brethren of Philipp disappear, and are but little heard of. At the conference of the different Anabaptists held at Buck-holt, in Westphalia, they do not seem to have been present. In 1548 we find them at Emden. After that we only meet Dirk now and then, but always in closest intimacy with Menno. Ubbo finally separated from both Dirk and Menno, and took a conciliatory position between the Protestants and Romanists. But Dirk remained true to Menno, and ever after is warmly commended by the great Dutch Reformer and founder of the Quakers of Holland. After the death of Simon Menno, Dirk was more or less involved, and that unhappily, in the controversies which agitated the Dutch Anabaptists. In 1568 he was at Dantzic, but was so much sought after at home that the sixty-four-year-old man consented to return to Emden. He died there in 1583. His many pamphleteering publications have been collected in his Exarchia, or "Hand-book," among which there is an Apology or Defence of the Anabaptists; a treatise on Christian Marriage, etc. It is the universal testimony of Protestants and Romanists that Dirk Philipp was a very learned man in the Scriptural languages, and a pithy orator of the very highest order.
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Philipp. Ubbo. See Philipp., Dirk.

Philippussohn, Moses, a noted Hebraist, was born May 9, 1775, in Sandersleben, a small town on the Wipper, and was destined for a rabbinist by his parents, who began to initiate him into Hebrew when he was scarcely four years of age. In 1787 he was sent to a rabbinic school at Halberstadt, where he was instructed in the Talmud and other branches of rabbinic literature. He then went to Brunswick, where he devoted himself to the study of the sciences generally, and in particular Hebrew theology, acquiring a most striking and charming style in Hebrew composition. In 1799, when only four and twenty, he was appointed master of the noted Jewish school at Dessau, where the celebrated historian Jost and the philosopher Mendelssohn were educated. Here Philippussohn prosecuted more zealously than ever the study of Hebrew and the Hebrew Scriptures, and determined to continue, with the aid of his three colleagues, the great Bible work commenced by Mendelssohn (q. v.), selecting the minor prophets for their conjoint labor. In 1795, S. Th. Hone and Joel, being the two most difficult books of the twelve minor prophets; his colleague Wolf the translation and exposition of Obadiah, Micah, Habakkuk, and Zephaniah; his colleague Solomon undertook Haggai and Zechariah; while Neuman undertook the Hagiographa. The entire work, as it had been already published by Löwe (q. v.); and the whole was published under the title סדרונות לענבה, a Pure Offering, at Dessau, in 1805. Three years later Philippussohn published a Hebrew Grammar and Chrestomathy, entitled חידראים ו却דראים, Friend of Students (Dessau, 1808; 2d improved ed. 1822); and a Hebrew Commentary on the Book of Daniel, with a translation by Wolf (ibid. 1808). He also wrote essays on various subjects connected with Hebrew literature in the Hebrew periodical called עירדיא, The Gatherer, and died April 20, 1814. See Steinschneider, Catalogue Libr. Hebr. in Bibliotheca Rodliana, col. 2099, and the interesting biographical sketch by Dr. Ph. Philippson, in his Biographische Rätsel (Leips. 1881); Jost, Gesch. der Juden, und seiner Sitten (see Index in vol. iii.).

Philips, Edward, M.A., an English divine, was born near the middle of the 16th century. He was entered a student in Broaglate's Hall, now Pembroke College, in 1574; became preacher at St. Saviour's, Southwark, London, and died about 1600. He was a Calvinist, and esteemed "a person zealous of the truth of God, earnest in his calling, faithful in his message, powerful in his speech, careful of his flock, peaceable and blameless in his life, and comfortable and constant in his death." His published sermons are entitled, Certaine Cordly and Learned Sermons, Preached by that worthy Servant of Christ at St. Saviour's, in Southwark; and were taken by the pen of H. Welerton, of Gray's Inn, Genessem (Lond. 1607, 4to).

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

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

Philistia (Heb. פֶּלֶסְח, פֶּלֶסְח, signifi doubtful [see below]; Sept. Ἀλλυρίας, the land of the Philistines, as it is usually styled in prose (Gen. xxi, 32, 33; Exod. xiii, 17; 1 Sam. xxvii, 1, 7; xxix, 11; 1 Kings iv, 21; 2 Kings viii, 2, 8). This term is rendered in our version sometimes "Palestine," as in Exod. xiv, 14, and Isa. xxi, 9, xxvi, 12; Ps. cxxvii, 4; but "Philistines" in Ps. lx, 8; lxxxi, 4, and es, 9; and "Philistines" in Ps. lxxxiii, 7. "Palestine" originally meant nothing but the district inhabited by the "Philistines," who are called by Josephus Πελασγίων, "Palestines" (Ant. v, 6). In fact the two words are the same, and the difference in form is but the result of gradual corruption. The form Philistia does not occur anywhere in the Sept. or Vulgate. In Exod. xv, 14 this word (Pelaseh) is used along with Canaan, and as distinct from it; in Joel iii, 4, ita "coasts" are referred to (for it was a littoral terri- tory), and are coupled with Tyre and Sidon as having sold into slavery the children of Judah and Jerusalem, and carried off silver and gold from the Temple; and in Isa. xiv, 29-31 it is told not to congratulate itself on the death of Ahas, who had smitten it. In Ps. lx, 8; lxxxi, 7; lxxii, 11, 12; lxxiii, 9, 10; lxxvii, 9, 10 Philo says of Palestine, νότος πρωτογενοῦς Χαναναίων, and Jerome says, "Terra Judaea quae nunc appellatur Palestina." (see Reiland, Palest. chap. i, vii, viii.) In the Talmud and the Arabic it likewise does not the whole land of the Jews. See PALESTINE.

The name itself has given rise to various conjectures. Hitzig identifies the Philistines with Παλαιστηι, and supposes the word, after the Semitic Vulakhah, to denote the white races, as opposed to the Phoenician or dusky races (see Kruetzcr, Phem, p. 169). This makes it a translation of the name of their country, פַּלְסָל, φελσικ, the low country (A. V. "valley" or "plain"). Knobel, Gesenius, Movers, and Roth take it from the root פָּלָס, "to emigrate," of which Αλλυρίας is supposed to be a translation. First substantially agrees with this etymology, from the same Heb. root, in the sense of "wandering." Stark regards this Greek term as opposed to Ἀμβροσί, "of the same race" (Graec, p. 67); and Von Lengerke looks upon it as a playful transposition of Φελσικιος. Αλλυρίας seems, in later Greek, to denote a foreign race living in a country among its natives. Thus Pto- lybius gives the name to the forces of Hannibal located in Gaul and Italy. (Strab. v, 6). The Sept. made this way, given it to a race that lived in a country which God had conferred in promise on the Hebrew people. The same name is for a like reason given to the population of Galleia (1 Macc. v, 15).

Philistia prospered for a long and somewhat broad strip of land lying on the sea-coast, west of the hills of Ephraim and Judah, and stretching generally from Egypt to Phocinia. The northern portion of this territory, from Joppa nearly as far as Askelon, was allotted to Dan; and the southern portion, from Gaza to Ashdod, was allotted to Judah. In short, it comprised the southern coast and plain of Canaan, along the Mediterranean, hence called "the sea of the Philistines" (Exod. xxviii, 31), from Ekron to the border of Egypt; though
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at certain times the Philistines had also in possession large portions of the interior (1 Sam. ix. 7; lxxxvii. 4; xvii. 10; 1 Sam. xxxi. 8; 1 Kings xv. 27; 1 Sam. lxxiii. 7). The land of the Philistines partakes of the general desolation common to it with Judea and other neighboring tracts, as it comes to pass that, except the immediate environs of a few villages, the whole country is a desert abandoned to the Bedawin Arabs, who feed their flocks on it (Zeph. ii. 4-7). See PHILISTINE.

Philistia (Gen. x. 14). See PHILISTINE.

Philistia (Heb. יִפְלִיסִית, יִפְלִיסִית, genitive from יִפְלִיס, יִפְלִיס, Sept. ἁλφολοχος, but sometimes Φυ- λισίτης, for the plur., which is the usual form; A. V. once "Philistia," Gen. x. 14; Ἰοσαβάθ, Ὀλισάμ, Ὀλασάμ, v. 11), a race of aboriginal Canaanites inhabiting the land of Philistia (q. v.). The following article contains the Scripture information that can be derived from other sources.

1. Early History. - The origin of the Philistines is nowhere expressly stated in the Bible; but since the prophets describe them as "the Philistines from Caphtor" (Amos ix. 7), and "the remnant of the maritime district (Caphtor)" (Ezek. xxvi, 4), it is generally assumed that they were the "Caphtorims which came out of Caphtor" who expelled the Avim from their territory and occupied it in their place (Deut. ii. 23), and that these again were the Caphtorim mentioned in the Mosaic genealogical table among the descendants of Dan (1 Chron. v. 13). But in establishing this conclusion certain difficulties present themselves: in the first place, it is observable that in Gen. x. 14 the Philistines are connected with the Cushalim rather than the Caphtorim. It has generally been assumed that the text has suffered a transposition, and that the parataetical clause "out of whom came Philistia" ought to follow the words "and Caphtorim." This explanation is, however, inadmissible; for (1) there is no external evidence whatever of any variation in the text, either here or in the parallel passage in 1 Chron. i. 12; and (2) if the transposition were effected, the desired sense would not be gained; for the words rendered in the A. V. "out of whom" (מֵאָשֶׁר) really mean "whence," and denote a local movement rather than a genealogical descent, so that, as applied to the Caphtorim, they would merely indicate a sojourn of the Philistines in their land, and not the identity of it as a people. The clause seems to have an appropriate meaning in its present position: it looks like an interpolation into the original document with the view of explaining when and where the name Philistia was first applied to the people whose proper designation was Caphtorim. It is an etymological as well as a historical memorandum; for it is based on the meaning of the name Philistia (from the root פלס, פלס, "to migrate"); a term which is said to be still current in Abyssinia [Knobel, Vollkert, p. 281], and which on the Egyptian monuments appears under the form of Pulpot [Brugsch, Hist. d'Egypt, p. 187], viz. "emigrant," and is designed to account for the application of that name. But a second and more serious difficulty arises out of the language of the Philistines; for while the Caphtorim were Hamitic, the Philistine language is held to have been Semitic. (Hitzig, in his Urgeschichte d. Phil. however, maintains that the language is Indo-European, with a view to prove the Philistines to be Pelasgi. He is, we believe, singular in his view.) It has hence been inferred that the Philistines were in reality a Semitic race, and that they derived the title of Caphtorim simply from a residence in Caphtor (Ewald, i. 331; Movers, Ptolemais, iii, 258), and it has been noticed in confirmation of this that their land is termed Canaan (Zeph. ii. 5). But this seems to be inconsistent with the express assertion of the Bible that they were Caphtorim (Deut. ii. 23), and not simply that they came from Caphtor; and the term Canaan is applied to their country, not ethnologically but etymologically, to describe the trading habits of the Philistines. The difficulty arising out of the question of language has been met by assuming either that the Caphtorim adopted the language of the conquered Avim (a not unusual circumstance where the conqueror assimilated the bulk of the people), or that they diverged from the Hamitic stock at a period when the distinctive features of Hamitic and Semitic were yet in embryo. (See below.) A third objection to their Egyptian origin is raised from the application of the term "uncircumcised" to them (1 Sam. xvii. 26; 2 Sam. i. 20), which shows the Egyptians were circumcised (Herod. ii. 30). But this objection is answered by Jer. ix. 25, 26, where the same term is in some sense applied to the Egyptians, however it may be reconciled with the statement of Herodotus. See CAPHTOR.

There is additional evidence to the above that the Philistines belonged to the Semitic family. The names of their cities and their proper names are of Semitic origin. In their intercourse with the Israelites there are many intimations that the two used a common language. How is this, if those kings resided in Palestine? This difficulty is removed by supposing that originally they were in Palestine, being a part of the great Semitic family, went westward, under pressure from the wave of population which came down from the higher country to the sea-coast, and afterwards ranged farther and farther back from the coast to Palestine; so that in Amos ix. 7 it is to be understood that God brought them up to Palestine, as he brought the Israelites out of Egypt—back to their home. This view the passage undoubtedly admits; but we cannot agree with Movers in holding that it gives direct evidence to its favor, though his general position is probably correct, that the Philistines first quitted the mainland for the neighboring islands of the Mediterranean sea, and then, after a time, returned to their original home (Movers, p. 19, 29, 35). Greek writers, however, give evidence of a wide diffusion of the Semitic race over the islands of the Mediterranean. Thucydidus says (i, 8) that most of the islands were inhabited by Carians and Phoenicians. Of Crete, Herodotus (i. 173) declares that barbarians had, before Minos, formed the population of the island. There is evidence in Homer to the same effect (Od. ix. 174; comp. Strabo, p. 475). Many proofs offer themselves that, before the spread of the Hellenes, these islands were inhabited by Semitic races. The worship observed in them at this time shows a Semitic origin. The Philistines gave place to the Greeks by a rapid change which dates from the time of Minos, who drove them out of the islands, giving the dominion to his son. The expelled population settled on the Asiatic coast. This evidence, derived from heathen sources, gives a representation which agrees with the scriptural account of the destruction of the Philistines by the westerly wandering of the eastward return of the Philistines. But chronology creates a difficulty. Minos probably lived about the year B.C.1300. According to the O. T. the Philistines were found in Palestine at an earlier period. In Gen. xx. 2; xxvi, 1, we find a Philistine king, "king of the Philistines." At a later period (Josh. x. 25) we find a Philistine king "king of the Philistines," and a Philistine "king of the Philistines." At a later period (Josh. x. 25) we find a Philistine king, "king of the Philistines," and a Philistine "king of the Philistines."
inhabitants of the islands, gave themselves to navigation. To these tribes the Philistines appear to have belonged, who, for what reason we know not, left Crete, and settled on the coast of Palestine.

2. The next question therefore that arises relates to the early movements of the Philistines. It has been very generally assumed of late years that Caphthor represents Crete, and that the Philistines migrated from that island, either directly or through Egypt, into Palestine. This hypothesis presupposes the Semitic origin of the Philistines; for we believe that there are no traces of Hamitic settlements in Crete, and consequently the Biblical statement that Caphthor was descended from Mizraim forms an a priori objection to the view. Moreover, the name Caphthor can only be identified with the Egyptian Coptos. But the Cretan origin of the Philistines has been deducted, not so much from the name Caphthor, as from what of the Cherethites. This name in its Hebrew form (צפר) bears a close resemblance to Crete; and is rendered Cretans in the Sept. A further link between the two terms has apparently been discovered in the term צפר,  צפר, which is applied to the royal guard (2 Kings xi, 4, 19), and which sounds like Cretans. The latter of these arguments assumes that the Cherethites of David's guard were identical with the Cherethites of the Philistine plain, which appears in the highest degree improbable. See CHERETHITE. With regard to the former argument, the mere coincidence of the names cannot pass for much without some corroborative testimony. The Bible furnishes none, for the name occurs but thrice (1 Sam. xxx, 14; Ezek. xxv, 16; Zeph. ii, 8), and apparently applies to the occupants of the southern district; the testimony of the Sept. is invalidated by the fact that it is based upon the mere sound of the word (see Zeph. ii, 6, where Kere is also rendered Crete); and, lastly, we have to account for the introduction of the classical name of the island side by side with the Hebrew term Caphthor. A certain amount of testimony is indeed adduced in favor of a connection between Crete and Philistia; but, with the exception of the vague rumor, recorded but not adopted by Tacitus (Hist. v, 8), the evidence is confined to the town of Gaza, and even in this case is not wholly satisfactory. The town, according to Stephanus Byzantinus (a. v. Porco), was termed Minoa, as having been founded by Minos, and

this tradition may be traced back to, and was perhaps founded on, an inscription on the coins of that city, containing the letters ΜΕΙΝΩ; but these coins are of no higher date than the 1st century B.C., and belong to a period when Gaza had attained a decided Greek character (Josephus, War, ii, 6, 8). Again, the worship of the god Marn, and its identity with the Cretan Jove, are frequently mentioned by early writers (Movera, Phoin. i, 682); but the name is Phoenician, being the marum, "lord," of 1 Cor. xvi, 22, and it seems more probable that Gaza and Crete derived the worship from a common source, Phoenicia. Without therefore asserting that migrations may not have taken place from Crete to Philistia, we hold that the evidence adduced to prove that they did is not altogether sufficient. What is remarkable, and as if two distinct and unrelated peoples bore the same appellation, on a tablet of Hanno III at Medinet Habu is sculptured a naval victory over the Sharkatana, perhaps the Cherethites of Crete; while another nation of the same name, perhaps the Cherethites of the mainland, form a portion of the Egyptian army. We find also the name Pulasaita in close connection with this Sharkatana. See CRETE.

On the other hand, it has been held by Ewald (i, 330) and others that the Cherethites and Pelethites (2 Sam. xx, 23) were Cherethites and Philistines. The objections to this view are: (1) that it is highly improbable that David would select his officers from the hereditary foes of his country, particularly so immediately after he had enforced their submission; (2) that there appears no reason why an undue prominence should have been given to the Cherethites by placing that name first, and altering Philistines into Pelethites, so as to produce a paronomasia; (3) that the names subsequently applied to the same body (2 Kings xi, 19) are appellatives; and
and (3) that the notice in Deut. ii. 23, which certainly bears marks of an antiquity, belong to a late date, and refers solely to the Cherethites. But, beyond these inconsistencies, there are two points which appear to militate against the theory of the second immigration in the time of the Judges: (1) that the national title of the nation always remained Philistine, whereas, according to this theory, the Philistines in the neighborhood of Gerar (Gen. xxi, 32; xxvi, 8) and this position accords well with the statement in Deut. ii. 23 that the Avim dwelt in Hazerim, i.e. in nomad encampments; for Gerar lay in the south country, which was just adapted to such a life. At the time of the Exodus they dwelt in the same neighborhood, but grew sufficiently powerful to inspire the Israelites with fear (Exod. xiii. 17; xvi. 14). When the Israelites arrived, they were in full possession of the Shephelah from the "river of Egypt" (El-Ariah) in the south to Ekron in the north (Josh. xv. 4, 47), and had formed a confederation of five powerful cities—Gaza, Ashdod, Ashkelon, Gath, and Ekron (Josh. xiii. 3). At what period these cities were originally founded we know not, but there are good grounds for believing that they were of Canaanitish origin, and had previously been occupied by the Canaanites; for the Joshua is doubtless; and the terminations both of this and Ekron may be Philistine. Gaza is mentioned as early as in Gen. vi. 19 as a city of the Canaanites; and this as well as in Josh. x. 5 alludes to its state at Joshua's time the presence of the Canaanitic Anakim (Josh. xi. 22). The interval that elapsed between Abraham and the Exodus seems sufficient to allow for the alteration that took place in the position of the Philistines, and their transformation from a pastoral tribe to a settled and powerful nation. But such a view has not met with acceptance among modern critics, partly because it leaves the migrations of the Philistines wholly unconnected with any known historical event, and partly because it does not serve to explain the great increase of their power in the time of the Judges. To meet these two requirements a double migration on the part of the Philistines, or of the two branches of that nation, has been suggested. Knobel, for instance, regards the Philistines proper as a branch of the same stock as that to which the Lykoon belonged, and he discovers the name Philistine in the proper name Philiat or Philia, bestowed on the Shepherds kings (Herod. ii. 128); their first entrance into Canaan from the Casalibum would thus be subsequent to the patriarchal age, and coincident with the expulsion of the Hyksos. The Cherethites he identifies with the Cherethites who peopled the Shephelah, and he regards the Bashan, who did not enter Canaan before the period of the Judges. The former part of his theory is inconsistent with the notices of the Philistines in the book of Genesis; these, therefore, he regards as additions of a later date (Vulgar. p. 218 sq.). The view adopted by Movers is, that the Philistines were carried westward from Palestine into Lower Egypt by the stream of the Hyksos movement at a period subsequent to Abraham; from Egypt they passed to Crete, and returned to Palestine in the early period of the Judges (Phoen. iii. 296). This is inconsistent with the notices in Joshua. Ewald, in the second edition of his Geschichte, propounds the hypothesis of a double immigration from Crete, the first of which took place in the ante-patriarchal period, as a consequence either of the Canaanitic settlement or of the Hyksos movement, the second in the time of the Judges (Gesch. i. 329-331). We cannot regard the above views in any other light than as speculations, built up on very slight data, and unsatisfactory, inasmuch as they fail to reconcile the statements of Scripture. For they all presuppose that the notice of Captorim in Gen. x. 14 applies to an entirely distinct tribe from the Philistines, as Ewald (i. 381, note) himself allows; (2) that either the notices in Gen. xx, xxvi, or those in Josh. xv. 43-47, or perchance both, are interpolations;
Tyre (Justin, viii, 3). About the same period, or a little after, they were engaged in a naval war with Remes III of Egypt, in conjunction with other Mediterranean nations; in these wars they were unsuccessful (Buiges, Hist. d'Egypte, p. 185, 187), but the notice of them proves their importance, and we cannot therefore be surprised that they were able to extend their authority over the Israelites, devote as these were of internal misrule, and harassed by external foes. With regard to their tactics and the objects that they had in view in their attacks on the Israelites, we may form a fair idea from the scattered notices in the books of Judges and Samuel. The warfare was of a guerilla character, and consisted of a series of raids into the enemy's country. Sometimes these extended only just over the border, with the view of plundering the threshing-floors of the agricultural produce (1 Sam. xxiii, 1); but more generally they penetrated into the heart of the country and seized a commanding position on the edge of the Jordan valley, whence they could secure themselves against a combination of the Trans-Jordanic and Edomite divisions of the Israelites, or prevent a return of the fugitives who had hurried across the river on the alarm of their approach. Thus at one time we find them crossing the central district of Benjamin and posting themselves on Michmash (xxiii, 12), the next time, following the coast-road to the plain of Ederaelon and reaching the edge of the Jordan valley by Jezreel (xxiii, 11). From such posts as their headquarters they sent out detached bands to plunder the surrounding country (xiii, 17), and, having obtained all they could, they established some military mark (2 Sam. vii, 19; A.v. "garrison," but perhaps meaning only a colony, as in Gen. xxxix, 26) as a token of their supremacy (1 Sam. x, 5; xiii, 7), and retreated to their own country. This system of incursions kept the Israelites in a state of perpetual discontent: all commerce was suspended, from the insecurity of the roads (Judg. v, 7); and at the approach of the foe the people fled to the natural hiding-places of the country, or fled across the Jordan (1 Sam. xii, 6, 7). By degrees the ascendency became complete, and a virtual disarmament of the population was the effect of the suppression of the smites (xiii, 19). The profits of the Philistines were not confined to the goods and chattels they carried off with them. They seized the persons of the Israelites and sold them for slaves; the earliest notice of this occurs in 1 Sam. xiv, 21, where, according to the probably correct reading of 1872, and not 1872 followed by the Sept., we find that there were numerous slaves in the camp at Michmash: at a later period the prophets inveigh against them for their traffic in human flesh (Joel iii, 6; Amos i, 6): at a still later period we hear that "the merchants of the country" followed the army of Gerges into Judaea for the purpose of buying the children of Israel for slaves (1 Macc. iii, 41), and that these merchants were Philistines is a fair inference from the subsequent notice that Nicanor sold the captive Jews to the "cities upon the sea-coast" (2 Macc. viii, 11). There can be little doubt, too, that tribute was exacted from the Israelites, but the notices of it are confined to passages of questionable authority, such as the rendering of 1 Sam. xxii, 21 in the Sept., which represents the Philistines as making a charge of three shekels a tool for sharpening them; and again the expression "Methge-ammah" in 2 Sam. viii, 1, which is rendered in the Vulg. "fratum tributum," and by Symmachus τὴν ξύλειαν τοῦ φιδίου (the true text may have been θύσιν, instead of ἔργον). In each of the passages quoted the versions presuppose a text which yields a better sense than the existing one.

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

1. Under Joshua and the Judges. —The territory of the Philistines, having been once occupied by the Canaanites, formed a portion of the Promised Land, and was assigned to the tribe of Judah (Josh. xv, 2, 12, 45-47). No part, however, of it was conquered in the lifetime of Joshua (xiii, 2), and even after his death no permanent conquest was effected (Judg. iii, 3), though, on the authority of a somewhat doubtful passage, we are informed that the three cities of Gaza, Ashkelon, and Ekron were taken (Judg. i, 18). The Philistines, at all events, soon recovered these, and commenced an aggressive policy against the Israelites, by which they gained a complete ascendency over them. We are unable to say at what intervals their incursions took place, as nothing is recorded of them in the early period of the Judges. It seems as if they must have been in existence, indeed, as much as the national spirit of the Israelites was so entirely broken that they even reproved any attempt at deliverance (xv, 12). Individual heroes were raised up from time to time whose achievements might well kindle patriotism, such as Shamgar the son of Anath (iii, 81), and still more Samson (xii-xvi); but neither of these men succeeded in permanently throwing off the yoke. Of the former only a single daring feat is recorded, the effect of which appears, from Judg. v, 6, 7, to have been very shortlived. The true series of deliverances connected with the latter was predicted that "he shall begin to deliver" (xiii, 5), and were carried on by Samuel, Saul, and David. A brief notice occurs in Judg. vii, 5 of invasions by the Philistines and Ammonites, followed by particulars which apply exclusively to the latter people. It has hence been supposed that the brief reference to the Philistines is in anticipation of Samson's history.

The history of Samson furnishes us with some idea of the relations which existed between the two nations. As a "borderer" of the tribe of Dan, he was thrown into frequent contact with the Philistines; and as the Philistines were a people whose name was so established that no bar appears to have been placed to free intercourse with their country. His early life was spent on the verge of the Shephelah between Zorah and Eshtaol, but when his actions had aroused the active hostility of the Philistines he withdrew into the central district, and found a secure post on the seacoast at Ashdod, which is given in Judg. xv, 1 f. The Philistines followed him without opposition from the inhabitants. His achievements belong to his personal history: it is clear that they were the isolated acts of an individual, and altogether unconnected with any national movement; for the revenge of the Philistines was not the movement directed against Samson personally. Under Eli there was an organized and unsuccessful resistance to the encroachments of the Philistines, who had penetrated into the central district and were masters of Eben-ezer (1 Sam. iv, 1). The production of the ark on this occasion demonstrates the greatness of the emergency, and its loss marked the lowest depth of Israel's degradation. The next action took place under Samuel's leadership, and the tide of success turned in Israel's favor: the Philistines had been penetrated into the Arabo-Bashan country near Jerusalem; at Mizpeh they met the cowed host of the Israelites, who, encouraged by the signs of divine favor, and availing themselves of the panic produced by a thunderstorm, inflicted on them a total defeat. For the field of the Philistines erstwhile called Lechi or Hekele at Eben-ezer as the token of victory. The re-
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sults were the recovery of the border-towns and their territories "from Ekron even unto Gath," i.e. in the northern district. The success of Israel may be partly ascribed to their peaceful relations at this time with the Amorites (1 Sam. vii, 9-14).

2. Under the Hebrew Monarchy.—The Israelites now attributed their past weakness to their want of unity, and they desired a king, with the special object of leading them against the foe (1 Sam. viii, 20). It is a strange fact that Saul first felt inspiration in the presence of a pillar (A. V. "garrison") erected by the Philistines in commemoration of a victory (x, 5, 10). As soon as he was prepared to throw off the yoke he occupied with his army a position at Michmash, commanding the defiles leading to the Jordan valley, and his heroic general Jonathan gave the signal for a rising by overthrowing the pillar which the Philistines had placed there. The challenge was accepted; the Philistines invaded the central district with an immense force (a copyist's clerical exaggeration [see Num. xxvii, 8], and, having dislodged Saul from Michmash, occupied it themselves, and sent forth predaceous bands into the surrounding country. The Israelites shortly after took up a position on the other side of the ravine at Gala, and availing themselves of the confusion consequent on the death of Pharaoah's eldest son inflicted tremendous slaughter upon the enemy (ch. xii, xiv).

No attempt was made by the Philistines to regain their supremacy for about twenty-five years, and the scene of the next contest shows the altered strength of the two parties: it was no longer in the central district, but in a ravine leading down to the Philistine plain, the valley of Elah, the position of which is about fourteen miles south-west of Jerusalem; on this occasion the prowess of young David secured success to Israel, and the foe was pursued to the gates of Gath and Ekron (ch. xvii). The power of the Philistines was, however, still intact on their own territory, as is proved by the flight of David to the court of Achish (xxi, 10-15), and his subsequent abode at Ziklag (ch. xxi, 2), where he was secured from the attacks of Saul. The border warfare was continued; captures and reprisals, such as are described as occurring at Keilah (xxiii, 1-5), being probably frequent. The scene of the next conflict was far to the north, in the valley of Ecdraelon, whether the Philistines may have made a plundering incursion similar to that of the Midianites in the days of Jephthah. On this occasion the dissensions among the Israelites: Saul himself perished, and the Philistines penetrated across the Jordan, and occupied the forlorn cities (xxxi, 1-7). The dissensions which followed the death of Saul were naturally favorable to the Philistines, who were then given to a close appointment of David to be king over the united tribes than the Philistines attempted to counterbalance the advantage by an attack on the person of the king; they therefore penetrated into the valley of Rephaim, south-west of Jerusalem, and even pushed forward an advanced post as far as Bethlehem (1 Chron. xi, 16). David twice attacked them at the former spot, and on each occasion with signal success, in the first case capturing their images, in the second pursuing them "from Gala until thou come to Gazer" (2 Sam. vi, 17-20; 1 Chron. xiv, 8-16). About seven years after the defeat at Rephaim, David, who had now consolidated his power, attacked them on their own soil, and took Gath, with its dependencies (1 Chron. xvi, 1), and thus (according to one interpretation of the obscure expression "Methath-sammâm" in 2 Sam. vii, 1) "he took the arm-bridle out of the hand of the Philistines" (Bernheu., Comm. on 1 Chron.), or (according to another) "he took the bridle of the metropolis out of the hand of the Philistines" (Genesijs, Theaur., p. 118)—meaning in either case that their ascendancy was utterly broken. As he appears to have summoned to his aid, proved themselves to be the "cockatrice that should come out of the serpent's (Juda'h's)
of the rival kings Demetrius II and Alexander Balas, under Apollonius and Jonathan respectively, contended in the Philistine plains: Jonathan took Ashdod, triumpantly entered Ashkelon, and received Ekron as his reward (1 Macc. v, 69-89). A few years later Jonathon again descended into the plain in the interests of Philistia. The capital Gaza was captured by the king, who then formed an alliance with the Egyptians, as a counterpoise to the Assyrians, and the possession of Philistia became henceforth the turning-point of the struggle between the two great empires of the East. Henceforth, in the early part of his reign, re-established his authority over the whole of it, "even unto Gaza" (2 Kings xviii, 8). This movement was evidently connected with his rebellion against the king of Assyria, and was undertaken in conjunction with the Egyptians; for we find the latter people shortly after in possession of five Philistine cities, to which alone are we able to refer the prediction in Isa. xxx, 18, when coupled with the fact that both Gaza and Ashkelon are termed Egyptian cities in the annals of Sargon (Bunson, *Egypt*, iv, 608). The Assyrians under Tantor, the general of Sargon, made haste to march against Egypt, to the Ashtod, as the key of that country (Isa. xx, 1, 4, 5). Under Sennacherib Philistia was again the scene of important operations: in his first campaign against Egypt Ashkelon was taken and its dependencies were plundered; Ashdod, however, resisting, was rewarded as a "reward of Hezekiah's territory" (Rawlinson, *Herod.*, i, 477); in his second campaign (on the view that the two were different) other towns on the verge of the plain, such as Libnah and Lachish, were also taken (2 Kings xviii, 14; xix, 6). The Assyrian supremacy, though shaken by the failure of this latter expedition, was restored by Esar-haddon, who claims to have conquered Egypt (Rawlinson, i, 481); and it seems probable that the Assyrians retained their hold on Ashdod until its capture, after a long siege, by the Egyptian monarch. Hence, with the earliest ages exclusively in possession of the traffic which was carried on between Europe and Asia. Besides a great transit trade, they had internal sources of wealth, being given to agriculture (Judg. xv, 5). In the time of Saul they were evidently superior in the arts of life to the Israelites; for we read (1 Sam. xiii, 20) that the latter were indebted to the former for the utensils of ordinary life.

The five chief cities had, as early as the days of Joshua, constituted themselves into a confederacy, restricted, however, in all probability, to matters of offence and defence. Each of the heads of the five cities possessed a general whose official title was sīrum, sīrim (Josh. iii, 8; Judg. iii, 8, etc.), and occasionally sīrīm (1 Sam. xviii, 30; xxix, 6). Gaza may be regarded as having exercised a hegemony over the others, for in the list of the towns it is mentioned the first (Josh. iii, 8; Amos i, 7, 8), except where there is an especial ground for giving prominence to another, as in the case of Ashtod (1 Sam. vi, 17). Ekron always stands last, while Ashdod, Ashkelon, and Gath interchanged places. Each town possessed its own territory, as instanced in the case of Gath (1 Chron. xviii, 1), Ashdod (1 Sam. vi, 6), and others, and each possessed its dependent towns or "daughter towns" (Josh. xxv, 65-67; 1 Chron. xviii, 1; 2 Sam. i, 20; Ezek. xvi, 27, 57), and its villages (Josh. i, c.). In later times Ashdod had a senate of five hundred (Joseph. *Ant.* iii, 13, 8).

The Philistines appear to have been deeply imbued with superstition: they carried their idols with them on their campaigns (2 Sam. v, 21), and proclaimed their victories in their presence (1 Sam. xxxi, 9). They also carried about of the most sacred things that had been presented before the idols (2 Macc. xii, 40). The gods whom they chiefly worshipped were Dagon, who possessed temples both at Gaza (Judg. xvi, 23) and at Ashtod (1 Sam. vi, 5-6; 1 Chron. x, 10; 1 Macc. x, 68), Ashoreth, whose temple at Ashdod was called Ashoreth-Hepher (1 Sam. xxviii, 10; 1 Sam. ii, 10; 1 Macc. ii, 10); Baal-zebub, whose name...
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at Ekron was consulted by Ahaziah (2 Kings i, 2-6); and
Derceto, who was honored at Ashkelon (Diod. Sic. ii, 4),
though unnoticed in the Bible. Priests and diviners (1 Sam. vi, 2) were attached to the various seats of worship,
and the Philistine magicians were in repute (Jas. ii, 6).

The special authorities for the history of the Philis-
tine are Stark, Gaza und die philistische Küste (Jena, 1852);
Knobel, Volkerzelt der Genesia (Giess. 1850); Movers, Philistii (Bonn, 1841); Hitzig, Urgesch. und
Mythologie der Philistern (Leipsic, 1852, and Kneess, in
Schenkel's Bibel-Lex. s. v. Philistia. See also Jour.
Frisch, De Origine, dia et terrae Philistiorum (Tubing.
1860); Wolf, Apparatus Philistiorum bibleorum (Vitcb.
1711); Hannecker, De Philistia (Eichstädt, 1872).

Phillips, Gnomoe, a Congregational minister, was
born at Roodham, in the county of Norfolk, England,

near the opening of the 17th century. Having given early indications of a remarkably vigorous mind, a
strong love of knowledge, and a deep sense of religion,
he was sent to the University of Cambridge, where he
received his education, and distinguished himself as a scholar. Theology was his favorite study; and, when
yet a young man, he had made himself familiar with
the most celebrated of the fathers of the Christian Church.

Not long after his ordination he began to entertain scru-

ples with regard to certain requirements of the Estab-
lishments of his Church; this dissatisfaction became so

strong that at last he determined to emigrate to this country
with a company of Puritans, among whom was John
Winthrop. He arrived at Salem in 1630. Having

founded with a number of others the settlement of Wat-
tertown, Mass., Phillips became the first pastor of the
Church, and as such he continued his labors till near
the time of his death, which occurred July 1, 1644.

Phillips possessed no small degree of intellectual acu-

men, and was an able controversial writer. He was

a man of great independence of mind, and adhered with
unyielding tenacity to his conscientious convictions.
He seems to have been in advance of nearly all his con-
temporaries in regard to the principles of strict Congre-
gationalism; insomuch that his views were, for a time,
regarded as novel and extreme. His ministry was
marked by great diligence and fervor, and attended
with rich blessings. His publications are, *Reply to the
Constitution of some Grounds of Infant Baptism*; *as also
Concerning the Form of a Church, putt forth against me
by one Thomas Lamb* (London, 1645, 4to). See Mather,
Reformed Church*, i, 200 sqq.

Phillips, James, D.D., an eminent Presbyterian
divine, was born at Newendon, Essex County, England,
April 22, 1792. His father was a minister of the Estab-
lished Church of England, and attached to the Evangeli-
gical party in that Church. His early education was
acquired mostly while he was engaged in private study
and teaching in the service of the English navy. His
tastes and habits seem to have been fixed early, and to
the impressions which he there received, and the scenes
he witnessed at the great military and naval stations,
may be traced many of his later habits and interests.
He came to America in 1818, and engaged in the busi-

ness of teaching at Harlem, N.Y., where he remained
for a number of years and had a flourishing school. There were at that time in New York and the neighborhood a number of American and
British mathematicians who had organized a mathemati-
cal club, of which he became a member. To the mathe-
matical club he was attached at the time he was a
regular contributor, or at least to two of them—the Math-
ematical Repository and Nash's Diary. In 1826 he was
invited to the vacant mathematical chair in the Univer-
sity of North Carolina, and entered upon the duties of
his professorship in the month of July of the same year. In
this position he continued to labor for forty years, devoting himself with unremitting care and attention to his du-
ties. The amount of work he went through with is
amazing. He projected a complete course of mathe-
matical works, and published in 1828 a work on conic
sections, which was afterwards adopted as a text-book
in Columbia College, New York. He also published a
series of lectures on algebra, geometry, trigonometry, differential and
integral calculus, and natural philosophy, besides mak-
ing for his own use translations of many of the French
mathematicians—which works, however, he never made
any attempt to publish. He also joined the other mem-
ers of the faculty in contributing his quota to the Harvardian, a newspaper published at Chapel Hill, in
1832, under the direction of Dr. Caldwell. Up to the
time of his coming to North Carolina, and for many
years after, he seems to have devoted himself exclu-
sively to scientific studies. Although he had been for
years a consistent member of the Church, yet now he
began to experience a change, which he regarded as the
true beginning of his Christian life. Henceforth he ceased to be the mere teacher of science; he added to his
other duties the diligent study of theology and un-
wearying activity in all Christian duties, and in Septem-
ber, 1838, was licensed by the Presbytery of Orange, at
New Hope, and in April, 1839, was ordained to the full
work of the ministry. He was never installed as pastor,
but he preached as a supply for some time at Pittsboro,
and after his death, the greater part of his Christian
life, at New Hope Church. He was in the full discharge
of his professional duties when he died suddenly March
14, 1867. Dr. Phillips was a man of remarkable literary,
thecological, and professional attainments. He was an
inexorable mathematician, but well and thoroughly read
in all departments. Many books in his library had this
simple comment, "Perlegi." His chief religious reading
was among the old Nonconformist divines; his favorite
authors were the old English classical book that was
ever in his hand was the Bible. He was a great precentor, and his sermons were commended for their
there was nothing oratorical about him—it was the pure
"weight of metal." As a man he was uncompromisingly
conscientious, remarkably modest, free from all arro-
grance and presumption, and yet most genial as a com-
1868, p. 549. (J. L. S.)

Phillips, John, LL.D., an American philanthropist
of some note, was born in Andover, Mass., Dec. 27, 1719;
and was educated at Harvard College (class of 1738); and
having preached for some time, at length engaged in
mercantile pursuits, and was for several years a member
of the Council of New Hampshire. In 1778 he and his
brother, Samuel Phillips, of Andover, founded and liber-
ally endowed the academy in that town, which was in-
corporated in 1780. In 1789 he further gave to this
institution $20,000. The academy called Phillips Ex-
eter Academy, of which he was the sole founder, was
incorporated in 1781, with a fund which was eventually
increased to $134,000. He endowed a professorship in
Dartmouth College, and he contributed liberally to
Princeton College. He died in April, 1795, bequeath-
ing to his academy two thirds of all his estate, and one
third of the residue to the seminary at Andover, par-
ticularly in the benefit of pious youth.

Phillips, Morgan, sometimes called Philip Morgan,
was born during the latter part of the 15th century. He
received his education at Oxford, graduating in the class
of 1587. He was made principal of St. Mary's Hall in 1546,
and was one of the founders of the English College at Douay,
where he resided for some time, but where he was not
so great that he was called "Morgan the Sophister," and
he was one of the three selected to dispute with Peter
Martyr on the Eucharist, and published on that occasion
*Disputatio de Sacramentis Ecclesiasticis in Univ. Oxon.*
*habita contra D. Pet. Martyn*, 1549. He also
published two works in Latin, *De Rebus Wisiensi Con-
formable to the Law of God and Nature* (Ligue, 1571,.
Phillips, Richard, an English Wesleyan preacher, was born in 1777. In early life he was brought to Christ through Methodist influence, and, feeling called of God to the work of the ministry, entered the itinerant ranks in 1810 and continued in the active labors of the ministry until 1844, when debility constrained him to accept an assistant, and to preach only occasionally. "Blessed with a good understanding and a retentive memory, patient and prudent, enjoying the life of God in his soul and manifesting in his life the truths and discipline of Methodism, he preached those doctrines and administered that discipline to the profit of the Wesleyan body." See Wesleyan Magazine, 1846, p. 916.

Phillips, Samuel (1), a Congregational minister, was born Feb. 17, 1690 (O. S.), at Salem, Mass. He graduated at Harvard College in 1708, and was ordained, Oct. 17, 1711, pastor of the South Parish, Andover, where he remained until his death, June 5, 1771. Samuel Phillips was a devoted orthodox preacher, and not only refused to be affected by the heretical tendencies of his times, but combated all Arian influences, and became a most decided opponent of the Unitarians. "As a preacher he was highly respectable, and so endowed not only to indoctrinate his people in sentiments which he deemed correct and important, but to lead them to the practice of all Christian duties." He published, Elegy upon the Death of Nicholas Noyes and George Cgrim (1718);——A Word of Counsel to the Duty of a People to take the Oath of Allegiance to a Glorious God (1725);——Advice to a Child (1729);——The History of the Saviour (1738);——The Orthodox Christian, or a Child well Instructed (1738);——A Minister's Address to his Child, Nov. 23, 1749 (4to);——A Sermon on the Duty to be done for Asking (1750);——A Sermon on the Sinner's Re- fusal to Come to Christ (1758);——A Sermon on the Necessity of God's Drawing in Order to Men's Coming unto Christ (1758);——Seasonable Advice to a Neighbor, in a Dialogue (1761);——Advice to Young People, in a Dialogue (1763); and several occasional sermons. See Sprague, Annals, i, 273.

Phillips, Samuel (2), LL.D., an American philanthropist, noted for his service to the state, derives a place here for the interest which he took in educational matters. He was born at Andover in 1751, and graduated at Harvard College in 1771. He was a member of the Provincial Congress in 1775, and of the House of Representatives till the year 1780, when he assisted in framing the constitution of Massachusetts. On its adoption he was elected a member of the Senate, and was its president from 1785 to 1802. Being appointed justice of the Court of Common Pleas for Essex in 1781, he held his office till 1797, when his declining health induced his resignation. He was commissioner of the state in Schanck's insurrection, and in 1801 was chosen lieutenant-governor. He died Feb. 10, 1802. Although so greatly honored with public eminence, he remained a faithful son of the Church of England, and was not only regular in his own observances, but ministered frequently to those unable to go to church. He appeared to be continually governed by love to the Supreme Being, and by the desire of imitating his benevolence and truth, he was Phillips's deep views of evangelical doctrine and duty, of human depravity and mediatorial mercy, formed his heart to humility, condescension, and kindness, and led him continually to depend on the grace of God through the atonement of his Son. He was one of the protectors of the Museum of the University of Andover, and was much concerned in establishing that, as well as the academy at Exeter, which were founded by his father and uncle. To these institutions he was a distinguished benefactor. He was also a founder of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences of Boston. At his death he left to the town of Andover $5000, the income to be applied to the education of a son of his death his widow, Phoebe Phillips, and his son, John Phillips, of Andover, evinced the same attachment to the interests of learning and religion, by uniting with Samuel Abbott, and three others of a most liberal and benevolent spirit, in founding the theological seminary at Andover, which was opened in September, 1808. See Dibdin, Dict. of Amer. Biog. s. v.; Brown, Rel. Cyclop. s. v.; Drake, Dict. of Amer. Biog. s. v.

Phillips, Thomas, an English Roman Catholic priest, was born in Buckinghamshire in 1708. He received his education at St. Omer's College, and became in his zeal and ardent in the Church. He obtained a prebend in the collegiate church of Tournay for many years in the family of the earl of Shrewsbury. Towards the end of his life he retired to the English college at Lige, where he died in 1774. He published, The Study of Sacred Literature Fully Stated and Considered (London, 1746, 4to); 2d ed. 1758, 3d ed. 1765;)—Phileneum (1761, 4to). This autobiographical pamphlet was privately printed, and suppressed: — The History of the Life of Reginald Pole (Oxford, 1764—1767, 2 pts. in 1 vol. 4to; Lond. 1767, 2 vols. 8vo). This work elicited six answers, by Richard Lillibridge, T. Hakley, T. Neve, E. Stone, B. Pye, and J. Jones (see Chalmers, Biog. xxi, 460—461, 460), and Phillips responded in an appendix to the life (1767, 4to); see also end of his 8d ed. of Study of Sacred Literature:—Reasons for the Repeal of the Law against the Popists:—Translation in Metre of The Hymn Laudis Sion Translationis in Metre Cornelli a Lapide, in Latin, on a single sheet. He also addressed some poetry to his sister Elizabeth, abbess of the Benedictine nuns at Ghent. See Cole's M. S. Athen. in the British Museum; European Magazine, for September, 1796; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth. s. v.

Phillips, William (1), a Christian philanthropist, was born in Boston April 10, 1750. Owing to feeble health, he was prevented from receiving many educational advantages. He entered upon mercantile pursuits with his father, from whom he received a large fortune at his death. In 1772 he made a profession of religion; in 1794 he was made a deacon of Old South Church, Boston, where he officiated until his death, May 26, 1817. He was highly respected by the community at large, and was influential in all the affairs of State and Church. He was at one time the lieutenant-governor of the State and was nominated for the United States Senate. He was also actively engaged in philanthropic labors, and was at his death president of the Massachusetts Bible Society. His charities were very extensive, and during a series of years amounted to from $8000 to $11,000. He bequeathed $15,000 to Phillips Academy; $40,000 to the theological institution at Andover; to the Society for Propagating the Gospel among the Indians, the Massachusetts Bible Society, the Foreign Mission Board, the Congregational Society, the Educational Society, and the Massachusetts General Hospital, each $5000; to the Medical Dispensary $3000; to the Female Asylum, and the Asylum for Boys, each $4000.

Phillips, William (2), a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Jesse County, Ky., May 7, 1757. Even as a youth he exhibited talents of a superior order. He received a careful and pious training, but he did not as a young man manifest any outward profession of religion; and after entering political life, and while engaged for several years as a successful teacher, he became even less considerate of his higher and immortal interests, and sought refuge from the accusations of conscience in the dark and cheerless regions of infidelity. His early impressions of religious truth were, however, strong and abiding, and he was finally converted, and deeply impressed with the idea that he was called of God to enter the Methodist ministry. Dec. 27, 1828, he was licensed as a local
preacher. In the fall of 1831 he was received into the Kentucky Conference. He was appointed consecutively to the Winchester Circuit, Lexington Circuit, and Newport and Covington stations. He was also assistant editor of the Western Christian Advocate, serving for one year by appointment of the District Committee, and then by vote of the General Conference of 1836. Among his numerous contributions to that journal was a series of articles on the peculiar tenets of Alexander Campbell, which excited very considerable attention. These were republished, by request of the Ohio Conference, after Dr. Phillips's death, by the Reformed Union, 1836, only a few weeks after his election by the General Conference.

Phillips, William Wirt, D.D., a Presbyterian divine, was born in Montgomery County, N. Y., Sept. 23, 1796. He graduated at Union College, Schenectady, N. Y., in 1812; completed a three years' course in the Associate or Reformed Theological Seminary, New York, and afterwards spent a year in the theological seminary at New Brunswick, N. J., under the instruction of Rev. Dr. Livingston; was licensed by the New Brunswick Classis of the Reformed Dutch Church, and in April, 1818, was ordained and installed pastor of Pearl Street Reformed Church, New York City. From this church he was called to the First Presbyterian Church, New York. The congregation having disposed of their building and ground in Wall Street, in May, 1844, the corner-stone of the building on Fifth Avenue, near Twenty-third Street, was laid in the following autumn, and soon after completed. Dr. Phillips was their beloved pastor for a period of nearly forty years; he was actively engaged in the discharge of his ministerial duties until about four weeks before his death, which occurred March 20, 1863. Dr. Phillips was a man of the utmost simplicity of character; a sound and able preacher of the Gospel, whose aim in the pulpit was to hold forth the Word of Life in all its purity, and to impress it with solemnity upon the hearts of all his hearers. He was moderator of the General Assembly which met at Pitts- burgh in 1855, and for many years previous to his death he was the presiding officer of the Board of Foreign Missions. He was also president of the Board of Publication; a trustee of Princeton College and Seminary; a director of the Sailors' Snug Harbor, and several other benevolent institutions. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1866, p. 160; Congreg. Quar. 1859, p. 133. (J. L. S.)

Philippoteaux, Henry, D.D., an English prelate of much note, was the son of a respectable hotel-keeper of Gloucester, and was born in that city in 1777. At the age of fifteen he was elected to a scholarship at Corpus Christi College, Oxford, and having taken the degree of B.A., gained the chancellor's prize for an English essay in 1795. He was elected in the following year to a fellowship at Magdalen College, which he vacated on his marriage in 1804 with Miss Suttees, a niece of the late lord chancellor Eldon. In 1806 he became chaplain to Dr. Barrington, bishop of Durham, and in that capacity distinguished himself by a controversy in which he maintained against the learned Roman Catholic historian of the England, Dr. Languid (q. v.), and subsequently by the publication of some pamphlets, vindicating the established clergy in the North from the attacks of lords Grey and Durham. For those services he was rewarded with the living of the jurisdiction of Chester, which he exchanged in October, 1830, for the bishopric of Exeter. As a member of the House of Lords, bishop Philippoteaux proved the zealous champion of Tory principles, and consequently opposed the Reform Bill, the Irish Church Temporalities Bill, the Poor-law Bill, the Ecclesiastical Commission, the National Education Bill, and every measure of a liberal tendency. Dr. Philippoteaux was for many years in that assembly the recognised episcopal head and representative of the extreme HighChurch party, and by his writings and speeches warmly advocated the revival of convocation, and of other innovations which were calculated to cause a religious reformation. In 1849 he rejected Mr. Gorham, who was nominated by the crown to a living in Devonshire, on the ground that he held erroneous opinions as to the effects of infant baptism; and though he was supported by the ecclesiastical courts, their judgment could not be made to prevail by a vote of the judicial committee of the privy council in 1850. On this Dr. Philippoteaux published a Letter in which he formally excommunicated the archbishop of Canterbury, who had been a party to the decision (see Edinb. Rev. xcv. 98-103). See Gorham Case. In the following year he held a synod of his clergy at Exeter, which was pronounced illegal by the officers of the crown, and has never since been summoned. He died in 1869. The list of Dr. Philippoteaux's controversial pamphlets occupies no less than twelve pages in the new catalogue of the British Museum. His best-known publications are given in Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, &c. See English Cyclop. &c. &c. Men of the Time, &c. &c. Blackwood's Mag. xxiv, 1; xxv, 157; Dublin University Mag. xx, 223; Fraser's Mag. ii, 677; Lond. Athen. 1861, i, 161.

Philos (surnamed in Latin Judaeus, i. e. the Jew; in Hebrew, יודאוס; in Greek, Philou [i] Φιλοθε̄ο̂ς], the greatest of ancient Jewish philosophers, flourished in the 1st century of the Christian era. He gave a somewhat lengthy exposition of his philosophic and religious opinions.

Life.—Philos was a native and throughout life a resident of Alexandria. The precise time of his birth is unknown, but he represents himself as of advanced age about A.D. 40, when he was sent as chief of an embassy from the Jews of Alexandria to the emperor Claudius, for the purpose of pleading their cause against Apion, who charged them with refusing to pay due honors to Cesar (Josephus, Ant. xviii, 8, 1; comp. De Legat. ad Caesar, xxviii). He was probably about sixty years old; if so, he was born about thirty years before the commission to Alexander mentioned in Acts iv, 6 as a man "of the kindred of the high-priest." That Philos was a member of the sacerdotal family is asserted by Josephus (Ant. xviii, 8, 1), and also by Eusebius, Jerome, and others, and his own writings indirectly testify that such was the fact. There is all reason to believe that he belonged to the sect of the Pharisees. Philos was eminent for his learning and eloquence. To the attainments usually secured by Jews of his social condition (Eusebius, Prep. Evang., viii, 13) he added an extensive knowledge of the Greek philosophy, especially the Platonic, for the acquisition of which the most favorable opportunities would occur in Alexandria, at that time the very metropolis of the learned world and the home of revived Hellenism. He has been represented by Scaliger and Cadwath as ignorant of Jewish literature and customs, but Fabricius and Mom- 
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they were no longer so much at home and versed in it that they could have fully mastered the Book which was to offer them the bread and water of life; it was the Grecian language that must bring it home to them." (p. 146; comp. also p. 148). As absurd as is this charge of Philo, it now speak the truth; the change of men's views was not fully apparent. Helpless and hopeless enough were the clique of men out of whom the first two Ptolemies hoped to form a school of philosophy; men certainly clever enough, and amusing withal, who might give the kings of Egypt many a shrewd lesson in kingscraft and the arts of this world, and the art of profit by the folly of fools and the selfishness of the selfish; or who might amuse them, in default of fighting-cocks, by puns and repartees, and battles of logic: 'how one thing cannot be predicated of another,' or 'how the wise man is not only to overcome every misfortune, but not even to feel it,' and other such weighty questions, which in those days hid that deep unbelief in any truth whatsoever which was spreading fast over the minds of men... during those frightful centuries which immediately preceded the Christian era, when was fast approaching that dark chaos without unbelieving, of the three worlds, of the Saul of Tarsus so analyzes and describes in the first chapter of his Epistle to the Romans; when the old light was lost, the old faiths extinct, the old reverence for the laws of family and national life destroyed, yea, the very nature of things, so that the chaos of whose darkness Juseph and Petrus and Tuci- tus have proved in their fearful pages not to have been exaggerated by the more compassionate though more righteous Jew" (p. 55-58).

Fortunately for the Macedonians, another Eastern nation had closely intermingled with them, and from this mixture of two races came that superior product which gave to Alexandrian thought not only a new impulse, but a superior life. When Hellenism was transferred to Alexandria, the Grecian spirit, as we have seen, could not do without a base, and with Hellenism had come Judaism also. True, the latter was not sought for and imported at the bidding of the mighty conqueror of three worlds, but he had suffered the Jews to find a home in Alexandria, and thus Judaism found its establishment there and there. The Ptolemies also pursued the same conciliatory policy; and Judaism gained strength and developed so much at Alexandria that it became a centre of Jewish thought and learning for several centuries, and its rabbis were called "the light of Israel."

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

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

The allegorical method of interpreting the sacred Scriptures, which had long prevailed among the more cultivated of the Alexandrian Jews, was adopted by Philo without restriction. His principle that the prophets were only involuntary instruments of the Spirit which spoke through them was favorable to the freest use of this mode of exegesis. He pronounced those who would merely tolerate a literal interpretation of the Scriptures as low, unworthy, and superstitious; and while he was thus led astray frequently to the introduction of foreign heathen elements into the store of divine truths, Philo endeavored to redeem the results which, like all the anthropomorphisms for instance, seemed offensive to the culture of the time, Philo, like Origen (q.v.) in later times, far from rejecting the literal sense in every case, often, especially in the case of historical events, preterite and protracted, and the allegorical sense as equally true. But Philo, besides this, regarded as higher that conception of Scripture which penetrated beneath the shell of the letter to what he thought was the kernel of philosophical truth; beneath the anthropomorphic and anthropopathic representations of God, to that idealistic view of God which, in fact, dissolves him in the end of all concrete attributes. In this way, in spite of his opposition to Hellenic mysteries, Philo set up a radical distinction of initiated and uninitiated, a mode of interpretation which leads very easily to the contempt of the letter and, thus to an un-historical, abstractly spiritualistic tendency. See Interpretation. As a devoted, believing Jew, Philo accepted Judaism as a truth requiring no proof. But in him, as in others of the Alexandrian-Jewish school of philosophers before him, the desire was awakened to blend the Jewish inheritance with the newly acquired Greekian knowledge: to heighten the truths of Judaism by the addition of Hellenic culture; to reconcile both treasures with each other, so that each should make the lustre of the other shine the more clearly and brightly; to assimilate the Jewish theologically, and the Hellenic philosophically. The compromises must be effected between them. Judaism is the fruit of self-evidence, inner experience of a vivid conviction, for which no proof is required. Hellenism, on the contrary, proceeded from investigation, from human research, starting from the physical, to reach, by combination and analysis, the higher idea. These are two processes not only diverging in their progress, but even in their whole conception, and these two directly antagonistic views clashed against each other. But there was also in Hellenism a tendency which, although grown from the (Grecian) spirit, nevertheless endeavored to conceive, by a certain prophetic flight of poetry, the higher, thence to descend to the lower, and thus to make the former descend into lower degrees. It desired likewise directly to conceive the divine, the ideal, by intuition, by higher perception. With such a bold flight Plato conceived the everlasting Good, the everlasting Beautiful, whence individual ideals evolve themselves, which as archetypes— we are not told whether they have a distinct existence, or must be regarded as the images of the ideas, in the same manner as real objects, perfect in themselves, while the several visible objects represent them in a limited degree. This was a system which especially suited the philosophizing Jews; it afforded them a bridge between the purely spiritual and the physical objects. How does the Highest Spirit, the eternally Perfect One, enter into the finite world? He creates ideals from himself, says Plato. He intraposes himself, and thus perfection is produced; but this perfection impresses itself upon more subordinate existences, and thus it descends from immediate causes to intermediate causes, until the real objects spring into existence, and creation becomes manifest to us; God, the eternal, is the cause of all. But the highest cause, but the eternally Pure One does not immediately come into contact with the impure—only by means of manifold emanations and concatenations, the earthly grows into existence. Such views afforded the Jewish philosophers a happy means of preserving the theory of the infallibility and inconceivability of God, and yet of accepting the different figurative expressions concerning God in the Bible, because they could refer to the subordinate beings. Hellenism of that time, stiff and sober as it was, was unif to conceive native, poetic images, and to admit poetical expression without fearing that thereby the sublimity of thought might be violated. The latter was tenaciously adhered to, and whenever it expressed entities too directly, it had to yield to forced interpretations. To such also the Bible was frequently allegorized, which the Jewish spirit, which is forcibly driven from their natural simplicity into artificial philosophemes, in the belief that their value would thus be enhanced. The figurative expressions and events in connection with God were referred to such subordinate and artificers, who had evolved themselves from God. In the writings of Philo that intermediate agency is comprised in the Logos.

As with Plato and the elder Greeks, so with Philo, theology was the ultimate object of all metaphysical science. But there arose a puzzle in the mind of the Jewish philosopher, as in reality it had already arisen in the minds of Socrates and Plato. How could he reconcile the idea of that absolute and eternal one Being; that Zeus, Father of gods and men, self-perfect, self-contained, without change or motion, in whom, as a Jew, he believed; that Yahweh, synonymous with the Demon of Socrates, the divine teacher whom both Plato and Solomon confessed? Or how, again, could he reconcile the idea of him with the creative and providential energy, working in space and time, working in matter, and apparently affected and limited, if not baffled, by the imperfection of the matter which he moulded? Philo offered a solution in that idea of a Logos, or Word of God, of divinity articulate, speaking and acting in time and space, and therefore by successive acts, and so doing in time and space the will of the One, in the timelessness of the word, One, the eternal Being, of whom he was the perfect likeness. In calling this person the Logos, and making him the source of all human reason, and knowledge of eternal laws, he only translated from Hebrew into Greek the name which he found in his sacred books, "The Word of God." Of God himself, Philo teaches that he is incorporeal, invisible, and cognizable only through the reason; that he is the most universal of beings, the Being to whom alone being, as such, truly pertains; that he is more excellent than virtue, than science, or even than the good, so that it is not beautiful per se. He is one and simple, imperishable and eternal; his existence is absolute and separate from the world; the world is his work. Thus while Philo contends that God is to be worshiped as a personal being, he yet conceives him at the same time as the most general of existences. In the same way that God is the only truly existent being, to or (De Soma, i. 655, ed. Mang.). But Philo, similarly to the Neo-Platonists of a later epoch, advances upon the Platonic doctrine by representing God as the reason of all things and the fountain of knowledge and virtue— as Plato had done—but as above the idea of the Good—εις την ἁρμανιν, και εις την ἁσιστημονεται, και εις τον θρόνον του αὐτοῦ πανίκην και εις τον θρόνον του αὐτοῦ παλαιον (De Mand. Officio, 1, 2, ed. Mang.)—with which Plato identifies him—and by teaching that we do not arrive at the absolute by scientific demon-
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Neander, "In proportion as he occupied the standpoint which divested the Divine Being of human qualities, or that which favored anthropomorphism, the ideal or the symbological, might not the λόγος appear as a power of God or as a hypostatic being?" Philo describes the λόγος, therefore, as the first-born before all existence, the original and uncreated source of all wisdom and the ideal reflection of God, as the αρχή γεγονός among the angels, as the original power of the divine powers. Alluding to the νους παράδειγμα of Plato, he describes him as the world-constructing reason; he compares the Logos of the Logos of Plato to the λόγος of the soul of the world; he calls him God's vicegerent in the world (Επιγεγέρσας); he gives him the office of mediator between God and the universe, since the connection of phenomena with God is effected through the reason revealed in the world. Hence he is the high-priest of the world, the advocate (παράδειγμα) for the defects of men with God, and generally the revealer of the divine nature to the universe. The Logos is the archetype of the reason, which is formed not after the Absolute itself, the Θεός, but after the Logos. He, as the revelation of the Absolute in the man, is the only true mediator of man, according to Genesis, was created. In this connection he calls the Logos the ideal man; and alluding to a Jewish mystical idea, the original man. In the Logos is the unity of the collected revelations of the Divine Being which is individualized in man. In general, everything that is called a revelation centers in the Logos, the Logos be the Divine Being as he is in himself and his revelation in the Logos, or the οἶνος and the λίγαναι. The revelation of God in creation—in all positive revelation—in the communication of separate ideas by peculiar dogmas—all this forms part of the knowledge of the revealed God in the phenomenal world, and of the symbolic knowledge from the standpoint of the νους τοῦ λόγου, over which the standpoint of the νους τοῦ Θεοῦ is raised. But this Logos by Philo is only a sort of intermediate being between God, who is in his nature hidden, simple, without attributes, and the eternal, shapeless, chaotic matter (the Platonic Θαλάτζα). It is the reflection, the first-born Son of God; the second God; the sum of the ideas, which are the original types of all existence; the ideal world itself (εικός νομοκρατεία); the medium through which the actual, sensible world (εικός ουσιοδοτικός) is created and upheld; the interpreter and revealer of God; the archangel, who destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah, spoke to Jacob and to Moses in the burning bush, and led the people of Israel through the wilderness in a pillar of fire and a cloud. By the Logos, an υπάρχον of the Father (παράδειγμα), who pleads the cause of sinful humanity before God, and procures for it the pardon of its guilt. We see an apparent affinity of this view with the chriology of St. Paul and St. John, and thus it probably came to exert no small influence with the early Church fathers in the evolution of their doctrine of the Logos. But at the same time we must not overlook the very essential difference. Philo's doctrine would not itself suggest the application of the idea of the Logos to any historical appearance whatever; for the revelation not only by the Logos, but indeed by the Logos itself, was never presented by Philo as a single fact, but to everything relating to the revelation of God in nature and history. If, according to John's Gospel, the appearance of the Logos is the highest and only medium of communication with God, then communion with the Logos in Philo's sense can only be supposed, in the highest degree, to be an immediate apprehension of the Absolute. Yet out of this religious idealism a preparation and a medium might be formed for Christian realism, when what was here taken in a merely ideal sense showed itself as realized in human reality. Christian theology was the immediate result of the revelation of God in human nature, to the one revelation in Christ; and substitutes for the immediate apprehension of the Absolute the historically founded communion with God revealed in Christ. The symbolic meaning of Philo's Paraclete was elevated by the reference to the
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historical Christ as the only high-priest. Thus the Alexandrian ideas formed a bridge to Christianity. But we cannot regard the doctrine of a union of the Logos with humanity, in all its forms, as the only thing which it appeared to reflect in the first place of Christology, but must doubtless presuppose a tendency of this kind before the Christian era. A yearning of the spirit goes before great events—an unconscious longing for that which is to come. This must especially have been the case with the greatest representatives of the religious development of humanity experienced. It was preceded by an unconscious feeling of a revelation of the spiritual world to humanity—a longing which hastened to meet the new communications from God. It was not difficult for those who regarded the Logos as the medium of revelation, by which God made himself cognizable to pious souls, and, on the other hand, who held the Messiah to be the highest of God's messengers, to suppose a particular connection between him and the Logos. But, after all, this Jewish idea of the Logos is quite eclipsed by the Christian idea of the Messiah : with the Jews it is simply the hope of their miraculous restoration from all parts of the world to Palestine, through the agency of a superhuman appearance (τό δοξά); and even this super-
natural phenomenon has no legitimate place in Philo's system of thought. But his dualistic and idealistic view of the world absolutely excludes an incarnation, which is the central truth of Christianity (comp. Dorner, Person of Christ). His Christ, if he needed any, could have been at best but a gnostic, do-
catistic, fantastic Christ; his redemption, but ideal and intellectual. He attained only an artificial harmony between God and the world, between Judaism and hea-
thenism; which hovered, like a „spectral illusion,” an
“evanescent fata morgana,” on the horizon of dawn-
ing Christianity. Says Schaff, “It is a question not yet
everly settled whether the idea of the Logos was a personal
hypostasis or merely a personification, a divine attri-
but. While Gfrörer, Grossmann, Dähne, Lücke, Ritter,
and Semisch maintain the former view, Dorner (Ent-
wicklungsgeschichte der Lehre von der Person Christi, 2d ed.
1, 26 sq.) has latterly attempted to re-establish the
other. To me, Philo himself seems to vibrate between
the two views; and this obscurity accounts for the dif-
ference among so distinguished scholars on this point”
(Hist. of the Apostolic Churc., p. 190).
The eternal atonement, which Philo imagined already made
and eternally ready for all, he regarded as the efficacy
only by a creative act of the condescending love of
God; and it is a remarkable instance of divine wisdom in
history that this reeding act was really performed about
the same time that the greatest Jewish philoso-
pher, while the age was still in the dawning of and an-
nouncing to the world a glorious shadow of it.
Of his other philosophic speculations we have space
only to refer to some of his ethical views. With him
knowledge and virtue are gifts of God, to be obtained
only by self-alignment on the part of man. A life of
contemplation in superior places or forms of practical, politi-

cal occupation. In other words, the business of man is to
follow and imitate God (De Caritate, ii, 404, et pass.).
The soul must strive to become the dwelling-place of
God, his holy temple, and so to become strong, whereas
it was before weak, and wise, whereas before it was
foolish (De Somn. i, 23). The highest blessedness is to
abide in God (πάντα τοις ὑπερωνοις τὸ ἐκλειστός καὶ ἐφικ-
τος ἐν μόνῳ στήναις). The various minor sciences
serve as a preparatory training for the knowledge of
God. Of the philosophical discussions logical and phys-
ics are of little worth. The highest step in the philo-

sophy of Philo is to be the intuition of the Logos, to
which the sage attains through divine illumination when, completely renounc-
ing himself and leaving behind his finite self-conscious-
ness, he resigns himself unreservedly to the divine in-
fluence.

It remains for us to notice the use that has been made
of Philo's writings within the domain of New-Test. in-
terpretation. There are some Christian exegiists who
in their rationalistic tendency have gone so far as to
account for the character and style of some of the New-
Test. Scriptures by referring their origin to Philo
(Weissenius, Krito's Biblical Cy-
clopædia.). Mr. Grinfield, in his Hellenistic Greek Testa-
ment, and the accompanying Scholia, has derived many
of his notes from the works of Philo; in the applica-
tion, however, of such illustrations, it must be borne in
mind that Philo's style was hardly a natural one; it is
very elaborate, and avoids Alexandrian provincialisms,
and on that account often fails to elucidate the simple
diction of the New Test., even where there is similarity
in the subject-matter (comp. Carpovill Evex. Exerc. in
Ep. ad Heb. 40). The Alexandrian school are not content with finding in Philo
such illustration of the New Test. as might be expected to
occur in a contemporary, and in some respects kindred,
Grecian writer; they go so far as to assert that some of
the prominent doctrines of the sacred writers are little
else than accommodations from the Neo-Platonism of
Philo, immediate or immediate. Thus Grossmann (Quastr. Philos.,
sub init.) does not scruple to say that Christianity is
the product of the allegories of the Jewish synagogue
and of Philo. Other writers, more measured in their
terms, trace the source of Christ's kingdom, his
resurrection, the well-disposed Erastini (Institutes), and
after him Lücke, who says, "It is impossible to mistake as
to the immediate historical connection of John's doc-
trine of the Logos with the Alexandrian in its more
perfect form, as it occurs in Philo." Similarly, Strauss,
De Wette, and others; while others again apply the
type of criticism to St. Paul. Among these we must
especially notice Gfrörer, whose work, Philo and die jü-
disch-alexandrinische Theologie, has been made acces-
sible to English readers, in an abridged form, by Prof.
Jowett, in his dissertation St. Paul and Philo, contained
in his commentary on St. Paul's Eph. i, 363-417. No
criticism, however, is to be tolerated by the believer in
Revelation which does not start from the principle that
the characteristic truths of Christianity are self-evolved,
i. e. (to use Dorner's words) "have not emerged from
without Christianity, but wholly from within it" (Per-
son of Christ [Clark], vol. i, Introduction, p. 45).

Instead of making Philo, in any sense, a fountain-head
of Christian doctrine, it would be more correct to regard
him as the unconscious source of antichristian opinion
—and unconscious source, for all the influence which
he exerted in the skill in style, Philo possessed not those energetic qual-
ities which characterize founders of schools of opinion.
To say nothing of Philo's influence upon the theo-
osophizing fathers of the church, Clement of Alexandria
and Origen, who borrowed largely from their Jewish
predecessor and further developed, critics, some of the salient her-

eies of the early centuries had almost their spring in the
Philonian writings (for the affinity of the opposite
opinions of Arius and Sabellius to certain opinions of
Philo, see Mosheim's Notes on Cudworth cited below); while
that pagan philosophers, in this Neo-Platonism, which derived much of its strength and ob-
tained its ultimate defeat from the Christianity which
it both adored and hated, is mainly traceable to our Philo.
For a popular but sufficiently exact statement of (1)
Philo's relation to Neo-Platonism, and (2) of the antith-
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instance his delineation of the character of Pontius Pilate (De Legat. ad Cisiam, xxviii, Richter, vi, 184; Bohn, iv, 164). This well-drawn sketch of such a man, from the masterly hand of a contemporary, throws considerable light on more than one point, such as the relationship of Pilate to his people, which is slightly touched in the Gospels (comp. Hale's Apologet., iii, 216-218). As a second instance, may we not regard the remarkable passage of St. Paul as receiving light from Philo's view of the twofold creation, first of the heavenly (Ioanouc) or ideal man, and then of the earthly (yiyoc) man? (Comp. 1 Cor. xvi, 46, 47; with Philo, De Allegor. Leg., i, 12, 13 [Richter, i, 68; Bohn, i, 60]; and De Mundi Orig. Op. p. 46 [Richter, i, 43; Bohn, i, 59]; and see Stanley on Corinthienses, i, 351.) But then such illustration is either an example of how Philo is corrected by St. Paul, than of how St. Paul borrowed from Philo. Respecting the allegorical method of interpreting the Old Testament, of which the apostle is alleged to have derived the idea from our author, it should be remembered that St. Paul, guided by the Divine Spirit, who had indited the ancient Scriptures, was directed to apply Old-Test. figures to New-Test. truth. A parallelism of this kind, I think, is the only great scheme of providential dispensation; whereas Philo's adaptations of the same facts were only the product of an arbitrary and extremely fanciful imagination; so that in the case of the former we have an authoritatively compelled interpretation, while in the latter event the allegory was without ever impairing their historical and original truth, whereas the latter affords us nothing besides the conjectures of a mind of great vivacity indeed, but often capricious and inconsistent, which always postposes the truth of history to its allegorical sense, and oftentimes wholly reduces it to a simple myth. Readers of Philo are well aware of the extravagance and weakness of many of his allegories: of these some are inoffensive, no doubt; and some others are even neat and interesting, but none carry with them the simple dignity and expressiveness of the true allegory of the Old Testament. St. Paul and Philo, it is well known, have both treated the history of Hagar and Sarah allegorically (comp. Gal. iv, 22-31 with Philo, De Congresu, p. 1-5 [Richter, ii, 71-76; Bohn, ii, 157-162]; and see Lightfoot, Epist. to Gal. p. 189-191; and Howson's Hagar and Arabah, p. 30, 36, 37); but although we have here one of the best specimens of Philo's favorite method, how infinitely does it fall short of St. Paul's! To say nothing of authority, it falls in terseness and point, and all the features of proper allegory. The reader will at once perceive that we are dealing with a very different thing.

Literature.—For an account of Philo's philosophical and theological system in general, the reader is referred to Mosheim's notes on cudworth, p. 640-649 [transl. by Harrison, ii, 230-333], where Philo's influence on Pietism and early heresy, especially the Sabellian, is clearly traced; to Ritter, Hist. of Philo, [transl. by Morrison], iv, 407-478; and to Döllinger, Th. Gentil. et Jee, [transl. by Darrell], ii, 389-408; Neander, Hist. of Christ, Dogma, xi, 185 sq.; id. Ch. Hist, p. 84 sq.; Ueberweg, Hist. of Philos., ii, 225 sq.; Schaff, Hist. of the Christian Church, p. 269; Tellenmann, Geschichte der jüdisch-alemannischen Philosophie, 2 p., p. 170 sq.; Fabricius, Diss. de Platonismo Philonis (Leips. 1693, 4to); id. Sylog. Dissertat. (Hamb. 1738, 4to); Stahl, Attempt at a Systematical Statement of the Doctrines of Philo of Alexandria, in the Algem. Bibl. der Bibl. Literatur of Eichhorn, tom. iv, fasc. v; Schreiter, Ideas of Philo respecting the Immortality of the Soul, the Resurrection, and Future Retribution, in the Assembler of Keil and Tischendorf, vol. i, sec. 2; see also vol. iii, sec. 2; Scheffer, Quaestiones, pt. ii, 1829-31; Groot, Quaestiones Philippicenses, pt. ii, 1831-37; Der Glaubensbegriff, der Philosophen und Aposteln (1867); Grotius, Philo et die Alexandriae Theologiae (1831, 1853, 2 vols.); Dähne, Geschichtliche Darstellung der jüdisch-alemannischen Philosophie (1881), pt. i; id. in the Thol. Studien und Kritiken, 1883, p. 984; Bacher, Philo- helmische Studien (1849); Creuzer, Kräfz der Schriften des Juden Philon in, Thol. Studien und Kritiken, Janu- ary, 1882. Philo's opinions about the divine Logos have been warmly discussed. The ancients, as we have seen, were fond of identifying them with Christian doctrine; Mangey, in the middle of the last century, accompanied his splendid edition of Philo's works (2 vols.), with a dissertation, in which he made our author an apostle, in the Christian sense, a distinct personality to the Logos; bishop Bull had stated a similar opinion (Def. Fid. Ant. [transl. by the Rev. Peter Holmes for the Anglo. Cath. Lib.], i, 81-83); and, more recently, Bryant (Sentimentes Philo, Lond., 1848) has shown himself in favor of this theory; and, very lately, Fye Smith (Messian, i, 573-600). But the conclusions of these writers, however learnedly asserted, have been abundantly refuted in many works; the chief of which are Carpozio, Dieuqet de la giocn Philon, nos John, admonus Mangey (1749); Caesar Morgan's Investigation of the Divinity of Plato and of Philo Jud.; Burton'sampton Lectures, note 93, p. 550-560; and Dörner's Person of Christ [Clarke], i, 22-41. (See also the able articles of professors H. B. Smith and Moses Stuart, in the Bibliotheca Sacra, vi, 156-185, and vii, 269-782.) An attempt to recede to the view of the Alexandrian circle and its relation to Judaism, from the Jewish point of view, occurs in Jonst's Geschichte des juden, i, 879-899 (the chapter is designated Die Gnosis des Juden), ii, 298 sq.; Schultz, Die jüdische Religionsgeschichte, vol. ii, 939-962, and no at all without ever impairing their historical and original truth, whereas the latter affords us nothing besides the conjectures of a mind of great vivacity indeed, but often capricious and inconsistent, which always postposes the truth of history to its allegorical sense, and oftentimes wholly reduces it to a simple myth. Readers of Philo are well aware of the extravagance and weakness of many of his allegories: of these some are inoffensive, no doubt; and some others are even neat and interesting, but none carry with them the simple dignity and expressiveness of the true allegory of the Old Testament. St. Paul and Philo, it is well known, have both treated the history of Hagar and Sarah allegorically (comp. Gal. iv, 22-31 with Philo, De Congresu, p. 1-5 [Richter, ii, 71-76; Bohn, ii, 157-162]; and see Lightfoot, Epist. to Gal. p. 189-191; and Howson's Hagar and Arabah, p. 30, 36, 37); but although we have here one of the best specimens of Philo's favorite method, how infinitely does it fall short of St. Paul's! To say nothing of authority, it falls in terseness and point, and all the features of proper allegory. The reader will at once perceive that we are dealing with a very different thing.

Besides Mangey's edition of Philo, above referred to, we mention Turnebus's edition (Paris, 1552, fol.), emended by Hoeschelius (Colom. Allobrog. 1618; Paris, 1640; Francof. 1691); Pfeiffer's edition, incomplete (Er- langen, 1785-92, 5 vols, 8vo), and the convenient edition by Richter (Leips. 1828-30, 8 vols. 12mo). This last contains not only a reprint of Mangey, in the first six volumes, but two supplementary volumes of Philo's writings, discovered by Angelo Mai in a Florentine MS., and by Bapt. Acher in an Armenian version, and translated by him into Latin. In an edition of Philo wished to be to deserve the approbation of the critical student has been pointed out by different German theologians, most recently by Creuzer, in Theol. Studi- en u. Kritiken, 1832, p. 1-43. A popular and cheap edition was published at Leipsic (1851), also at Philo- nomes, ed. Tischendorf (Leips. 1869). A fuller account of these editions, with a list of the various versions of Philo's writings, which have been made from time to time into Latin, Hebrew, German, French, Italian, Spanish, and English, is in Canusenius Furst's Bibl. Jud. First adds a catalogue of all the leading works with which Philo and his writings have been treated. To his list of versions we must add here the useful one published by Mr. Bohn, in four vols. of his Eccl Library, by Mr. Yonge.

For a complete, and withal succinct examination of
PHILO

the entire field of Philo's opinions, we refer to Herzog's *Real-Encyklopädie*. More short and more accessible, but inevitably imperfect, notices occur in Smith's *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biographers and Mythologists*, iii, 309 sq.; *Cassels' Atheneaum*, ii, 488; *Clarke's Scripture Dictionary*, p. 214; *Horne's Hebrew Introduction* [by Eyre], p. 277, 278; [by Davidson], p. 383–385; Davidson's *Hermeneutics* [Clarke, 1848], p. 63–65; *Fairbairn's Hermetick Man*, p. 47. A temperate review of Jowett's *Dissertation on Philo and St. Paul* may be found, written by Dr. Lightfoot, in the *Journal of Philology*, iii, 119–121; and for some views respecting Philo's doctrine of the Logos, as bearing upon the writings of the New Testament, see Neander's *Planting of the Christian Church* [Bohn], ii, 13–15; Westcott's *Introduction*, p. 138–148; and Tholuck's *St. John* [Clarke], p. 62–67. For a glimpse of Jewish and Greek the writings of their philosophic countryman is curiously exhibited in the Hebrew version certain of them. These are enumerated by Fürst, *Bibl. Judaica*, ii, 90. *A. de Rossi*, one of the translators, has revived Philo's *Synonymia* edited by him, which was anciently designated in Rabbinical literature (see Bartholomew, *et al.*, and Steinschneider's *Bodl. Catal. a v.* Philon).

**Philo Carpathius** (from Carpathus, an island north-east of Crete), or, rather, *Carparhas* (from Carpathia, a town in the north of Cyprus), an Eastern ecclesiastical, flourished about the opening of the 5th century. He is unique in the history of literature, as deriving his cognomen from his having been ordained bishop of Carpathia by Epiphanius, the well-known bishop of Constantia. According to the statements of Joannes and Polybius, bishop of Rhodes, in their life of Epiphanius (*Vita Epiphani* ch. xlix), Philo, at that time a deacon, was sent along with some others, by the sister of the emperors Arcadius and Honorius, to bring Epiphanius to Rome, that through his prayers and the laying on of hands she might be saved from a dangerous disease under which she was laboring. Pleased with Philo, Epiphanius ordained him bishop of Carpathia, but gave him charge of his own diocese during his absence. This was about the beginning of the 5th century (*Cave, Hist. Litt.* p. 240, ed. Geneva). Philo Carpathius is principally known from his commentary on the Canticles, which he treats allegorically. A Latin translation, or, rather, paraphrase of this commentary, with ill-assorted interpolations from the commentary of Gregory I, by Salutatus, was published (Paris, 1557, and reprinted in the *Bibl. Patr. Lat. Patrum*, vol. v.). Fragments of Philo's commentary are inserted in that of St. Isidore of Seville (*Cave, Bibl.*, edited by Meursius (Lugd. Batav. 1617). In these he is simply named Philo, without the surname. Banduriu, a Benedictine monk, published in 1705 a genuine edition, which he never fulfilled. An edition, however, was published from a Vatican MS. in 1756, under the name of Epiphanius, and edited by Poggio. The most important edition, however, is that of Giaconcellus (Rome, 1772), from two MSS. This has the original Greek, a Latin translation, with notes, and is accompanied by the entire Greek text of the Canticles, principally from the Alexandrian recension. This is reprinted in Galland, *N. Bibl. Patr.*, i, 718; Ernesti (Neuere Theolog. Bibl.* vol. iii, pt. vi), in a review of this edition, of which he thinks highly, is of opinion that the commentary, as we have it, is but an abridgment of the original. Besides this commentary, Philo wrote on various parts both of the Old and New Testaments, of which are contained in the various *Cicero*. See *Suida*., *Cave, I.* C. Fabricius, *Bibl. Grav. viii, 396, 611; viii, 645; x, 479; Smith, *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography*, a. v.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, a. v.

**Philo the Dialectician. See Philo the Magarian.**

**Philo of Larissa.** An academic philosopher of Athens, flourished in the century preceding the Christian era. He quitted the Greek capital on the success of the army of Mithridates, and went to Rome, where he had Cicero for a disciple. He gained renown by his services to philosophical science. He furnished a more complete and systematic division of the different branches of philosophy, and was metaphysic in his terms. He is also often spoken of as the founder of the third academy. See Tenmann, *Manual of History of Philosophy*; Cebrer, *History of Philosophy* (see Index in vol. ii).

**Philo the Magarian, of Dialectician, was a disciple of Diodorus Cronus, and a friend of Zeno, though older than him.** According as the residence (vii, 16) is correct. In his *Menezes* he mentioned the five daughters of his teacher (Clem. Alex. *Strom.* iv, 528, ed. Peter), and disputed with him respecting the idea of the possible, and the criteria of the truth of hypothetical propositions. With reference to the first point, Philo approximated to Aristotle, as he recognised that not only what is, or will be, is possible (as Diodorus maintained), but also what is in itself conformable to the particular purpose of the object in question, as of charm to burn (κατὰ ὁμοίως ἐπιρροήν ἠπότιμη, *Alex, Aphrod. Nat. Qual.* i, 14; comp. on the whole question Harris, in *Upton's Arrian* *Discertat.* *Epict.* ii, 19, ap. Schweighäuser, ii, 515, etc.). Diodorus had allowed the validity of hypothetical propositions only when the antecedent clause could never lead to an untrue conclusion, whereas Philo regarded those only as false which with a correct antecedent had an incorrect conclusion (Sext. Empir. *Adr. Math.* viii, 113, etc.; *Hypotyp.* ii, 110; comp. Cicero, *Acad.* ii, 47; *De Fato*, 6). Both accordingly had sought for criteria for correct sequence in the members of hypothetical propositions, and each of them in a manner corresponding to what he maintained respecting the ideas of the possible. Chrysippus attacked the assumption of each of them.

The Philo who is spoken of as an Athenian and a disciple of Pyrrhus, though ridiculed by Timon, was not a sophist, as some have supposed, but different from Philo the dialectician (*Diog. Laert. ix, 67, 69*). Jeronimo (*Nov.* 1) speaks of Philo the dialectician and the author of the *Menezes* as the instigator of Carneades, in contradiction to chronology, perhaps, in order to indicate the sceptical direction of his doctrines.

**Philo the Monk.** An ascetic treatise, bearing the name of Philo Monachus, whom *Cave* (*Hist. Litt.* p. 176) seems to be much later than the other ecclesiastical writers of the same name, is preserved in the library of the University of Vienna (*Cave, Bibl.* 332, No. 15). It is entitled *Contus Philotheodori Fsenarium.*

**Philo the Phytogoran.** Clemens Alexandrinus (*Strouvi, i, 305) and Sozomen (i, 12) mention Philo ο Πυθγόριος. It is probable from their language that they both mean by the person so designated Philo Jucundus. *Sousan* (*Bibl. iii, c. iv*, p. 17) is strongly of opinion that Philo the elder and this Philo mentioned by Clemens are the same. Fabricius, who once held this opinion, was led to change his views (*Bibl. i, 862*) and tacitly assumes (iv, 758) that Sozomen indicates Philo Judeus by this epithet.

**Philo the Rhetorician and Philosopher.** *Cave, Giacomelli*, and Ernesti are of opinion that this is no other than Philo Carpathius (q. v.). His era agrees with this, for the philosopher is quoted by Athanassianus, who flourished about A.D. 561. We need not be startled at the term *philosopher* as applied to an ecclesiastic. *Cave, ii, 302*, 303. Michael Psellos was termed the prince of philosophers, and Nicetas was nicknamed, in the same way as Philo, *πρωτωρ και φιλοσοφος*. Besides, Polyaenus, in the *History of Philosophers*, expressly calls Philo Φιλόσοφος ἀληθῶν ἀπὸ πρωτορως, which Timoleon and others erroneously understand to mean a man who has changed from the profession of the law to that of the Church. *Cave* shows that the *πρωτωρ held*
an office in the Church itself, somewhat analogous to our professorship of ecclesiastical history. Our only knowledge of Philo, under this name, whether it be Philo Carpathius or not, is from an inedited work of Anastasius Sinaita, preserved in the library of Vienna and the Bodleian. Glycera (Annal. p. 288, etc.), it is true, quotes as if from Philo, a metaphorical description of the universe, and without acknowledgment, from Anastasius. The work of Anastasius referred to is entitled by Cave Demonstratio Historiae de Magna et Angelica summni Sanctorum Digesta. Philo's work therein quoted is styled a Christian, not a Jewish, history. Durie dialectically refuses the only specimen of it we have, we need hardly regret its loss. It consists of a tale regarding a monk, that, being excommunicated by his bishop, and having afterwards suffered martyrdom, he was brought in his coffin to the church, but could not rest till the bishop, warned in a dream, had formally absolved him. See Cave, Hist. Lit. p. 176 (ed. Geneva, 1720); Fabricius, Bibl. Græc. vii. 420.

Philo Senior. Josephus (Apion, i. 23), when enumerating the heathen writers who had treated of Jewish history, mentions together Demetrius Phalerenus, Philo, and Josephus. Philo has a distinction from the older (a ψηφιστήριος), probably to distinguish him from Philo Judaeus, and he cannot mean Herennius Philo, who lived after his time. Clemens Alexandrinus (Stromat. i. 146) also couples together the names of Philo the elder and Demetrius, stating that their lists of Jewish kings differed. Hence Vossius thinks that both authors refer to the same person (De Hist. Graec. p. 486, ed. Westermann). In this Jonasius agrees with him, while he notices the error of Josephus, in giving Demetrius the surname of Phalerenus (De Script. Hist. Phil. iii. 4, p. 17), his Huetius (Demonstrat. Evangel. p. 62) was of opinion that the apochryphal Book of Wisdom was written by this Philo, he was necessitated to consider him as a Hellenistic Jew, who, unskilled in the original Hebrew, had it translated, and then expanded it, in language peculiar to his class (ibid. p. 62, 246, etc.). Fabricius thinks that the Philo mentioned by Josephus may have been a Gentile, and that a Philo different from either Philo Judaeus or senior was the author of the Book of Wisdom. Eusebius (Præp. Evang. ix. 20, 24) quotes fifteen obscure hexameters from Philo, without giving the name of who he is, and merely citing him as from Alexander Polyhistor. These evidently form part of a history of the Jews in verse, and were written either by a Jew, in the character of a heathen, as Fabricius hints is possible, or by a heathen acqulainted with the Jewish Scriptures. This is, in all probability, the work referred to by Philo Judaeus and Clemens Alexandrinus. Of course the author must have lived before the time of Alexander Polyhistor, who came to Rome B.C. 53. It is doubtful whether he is the same as the geographer of the same name.

Philo of Tarshis, a secon. He was a companion of Ignatius of Antioch, and accompanied the martyr from the East to Rome, A.D. 107. He is twice mentioned in the epistles of Ignatius (Ad Philadeph. c. xi.; Ad Smyrnae. c. xii.). He is supposed to have written, along with Rheus Agathopus, the Martyrium Ignatii, for which see Ignatius. See Cave, Hist. Lit. p. 28 (ed. Geneva, 1720).

Philoecius, a Pythagorean philosopher, was born at Crotona, or Tarentum, towards the close of the 6th century B.C. Areas, a probable disciple of Pythagoras, was his master; so that we receive the Pythagorean doctrine from Philoecius, only as it appeared to the third generation, for a proposition of it is therefore more properly in place in a general examination of the philosophy of Pythagoras (q. v.). It has been repeated once and again that Philoecius divined the true theory of the universe, and was the virtual predecessor of Copernicus. Nothing can be more false. In his scheme, indeed, not the earth, but fire, is placed in the centre of the universe; that fire, however, is not the sun, which, on the contrary, he makes revolve around the central fire. The scheme, in so far as it can be understood, is altogether fantastic, based on no observation or comparison of phenomena, but on vague and now uninterpretable metaphysical abstractions. The pupil of Copernicus in antiquity was Aristarchus of Samos, whose remarkable conjectures appeared first in the editio princeps of Archimedes—published after Copernicus wrote. Of Philoecius's three works, written in the Doric dialect, only fragments now remain. See Blackth. Leben, nebst den Hruchstücken seiner Werke (Berl. 1819); Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol. a. v.; Ueberweg, Hist. of Philos. (see Index in vol. ii); Butler, Hist. of Ancient Philos. vol. ii. (J. H. W.)

Philo-logus (ψηφιλογος, fond of talk), one of the Christians at Rome to whom Paul sent his salutations (Rom. xvi. 5). A.D. 55. Origen conjectures that he was the head of a Christian household which included the other persons named with him. Dorotheus makes him one of the seventy disciples, and alleges that he was placed by the apostle Andrew as bishop of Sinope, in Pontus (see Epiphanius, Mon. p. 68, ed. Dresel). Pseudo-Hippolytus (Supp. XX. A.D. 127) assigns to him a life of 70 years. His life repeats the same improbable tradition. His name is found in the Columbarium "of the freedmen of Livia Augusta" at Rome; which shows that there was a Philologus connected with the imperial household at the time when it included many Julias. The name Philologus was a common one at Rome (Lewin, Life and Epistles of St. Paul, ii. 71).

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HEBREW</th>
<th>GREEK</th>
<th>LATIN</th>
<th>FRENCH</th>
<th>GERMAN</th>
<th>ENGLISH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>to dwell</td>
<td>αὐδαίρεω</td>
<td>aveo</td>
<td>aveo</td>
<td>avere</td>
<td>dwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to speak</td>
<td>λαλω</td>
<td>plâllier</td>
<td>bawl</td>
<td>parole</td>
<td>speak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to understand</td>
<td>κατάνοω</td>
<td>donc</td>
<td>Bângel</td>
<td>beak</td>
<td>understand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to gather</td>
<td>ἑλκύω</td>
<td>volvo</td>
<td>wheel</td>
<td>rouler</td>
<td>gather</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to go</td>
<td>ἐπέχω</td>
<td>non</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>non</td>
<td>go</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>this</td>
<td>οὗ</td>
<td>ille</td>
<td>il</td>
<td>il</td>
<td>this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to speak</td>
<td>στοιχεῖον</td>
<td>angolo</td>
<td>angoloose</td>
<td>enge</td>
<td>anger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to lay up</td>
<td>ἀποθήκη</td>
<td>en</td>
<td>store</td>
<td>en</td>
<td>lay up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to travel</td>
<td>ἐκπορευόμαι</td>
<td>store</td>
<td>store</td>
<td>store</td>
<td>travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the earth</td>
<td>οὐρά</td>
<td>Erde</td>
<td>earth</td>
<td>terre</td>
<td>earth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to card</td>
<td>τηράω</td>
<td>Cera</td>
<td>card</td>
<td>card</td>
<td>card</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to come</td>
<td>εἰσίν</td>
<td>this</td>
<td>is</td>
<td>this</td>
<td>come</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to see</td>
<td>εἴδε</td>
<td>se</td>
<td>see</td>
<td>se</td>
<td>see</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to appear</td>
<td>καταφθάνω</td>
<td>da</td>
<td>show</td>
<td>da</td>
<td>appear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to be</td>
<td>ἔστω</td>
<td>be</td>
<td>be</td>
<td>be</td>
<td>be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to eat</td>
<td>ταΐζε</td>
<td>eat</td>
<td>eat</td>
<td>eat</td>
<td>eat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to dig</td>
<td>κηρίζε ταῖον</td>
<td>fero</td>
<td>perger</td>
<td>boren</td>
<td>bore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to coin</td>
<td>συμφύομαι</td>
<td>bee</td>
<td>bee</td>
<td>bee</td>
<td>coin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to pour</td>
<td>δέχεται</td>
<td>vent</td>
<td>vent</td>
<td>vent</td>
<td>pour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to water</td>
<td>νερά</td>
<td>waten</td>
<td>waten</td>
<td>waten</td>
<td>water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to drink</td>
<td>τείχει</td>
<td>Pfad</td>
<td>path</td>
<td>Pfad</td>
<td>drink</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HEBREW</th>
<th>GREEK</th>
<th>LATIN</th>
<th>FRENCH</th>
<th>GERMAN</th>
<th>ENGLISH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>to fall</td>
<td>ἔφαλλον</td>
<td>falso</td>
<td>fallot</td>
<td>fallen</td>
<td>fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to fall</td>
<td>ἔπαλλον</td>
<td>[chop]</td>
<td>cooper</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>cuff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to give</td>
<td>ἐδόμας</td>
<td>donum</td>
<td>donner</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>endow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to give up</td>
<td>ἐδομοῖον</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to serve</td>
<td>τιμή</td>
<td>silex</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to pass</td>
<td>πεπίλησ</td>
<td>super</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>über</td>
<td>over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to live</td>
<td>ψαλτήριον</td>
<td>to live</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to ascend</td>
<td>ἔκ σκαλοπατα</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to ascend</td>
<td>ἔκ σκαλοπατα</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to ascend</td>
<td>ἔκ σκαλοπατα</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to ascend</td>
<td>ἔκ σκαλοπατα</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to ascend</td>
<td>ἔκ σκαλοπατα</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to ascend</td>
<td>ἔκ σκαλοπατα</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to ascend</td>
<td>ἔκ σκαλοπατα</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to ascend</td>
<td>ἔκ σκαλοπατα</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to ascend</td>
<td>ἔκ σκαλοπατα</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to ascend</td>
<td>ἔκ σκαλοπατα</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to ascend</td>
<td>ἔκ σκαλοπατα</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to ascend</td>
<td>ἔκ σκαλοπατα</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to ascend</td>
<td>ἔκ σκαλοπατα</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to ascend</td>
<td>ἔκ σκαλοπατα</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to ascend</td>
<td>ἔκ σκαλοπατα</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to ascend</td>
<td>ἔκ σκαλοπατα</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to ascend</td>
<td>ἔκ σκαλοπατα</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to ascend</td>
<td>ἔκ σκαλοπατα</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to ascend</td>
<td>ἔκ σκαλοπατα</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to ascend</td>
<td>ἔκ σκαλοπατα</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to ascend</td>
<td>ἔκ σκαλοπατα</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to ascend</td>
<td>ἔκ σκαλοπατα</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to ascend</td>
<td>ἔκ σκαλοπατα</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to ascend</td>
<td>ἔκ σκαλοπατα</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to ascend</td>
<td>ἔκ σκαλοπατα</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to ascend</td>
<td>ἔκ σκαλοπατα</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to ascend</td>
<td>ἔκ σκαλοπατα</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to ascend</td>
<td>ἔκ σκαλοπατα</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to ascend</td>
<td>ἔκ σκαλοπατα</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to ascend</td>
<td>ἔκ σκαλοπατα</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to ascend</td>
<td>ἔκ σκαλοπατα</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to ascend</td>
<td>ἔκ σκαλοπατα</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to ascend</td>
<td>ἔκ σκαλοπατα</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to ascend</td>
<td>ἔκ σκαλοπατα</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to ascend</td>
<td>ἔκ σκαλοπατα</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to ascend</td>
<td>ἔκ σκαλοπατα</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to ascend</td>
<td>ἔκ σκαλοπατα</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to ascend</td>
<td>ἔκ σκαλοπατα</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to ascend</td>
<td>ἔκ σκαλοπατα</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to ascend</td>
<td>ἔκ σκαλοπατα</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to ascend</td>
<td>ἔκ σκαλοπατα</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to ascend</td>
<td>ἔκ σκαλοπατα</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to ascend</td>
<td>ἔκ σκαλοπατα</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to ascend</td>
<td>ἔκ σκαλοπατα</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to ascend</td>
<td>ἔκ σκαλοπατα</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to ascend</td>
<td>ἔκ σκαλοπατα</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to ascend</td>
<td>ἔκ σκαλοπατα</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to ascend</td>
<td>ἔκ σκαλοπατα</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to ascend</td>
<td>ἔκ σκαλοπατα</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This list is sufficiently copious, after deducting those which further researches may show to be merely fortuitous, to prove a more than accidental agreement in words of frequent use. Many of the roots are evidently related to each other, and most of them are found in several kindred forms. Among these the selection has here been made not so much for the purpose of exhibiting the most palpable similarity, as to include the greatest variety of distinct etymons in each line of descent. We have no room to express the numerous cognates and derivatives of each, to trace the connection of their meanings with the common or generic import, nor to note the various orthographical changes that they have undergone. If the reader will take the trouble to investigate these points at his leisure, as he may readily do.
with the help of good lexicons of the respective languages, he will soon satisfy himself how widely these radices have ramified and how intimately they are connected. A comparison with their Arabic and Sanscrit preparations is therefore in many other instances the very natural following result.

II. Monomorphic Roots.—It is well settled that the so-called weak radicals in Hebrew verbs, technically denominated Pe-Aleph, Pe-Nun, Pe-Yod, Lamed-He, etc., which drop away in the course of infection, were not in reality originally trilateral at all, but that these letters were only added to those forms in which they appear for the sake of uniformity with regular verbs. But these constitute in the aggregate a very large part, we apprehend a decided majority, of all the verbs most frequently employed in the language. Besides these, there is another very large class of roots of kindred or analogous signification with each other, and having two radicals in common. All these, as Gesenius has ingeniously shown in his Lexicon, are likewise to be regarded as essentially identical, the idea clinging in the two letters possessed by them in common. Thus we have reduced nearly the other moiety of Hebrew verbs, and these it must be remembered are the ground or stock of the entire vocabulary, to bilaterals. The presumption is not an unwarrantable one that all the roots might etymologically be similarly retrenched. The few quadri- radials that are the first person, rather the status quo in that instance, being regarded as formed from ordinary roots by reduplication or interpolation.

Now it is a remarkable coincidence that the ultimate theme of the primitive Greek verb has been ascertained, in like manner, by modern philologists to be a monomorph- erable, consisting of two consonants vocalized, in precise conformity with the Hebrew system of vowel points, by a single mutable vowel. Thus the basis of such protokorean forms even as λαθώνη, μήθον, δικαίων, becomes λατή, μήθ, δίκαιον. Indeed, Noah Webster has applied the same method to the roots of English words; and in his Dictionary (we speak of the quarto edition, originally published at New Haven in two volumes) he has indicated them as "class Dg. No. 26," etc., although he seems never to have published the key of this classification.

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

The Hebrew verb is found in its least disguised form in the greater Kal. The future is but a modification of this, as is especially evident from the facility with which it preserves the preterit import with "vav conversive." The past is naturally the first and most frequent tense in use, because it is historical. In all these respects the preter answers to the Greek second aorist. The augment of this tense was a secondary or subsequent invention, and, accordingly, Homer habitually disregards it. The "Attic reduplication" (for example, 8γόργος) had a still later origin. The second aorist gives us a root in its simplest if not purest form. It is further remarkable that none but primitive verbs have this tense, and no Greek verbs are primitive but those which exhibit a monomorphic root as found in the stem of the second aorist. We invite the attention of scholars especially to these last enunciated principles. They show that this tense was originally the ground-form of the verb.

No tense in Greek exhibits greater modifications of the root than the present. This argues that the tense itself was of comparatively late date. Accordingly the derivative verbs most usually have it, although defective in many other respects; and the older verbs to which it appears occasions most of the so-called irregularities set down in tables of Greek verbs. Now the Hebrew has properly no present tense. Present time can only be expressed by means of the participle, with the substantive verb (usually underlined) like our "periphrastic present" ("I am doing," etc.), or by the analogy which we have indicated, the junior members of the Hebrewistic family, especially the Chaldee and Syriac, have constructed a present tense out of the participle by annexing the indicative terminations appropriate to the different numbers and persons. This process illustrates the formation of

IV. Verb Infections.—In Greek, as in Hebrew, the personal endings are obviously but fragments of the personal pronouns, appended to the verbal root or tensestem. This is so generally recognized as to be the fact with respect to both these languages, that we need dwell upon it only for the purpose of explaining, by its means, some of the peculiarities of the Greek verbs in -μ. This termination, which reappears in the optative of other verbs, was doubtless the original and proper sign of the first person, just as the reflexive in Greek is the basis of the oblique cases of the pronoun of the first person, μι, με; as the latter is the last, but non-radical, syllable of the nominative, με, i. e., in keeping with this that the verbs in -μ are some of the oldest in the language, for example, the substantive verb, σιν. The passive terminal -μοι is doubtless but a modification of the same. Now the principle or fact to which we wish to call particular attention in this connection is this: Every primitive "pure" verb in Greek is a verb in μ. By this rule the student may always know them, as we are at least the general rule that no other consonant is found in the forms in -μ, and very rare exceptions like πιμ, πινόμ, πιθομ, which are attributable to disguises of the true root. Let it now be further noted, in confirmation of what we have stated above concerning the Greek primate tense, that verbs in -μ have substantially the same forms in infection as the second aorist, and they have only those tenses with which these infections are compatible. Neither of these last-named principles, it is true, is carried out with exactness, for the aorist passive of other verbs seem to have usurped these active terminations; but we are persuaded that the general rule is sufficient to the defectiveness and peculiar inflection of the forms in μ. We therefore look upon the verbs in question as interesting links in the descent from the older Hebrew type.

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

VI. Vowel Changes.—To the learner the Hebrew language seems very complicated in this respect; but the whole process of vocalization is wrought out under the following simple law: that "without the tone, a long vowel cannot stand in a closed syllable, nor a short vowel in an open syllable." From this results practically the alternative of a long vowel or an addition of a consonant (or dagesh forte) in every unaccented syllable. In the Greek the following fundamental principle prevails: that a long vowel (or diphthong) indicates the omission of a consonant, namely wherever we have short vowels; and this latter is tantamount to the other, for there is one letter less. Thus the systems of syll-
bication in both languages essentially coincide in this:
that length in the word is equivalent to another consonant.
We might take room to exemplify these rules, but the
more important point, as it were, naturally seen the
aforementioned of the later cognate languages is this principle
regarded with much uniformity, although from the nature of the
vocal organs themselves, it follows, even in so arbitrary
a tongue (or rather so historical a spelling) as the Eng-
lish, that a vowel is naturally long when it ends the
syllable, and short when a consonant closes the sound.
But in the Greek and Hebrew the law we have pro-
pounded is consistently carried out in a complete system
of euphonic changes which lie at the very threshold of
either language.
Accordingly, in exactness of phonetic representation
these two languages have no rival, not even in the Ger-
man, Italian, or Spanish. Though the original sounds
are now somewhat uncertain, yet it is evident (unless we
take the degenerate modern Greek, and the discordant
modern Rabbinical pronunciations as perfect guides) that
each letter and vowel in both had its own peculiar pow-
er. The two alphabets, we know, were identical in or-
igin; for if we distrust the story of the importation of
the Phoenician characters by Cadmus into Greece, we
have but to compare the names, order, and forms of the
written word. But, if we entertain the suggestion that
the two languages were read in opposite directions), in order to satisfy
ourselves that they are essentially the same. Even the
unappreciable Δ has its equivalent in the spiritus lenis
(as the Ι may be visually represented by the spiritus asper),
and the old digamma (Ϝι) reappears in the consonantal Π.
Perhaps the reason why υ initial always
has the rough breathing owing to its affinity to both
these last named. See Alphabet.
We trust we have said enough to illustrate our propo-
sition that these two lingual families, and especially
their two chiefly interesting representatives—which,
widely variant as they are in age, culture, flexibility,
and genius, yet by a remarkable Providence have been
brought together in the only revelation written for man
—have no ordinary or casual points of resemblance.
We would be glad to see the subject extended by some
competent hand, especially by a comparison of the vener-
able and rich Sanscrit and Arabic. See Semitic Lan-
guages.
Philemoteor (Φιλομήτωρ, mother-loving), the sur-
name of Tolemeus VI of Egypt (2 Macc. iv, 21). See
Philemoteor.
Philon. See Philo.
Philopatris is the name of a dialogue found among
the writings of Lucian (q.v.). It is quoted in Church
history as a contribution to the heathen satires against
Christianity. It is a frivulous derision of the character
and doctrines of the Christians in the form of a dialogue
between Critias, a professed heathen, and Triphon, an
Epicanic, personating a Christian. It represents the
Christians as disaffected to the government, dangerous
to civil society, and delighting in public calamities.
It calls St. Paul a half-baked, long-nosed Galilean, who trav-
celled through the air to the third heaven (2 Cor. xii,
1-4). It combats the Church doctrine of the Trinity,
and of the procession of the Spirit from the Father,
though not by argument, but only by ridicule. Not
its intrinsic value, but its historic references, make it a
valuable production. The authenticity of the work
has been called in question by Gesner, in his De aetate
et auctore dialogi Lactantii, qui Philop. in scribendum
(Jen. 1714; Leips. 1730; Götting. 1741; et in tom. x., ed. Bip.),
who ascribes to it a post-Nicene age. Of like opinion
are Neander (Church Hist. ii, 90) and Tzchiner (Fall
des Heidenthums, p. 312). Niebuhr (Kleine Histor. u.
philolog. Berl. Jahrb. ii, 73) dating the composition of
Nicophorus Phocas (963-969), but this date is general-
ly regarded as too recent. Compare Bernardy, Berl.
Jahrb. 1882, i, 131; Ehrmann, in Stein's Studien der
Evangel. Gelehrlichkeit Württembergis, 1889, p. 47; Schmid,
De Philopatride Lucimeo dialogo norte disert. (Leips.
1890); Wetzlar, De etatis et auctore dialogi Lactantii,
(Monumenta Historica, Ch. Hist. ii, 79). (J. H. W.)
Philonastair, a sect of Tribeists in the 6th cen-
tury, named after a famous Alexandrian grammarian.
Nature and hypostasis, he affirmed, were identical, unity
not being something real, but only a generic term, ac-
taccording to the Aristotelian logic. See Philonastair.
Philoponus, Ioannes (Ἰωάννης ὁ Φιλόπονος), or
Ioannes Grammaticus (ὁ Γραμματικός), an Alex-
andrian theologian and philosopher of great renown, but
which he, determined on account of his unworld-
liness and want of good-sense, was called Philoponos be-
cause he was one of the most laborious and studious men
of his age. He lived in the 7th century of our era;
one of his writings, Physica, is dated May 10, 617.
He calls himself γραμματικός, undoubtedly because he
taught grammar in his native town, Alexandria,
and would in earlier times have been called rhetor. He was
a disciple of the philosopher Ammonius. Although
his celebrity is more based upon the number of his
varied productions and the estimation in which they
were held by his contemporaries than upon the intrin-
sic value of those works, he is yet so strangely
connected with one of the most important events of his
(Gibbon's Decline and Fall). It is extremely doubtful
that Philoponos became a Mohammedan. His favorite
authors were Plato and Aristotle, with whom he tended
towards the philosophy of the Arians. He was one of the first and principal pro-
"pomoters of the sect of the Tribeists, which was con-
demned by the Council of Constantinople of 681. Start-
ing with Monophysite principles, taking ψευτα in a con-
crete instead of an abstract sense, and identifying it
with εικονομον, Philoponos distinguished in God,
three individuals, and so became involved in Trithesism.
This view he sought to justify by the Aristotelian categories
of genus, species, and individuum. His followers
were called Philoponiani and Tribeists. Philoponos, it may
be remarked, was not the first promulgator of this error;
but (as appears from Asseman, Bibl. Orient. ii, 327; comp.
Hefele, ii, 556) the Monophysite John Acsesianus, who
ascribed to Christ only one nature, but to each person
in the Godhead a separate nature, and on this account
was banished by the emperor and excommunicated by
the patriarch of Constantinople. The time of the death
of Philoponos is not known. The following is a list of his
works: Τὸν εἰς τὴν Μακάριος κοιμησόμενον ἐγκα-
τιστῶν λόγος ζ, Commentarius in Mosaicum Commentarnum,
lib. viii, dedicated to Sergius, patriarch of Constanti-
nople, who was contemporary with the reign of Justin I,
610, and to Basil I, 641. Ed. Grecce et Latine by Balsalazar Corcuera
(Vienna, 1830, 4to). The editor was deficient in scholar-
ship, and Lambecius promised a better edition, which,
however, never appeared. Photius (Biblioth. cod. 75) compares theCosmopontia with its author, and forms no good opinion of either: — De cunctis Pauly, "ad calcem Cosmoponii," by the same editor.—Kardar Προ-κουνικαρικοφόρον κελίου λόγιον, λόγον τον με, Adversus Procli de Eternitate Mundus Argumenta XIXIII Solu- tiones, edited by the same. The end is mutilated. Edit. the text by Victor Triconavellis (Venice, 1535, fol.); Latin versions, by Joannes Mahotius (Lyons, 1557, fol.), and by Casparus Marcellius (Venice, 1551, fol.);—De quinque Dialectica Graeco Longam Liber. Edit. Graecae, together with the writings of some other grammarians, and the Thesaurus of Varinius Cameretis (Venice, 1476, fol.; 1504, fol.; ad calcem Lecxi Grieco-Latini. Venice, 1524, fol.; another, ibid. 1524, fol.; Basle, 1532, fol.; Paris, 1521, fol.);—Ευλογημα των προ δια- φορον ενεσισαν ἰδιωτικών τουρνακών λείων, Collec- tio Voscanum pro diversa significantia Accentum diem versus occupant, in alphabetical order. It has often been published at the end of Greek dictionaries. The only separate edition is by Erasmus Schmid (Wittenb. 161, 14vo), under the title of Cyrilli, Rel. ad uti soluit, Aristotelis de Generatione Animalium utilissimum Differentia Vercos Gracum, quod Totum, Spiritum, Genus, etc., to which is added the editor's Dieraitaria de Pronunci- atione Graecce Antiqui. Schmid appended to the diction of Philoponus about five times as much of his own, but he severed his additions from the text:—Commentary in Aristotelis, viz. (1) De tria Prima. Edit: the text, Venice, 1596, fol.; Latin versions, by Gulielmus Dorotheus (Venice, 1541, fol.), Lucullus Philalethes (ibid. 1544, 1548, 1553, fol.), Alexander Justinianus (ibid. 1560, fol.). (2) In Analytica Priora. Edit.: Venice, 1564, fol., together with Anonymous Commentarii on the same work (ibid. 1584, fol.), revised and with additions, together with Eustratius, episcopi Nicanei (who lived about 1117) Commentarii on the same work. A Greek edition of 1524 is said to exist. Latin versions by Andreae Gregorios (Venice, 1492, fol.; Paris, 1548, fol.) and by Marcellus Bota (Venice, 1559, 1568, fol.). (3) In quattuor priores Libros Physicorum. Edit.: the text, cum Prefatione Victoris Triconavellii ad Casparum Comeniana Cardenale (Venice, 1635, fol.); Latin version, by Gulielmus Dorotheus (ibid. 1589 and 1541, fol.); a better one by Bapstia Basiaris (ibid. 1558, 1569, 1581, fol.). Philoponus speaks of his Scholia to the sixth book, whom we may infer that he commented upon the last four books also. (4) In Librum veneciam Meteororum. The text ad calcem Olympiodori. In Meteororum (Venice, 1651, fol.); Lateine, by Joannes Bap- stia Basiaris (ibid. 1667, fol.). In III de Anima. Edit. Graecae, cum Triconavelli Epistola ad Nicolaum Rudolphum Cardenale (Venice, 1558, fol.); Lateine, by Gentianus Hervetus (Lyons, 1544, 1546; Venice, 1554, 1608) and by Matthaeus a Bose (Ven- ice, 1554, 1561), all in folio. (5) In Libros V De Generation- et Interitus. Graecae, cum Prefatione Asanali (Venice, 1527, fol.), together with Alexander Aphrodi- us's Meteorologia. (6) In Libros V De Generatione Animalium, probably by Philoponus. Edit. Graecae cum Psell's Comment Epistola Graecae ad Andream Matthaeum Aquavitum (Venice, 1556, fol.). In the same year, ibid, edn. anno. Black letter. (7) In Libros XIV Metaphysicorum. Lateine by Franciscus Patricius (Ferrara, 1568, fol.). The text was never published. Philo- ponus wrote many other works, some of which are lost, and others have never been published. Fabricius gives an "Index Scriptoriorum in Philop De Mundi Eternitatem memorandum," and an "Index Scriptorum in universis Philoponi ad Aristotelis Commentariis membrorum," both of great length. See Fabricius, Bib. Grac. x, 639, et seq. (8) In Libris IIII. Smith, History of Philosophy, i, 318; Stillingsheet, Works, vol. i, Gieseler. Ecclesiastical History (see Index); Hagenbach, History of Doctrines; Cockworth, Intellectual System of the Universes (see Index).

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

Philosopher (φιλοσοφος). Of the Greek sects of philosophers existing in the time of the apostles, the Stoics and Epicureans are mentioned in Acts xvii, 18, some of whom disputed with Paul at Athens. In Col. ii, 8 a warning is given against philosophy itself, as a departure from the knowledge of Christ; and it has been noticed that Paul, who had been a Pharisee, acted in this respect in harmony with the sect in which he had been educated (cf. Ignace-Germain, De Christiostomo Ju- dos, Alex. i, 8). At least the rabbis set the divine law above all human wisdom; yet they do not appear to have given the name of philosophy to their expositions of the law (see Josephus, Ap. ii, 4; 1 Macc. i and v). Paul is speaking in the passage alluded to of theo- sophic speculation, which had come from an entrance among Christians (v. 16 sq.), and on which Rhein- wald (De pseudo doctor. Colos. Bonn, 1884), Neander (Gesch. d. Pfaffen, i, 488 sq.), and others have made in- vestigations (see, in brief, De Wette, Br. a. d. Kolos, p. 1 sq.). It is plain from the full letter's explanation, however, that it is worth to human wisdom and philosophy in comparison with that eternal salvation which is only to be obtained through the divine revelation in the Gospel; but it is not necessary to suppose that he was a despiser of sober philosophic investigation, either on the ground of his pharisaic training or of his apostolical duties. For monographs, see Volbeding, Index Programmatum, p. 89 sq. See PHILOSOPHY.

Philosophists, a name given to a class of French writers who entered into a combination to overthrow the religion of Jesus, and eradicate from the human heart every religious sentiment. The man more particularly to whom this idea first occurred was Voltaire, who, being weary (as he said himself) of hearing people repeat that twelve men were sufficient to establish Christianity, resolved to prove that one might be sufficient to over- turn it. Full of this project, he swore, before the year 1790, to dedicate his life to its accomplishment; and for some time he flattered himself that he should enjoy alone the glory of destroying the Christian religion. He found, however, that associates would be necessary; and, from the numerous tribe of his admirers and disciples, he chose D'Alembert and Diderot as the most proper persons to co-operate with him in the execution of his designs. But Voltaire was not satisfied with their sole aid. He contrived to embark in the same cause Frederick II, king of Prussia. This royal adept was one of the most zealous of Voltaire's coadjutors, till he discovered that the philosophers were waging war with the throne, as well as with the altar. This, indeed, was not originally Voltaire's intention. He was vain; he loved to be ca- reassed by the great; and, in one word, he was from natural disposition an aristocrat, and an admirer of roy- alty. But when he found that almost everything was vain but Diderot's disappointment of his imperial projects be- cause they perceived the issue, he determined to oppose all the governments on earth rather than forfeit the glory, with which he had flattered himself, of vanquishing Christ and his apostles in the field of contro- versy. He now set himself, with D'Alembert and Dide- rot, to excite pure discontents with the established order of things. For this purpose they formed secret societies, assumed new names, and employed an enigmatical language. Thus Frederick was called Luc; D'Alembert, Pilaton; and Diderot, Platon, or its anagram, Tom- plis; while the general term for the conspirators was Cucucco. In their secret meetings they professed to celebrate the mysteries of Mythra; and their great ob- ject, as they professed to one another, was to confound
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the wretch, meaning Jesus Christ. Hence their secret watchword was Écrivez l’Infini, "Crush the Wretch." If we look into some of the books expressly written for general circulation, we shall find there the following doxology: God is the education of all their senses, their voluble amusements, their condemned horrors, others surrounded by sophistry and meretricious ornaments, to entice the mind into their net before it perceives their nature: "The Universal Cause, that God of the philosophers, of the Jews, and of the Christians, is but a chimera and a phantom. The phænomena of nature only prove the existence of God to a few prepossessed men: so far from bespeaking a God, they are but the necessary effects of matter prodigiously diversified. It is more reasonable to admit, with Manes, a twofold God, than the God of Christianity. We cannot know whether a God really exists, or whether there is the smallest difference between good and evil, or vice and virtue. Nothing can be more absurd than to believe the soul a spiritual being. The immortality of the soul, so far from stimulating man to the practice of virtue, is nothing but a barbarous, desperate, fatal tenet, and contrary to all legislation. All ideas of justice and injustice, of virtue and vice, of glory and infamy, are purely arbitrary, and dependent on custom. Conscience and remorse are nothing but the foresight of those physical penalties to which crimes expose us. The laws of the land which, above the laws of God, without remorse the dishonest act that may serve his purpose. The fear of God, so far from being the beginning of wisdom, should be the beginning of folly. The command to love one's parents is more the work of education than of nature. Modesty is only an invention of refined voluptuousness. The law which condemns married people to live together becomes barbarous and cruel on the day they cease to love one another." These extracts from the secret correspondence and the public writings of the men will suffice to shew us that the nature and tendency of the dreadful system they had formed. The philosophists were diligently employed in attempting to propagate their sentiments. Their grand Encyclopædia was converted into an engine to serve this purpose. See ENCyclopæDIA. Voltaire proposed to establish a colony of philosophists at Cleves, who, protected by the king of Prussia, might publish their opinions without dread or danger; and Frederick was disposed to take them under his protection, till he discovered that their opinions were anarchical as well as impious, when not suppressed even off, and even against them. They contrived, however, to engage the ministers of the court of France in their favor, by pretending to have nothing in view but the enlargement of science: in works which spoke, indeed, respectfully of revelation, while every discovery which they brought forward was meant to overthrow it. The system was very finished. When the throne was to be attacked, and even when barefaced atheism was to be promulgated, a number of impious and licentious pamphlets were dispersed (for some time none knew how) from a secret society formed at the Hotel d'Holbach, as a badge of which, Voltaire was elected honorary and perpetual president. To conceal their design, which was the diffusion of their infidel sentiments, they called themselves Encyclopædists. See HOLBACH. The books, however, that were issued from this club were calculated to impair and overturn religion, morals, and government; and these, indeed, spreading over all Europe, imperceptibly took possession of public opinion. As soon as the sale was sufficient to pay the expenses, inferior editions were printed and given away, or sold at a very low price; circulating libraries of them were formed, and reviews and periodical publications; established a general intercourse, by means of hawkers and peddlers, with the distant provinces, and instituted an office to supply all schools with teachers; and thus did they acquire unprecedented dominion over every species of literature, over the minds of all ranks of people, and over the general conduct of youth, with the greatest, if not the worst alarm to the world. The lovers of wit and polite literature were caught by Voltaire; the men of science were perverted, and children corrupted in the first rudiments of learning, by D'Alembert and Diderot; stronger appetites were excited by the ridicule of d'Alembert; the imaginations of the higher orders were set dangerously aflame by Montesquieu; and the multitude of all ranks were surprised, confounded, and hurried away by Rousseau. Thus was the public mind in France completely corrupted, and this, no doubt, greatly accelerated those dreadful events which afterwards transpired in that country.

Philosophoumena. See HIPPOLYTS.

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

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

"the meanest flower that blows can give thought that do often lie too deep for ours."
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Philosophy is, like death, one of the few things that we can by no means avoid; whether we welcome or reject it; whether we regard the irresistible tendencies of our intellectual constitution to speculative inquiry, or the latent regularity, order, and law controlling all things that fall under our notice, when they develop themselves in a series of institutions. While they constantly disown these productions before the world, they contrived to give them a false celebrity through their confidential agents and correspondents, who were not themselves always trusted with the entire secret. The philosophy there is most of all the reviews and periodical publications; established a general intercourse, by means of hawkers and peddlers, with the distant provinces, and instituted an office to supply all schools with teachers; and thus did they acquire unprecedented dominion over every species of literature, over the minds of all ranks of people, and over the general conduct of youth, with the greatest, if not the worst alarm to the world. The lovers of wit and polite literature were caught by Voltaire; the men of science were perverted, and children corrupted in the first rudiments of learning, by D'Alembert and Diderot; stronger appetites were excited by the ridicule of D'Alembert; the imaginations of the higher orders were set dangerously aflame by Montesquieu; and the multitude of all ranks were surprised, confounded, and hurried away by Rousseau. Thus was the public mind in France completely corrupted, and this, no doubt, greatly accelerated those dreadful events which afterwards transpired in that country.

Philosophoumena. See HIPPOLYTS.

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

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

"the meanest flower that blows can give thought that do often lie too deep for ours."

Thoughts that do often lie too deep for ours. Philosophy is, like death, one of the few things that we can by no means avoid; whether we welcome or reject it; whether we regard the irresistible tendencies of our intellectual constitution to speculative inquiry, or the latent regularity, order, and law controlling all things that fall under our notice, when they develop themselves in a series of institutions. While they constantly disown these productions before the world, they contrived to give them a false celebrity through their confidential agents and correspondents, who were not themselves always trusted with the entire secret. The philosophy there is most of all the reviews and periodical publications; established a general intercourse, by means of hawkers and peddlers, with
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varieties of subjects. There is mental, moral, political, economical, and natural philosophy; there is the philosophy of religion, the philosophy of enthusiasm, and the philosophy of insanity; the philosophy of logic, the philosophy of rhetoric, the philosophy of language, and the philosophy of grammar; there is the philosophies of poetry and music, of the inductive sciences; there is the philosophy of colors, the philosophy of music, the philosophy of dress, the philosophy of manners, the philosophy of cookery, the philosophy of building, etc. All imaginative topics reveal an aptitude for philosophic treatment, and pretend to furnish a basis for the special philosophy. It would occasion no surprise to encounter a philosophy of jack-straws, and other infantile amusements. There must be some legitimacy, however slight, in these numerous pretensions, some semblance of truth in such easy assumption, or such professions would not continue to be repeated and tolerated. There must be some common element, some cord of similitude, uniting together under one category these multitudinous forms of inquiry, and the unnumbered inquiries which are left unmentioned.

Scope of the Term. — The word philosophy first appears in the Father of History. It is applied by Croesus to Salyon, in his travels in search of knowledge and information, and is used as almost equivalent to 

theory, which in the context means scarcely anything more than the enumeration of facts. (Hdt. i, 31.) It next appears in Thucydides. Pericles speaks of the Athenians as “philosophizing without efficiency,” where the term seems to denote the acquisition of information and culture (Thuc. ii, 40). The origin of the word is ascribed to Pythagoras in a familiar anecdote, which reports that, being asked by Leon, the chief of Phlius, “What were philosophers?” he replied, with a happy allusion to the concourse at the Olympic Games, that “they were those who diligently observed the nature of things,” calling themselves “students, or lovers of wisdom,” and occupied with “the contemplation and knowledge of things” (Cicero, Tusc. Q. v, 3, 9). He is supposed to have thus repudiated the designation of “wise man,” or “sophister,” previously in vogue, and to have modestly proposed in its stead the appellation of “philosopher,” a lover of wisdom. The authenticity of the anecdote has been gravely questioned; and the designation, alleged to have been rejected in this manner, continued in habitual use, with no invidious sense, and was applied to Socrates and the chief of the Sophists (Grote, Hist. of Greece, p. ii, vol. viii, ch. xlviii, p. 281; Smith, Hist. of Phil., vol. i, p. 326). The term may be added Androtion, Fr. 89; Phan. Eriu. Fr. 21; and Symesi Dio, apud Dion Chrysostomus, ii, 329, ed. Teubner). The censures of the Sophists by Plato and Aristotl, the character of the Socratic teaching, and the almost exclusively inquisitive and indeterminate complexion of the Platonic speculation, appear to have given currency to the designation of philosophy, as a more modest and inconclusive appellative than “sophia,” or wisdom.

Originally, then, philosophy imported only the loving pursuit of knowledge, without any indication of actual attainment, but soon acquired a more positive and distinct acceptation. In the Republic Plato defines philosophy as the circuit, or beating about of the soul in its ascending progress towards real existence, and declares those to be philosophers who embrace the really existent, and who are able to apprehend the eternal and unchanging. In the Euthyphro he goes farther, and describes philosophy as the acquisition of true knowledge. In the definitions ascribed to Plato, which, though not his, may preserve the tradition of his teaching, the cardinal characteristics of the Platonic philosophy are given: the indeterminate movement, and eternal existence. Xenophon rarely employs the term, but applies “sophia” to the Socratic knowledge. In one passage where he uses it signifies the knowledge and practice of the duties of life (Mem. iv, 2, p. 23). A great step towards the definite restriction of the meaning of philosophy was made by the Platonists, though the name continued, and has always continued, to be employed with great latitude. Aristotle, who gave a sharp, scientific character to nearly everything which he touched, first confined the term to special significations, and gave to it a limited and, in some cases, a purely technical meaning. He calls philosophy “the knowledge of truth,” and he endeavored to discover a “first philosophy,” or body of principles common to all departments of speculative inquiry, and dealing solely with the primary elements and affections of being (Met. i, 1, p. 985; Phys. i, 9, p. 5; Simplicii de first philosophia, c. 1, p. 222, ed. Dacier; Dickel's, vol. i). The first principle of the philosopher, "corresponds to metaphysics in its stricter sense—a division of speculative science receiving its name from the remains of Aristotle, and, in great measure, constituted by his labors. It is the science of being as being (τὸ ἐστὶ οὐκ, Met. vi, 1, p. 1026; xi, 2, p. 1060; iv, p. 1061). Thus, with the Peripatetics, philosophy included all science, but especially theoretical science, and was peculiarly attached to metaphysical science. With this accords the definition of Cicero, which is evidently derived from Peripatetic sources (De Off. ii, 2, 5).

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

Philosophy is the earnest investigation of the principles of knowledge, and most appropriately of the first principles, or principles of abstract being. It is not science, but search (Kant, "Program" 1763-66; Sir William Hamilton, Metaph. lect. i, iii, Discussions, p. 787). It is distinctively setetic, or inquisitive, rather than dogmatic. Its chief value consists in the zeal, perspicacity, simplicity, and usefulness of the persevering desire for the highest truth, not in its attainment; for the highest truth is, in its nature, unattainable by the finite intelligence of man. It has not, or ought not to have, the pretension or confident assurance of knowledge, though this claim has frequently been made (ὅ filosóphia γνωστικὴ ἐπηρέασθαι, Thucyd. i. 49, 3. Tr. W. and T.). It may be added to the "empire" school. Aristotl. p. 29, ed. Acad. Berol.). It is only a systematic craving and continuous effort to reach the highest knowledge.

"For man loves knowledge, and the beams of truth are more welcome to his mind than all the blandishments of sound his ear, Than all of taste his tongue" (Akenside).

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

What is man? What are his faculties and powers? Whence is he? Whither is he going? Herein lies the secret of the power. What are man's duties to it, to himself, and to his fellow-men? What knowledge of these things can be acquired? What are his destinies, and are the aids for their achievement? These questions, and questions like these, constitute the province of philosophy.
proper. They present themselves dimly or distinctively to every reflecting mind; and they will not be gainsaid. Our intellectual constitution compels us to think of them; and to think of them, however weakly and spasmodically, is the beginning of philosophy. They all arise, as the result of an analysis of an anomaly and at least which stimulates further investigation. None of them can receive a full and complete reply from the human reason— they stretch beyond its compass. All of them, in every age, have met with some response, either in the poetic and bucolic, or in the popular mythologies, or in the wild guesses of popular credulity; either in the aporias of the prudent, or in the conclusions of those who have sedulously devoted themselves to the unravelling of these enigmas. This latter class have been the philosophers of each generation, from the commencement of rational inquiry to the current day, as they will continue to be till the closing of the great roll of time; for of philosophy there is no end.

This constant disappointment and continual renewal of effort are strange phenomena, and have often proved utterly disheartening. Hence has proceeded the objection so frequently urged that philosophy is ever in restless and fruitless activity, but does not advance. The allegation of an entire failure of progress is unjust; but the same questions constantly reappear with changed aspects, and the same solutions are offered under altered forms. A conviction of change in the same old processes and the alteration in the forms are themselves an advancement. The true source of encouragement is, however, to be derived less from the progress which can never pass the boundaries imposed by the same old questions than from the knowledge that the pursuit is more than the impracticable attainment—the race more important than the arrival at the goal could be—at least in this finite life, with our finite powers. From this habitual disappointment, and the apparent failures which bring the disappointment, have arisen, too, the variety of solutions that have been proposed for the solution of the philosophic riddles that philosophy proposes to man. Varrò enumerated two hundred and eighty-eight possible sects, apparently on the basis of ethics alone (August. De Civ. Dei, xix, 1); and the number of distinguishable schemes of philosophy, to say nothing of diversities of opinion in regard to details, is countless. Yet each of these has contributed something to our knowledge: in the more precise statement of the problems to be solved, in the clearer determination of their conditions, in the refutation of those, in the exposure of previous misapprehensions, in presenting the incipient truths in new, and brighter lights, or in adding to our positive information in regard to these dark and difficult subjects. The gratitude which Aristotle expresses, in a remarkable passage (Met. i), towards his predecessors, who had gone astray, or who had failed to see the truth, is due to all philosophical inquirers. They have contributed something towards the result, however incomplete that result may remain (καὶ γὰρ οὕτω τυναμόθεακα τι τὴν γὰρ ἢν προσφέροντο ημῶν; and see Alexander Aphrodis. Αριστοτελίτου, ἢ τῶν κατα- βιβλήματις δύσκολα εὐχρήστωτος ημῖν η λογίας παρατηκόντων). History of the Subject.—The hopelessness of satisfactory attainment, with the inevitable perspicacity of the search, and the gradual approximation, or appearance of approximation, to a goal which is never reached, but is ever receding, eventuate in changes, expansions, fluctuations, and revolutions in opinion, which are recorded and appreciated in the history of philosophy. This history chronicles the origins and original phases of philosophy, the mutations, progresses, and recessions, and the causes of them; it notes the introduction of new doctrines, new methods of procedure, new modes of exposition; the dissensions and controversies which spring up and minister to new developments; the reduction of kindred views to a coherent body; and the constitution of sects and schools; the fortunes of such schools, the development or perversion of the several successive or contemporaneous schemes of speculation in the bosom of the schools themselves, either in consequence of their own internal activity, or of the necessities suggested or enforced by external attack. In this manner of an analysis of an anomaly and at least which stimulates further investigation. None of them can receive a full and complete reply from the human reason—they stretch beyond its compass. All of them, in every age, have met with some response, either in the poetic and bucolic, or in the popular mythologies, or in the wild guesses of popular credulity; either in the aporias of the prudent, or in the conclusions of those who have sedulously devoted themselves to the unravelling of these enigmas. This latter class have been the philosophers of each generation, from the commencement of rational inquiry to the current day, as they will continue to be till the closing of the great roll of time; for of philosophy there is no end.

This constant disappointment and continual renewal of effort are strange phenomena, and have often proved utterly disheartening. Hence has proceeded the objection so frequently urged that philosophy is ever in restless and fruitless activity, but does not advance. The allegation of an entire failure of progress is unjust; but the same questions constantly reappear with changed aspects, and the same solutions are offered under altered forms. A conviction of change in the same old processes and the alteration in the forms are themselves an advancement. The true source of encouragement is, however, to be derived less from the progress which can never pass the boundaries imposed by the same old questions than from the knowledge that the pursuit is more than the impracticable attainment—the race more important than the arrival at the goal could be—at least in this finite life, with our finite powers. From this habitual disappointment, and the apparent failures which bring the disappointment, have arisen, too, the variety of solutions that have been proposed for the solution of the philosophic riddles that philosophy proposes to man. Varrò enumerated two hundred and eighty-eight possible sects, apparently on the basis of ethics alone (August. De Civ. Dei, xix, 1); and the number of distinguishable schemes of philosophy, to say nothing of diversities of opinion in regard to details, is countless. Yet each of these has contributed something to our knowledge: in the more precise statement of the problems to be solved, in the clearer determination of their conditions, in the refutation of those, in the exposure of previous misapprehensions, in presenting the incipient truths in new, and brighter lights, or in adding to our positive information in regard to these dark and difficult subjects. The gratitude which Aristotle expresses, in a remarkable passage (Met. i), towards his predecessors, who had gone astray, or who had failed to see the truth, is due to all philosophical inquirers. They have contributed something towards the result, however incomplete that result may remain (καὶ γὰρ οὕτω τυναμόθεακα τι τὴν γὰρ ἢν προσφέροντο ημῶν; and see Alexander Aphrodis. Αριστοτελίτου, ἢ τῶν κατα- βιβλήματις δύσκολα εὐχρήστωτος ημῖν η λογίας παρατηκόντων). History of the Subject.—The hopelessness of satisfactory attainment, with the inevitable perspicacity of the search, and the gradual approximation, or appearance of approximation, to a goal which is never reached, but is ever receding, eventuate in changes, expansions, fluctuations, and revolutions in opinion, which are recorded and appreciated in the history of philosophy. This history chronicles the origins and original phases of philosophy, the mutations, progresses, and recessions, and the causes of them; it notes the introduction of new doctrines, new methods of procedure, new modes of exposition; the dissensions and controversies which spring up and minister to new developments; the reduction of kindred views to a coherent body; and the constitution of sects and schools; the fortunes of
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constituting philosophy, or they may be kept distinct and variously subdivided. Sir William Hamilton, who, in deference to the narrowness of the Scotch school, at times almost identifies psychology with philosophy, enumerates, by a strained construction, five branches of the former: logic, ethics, politics, aesthetics, and theology (Ethics, Lect. iii, p. 44). Remusat incidentally distinguishes philosophy from the five heads of psychology, logic, metaphysics, theology (or the philosophy of religion = theology), and morals (Vie d'Aubier, liv. ii, ch. iii, vol. i, p. 351 sq.). Ampère, in his ingenious and fantastic classification of human knowledge, by a separation of the sciences into four departments (Phil. de la Religion, 1821, pp. 535, 545), assigns each of the four departments of philosophical inquiry. For the present purpose, the sufficiency or the insufficiency, the validity or the invalidity, of these various divisions and subdivisions is unimportant. The history of philosophy includes them all, either as definite members or as subordinate parts. Each may be treated separately, or all may be embraced in one treatment, or a distinct discussion may be bestowed upon several of them combined in one view. There may thus be a history of mental philosophy, and a history of ethics, like the supplement of Descartes to the Encyclopædia Britannica; or a history of logic, like Mr. Blackey's very feeble treatise on that subject; or a history of heretical opinions, like those so common in the earlier ages of the Christian Church; or a general history of philosophy, as in Dr. Renan's or Tennyson's works. This is the mode in which the history of philosophy may be divided.

The other process of division regards primarily the succession of philosophical systems, or of philosophical schools, where the systems are identified with particular schools. If this be done, it is not only not in doctrine, but in character. Hence other divisions, more precise than are attainable by these indistinct chronological periods, have latterly won more favor. The following may be offered as an example of such a distribution.

I. The beginnings of philosophy, chiefly among the Orientals, with whom philosophy, mythology, and the divine power inseparably interwoven.

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

III. The philosophy of the Schoolmen, which but occupies a small portion of modern systems. To this the philosophy of the Jews and Saracens may be added as an appendix, since it affords the transition to itself from the Greeks.

IV. Philosophy of the Renaissance, or Transition Age, commencing with Simplicius Plutarch and the Medicus Academy, and ending with Pascal and Gassendi.

V. The philosophy of Modern Times—First begun by Francis Bacon and Hobbes.

Each of these periods has many subdivisions, which have been variously constituted by different historians, and necessarily vary with the variation of the aspects under which philosophy is contemplated by the several chroniclers of its fluctuations.

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

Philosophy, Chaldean, See MAGI; PHILOSOPHY, Hebrew.

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

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

The various attempts which have been made to derive Western philosophy from Eastern sources have signalized failure. The external evidence in favor of this hypothesis is wholly insufficient to support (Heracleon, Orph. g. d. Phil. i, 159, et seq.; Thirlwall, Hist. of Gr. Ant., i, 180; Zeller, Geschichte der Phil. d. Griechen, i, 18-34; Max Müller, On Language, 84 note), and on internal grounds it is most improbable. It is true that in some degree the character of Greek speculation may have been influenced, at least in its earliest stages, by religious ideas which were originally introduced from the East; but this indirect influence does not affect the real originality of the great Greek teachers. The spirit of pure philosophy, distinct from theology, is wholly alien from Eastern thought; and it was comparatively late when even a Greek ventured to separate philosophy from religion. But in Greece the separation, when it was once effected, remained essentially complete. The opinions of the ancient philosophers might or might not be outwardly reconcilable with the popular faith, but philosophy and faith were independent. The very value of Greek teaching lies in the fact that it was, as far as is possible, a result of simple reason, or, if faith asserts its prerogative, the distinction is sharply marked. In this we have a record of the power and weakness of the human mind written at once on the grandest scale and in the fairest characters.

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

1. The pre-Socratic Schools.—The first Greek philosophy was little more than an attempt to follow out in thought the mystical cosmogonies of earlier poets. Gradually the depth and variety of the problems included in
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the idea of a cosmogony became apparent, and, after each chew had been turned out, the period ended in the negative teaching of the Sophists. The questions of creation, of the immediate relation of mind and matter, were pronounced in fact, if not in word, insoluble, and speculation was turned into a new direction. Which element or elements held the changing forms of things? — this was the primary inquiry to which the IONIC school endeavored to find an answer. Thales (B.C. cir. 625-610), following, as it seems, the genealogy of Hesiod, pointed to moisture (water) as the most primitive and supervening form of all matter. Anaximenes (B.C. cir. 540-480) substituted air for water, as the more subtle and all-pervading element; but equally with Thales he neglected all consideration of the force which might be supposed to modify the one primal substance. At a much later date (B.C. cir. 460) Diogenes of Apollonia, to meet this difficulty, represented this element as endowed with intelligence (σοφής), but even he makes no distinction between the material and the intelligible. The atomic theory of Democritus (B.C. cir. 460-357), which stands in close connection with this form of IONIC teaching, offered another and more metaphysical position. The universe of atoms included the action of force, but he wholly omitted to account for its source. Meanwhile another mode of speculation had arisen in the same school. In place of one definite element, Anaximander (B.C. cir. 610-547) suggested the infinite as the source of all the changes in the universe, and the many elements. Subsequently, however, this raised the question of the stability of the world. How the connected worlds with concrete being it is impossible to determine; but it may not be wholly fanciful to see in the doctrine of the transformation of souls an attempt to trace in the successive forms of life an outward expression of a harmonious law in the moral as well as in the physical world. (The remains of the pre-Socratic philosophers have been collected in a very convenient form by F. Mollach in Didot's Biblioth. Gr. Paris, 1860.)

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

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

The famous sentence in which Aristotle (Met. xiii, 4) characterizes the teaching of Socrates (B.C. 468-399) places his scientific position in the clearest light. There are two things, he says, which we may rightly attribute to Socrates, inductive reasoning and general definition (ὁ Β Σ Η Β Λ Π Κ Ν , ὁ καθολικός). By the first he endeavors to discover the essential elements which underlie the changing forms of appearances and the varieties of opinion: by the second he fixed the truth which he thus had gained. But, besides this, Socrates rendered another service to truth. He changed not only the method, but also the subject
of philosophy (Cicero, Acad. Post. i. 4). Ethics occupied
in his investigations the primary place which had
hitherto been held by physics. The great aim of his
inductions was to discover the laws of virtue; and,
before entering on other speculations, he determined
to obey the Delphian maxim and “know himself”
(Plato, Phdr. p. 229). It was a necessary consequence
of a first effort in this direction that Socrates regarded
all the results which he derived as like in kind. Knowl-
dge (ισόμετρα) was equally absolute and authorita-
tive, whether it referred to the laws of intellectual op-
terations or to questions of morality. A conclusion
in geometry and a conclusion on conduct were set forth as
true in the same sense. Thus virtue was only another
name for happiness (Xenoph. Mem. iii. 5, 4; Arist. Eth. Euk.
End. i. 5). Every one was supposed to have within him
a faculty absolutely leading to right action, just as the
mind necessarily decides rightly as to relations of space
and number, when each step in the proposition is clearly
stated. Socrates practically neglected the determina-
tive power of the will. His great glory was, however,
clearly connected with this fundamental error in his
system. He affirmed the existence of a universal law
of right and wrong. He connected philosophy with
action, both in detail and in general. On the one side he
did nothing of importance for the working of Providence.
Not the least fruitful char-
acteristic of his teaching was what may be called its
desolatoriness. He formed no complete system. He
wrote nothing. He attracted and impressed his follow-
ers by his many-sided nature. He helped others to
give birth to thoughts, to use his favorite image, but he
was barren himself (Plato, Theat. p. 150). As a result of
this, the most conflicting opinions were maintained by
some of his professed followers, who carried out iso-
lated fragments of his teaching to extreme conclusions.
Some adopted his method (Euclides, B.C. cir. 400, the
Μεταφυσικα), others his subject. Of the latter, one
section, following out his proposition of the identity of
self-command (ισόμετρα) with virtue, professed an utter
disregard of everything material (Antithenes, B.C.
cir. 350, the Κυκλικα), while the other (Aristippus, B.C.
cir. 366, the Κυκλικα), inverting the maxim that vit-
ue is necessarily accompanied by pleasure, took imme-
diate pleasure as the rule of action.
These "minor Socratic schools" were, however, pre-
monitory of the crisis of the soul. The truths which
they distorted were embodied at a later time in more
reasonable forms. Plato alone (B.C. 480-547), by the
breath and nobleness of his teaching, was the true suc-
cessor of Socrates; with fuller detail and greater elabo-
ration of parts, his philosophy was as many-sided as
that of Socrates, his principles a consistent Platonic
system, though many Platonic doc-
tines are sufficiently marked. Plato, indeed, possessed
two commanding powers, which, though apparently in-
compatible, are in the highest sense complementary: a
mature destructive dialectic, and a creative imagina-
tion. By the first he refuted the great fallacies of the
Sophists on the uncertainty of knowledge and right,
carrying out in this the attacks of Socrates; by the
other he endeavored to bridge over the interval between
appearance and reality, and gain an approach to the
eternal. His famous doctrines of Ideas and Recollection
(ανανωτητα) are a solution by imagination of a logical
difficulty. Socrates had shown the existence of general
notions; Plato felt constrained to attribute to them a
substantive existence (Arist. Met. xiii. 4). A glorious
vision. It was his supreme and most extravagant developement in philosophy. The unembodied
spirits were exhibited in immediate presence of the
"ideas" of things (Phdr. p. 247); the law of their em-
bodyment was sensibly portrayed; and the more or less
vivid remembrance of supermundane realities in this
life, was in harmony with the other. These things were things
supposed to have been face to face with truth: the ob-
ject of teaching was to bring back impressions latent
but uneffaced.
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The "myths" of Plato, to one of the most famous of
which reference has just been made, play a most impor-
tant part in his system. They answer in the philosopher's
systematic philosophy. In the development of his
mythology and judgment he leaves the way of reason, and ventures,
as he says, on a rude raft to brave the dangers of the ocean
(Phdr. p. 85, D; Gorg. p. 528, A). "The peril and
the prize are noble and the hope is great" (Phdr. p. 114,
C, D). Such tales, as he admits, may seem puerile
and ridiculous; and if there were other surer and clearer
means of gaining the desired end, the judgment
would be just (Gorg. p. 527, A). But, as it is, thus only can he
connect the seen and the unseen. The myths, then,
mark the limit of his dialectics. They are not merely
poetical pictures of the truth; they are also an
illustration of his teaching, but real efforts to penetrate
beyond the depths of argument. They show that his
method was not commensurate with his instinctive de-
sires; and point out in intelligible outlines the subjects
on which man looks for revelations. Such are the illu-
sions of the human mind to truth (Phdr. p. 246-49);
the pre-existence and immortality of the soul (Menon,
p. 81-82; Phdr. p. 110-12; Tim. p. 41); the state of future
retribution (Gorg. p. 525-28; Rep. p. 614-16); the re-
volutions of the world (Pol. p. 262. Comp. also Sympa.
p. 189-91, 202. Plato, Phileb. p. 601-03, who gives the
literature of the subject).

The great difference between Plato and Aristotle (B.C.
384-322) lies in the use which Plato thus made of im-
agination as the exponent of instinct. The dialectics of
Plato is not inferior to that of Aristotle, and Aristotle
exhibits traces of poetic power not unworthy of Plato;
but Aristotle never allows imagination to influence his
final decision. He elaborated a perfect method, and
he used it with perfect fairness. His writings con-
tain the highest utterance of pure reason. Looking
back on all the earlier efforts of philosophy, he pro-
nounced a calm and final judgment. For him many of
the conclusions which others had maintained were val-
less, because he showed that they rested on feeling,
and not on argumet. This stern severity of logic gives
an indescribable pathos to those passages in which he
touches on the highest hopes of men; and perhaps there
is no more truly affecting chapter in ancient literature
than that in which he states in a few unimpassioned
sentences the issue of his inquiry into the immortality
of the soul (Phyl. p. 70). It is so, but that part
is impersonal (De An. iii. 5). This was the utterance of
reason, and he gives expression to it without a word of
protest, and yet as one who knew the extent of the sac-
rifice which it involved. The conclusion is, as it were,
the epitaph of free speculation. Laws of observation
and argument, and even the traditions of experience,
continue to exist, but there is no hope beyond the grave.

It follows necessarily that the Platonic doctrine of
ideas was emphatically rejected by Aristotle, who gave,
however, the final development to the original concep-
tion of Socrates. With Socrates "ideas" (general de-
initions) were mere abstractions; with Plato they had
an absolute existence; with Aristotle they had no exis-
tence separate from things in which they were realized,
though the form (μορφη), which answers to the Platonic
idea, was held to be the manifest of the thing itself (comp.
Zeller, Philos. d. Griech. i. 119, 120).

There is one feature common in essence to the sys-
tems of Plato and Aristotle which has not yet been
noticed. In both, ethics is a part of politics. The citizen
is prior to the man. In Plato this doctrine finds its
most extravagant development in philosophy. The
life, and, in some places, his teaching, were directly op-
posed to it (e. g. Gorg. p. 527, D). This practical
inconsequence was due, it may be supposed, to the con-
dition of Athens at the time, for the idea was in complete
nationalism. It may be regarded as an absolute subordina-
tion of the individual to the body includes one of the chief lessons of the ancient world.

In Aristotle the "political" character of man is defined
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with greater precision, and brought within narrower limits. The breaking up of the small Greek states had prepared the way for more comprehensive views of human nature and, the desire for a deeper and more fundamental truth of the necessity of social union for perfect life. But in the next generation this was lost. The wars of the succession obliterates the idea of society, and philosophy was content with aiming at individual happiness.

The coming change was indicated by the rise of a school of sceptics. The scepticism of the Sophists marked the close of the first period, and in like manner the scepticism of the Pyrrhonists marks the close of the second (Stilpo, B.C. cir. 299; Pyrrho, B.C. cir. 350). But the Pyrrhonist's position was serviceable to the cause of philosophy, as the Sophists did by the refinement of language. Their immediate influence was limited in its range, and it is only as a symptom that the rise of philosophy is important. But in this respect it forebodes the character of after-philosophy by denuding the foundation of all higher speculations. Thus all interest was turned to questions of practical morality. Hitherto morality had been based as a science upon mental analysis, but by the Pyrrhonists it was made subservient to law and custom. Immediate experience was held to be the only true guide, and the world was made to appear as a spectacle, a mere show, and the reason of man was destroyed.

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

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

Epicurus (B.C. 382-270) defined the object of philosophy to be the attainment of a happy life. The pursuit of truth for its own sake he regarded as superfluous. He rejected dialectics as a useless study, and accepted the senses, in the widest acceptation of the term, as the criterion of truth. Physics he subordinated entirely to ethics (Cicero, De Fin, i, 7). But he differed widely from the Cyrenaics in his view of happiness. The happiness at which the wise man aims to be found, he said, not in momentary gratification, but in lifelong pleasure. It does not consist necessarily in excitement or motion, but often in absolute tranquility (dormit) of the wise man is happy even on the rack) (Diog. Laer. x, 118), for “virtue alone is inescapable from pleasure” (ib. p. 188). To live happily and to live wisely, nobly, and justly, are convertible phrases (id. p. 140). But it followed as a corollary from his view of happiness that the gods, who were assumed to be supremely happy and eternal, were absolutely free from all care or concern about any care for the world or man (id. p. 139; comp. Lucr. ii, 645-47). All things were supposed to come into being by chance, and so pass away; and the study of nature was chiefly useful as dispelling the superstitious fears of the gods and death by which the multitude are tormented. It is obvious how such teaching would degenerate in practice. The individual was left master of his own life, free from all regard to any higher law than a refined selfishness.

While Epicurus asserted in this manner the claims of one part of man's nature in the conduct of life, Zeno of Citium (B.C. cir. 280), with equal partiality, advocated a purely spiritual (intellectual) morality. The opposition between the two was complete. The infinite, chance-formed worlds of the one stand over against the one harmonious world of the other. On the one side are gods regardless of material things, on the other a being permeating and vivifying all creation. This difference necessarily found its chief expression in ethics. For when the Stoics taught that there were only two principles of things, matter and God, and argued that reason—for them the gods were many and various—was fashioned and quickened (τι ρωσιονι)—it followed that the active principle in man is of divine origin, and that his duty is to live conformably to nature (τι ρωσιονιανυμεν την γενευς) (p. 31). By "nature" some understood the nature of man, others the nature of the universe; but both agreed in regarding it as a general law of the whole, and not particular passions or impulses. Good, therefore, was but one. All external things were indifferent. Reason was the absolute sovereign of man. Thus the doctrine of Epicurus, practically left man to himself, but it was worse in its final results than Epicurism, for it made him his own god.

In one point the Epicureans and Stoics were agreed. They both regarded the happiness and culture of the individual as the highest good. Both systems belonged to a period of corruption and decay. They were the efforts of the man to support himself in the ruin of the state. But at the same time this assertion of individual independence and breaking down of local connections performed an important work in preparation for Christianity. It was for the Gentile world an influence corresponding to the Dispersion for the Jews. Men, as men, owned their fellowship as they had not done before. Isolating superstitions were shattered by the arguments of the Epicureans. The unity of the human race in the conception of one nature of man, others the nature of the universe; but both agreed in regarding it as a general law of the whole, and not particular passions or impulses. Good, therefore, was but one. All external things were indifferent. Reason was the absolute sovereign of man. Thus the doctrine of Epicurus, practically left man to himself, but it was worse in its final results than Epicurism, for it made him his own god.

Meanwhile in the New Academy Platonism degenerated into scepticism. Epicurus found an authoritative rule in the sense. The Stoics took refuge in what seems to answer to the modern doctrine that of the common sense,” and maintained that the senses give a direct knowledge of the object. Carneades (B.C. 218-129) combated these views, and showed that sensation cannot be proved to declare the real nature, but only some of the effects, of things. Thus the slight philosophical basis of the later schools was undermined. Scepticism remained as the last issue of speculation; and if we may believe the declaration of Seneca (Quaest. Nat. vii, 82), scepticism itself soon ceased to be taught as a system. The great teachers had sought rest, and in the end they found unrest. No science of life could be established. The reason of the few failed to create an esoteric rule of virtue and happiness. For in this they all agreed, that the blessings of philosophy were not for the mass. A "gospel preached to the poor" was as yet unknown to the wise men.

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

The complete course of philosophy was run before the Christian era, but there were yet two mixed systems afterwards which offered some novel features. At Alexandria Platonism was united with various elements of Eastern speculation, and for several centuries exercised an important influence on Christian doctrine. At Rome Stoicism was vivified by the spirit of the old republic, and exhibit the extreme Western type of philosophy. Of the first nothing can be said. It arose only when Christianity was a recognised spiritual and legal power of the state, and rendered it impossible for the pagans to resist its influence. The treatise of Denis (Histoire des Théories et des Idées morales dans l’Antiquité (Paris, 1856), is limited in range and hardly satisfactory. Dillinger’s Vorhalle zur Gesch. des Christenthums (Heidelberg, 1868), comprehensively, but covers too large a field. The brief surveys in De Presse’s Histoire des Trois Premiers siècles of l’Eglise chrétienne (Paris, 1858; transl. Edinb. 1862), and in Cocker, Christianity and Greek Philosophy (N.Y. 1670), are much more vigorous, and on the whole just. But no one seems to have apprehended the real character and growth of Greek philosophy so well as Zeller (though with no special attention to its relations to religion) in his history (Die Philosophie der Griechen, 2d ed. Tübingen, 1856), which for sublety and completeness is unrivaled. See also in Gatenby’s edition of Eusebius (adjoining articles) Brandis, Handb. d. gré. Philos. Philologie (1855 sq.); Maury, Histoire de la Religion de la Grèce (Paris, 1867, 3 vol.); Butler, Histoire de l’Anc. Philos. (London, 1866, 2 vols.).

II. Connection of Greek with Hebrew Philosophy.

The literature of Greece and Judaea came in contact at Alexandria; and the first known attempt to accomplish their fusion is that ascribed to the Jewish Peripatetic Aristotle, in the reign of Ptolemy Philometor (B.C. 186-146); but the principal extant specimens are those which were written during the 2d century after Christ. Philo, the date of whose birth may be placed about B.C. 20. (Aristobulus is said to have been a Peripatetic; but of his exact relations to this philosophy nothing is known. From the few fragments which remain of his writings, he seems to have anticipated Philo in the employment of an allegorical interpretation of Scripture. His name, however, is more known in connection with forgeries of the Greek poets in support of his theory that the wisdom of the Greeks was borrowed from Moses. See Valckener, Die griech. Lehren der Juden, 2d ed. Basle, 1896, represents a whole picture of the 1st century, as a source of consolation (iv, 2, 14; v, 15); but there is no confidence in any future retribution. In a certain sense the elements of which we are composed are eternal (v, 13), for they are incorporated in other parts of the universe, but we shall cease to exist (iv, 14, 21; v, 24; vi, 10). Not only is there no recognition of communion between an immortal man and a personal God, but the idea is excluded. Man is but an atom in a vast universe, and his actions and sufferings are measured solely by their relation to the whole (Aston, s, x, 6, 29; xii, 26; vi, 45; v, 22; vii, 9). God is but another name for “the mind of the universe” (Γ του κεφαλος του οσμοντ, v, 30), “the soul of the world” (iv, 40), “the reason that ordeth matter” (vii, 1), “universal nature” (Γ του ωσμοντ, vii, 33; ix, 1; comp. x, 1), and is even identified with the world itself (του γενεας του κόσμου, xii, 1; comp. Gataker on iv, 28). Thus the stoicism of M. Aurelius gives many of the moral precepts of the Gospel (Gataker, p. xviii), but without their foundation, which can find no place in his system. It is impossible to read his reflections without emotion, but he cannot have invented the idea of the soul of the world. There are the last strain of a dying creed, and in themselves he has no elevation of affinity to the new faith. Christianity necessarily includes whatever is noblest in them, but they affect to supply the place of Christianity, and do not lead to it. The real elements of greatness in M. Aurelius are many, and truly Roman; but the study of his Meditations by the side of the New Test can leave little doubt that he could not have helped to give a national standing-place to a Catholic Church.

The history of ancient philosophy in its religious aspect has been strangely neglected. Nothing, so far as we are aware, has been written on the pre-Christian era answering to the clear and elegant essay of Matter on post-Christian history in "Histoire de la Philosophie dans ses rapports avec la Religion depuis l’ère chrétienne," Paris, 1864). There are useful hints in Caro’s Vorbilder des Christenthums (Jena, 1861), and Ackermann’s Das Christliche in Plato (Hamb, 1836). The treatise of Denis, Histoire des Théories et des Idées morales dans l’Antiquité (Paris, 1856), is limited in range and hardly satisfactory. Dilling’s Vorbilder zur Gesch. des Christenthums (Heidelberg, 1868), comprehensively, but covers too large a field. The brief surveys in De Presse’s Histoire des Trois Premiers siècles de l’Église chrétienne (Paris, 1858; transl. Edinb. 1862), and in Cocker, Christianity and Greek Philosophy (N.Y. 1670), are much more vigorous, and on the whole just. But no one seems to have apprehended the real character and growth of Greek philosophy so well as Zeller (though with no special attention to its relations to religion) in his history (Die Philosophie der Griechen, 2d ed. Tübingen, 1856), which for sublety and completeness is unrivaled. See also in Gatenby’s edition of Eusebius (adjoining articles) Brandis, Handb. d. gré. Philos. Philologie (1855 sq.); Maury, Histoire de la Religion de la Grèce (Paris, 1867, 3 vol.); Butler, Histoire de l’Anc. Philos. (London, 1866, 2 vols.).

II. Connection of Greek with Hebrew Philosophy.

The literature of Greece and Judaea came in contact at Alexandria; and the first known attempt to accomplish their fusion is that ascribed to the Jewish Peripatetic Aristotle, in the reign of Ptolemy Philometor (B.C. 186-146); but the principal extant specimens are those which were written during the 2d century after Christ. Philo, the date of whose birth may be placed about B.C. 20. (Aristobulus is said to have been a Peripatetic; but of his exact relations to this philosophy nothing is known. From the few fragments which remain of his writings, he seems to have anticipated Philo in the employment of an allegorical interpretation of Scripture. His name, however, is more known in connection with forgeries of the Greek poets in support of his theory that the wisdom of the Greeks was borrowed from Moses. See Valckener, Die griech. Lehren der Juden, 2d ed. Basle, 1896, represents a whole picture of the 1st century, as a source of consolation (iv, 2, 14; v, 15); but there is no confidence in any future retribution. In a certain sense the elements of which we are composed are eternal (v, 13), for they are incorporated in other parts of the universe, but we shall cease to exist (iv, 14, 21; v, 24; vi, 10). Not only is there no recognition of communion between an immortal man and a personal God, but the idea is excluded. Man is but an atom in a vast universe, and his actions and sufferings are measured solely by their relation to the whole (Aston, s, x, 6, 29; xii, 26; vi, 45; v, 22; vii, 9). God is but another name for “the mind of the universe” (Γ του κεφαλος του οσμοντ, v, 30), “the soul of the world” (iv, 40), “the reason that ordeth matter” (vii, 1), “universal nature” (Γ του ωσμοντ, vii, 33; ix, 1; comp. x, 1), and is even identified with the world itself (του γενεας του κόσμου, xii, 1; comp. Gataker on iv, 28). Thus the stoicism of M. Aurelius gives many of the moral precepts of the Gospel (Gataker, p. xviii), but without their foundation, which can find no place in his system. It is impossible to read his reflections without emotion, but he cannot have invented the idea of the soul of the world. There are the last strain of a dying creed, and in themselves he has no elevation of affinity to the new faith. Christianity necessarily includes whatever is noblest in them, but they affect to supply the place of Christianity, and do not lead to it. The real elements of greatness in M. Aurelius are many, and truly Roman; but the study of his Meditations by the side of the New Test can leave little doubt that he could not have helped to give a national standing-place to a Catholic Church.
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are cited by Gfrörer, i. 54. Philo even maintains the divine inspiration of the Septuagint version, Viti. Mos. ii, c. 6, 7, p. 139, 140.) The result in his writings was an attempted combination of the two—the Greek philosophy supplying the ethical ideal of the Scriptures, through the Septuagint translation, contributed, by means of an extravagant license of allegorical interpretation, much of the language and illustration of the system, besides imparting to it the apparent sanction of a divine authority. The leading idea of Philo's teaching is the idea of a Platonic idea, which forms the connecting link between the philosophy of Greece and the pantheism of the East—that thought which represents the supreme principle of things as absolutely one and simple, beyond personality and beyond definite existence, and as such immutable and incapable of relation to temporal things. (Comp. Plato, Rep., vi, 509; i, 381. Gfrörer, i, 134, and Franck, Dict. des Sciences Philosophiques, art. Philon, regard this feature of Philo's theology as of Oriental origin. But his Greek studies might suggest the same idea, and much of his language seems to point to this origin. See Duhme, i, 31, 41.)

In place of the God of the Hebrew Scriptures, who, even in his most hidden and mysterious nature, is never regarded as other than a person, Philo is led to substitute a supreme idea of God, an ideal or abstract unity, as the first principle of a system in which philosophy and theology are to be reconciled and united: and though he is unable entirely to abandon the language of personality which the Scriptures at every page force upon him, he is at the same time unable, consistently with his philosophical assumptions, to admit an immediate personal relation between the Supreme Being and the creature. (See De Mut. Nom. c. 4, p. 582; Gfrörer, i, 144; Duhme, i, 154. The various passages inconsistent with this, in which Philo seems to speak as if the action of God in the world may perhaps be explained by supposing this action to be exerted through the medium of the Logos. Comp. Quod Deus sit immut. c. 12, p. 281; Gfrörer, i, 199, 293.) The medium of reconciliation is sought in a development of the scriptural manifestation of the Wisdom and the Word of God, which take the place of the soul of the world as it appears in the Timaeus, being represented as a second God—the connecting link between the first principle and the world; in whom are concentrated those personal attributes which are indispensable to religion, and which are concomitantly present in the Scripture theology (Fragm. 625, ex Euseb. Porpl. Evang. viii, 13: Διὰ τις ὡς περὶ θεοῦ οὐκ ἦν τὸ ἐκ τούτων θεὸν ἑιρήνα τῶν ἄνθρωπων, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῆς ἀνατολῆς; Πηγαδίως καὶ σφών τοιαύτης συνηρμομένης. Θύμων γάρ τις ἴνα ἐκ τούτων οὐκ ἐποιεῖται ἀνατολῆς καὶ Πηγής τῶν ἑλέους, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῶν ἑπτά εἶναι ὡς ἐκ τούτων ἵπτομαι). The following short summary of Philo's system will serve to exhibit those of its features which are most nearly related to our present inquiry (in this summary use has been made chiefly of that of Hegel, Grecia. der Philosophie, its Werke, xv, 18-23, and of that of Zeller, Philos. der Griechen, iii, 504-665): The highest aim of philosophy, and the most perfect happiness, according to Philo, is the knowledge of God in his absolute nature (De Vita Contempl. c. 2, p. 473. Comp. De Conf. Legis. c. 20, p. 419; De Vict. Offr. c. 16, p. 264; De Monarch. i, 3, 4, p. 216), in which he is exalted above all affinity to finite things, without qualities, and not to be expressed in speech (Legis. Alf. i, c. 13, p. 50: άντων οὖν θεός, χωρίς ἐκ τούτων πάντων ἐκ τούτων λαμβάνεται, καὶ διάθρων καὶ ἰσθούστος). De Somn. i, 39, p. 650: λαμβάνεται γὰρ ἐκ πάντων, ἀλλ' μόνον ἐκ τούτων. Comp. De Viti. Cont. c. 1, p. 472; Quod Deus immut. c. 11, p. 281). Such knowledge, though not fully attainable by any man, is nevertheless to be essentially present in the highest degree in which we apprehend directly the existence of God, though falling short of a comprehension of his essence (De Præm. et Post. c. 7, p. 415. Comp. Gfrörer, i, 135, 199. By this hypothesis of a primary and secondary knowledge, Gfrörer reconciles those passages in which the knowledge of God is stated as unattainable by others apparently of an opposite import: e. g. De Post. Cont. c. 48, p. 258; De Monarch. i, 6, p. 218). Even this amount, however, of direct knowledge is not to be gained by any effort of human thought, but only by God's revelation of himself, and is therefore a revelation in which the seer, himself passive, is elevated by divine inspiration above the conditions of finite consciousness, and becomes one with the God whom he contemplates (De Posver. Cont. c. 5, p. 229; Legis. Alf. iii, 23, p. 107; De Abr. c. 24, p. 19; De Migr. Abr. c. 31, p. 463; Fragm. p. 645; Quis rer. dic. har. c. 13, 14, p. 482; comp. Neander, Ch. Hist. i, 79, ed. Bohn. This ecstatic intuition is insisted upon also by Plotinus and the later Platonists, as in modern times by Schelling). But this ecstatic vision is possible only to a chosen few; for the many, who are incapable of it, there remains only that inferior and improper apprehension of God which can be gained through the means of derived and created existences, especially of his Word or Wisdom, who is the medium by which God is related to the world. The idea of the Supreme Being is the God of the wise and perfect (Legis. Alf. iii, 32, p. 107; iii, 73, p. 128; De Abr. c. 24, p. 19; De Migr. Abr. c. 31, p. 463; De Conf. Legis. c. 28, p. 427). This Word, or Logos, is described in various ways, some more externally personal, others more personally being. Whether the Logos of Philo is to be regarded as a distinct person or not is matter of controversy. The negative is maintained by Burton (Brompton Lectures, note 38) and by Dorrer (Person of Christ, ii, 27, Engl. transl. and note A), against Gfrörer, Duhme, and others. The view that the intermediate view is taken by Zeller, iii, 626, and to some extent by Prof. Jowett, Epistles of St. Paul, i, 484, 2d ed.) He is the intelligible world, the archetypal pattern, the idea of ideas (De Mund. Opif. c. 6, p. 5; elsewhere the Logos is distinguished from the Logos of the Logos. Comp. De Conf. Legis. c. 14, p. 414), the wisdom of God (Legis. Alf. i, 19, p. 56), the shadow of God, by which, as by an instrument, he made the world (Legis. Alf. iii, 81, p. 106; comp. De Monarch. ii, 5, p. 225; De Cherub. c. 56, p. 162): he is the eternal image of the Father (De Somn. i, 37, p. 658); the mediator between the Creator and his creatures, the suppliant in behalf of mortals, the abode and author from the ruler to his subjects (Quis rer. dic. har. c. 42, p. 501). He is moreover the God in whose likeness man was made; for the supreme God cannot have any likeness to a mortal nature (Fragm. p. 625): he is the angel who appeared to Moses at the bush (Viti. Mos. i, 12, p. 91; comp. Gfrörer, i, 288, 284), he is the guide of the Israelites, the angel who appeared to the Israelites (De Abr. c. 31, p. 468). This interposition of the Logos thus serves to combine the theology of contemplation with that of worship and obedience; it endeavors to provide one God for those whose philosophical meditations aspire to an intuition of the absolute, and another for those who are satisfied by the possession of a personal object, while at the same time it attempts to preserve the unity
of God by limiting the attribution of proper and superior deity to the first principle only.

In addition to this, which may be regarded as the central point of Philo's system, some have endeavored to elicit from his writings a closer approximation to Christian doctrine, in the recognition of a third divine being, the Logos, from whom the universe was created and from whom the Logos sprang. (See Allix, Judgment of the Jewish Church, p. 119, ed. 1821; Kidder, Demonstration of the Messiah, pt. iii, ch. 5.) A remarkable passage sometimes cited for this purpose occurs in his allegorizing commentary on which he wrought at thevimana meeting with God in Eden. "With one true and proper God," he says, "there are two first and highest powers, goodness and authority: by goodness he has produced everything, and by authority he rules over that which he has produced; and a third, which brings both together as a medium, is reason; for by reason God is both a ruler and good. Of these two powers—goodness and authority—the cherubim are the symbol; and of reason, the flaming sword" (De Cherub. c. 9, p. 148). In like manner he comments on the threefold appearance to Abraham in the plains of Mamre. [This appearance represents the Father of the universe, who in the sacred writings is called by his proper name, the Existent (Ω̄ν), and those on each side are the most ancient powers and the created universe, one of which is called the creative and the other the kingly power. The creative power is that which in the divinest sense as Jehovah rules the universe; and the kingly power is Lord, for it seems to have been developed from the universe, and in the other the seems to be identified with one of them; and the confusion is increased if we compare other passages in which additional powers are mentioned with further distinctions. (Comp. De Mut. Nom. c. 4, p. 592, where a διά θεοῦ εἶναι φύλακας is mentioned as distinct from the βασιλεία and υἱότης, and all three are distinguished from the supreme God.) The truth seems to be that Philo indulged his allegorizing fancy in the invention of divine powers ad libitum, in any number and with any significance which the text on which he commented would suggest; and he has no more difficulty in finding six divine powers to be represented by the six cities of refuge (De Prof. c. 18, 19, p. 560, 561). In this passage, again, the three higher powers, represented by the three cities beyond Jordan, are clearly distinguished from the supreme God) than he has in finding three, to suit the two cherubim and the flaming sword. In this kind of desultory playing with the language of Scripture it is idle to look for any definite doctrine, philosophical or theological.

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

In the language as well as in the doctrines of Philo we may trace the influence of Greek philosophy in conjunction with the literature of his own nation. The theory, indeed, which would trace the term ῥήτορος to the few and unimportant passages in which it is employed by Plato is too fanciful and far-fetched to be tenable; but the appearance in Philo of the Stoic distinction between διά θεοῦ and διά φύσεως, as well as his general use of the term, seems to indicate that in the employment of this word he was influenced by the language of the Greek philosophy. (The latter is the more in conjunction with that of the former.) (On the λόγος of the Stoics and its use in Philo, see Zeller, Philos. der Griechen, iii, 630. Comp. Wyttenbach on Platarch, ii, 44, 4.) The distinction between ἰδεῖν καὶ φύσεως ὁ λόγος, though acknowledged by Philo, is not applied by him directly to the terms. (Gfr. i, 187.) (On the distinction between Philo and the Stoics, see Valckenir, Diar. de Aristotelio, sec. xxxii.) In the use of the cognate term ζήσονται, as nearly, if not quite equivalent to ἀπο- γινόμενον, he was probably more directly influenced by writers of his own nation, by the Sept. version of the Proverbs, and by the books of Ecclesiastus and Wisdom. (On the identity of λόγος and ζήσονται in Philo, see Gfr. i, 213 sq.) Thus his language, no less than his matter, indicates the compound character of his writings; the twofold origin of his opinions being paralleled by a similar twofold source of the terms in which they are expressed.

It is necessary to dwell to some extent upon the writings of Philo, because it is through them, if at all, that the influence of the Greek philosophy on the Christian Scriptures is to be traced. Whether we admit the conjecture that St. John, during his residence at Ephesus, might have become acquainted with Philo's writings; or whether we regard these writings as the extant representatives of a widely diffused doctrine, which might have reached the apostle through other channels than the Syriac version of the Mosaic law, as se (see, for the one, see Tholuck, on St. John, p. 55, Engl. transl.; the truth may perhaps be found in an intermediate view, if we distinguish between the Christian doctrine itself and the language in which it is expressed. Notwithstanding the verbal parallelism which may be adduced between the language of Philo and that of some of the N.T. passages, the passage between the Alexandrian and the Christian doctrine is one rather of contrast than of resemblance. The distinguishing doctrine of the Christian revelation—that of the Word made flesh—not only does not appear in Philo, but could not possibly appear, consistently with the lead-
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The principles of his philosophy, according to which the flesh, and matter in general, is condemned as the source of all evil. The development of Philo's doctrine, if applied to the person of Christ, will lead, as has been pointed out, not to Christianity, but to deism (see Dorner on the Person of Christ, i. 17, Engl. transl.); and in the distinction, which he constantly makes, between the absolute God and the secondary deity, who alone is capable of relation to finite things, we may trace the germ of a theory which afterwards, in various forms, became conspicuous in the different developments of gnosticism.

In fact, the method of Philo, both in his philosophical theories and in his interpretations of Scripture, is so far from being, either in substance or in spirit, an anticipation of the Christian revelation, that it may rather be taken as a representative of the opposite spirit of rationalism, the tendency of which is to remove all distinction between natural and revealed religion, by striving to bring all religious doctrines alike within the compass of human reason. It is not the reception of divine truth as a fact, resting on the authority of an inspired teacher, telling us that these things are so; it is rather an inquiry into causes and grounds, framing theories to explain how they are so. The doctrine of the Logos, as it appears in Philo, is a hypothesis assumed in order to explain the possibility that the God whom his philosophy taught him to regard as above all relation to finite existence, could nevertheless, as his religion taught him to believe, be actually manifested in relation to the world.

To explain this difficulty, he has recourse to the supposition of an intermediate being between God and the world; standing, as it were, midway between the abstract and impersonal on the one side, and the definite and personal on the other; and described in language which wavers between the two concepts, without succeeding in combining them. In this respect the theory reminds us not only of those forms of gnosticism which subsequently emanated from the Alexandrian philosophy under the influence of Christianity, as Philo's system emanated from the same philosophy under the influence of Judaism, but also to some extent, of later speculations, which, in the endeavor to transfer the Catholicism of the first Christian century to a metaphysical foundation, have regarded the doctrine of the incarnation of the divine Word, not as the literal statement of a fact which took place at an appointed time, but as the figurative representation of an eternal process in the divine nature. (See Fichte, Anmerkungen zum seligen Leben, Werke, v. 182; Mill, A system ofLogic, Vorlesungen über Alcc Stud. p. 192; Hegel, Philosophie der Geschichte, Werke, ix., 388; Baur, Christliche Gnosis, p. 715.)

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

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

**Philo**


**De Somm. I. 15.** p. 633. ἐκεῖνος ἐφράστων μὲν οὗθεν ὅτι φήμι τοῦ λόγου. **De Vita Mon. I. 14.** p. 155. ἀναπτύσσεται γὰρ ὁ λόγος τοῦ λόγου κατά καταλογισμὸν, ἑκάτερον τῆς ὁμοιότητος ἀλληγορίας, κ. τ. λ. **[The Stoics here in the world, represented by the vestments of the high-priest.]**

An examination of these passages will, we believe, confirm the view which has been above taken of the doctrinal differences between them; while, at the same time, it will enable us to discern a purpose to be served by the verbal resemblances which they undoubtedly exhibit. If we except instances of merely accidental similarity in language, without any affinity in thought; or quotations by way of illustration, such as St. Paul occasionally borrows from heathen writers; or thoughts and expressions derived from the O.T., and therefore common to Philo and the apostles, as alike acknowledging and making use of the Jewish Scriptures; they may be reduced, for the most part, to two heads: first, the use of the name of Logos, by St. John, as a title of Christ, and the application to him, both by St. John and St. Paul, of various attributes and offices ascribed by Philo to the divine Word, and to the various philosophical representations with which the Word is identified; and, secondly, the recognition, chiefly in the acknowledged writings of St. Paul and in the Epistle to the Hebrews, of a spiritual sense, in parts of Scripture, distinct from the literal interpretation; though this is employed far more cautiously and sparingly than in Philo, and as an addition to, rather than, as Philo for the most part employs it, as a substitute for the literal sense. The apocryphal writing, which appeared from these passages, availed themselves, in some degree, of the language already established in the current speculations of their countrymen, in order to correct the errors with which that language was associated, and to lead men’s minds to a recognition of the truth of which these errors were the counterfeit. This is only what might naturally be expected from men desirous of adapting the truths which they had to teach, to the circumstances of those to whom they had to teach them. There was an earlier gnosticism founded in part on the perversion of the Law, as there was a later gnosticism founded in part on the perversion of the Gospel; and it is probable that, at least at the time when St. John wrote, the influence of both had begun to be felt in the Christian Church, and had modified to some extent the language of its theology (see Burton, Hampion Lectures, p. 218). If so, the adoption of that language, as a vehicle of Christian doctrine, would furnish the natural means both of correcting the errors which had actually crept into the Church, and of countering the influence of the source from which they sprang. If the philosophic Jews of Alexandria, striving, as speculative minds in every age have striven, to lay the foundations of their philosophy in an apprehension of the one and the absolute, were driven by the natural current of such speculations to think of the God whom they regarded as remote and solitary, having no relation to finite things, and no attributes out of which such a relation can arise, it is natural that the inspired Christian teacher should have been directed to provide, by means of their own language, the antidote to their error; to point, in the revelation of God and man united in one Christ, to the truth, and to the manner of attaining the truth; to turn the mind of the wandering seeker from theory to fact, from speculation to belief; to bid him look, with the eye of faith, to that great mystery of godliness in which the union of the divine and the finite is realized in fact, though remaining still incomprehensible in theory. If the same philosophers, again, seeking to bridge over the chasm which their speculations had interposed between God and man, distorted the partial revelation of the Angel of the Covenant, which their speculations supplied, into the likeness of the ideal universe of the Platonist, or of the half-personified world-reason of the Stoic, it was surely no unworthy object of the apostolic teaching to lead them, by means of the same language, to the true import of that revelation, as made known, in its later and fuller manifestation, by the advent of the Word made flesh. If the Platonicizing expositor of the Jewish Scriptures, eager to find the foreign philosophy which he adopted in the oracles of God committed to his own people, explained away their literal import by a system of allegory and metaphor, it was natural that
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the inspired writers of the New Covenant should point out the true meaning of those marks which the Jewish history and religion so clearly bear of a spiritual significa-
cance. By appealing to the legal institutions of the Law and the record of God's dealings with his chosen people are not an allegory contrived for the teaching of a present philosophy, but an anticipation, designed by the divine Author of the whole as a prepa-
ration, directly and indirectly, by teaching and train-
ing, by ritual and prophecy, by type and symbol, to make ready the way for him that was to come.
The attempts made by Grossmann, Gfrorer, and oth-
ers, to explain the origin of Christianity as an offshoot of the Jewish philosophy of Alexandria rest mainly on the statements of the Apostles concerning the spiritual absence of the men described in the New Testament, while overlooking fundamental differences of doctrine. The ideal Logos, the distinguishing feature of the Alexandrian philosophy, has no place in the teaching of the N.T. The belief in one Christ, very God and very man, has not only no place in, but is diametrically opposed to the philosophical speculations of Philo. For his personal relations to Christianity, see Philo. Christianity came into the world at a time when the Greek-Jewish modes of thought, of which Philo is the representative, were prevalent; and they had no recent spiritual leaders, so far as they had to deal with those to whom that philosophy was familiar, could do so most effectively by means of its language and associations. These considerations seem naturally to explain the resemblance and the dif-
ference between the two systems—resemblance as regards the doctrinal systems were presented in forms designed to meet the acknowledged wants of the time. According to the commonly received report, Origen was the scholar of Ammonius Saccas, who first gave consistency to the later Platonism, and for a long time he was the contro-
versial exposition. Neo-Platonism was, in fact, an attempt to seize the spirit of Christianity, apart from its historic basis and human elements. The separation between the two was absolute; and yet the splendor of the one-
sided spiritualism of Origen attracted, in some cases the admiration of the Christian fathers (Bas-
ii, Theodoret), and the wide circulation of the writings of the pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite served to prop-
gate many of their doctrines under an orthodox name among the schoolmen and mystics of the Middle Ages (Yogn, Neu-Platonismus u. Christianism, 1856; Herzog, Encyklop. s. v. Neu-Platonismus). See Neo-
Platonism.
The want which the Alexandrian fathers endeavored to satisfy is in a great measure the want of our own time, if Christianity be truth, it must have points of special connection with all nations and all periods. The difference of character in the constituent writings of the N.T. are evidently typical, and present the Gospel in a form (if technical language may be used) now ethical, now logical, now mystical. But this indicates a tendency to give the idea of a harmonious whole. Clement rightly maintained that there is a "gnosis" in Christianity distinct from the errors of gnosticism. The latter was a premature attempt to connect the Gospel with earlier systems; the former a result of conflict grounded on faith (Mühler, Patrologie, p. 424, etc.). Christian philosophy may be in one sense a contradiction in terms, for Christianity confessively derives its first principles from revelation, and not from simple reason; but there is no less a true philosophy of Christianity, which aims to show how completely these, by their form, their substance, and their consequences, meet the instincts and aspirations of all ages. The ex-
position of such a philosophy would be the work of a modern Origen.

See Haller, Philosophie der Kirchenväter (Münch. 1850); Stieckl, Philosoph. der philosophischen Zeit (Würzburg, 1859); Moller, Kosmologie in d. griech. Kirsche (Halle, 1868).

IV. Patriotic Recognition of the Propaedeutic Office of Greek Philosophy.—The divine discipline of the Jews and Greeks in nature; the true God, which formed so essential a tenet of the Gnostic schools, occurs in the N.T. (comp. Thiersch, Versuch u. der Her-
stellung d. hist. Standpunktes, etc., p. 231-304).
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The reason, no less than the will and the affections, had an office to discharge in preparing man for the incarnation. The proces and the issue in the two cases were widely different, but they were in some sense complementary, for its direct advent and that of revelation are implicitly included in their fundamental difference of method. In the one, man boldly aspired at once to God; in the other, God disclosed himself gradually to man. Philosophy failed as a religious teacher practically (Rom. i. 21, 22), but it is the noble witness to an Sotheral law (ii. 14, 15). It laid open instinctive wants which it could not satisfy. It cleared away error, when it could not find truth. It wavered the foremost minds of a nation, when it left the mass without hope. In its purest and grandest forms it was "a schoolmaster to bring men to Christ" (Clem. Alex. Strom. i, § 28).

This function of ancient philosophy is distinctly recognized by many of the greatest of the fathers. The principle which is involved in the doctrine of Justin Martyr on "the Seminal Word" finds a clear and systematic expression in the claims and aims of Plato (Respn. Repeosing, Origenes, i, 437-439). "Every race of men participated in the Word. And they who lived with the Word were Christians, even if they were held to be godless (ad Scot.); or, as, for example, among the Greeks, Socrates and Heraclitus, and others, who, like the claim of Origenes (De principiis, ii, 10, 13). "Philosophy," says Clement, "before the coming of the Lord, was necessary to Greeks for righteousness; and now it proves useful for godliness, being in some sort a preliminary discipline (φρονηματικα τον θου) for those who rep the facts and learn the language of the divine. ... Perhaps we may say that it was given to the Greeks with this special object (φυσικη ανεπαφηκτικη) for it brought (ινα παρασκευην) the Greek nation to Christ, as the law brought the Hebrews" (Clem. Alex. Strom. i, § 28; comp. § 42, and 16, § 80). In this sense he does not scruple to say that "Philosophy was given as a peculiar testament (διασοροντα) to the Greeks, as forming the basis of the Christian philosophy" (Ibid. vi, § 8). Origen, himself a pupil of Ammonius Saccas, speaks with less precision as to the education of his own mind, but all his witness to its influence. The truths which the philosophers taught, says he, referring to the words of Paul, were from God, for "God manifested these to them, and all things that have been nobly said" (c. Cels. vi, § 3; Plato, Theaet. 165 d). It is plain that the great Gentile teachers, allows that "some of them made great discoveries, so far as they received help from heaven, while they erred so far as they were hindered by human frailty" (August. De Cir. ii, 7; comp. De Doctr. Chr. ii, 16). They had, as he elsewhere confesses, fixed their views in part from the teaching of nature what prophets learned from the Spirit (Rom. i, vs; etc.).

But while many thus recognised in philosophy the free witness of the Word speaking among men, the same writers in other places sought to explain the partial harmony of philosophy and revelation by an original connection of the two. This attempt, which in the forerunners of a clearer criticism is seen to be essentially fruitless and even suicidal, was at least more plausible in the first centuries. A main line in the history of the Church carries the names of the Sibyls and Hymasts, which were obviously based on the O.T. Scriptures, and as long as they were received as genuine it was impossible to doubt that Jewish doctrines were spread in the West before the rise of philosophy. On the other hand, in the category of the being and non-being, the contradictions and errors of philosophers, it must be remembered that they spoke often fresh from a conflict with degenerate professors of systems which had long lost all real life. Some indeed there were, chiefly among the Latins, who consistently inveighed against philosophy. But even Tertullian, who is among the most determined of these, showed its first attempts and dispositions hit upon truth by a happy chance or blind good-fortune, and yet more by that "general feeling with which God was pleased to endow the soul" (Tertull. De Am. § 2). The use which was made of heathen speculation by heretical writers was one great cause of its disapprobation by their catholic antagonists. Tertullian endeavours to reduce the Gnostic teachers to a dilemma: either the philosophers with whom they argued knew the truth or they did not; if they did, the incarnation was superfluous; if they did not, whence comes the agreement of the true and the false? (Ad. Frex. ii, 14, 7). Hippolytus follows out the connection of different sects with earlier teachers in elaborate detail. Tertullian, with characteristic energy, declares that "Philosophy furnishes the arms and the subjects of heresy. What (he asks) has Athens in common with Jerusalem? the Academy with the Church? heretics with Christians? Our training comes from the Porch of Solomon. ... Let those look to it who bring forward a Stoic, a Platonic, a diabolic Christianity. We have no such explanations or inquiries after the ministry of Christ Jesus, nor of investigation after the Gospel." (Tertull. De Passac. i, 17.)

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

Philosophy, Hnamne. The term philosophy, as above noted, may be properly used in a wider and in a more restricted sense. In the former it is nearly synonymous with science, and in the latter, it is the knowledge capable of being scientifically classified—that is, where the facts are presented in their causes, where phenomena are referred to principles, and arranged under laws. In the latter it is confined to speculative knowledge, that is, knowledge which claims of its own operations and laws, or which it acquires by reasoning from its own thoughts. We have no evidence that philosophy in the stricter sense was cultivated by the ancient Hebrews; nor have we much reason to believe that scientific study, even as regards external phenomena, was much followed by them. For since our estimate from what of their literature has been preserved to us in the Bible, we must conclude that the ancient Hebrew mind was not specially characterized by those tendencies, nor largely endowed with those faculties which give birth to speculative research. The analytical and the logical are but slightly perceptible in their mental products, while the imaginative, the synthetic, and the historical largely predominate. We should be led to infer that they delighted rather in putting things together in the analogies to the things in themselves according to their differences. They were careful observers of phenomena, and their minds sought scope in bold flights of imagination, or reposed in calm, protracted, and profound reflection; but it was as historians and poets rather than as philosophers that they looked on the world. Being and non-being, the contradictions and errors of philosophers, it must be remembered that they spoke often fresh from VIII.—58.
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which truth is the one complete end, is essentially of Western growth. In the East the search after wisdom has always been connected with practice: it has remained there, what it was in Greece at first, a part of religion. The history of the Jews offers no exception to this remark: there is no Jewish philosophy properly so called on the other hand. The same proposition was not true of the Hebrews. The axioms of one system are the conclusions of the other. The one led to the successive abandonment of the noblest domains of science which man had claimed originally as his own, till it left bare systems of morality; the other, in the fulness of time, prepared many to welcome the Christ—the Truth.

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

1. The Philosophy of Nature.—1. Primitive Period.—

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

But though this simple and childlike theory of the universe gave little scope for speculative thinking and inquiry, and though the Bible presents us with but little that indicates the existence of philosophic study among the ancient Hebrews, we are not entitled to conclude from these data that such pursuits had no existence among them. It is to be borne in mind that it was foreign to the design and pretensions of the sacred writers to discuss speculatively points on which they were considered bound to speak authoritatively in the name of God; nor must it be forgotten that we have not in the Bible the entire literature of the Hebrew people, and that, as philosophical writings would, because not addressed to the popular mind, be precisely those most likely to be allowed to perish, it is possible that much may have been lost which had been preserved, would have shown how and to what extent scientific research flourished among the Hebrews. This suggestion acquires force, not only from the fact that we know that certain utterances by Solomon of a scientific kind, probably committed to writing, have perished (I Kings iv, 38), but also from the statement in Eccles. xii, 13, which, besides indicating that the literature of the Hebrews was more copious than what we now possess, leads, from its connection, to the conclusion that part of it at least was devoted to philosophic inquiry. The book of Ecclesiastes itself, as well as that of Job, may be held as proving that the Hebrew mind did not acquiesce wholly in simple faith, but had, like mind elsewhere, its seasons of doubt, question, and speculation on matters relating to man's condition and destiny. We may also point to the political, the social, the religious, the book of Proverbs, as indicating the same thing. Nor must we overlook the fact that the Hebrew is rich in terms which are appropriate to philosophic inquiry, and indicate habits of analytic research among those by whom they were used. Of these may be mentioned "wisdom, often used as we use philosophy (comp. Eccles. i, 13, where בִּלְתָּנָה בִּלְתָּנָה might almost be rendered to philosophize); מְנָתָנָה, from מְנָתָנָה, beteen, to separate, to discern, to understand, i.e. to analyze perceiving into their component elements, so as to arrive at just notions of them, whence מְנָתָנָה, insight, intelligence, judgment; בּוֹלָלָמָה and בּוֹלָלָמָה, to investigate, to examine; בּוֹלָלָמָה, to think, to reflect; לְפָרַד, to ponder; בּוֹלָלָמָה, to know, whence מְנָתָנָה, knowledge. To these may be added their names for the mental part of man, מְנָתָנָה, πνεῦμα; מְנָתָנָה, ψυχή; מְנָתָנָה, anima; מְנָתָנָה, σάρκα, σῶμα.

It is further to be observed that though the Bible does not present philosophic truth in a speculative form, it presents abundantly the materials out of which philosophic ideas may be formed, and in this it as it exists in nature, not (to use the scholastic phraseology) in a manifest and evolutive, but in a concrete and involute state; and it needs only a patient collection of its statements, and the arrangement of these according to their meaning and relations, to enable us to construct systematic developments of them. We may thus form not only a theology from the Bible, but an anthropology, including physiology and a system of ethics. See BOAS, Fundamenta Psychologiae et Sce. Script. in Sclavia (1769); Beck, Ueber d. biblischen Systemlehre (1839); Hahn, Lehrbuch der Lehre von den Menschen (1849); Von Schubert, Gesch. der Seele (4th ed. 1850); Delitzsch, System der bibl. Psychologie (3d ed. 1861); Taylor, Doctor Dubitamentum (1660); Budaeus, Instit. Theol. Moralis (1710); Stüdlin, Lehrbuch der Moral für Theologen (3d ed. 1817), the latter, however, by the Christianer, Die Christliche Sittenlehre (1843); Harless, Chris- tliche Ethik (4th ed. 1849); Wuttke, Handb. der Christl. Sittenlehre (2 vols.). See BIBLICAL THEOLOGY.

For the natural science of the Hebrews, see ASTRON- OMY, BOTANY, MEDICINE, ZOOLOGY, and the articles on subjects of natural history in the works of the exact sciences, see the articles CHRONOLOGY AND NUMBER.

2. Etruscan Period.—This is of great interest to the student of the Bible, in consequence of the influence which the Babylonian philosophy exerted on the opti-
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less and manner of thinking of the Israelites during their captivity in Babylon—an influence of a general and deep character. The Chaldean system of observation and calculation, as we admit, in alleging that the names of the angels and of the months were derived by the house of Israel from Babylon (Book Haschannah, p. 56). The system of opinion and manner of thinking which the captives met with in Babylon cannot be characterized exclusively as Chaldean, but was made up of elements whose birth-place was in various parts of the East, and which appear to have found in Babylon a not incongenial soil, where they grew and produced fruit which coalesced into the Chaldean system. Of these elements, the two principal were the Chaldæans and the Medo-Persian or Zoroastrian. It is to the first that the reader's attention is invited in this article.

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

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

The stars were masses of light; the space which held them were filled with light; no other power appeared to operate therein: accordingly the Chaldeans held light to be the moving power which had produced the stars, and the stars caused all other things to move with power possessed intelligence, and the operations of the mind appear to have so much resemblance to the subtlety and sweetness of light that men who had only imagination for their guide had no hesitation to represent intelli-

gence as a property of light, and the universal spirit or highest intelligence as light itself. The observations of the Chaldeans had taught them that the rays of the stars from the earth are unequal, and that light decreases in its approach to the earth, on which they concluded that light streams forth from an endless fountain far removed from the earth, in doing which it fills the space with its beams, and forms the heavenly bodies in different positions and of different magnitudes.

The creative spirit was therefore set forth by them under the image of an eternal, inexhaustible fountain of light; they thought this fountain was to the universe what the sun is to the regions lighted and warmed by his beams.

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

The space which contained the First Cause, or Fountain of radiations, was filled with pure and happy intelligences. Immediately beneath this region began the corporeal world, or the empyreum, which was a boundless space, lighted by the pure light which flowed immediately from the Great Source; this empyreum was filled with an infinitely less pure fire than the original light, but incomparably finer than all bodies. Below this was the ether, or grosser region, filled with still more corporeal fire. Next came the fixed stars, spread over a wide region where the thickest parts of the ethereal fire had come together and formed the stars. The world of planets succeeded, which contained the sun, moon, and the wandering stars. Then came the last order of beings—the rude elements which are deprived of all activity, and without the personal union the free powers. The different parts of the world are in contact, and the spirits of the upper regions can influence the lower, as well as descend and enter into them. As the chaotic elements were without shape and motion, the spirits of the higher regions must have formed the earth, and human souls are spirits sprung from them. To these spirits from above the system of the Chaldeans ascribed all the productions, appearances, and movements upon the earth. The formation of the human body, the growth, the development of the fruits, all the phenomena of nature were ascribed to beneficent spirits. In the space below the moon, in the midst of night, tempests arose, lightnings threaded the dark clouds, thunder broke forth and laid waste the earth; there were found spirits of darkness, corporeal demons spread through the air. Often, too, were flames of fire seen to rise out of the bottom of the earth, and the mountains were shaken. Earthly powers or demons were supposed to dwell in the centre of the earth; and since matter was held to be without activity, all movements were attributed to spirits. Storms, volcanoes, earthquakes, all these were supposed to be the work of these evil beings; and these demons were held to be wicked spirits who produced these evils; to them every unfortunate event was ascribed, and a sort of hierarchy was formed of these evil beings, as had been
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done in the name of the good spirit. But why did not the guard put down by an exertion of his power, this swarm of wicked spirits? Some thought it was beneath the dignity of the Primary Essence to contend with these demons; others were of opinion that these bad spirits were naturally indestructible, and as the Supreme could neither destroy nor improve them, he had bidden his creatures destroy one of them and to the region beneath the moon, where they indulged in their baseness and exercised their dominion: in order, however, to protect the human race against fiends so numerous and fearful, he commissioned good spirits, whose office it was to attack these corporeal demons. As the good and the bad spirits had various degrees of power and different offices, so they had names given to them which described their functions. As the good spirits were under an obligation to protect men and furnish succor in their need, they were compelled to learn human language; accordingly, it was believed that a guardian angel against every evil was possessed by every one who bore his mysterious name—a name which was to be pronounced only when succor was needed. All manner of names were therefore devised, by which the spirit could be conjured, and the information, human necessities; and all the combinations of the alphabet were exhausted in order to bring about a commerce between men and angels. Here is the origin of the Cabala, which gave strange names to these spirits in order to incant them to good men, so that by this means to do wonderful things (Matt. xii, 24-27). These names also sometimes served to drive bad spirits away: they were a kind of exorcism. For since it was believed that these demons had been banished to the centre of the earth, and that they could do evil only in consequence of having baffled the vigilance of the guardian spirits and escaped to the outer world, so, it was held, they were compelled to flee as soon as they heard the name of the good angels whose business it was to keep them shut up in subterranean caverns, and to punish them if they ventured from their prison-house. A power, too, was ascribed to the name of the spirit, or to the image which marked his office—a power which forced the spirit to come on being called; and, accordingly, it was held that this name carved on a stone kept the spirit near the person who wore the stone—a notion in which is probably found the origin of talismen, formed either by words or symbolic figures.

3. Cabalistic Period.—It is uncertain at what date the earliest Cabala (i.e. Tradition) received a definite form; but there can be no doubt that the two great divisions of which it is at present composed, the Cabala Charitri (Ezekiel) and "the Creation" (Bereishith, Gen. 1), found a wide development before the Christian era. The first dealt with the manifestation of God in himself; the second with his manifestation in nature; and as the doctrine was handed down orally, it received naturally, both from its content and form, great additions from foreign sources. On the one side it was open to the Persian doctrine of emanation, on the other to the Christian doctrine of the Incarnation; and the tradition was deeply impressed by both. It was first committed to writing in the 7th or 8th century. At present the points for the teaching of the Cabala are the Sepher Jestrakh, or Book of Creation, and the Sepher Hazohar, or Book of Splendor. The former of these dates, in its present form, from the 8th, and the latter from the 15th century (Zunt, Gottel, Pistor, de Juden, p. 185; Jellineck, Moses ben-Schemtob de Leon, Leips, 1851). Both are based upon a system of pantheism. In the Book of Creation the cabalistic ideas are given in their simplest form, and offer some points of comparison with the system of the Pythagoreans. The book begins with an enumeration of the thirty-two ways of which we see in the constitution of the world; and the analysis of this number is supposed to contain the key to the mysteries of Nature. The primary division is into 10 + 22. The number 10 represents the ten Sephiroth (figures which answer to the ideal world; 22, on the other hand, the number of the Hebrew alphabet, answers to the world of objects; the object being related to the idea as a word, formed of letters, to a number. Twenty-two again is equal to 8 + 7 + 12; and each of these numbers, which constantly recur in the O-T. Scriptures, is invested with a peculiar meaning. Generally the fundamental concepts of the Cabala may be thus represented:

The ultimate Being is Divine Wisdom (Chokmah, φόινιξ). The universe is originally a harmonious thought of Wisdom (Number, Sephirah); and the thought is afterwards expressed in letters, which form, as words, the germ of this ideas, and turn into the form of nature; this represents in some sense the whole universe. He is the microcosm in which the body clothes and veils the soul, as the phenomenal world veils the spirit of God. It is impossible to follow out here the details of this system, and its development in Zohar; but it is obvious how great an influence it must have exercised on the interpretation of Scripture. The calculation of the numerical worth of words (comp. Rev. xiii, 18; Gematria, Buxtorf, see Diction Rabb, p. 446), the resolution of words into initial letters of new words (Notarion, Buxtorf, p. 1329), and the translation of the primitive conjoin of the alphabet, (Rokh), were used to obtain the inner meaning of the text; and these practices have continued to affect modern Jewish exegesis.

The fragments of Berosus, preserved by Eusebius and Josephus, and the works of the 4th century (Euseb. Temp.), and more fully in Fabricius (Bibli. Gr. xiv, 175), afford some information on the subject of Chaldean philosophy. Berosus was a priest of the god Baal, at Babylon, in the time of Alexander the Great. On the naturalistic philosophy of the Jews in general, the Talmud and other works of the Jewish rabbins may also be advantageously consulted, together with the following authorities: Euseb. Propr. Evang. ix, 10; Philo, De Mus.; Selden, De Dies Sylph, Prol. 3; Stanley, Hist. of Oriental Philosophy; Kleuker, Über die Natur und den Ursprung der Exsas hia. bei den Kabbalisten (Riga, 1786); Molitoris, Philos. der Geschich (1827-28); Hartmann, Die soeb Verbindung des A. T. mit dem N. (1831); Ketzer, Lexicon von P. Fric (1834); Brucken, Histor. Crit. Phil.; Ritter, Geschichte der Phil.; Norn, Vergleichende Mythologie (1868); Lutterbeck, Natur, u. Geschicht. der Religionen der Antik. (Berlin, 1855); Reiske, Nature in Herzog's Encylop.; Joel, Die Religionphilosoph. d. Zohar (1849); Westcott, Introd. to Gospels, p. 131-154; Francek, La Kabbale (1843); See Ca bala.

II. The Philosophy of History.—The philosophy of history, as it is above outlined, of its naturalistic relations, essentially a moral philosophy, resting on a definite connection with God. The doctrines of Creation and Providence, of an Infinite Divine Person and of a responsible human will, which elsewhere form the ultimate limits of its speculation, are here assumed at the outset. The difficulties which they involve are but rarely noticed. Even when they are canvassed most deeply, a moral answer drawn from the great duties of life is that in which the questioner finds repose. The earlier chapters of Genesis contain an introduction to the spiritual source of the history which follows. Premature and partial developments, kingdoms based on godless might, stand in contrast with the slow foundation of the divine polity. To distinguish rightly the moral principles which were successively called out in this slow development of the nation, is a history of Israel; but the philosophical significance of the great crises through which the people passed lies upon the surface. The call of Abraham set forth at once the central lesson of faith in the Unseen, on which all others were raised. The father of the nation was first isolated from all natural ties, and was thereupon promised; his heir was the son of his extreme age; his inheritance was to him as a strange land. The history of the patriarchs brought out into yet clearer light the sovereignty of God; the young man was pre-
fier before the elder; suffering prepared the way for safety and triumph. God was seen to make a covenant with man, and his action was written in the records of a chosen family. A new era followed. A nation grew up in the presence of Egyptian culture. Persecution united elements which seem otherwise to have been on the point of being absorbed by foreign powers. God revealed himself now to the people in the wider relations of Lawgiver and Judge. The solitary discipline of the desert familiarized them with his majesty and his mercy. The wisest of Egypt was hallowed to his service. The renounced land was gained by the open working of a divine Sovereign. The outlines of national faith were written in defeat and victory; and the work of the theocracy closed. Human passion then claimed a dominant influence. The people required a king. A fixed Temple was substituted for the shifting Tabernacle. Times of disruption and disaster followed; and the voice of prophets declared the spiritual meaning of the kingdom. In the midst of sorrow and defeat and desolation the horizon of hope was extended. The kingdom was now a common necessity founded on the image of a noble "kingdom of God." The nation learned its connection with "all the kindred of the earth." The Captivity confirmed the lesson, and after it the Dispersion. The moral effects of these, and the influence which Persian, Greek, and Roman were able to exert at length abundant; and the influence, in the West, exercised upon the Jews, have been elsewhere noticed. See Cyrus; Dispersion. The divine discipline closed before the special human discipline began. The personal relations of God to the individual, the family, the nation, mankind, were established in infallible history, and then other truths were brought into harmony with these in the long period of silence which separates the two Testaments. But the harmony was not always perfect. Two partial forms of religious philosophy arose. On the one side the predominance of the Chaldean or Persian element gave rise to the Cabala; on the other the predominance of the Greek element issued in Alexandrian theosophy. Before these one-sided developments of the truth were made the fundamental ideas of the divine government found expression in words as well as in life. The Psalms, which, among the other infinite lessons that they convey, give a deep insight into the need of a personal apprehension of truth, everywhere declare the absolute sovereignty of God over the material and moral worlds. The classical scholar cannot fail to be struck with the clearness andcertainty with which the close connection which is assumed to exist between man and nature as parts of one vast order. The control of all the elements by one All-wise Governor, standing out in clear contrast with the delusion of isolated objects is no less essentially characteristic of Hebrew thought. In the world of action Providence stands over against fate, the universal kingdom against the individual state, the true and the right against the beautiful. Pure speculation may find little scope, but speculation guided by these great ideas is a sufficient basis on which to build a rational intellectual culture of man. (Comp. especially Ps. viii., xi., xii., lxvii., lxxvii., lxxviii., lxxx., xc., xcv., cvi., cxvii., cxxv., etc. It will be seen that the same character is found in Psalms of every date.) For a late and very remarkable development of this philosophy of Nature see Dillmann, Das B. Hemoch, xlvi., xlv.

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

Two books of the Bible—Job and Ecclesiastes—of which the latter, at any rate, belongs to the period of the close of the kingdom, approach more nearly than any others to the type of philosophical discussions. But in both the problem is moral and not metaphysical. The one deals with the evils which afflict "the perfect and upright," the other with the vanity of all the pursuits and pleasures of earth. In the one we are led for a time to a vision of "the enemy" to whom a partial and temporary power over man is conceded (Job i. 6-12); in the other to that great future when "God shall bring every work to judgment" (Eccl. xii. 14).

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

The conception of wisdom which appears in the book of Proverbs was elaborated with greater detail afterward (see Westcott, Introd. to Gospels, p. 60-66). In Egypt; but the doctrine of the Word is of greater speculative interest. Both doctrines, indeed, sprang from the same cause, and indicate the desire to find some mediating power between God and the world, and to make the presence and action of God from a material sphere. The personification of Wisdom represents only a secondary power in relation to God; the Logos, in the double sense of Reason (λόγος ἡγέτικος) and Word (λόγος πρωτοφανής), both in relation to God and in relation to the universe. The first use of the term Word (Word) based upon the common formula of the prophets, is in the Targum of Onkelos (1st century B.C.), in which "the Word of God" is commonly substituted for God in his immediate, personal relations with man (Westcott, Introd. to Gospels, p. 187); and it is probable that round
this traditional rendering a fuller doctrine grew up. But there is a clear difference between the idea of the Word being present in the immaterial and that current at Alexandria. In Palestine the Word appears as the outward mediator between God and man, like the Angel of the Covenant; at Alexandria it appears as the spiritual connection which opens the way to revelation. The preface to John’s Gospel includes the element of truth in both parts. The Philopapal bishop who there is no mention of the Word (yet comp. Wisd. xxviii. 15). For the Alexandrian teaching it is necessary to look alone to Philo (civ. B.C. 20–A.D. 50); and the ambiguity in the meaning of the Greek term, which has already been noticed, makes it difficult to agree with Eusebius in his treatise on the subject. In the language dominators over thought. He has no one clear and consistent view of the Logos. At times he assigns to it divine attributes and personal action; and then again he affirms decidedly the absolute indivisibility of the divine nature. The tendency of his teaching is to lead to the conception of a twofold personality in the Godhead, though he shrinks from the recognition of such a doctrine (De Monarch. § 5; De Somn. § 37; Quod. det. pot. insc. § 24; De Somn. § 39, etc.). Above all, his idea of the Logos was wholly dis- connected from the teaching of the great Christian master whom he was rather the philosophical substitute for them. (See Westcott, Introd. to I. G., p. 138–141; Dieth., Jhd. - Alex. Religiones phil., [1834]; Gfröer, Philo, etc. [1835]; Dornier, Die Lehre v. d. Person Christi, i, 28 sq.; Lücke, Comm. i, 297, and elsewhere [account of the earlier literature].) See PHILOSOPHIE, GREEK.

On the general subject, see Buch, Wirksamelehre der Hebräer (Strassb. 1851); Nicolas, Les doctrines religieuses des Juifs (Par. 1860).

**Philostorgius** (Φιλοστοργιος), an Eastern ecclesiastic, an historian of some note, was a native of Boriussa, in Cappadocia. He was the son of Cartarius and Eulamnia, and was born in the reign of Valentinian and Valens, in A.D. 358, according to Gothofredus (Proleg. ad Philos. p. 5, etc.), about A.D. 367, according to Vossius (De Hist. Gr. p. 314). He was twenty years old when Eunomius (q. v.) was expelled from Cæsarea. He was educated at Constantinople, and, together with his father, warmly embraced the doctrines of Eunomius. Philostorgius wrote an ecclesiastical history, from the hecary of Arius, in A.D. 300, to the period when Theodotius the Younger died. The epitome of the West Roman Valentinian the Younger (A.D. 425). The work, composed in twelve books, began respectively with the twelve letters of his name, so as to form a sort of acrostic. In this history he lost no opportunity of extolling the Arians, while he on the other side disdained to defend the orthodox party with abuse, with the single exception of Gregory of Nazianzus. Photius charges Philostorgius with introducing gross misrepresentations and unfounded statements, and says that the work is not a history, but a panegyric upon the heretics. Philostorgius, nevertheless, was a man of learning, and was possessed of considerable geographical and astronomical knowledge. Being a heretic, it is not to be wondered at that his work has not come down to us. An abstract of it, however, was made by Photius in a separate work, which has been preserved. Photius characterizes him as being elegant in his style, making use of figurative expressions, though not in excess. His figures were, however, sometimes harsh and far-fetched, and his narrative involved and indistinct (Phot. Bibl. cod. 40). Photius’ abstract was published at Geneva in 1643 by Jac. Godefroi, or Gothofredus, entitled Ecclesiastica historia, à Constantin. M. Arique initia ad suae saevo tempore, libri zii a Photio in epistolis contrahit; nunc primum editi à Jacobo Gothofredo, Gr. et Lat. cum supplementis, indiciis, quasque addit, ex prolixioribus dissertationibus (Lugd. 1643, 440), and in a somewhat corrected form, with a new Latin translation, by H. Valerius (Paris, 1673), together with the ecclesiastical history of Theodoretus, Evagrius, and Theodorus; also by Reading, Ex ecclesiastica Philostorgii historiam epimena, et fragmenta (Cantab., 1720). There is also a French translation of the same (Paris, 1676). See Fabricius, Bibli. Gr. vii. 490, etc.; Vossius, De Hist. Gr. p. 313, etc.; Schöll, Gesch. der Griech. Lit. iii. 313—Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. s. v. See Dowling, Introd. to Church Hist.; Hook, Eccles. Temp. viii. 72; Haggard, Hist. of Doctrines, i, 328; Jortin, Histoire apocryphe, lib. ii, 121; Stace, Cato et Cael. Cap. Ch. p. 168; Staudlin, Gesch. d. Kirchengesch. p. 72.

**Philostorus**, Flavius, a famous Greek Sophist, was a native of the island of Lemnos, and was born in the second half of the 2d century of our era. He taught the rhetorical doctrine of Thrasybulus, his master; and was the cause of a dispute between him and an Athenian, but Euanius and Suidas always speak of him as a Lemnian, and he himself hints in his Life of Apollonius that he used to be at Lemnos when he was young. He frequented the schools of the Sophists, and mentions having heard Damiants of Ephesus, Nicolas Naucratitas, and Hippodromus of Larissa. This shows that he lived in the reign of the emperor Severus (193–212). He also taught at Rome, where he became known and was patronized by the empress Julia, the wife of Septimius Severus, who was partial to the learned, and who, it is said, was surprised by the discourse of this sophist about herself such a brilliant circle of scholars. She commissioned him to compile the biography of Apollonius of Tyana from some memoirs written by a certain Damis of Nineveh, who had accompanied Philostorus in his peripatetic journey, and which had come into his possession. Philostorus professes also to have used in his composition a collection of letters of Apollonius, which were at one time in the possession of Hadrian, and were placed by that emperor in his palace at Antium, together with certain responses of the Oracle of Trophonius, which Apollonius had also collected. The biographer availed himself also, according to his own statement, of the narrative of a certain Maximus who had known Apollonius. The book of Philostorus displays great credulity in the compiler, and a great want of critical discrimination; it also contains many anachronisms and geographical errors. Huet and others have imagined that the object of Philostorus was to write a parody of the life of Christ, but this seems doubtful: the parody, if intended as such, is too gross; besides which, it appears from the testimony of Lampridius (Life of Alex. Severus), that 42 was not the year in which the dread emperor Maximinus had attempted to assassinate the later heathen emperors, together with Abraham, Orpheus, and Apollonius, these being all looked upon as holy men and tutelary demi. That Apollonius of Tyana was a real character, a philosopher, and a traveler, no one will deny; but it is remarkable that no one mentions him until nearly a century after the time assigned for his death. The empress Julia, a Syrian by birth, was probably fond of the marvellous: and Philostorus, intending to entertain her, inserted in his book all of wonderful stories he could collect relative to his hero. It seems, however, that in the time of the great struggle between the heathen and Christian religions under Diocletian and his immediate successors, some of the heathen writers thought of availing themselves of the Life of Apollonius as a kind of counterpart to the Gospel narrative.Hierocles, prefect of Alexandria, and an enemy of the Christians, wrote a book of which that in the style of a companion between the life of Apollonius by Philostorus and that of Christ, of which Eusebius wrote a refutation: Eusebius Pamphus: De modic毳lices in Philostratii de Apollonio Tyanaeo Commentarium ob institutum cum ilio ob Hierocles Christi comparationem, adnotato. Lacantius (Divin. Instr., v. 3) also combats the same notion as absurd. Augustine (Epist. 4) refers to Apollonius as a magician whom the heathens compared with Christ. (See Tilmanni, Hist. Gr. p. 408; Bacon’s History of Religion, and Bayle’s article Apollonius de Tyane.) The other works of Philostorus are, *The Lives of the Sophists,* in two books (ed. by Kayser, Heidelberg, 1888).- *Heroicus,* or
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comments on the lives of some of the heroes of Homer, in the shape of a dialogue (ed. by Boissoneade, Paris, 1866, 8vo).—Epiptodie, or descriptions or paintings which were in a portico near Neapolis by the sea-shore (these descriptions contain valuable information concerning the state of ancient art) (ed. by F. Jacobs and F. G. Wecker, Leipzig, 1825, 8vo).—Epitodes, mostly erotic, excepting a few on matters of literature; one, which is inserted towards the close of the volume, is his apology for the Sophists. Philostrotus wrote also many other works, such as a Lexicon Rhetoricum, orations, etc., but they are lost. Different editions of all the existing works of Philostrotus have been published. Those by Morellius (Paris, 1668) and Olearius (Leipsig, 1709, fol.) are good, but a better one, far more critical and complete, is that by Kayser (Zurich, 1844, 4to), with a valuable body of notes on each work. There are separate editions of the lives of the Sophists. See Neander, Christian Dogm. i, 122; Baur, Apollodorus c. Tymnus c. Chriastus (Tub., 1837); Alzog, Kirchengec, i, 149; Bitter, Hist. of Philos.; Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. s. v.; Butler, Hist. of Ancient Philosophy, vol. ii; Lardner, Works (see Index).

Philosophia (φιλοσοφία), i. e. the love of God, is a term which was sometimes applied by ancient Christian writers to the mystic life, because the soul, embracing that life professed to renounce all for the love of God. Hence Theodoret entitles one of his books Philosophos (φιλοσοφός).

Philosophos Historia (φιλοσοφος ιστορία, God-loving history), the name given by Theodoret, the well-known commentator, bishop of Cyprus, to his lives of thirty Eastern monastics. Eastern monks, he confesses, "cannot be adequately described," and he relates the most astounding prodigies of them. The tract is in the third folio of Sirmond's edition of his works. See PHILOTHEA.

Philosopher (φιλόσοφος) (1), an Eastern prelate, flourished as patriarch of Alexandria about A.D. 960. He was a man of luxurious habits and a most scandalous course of life. Philostrotus wrote four works, the titles of which, as translated from the Arabic, are, Dedicator:—Rara Commentatorum, et Depravationes Hereticonum:—Detectio Arcanorum:—Autobiography. All of these works are lost, and it does not appear whether the author wrote in Arabic or in Greek. A sermon, De Mandatis Domini nostri Iesu Christi (A.D. and Latin by P. Posinianus in his Aecetis), is ascribed to one S. Philotheus, perhaps the same person. See Cave, Neale, Hist. ad an. 999; Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. s. v.

Philosopher (2) Cucinica, also an Eastern ecclesiastic, flourished as patriarch of Constantinople. He was probably born in the beginning of the 14th century, and early took the monastic habit. After living for a considerable time as a monk, and afterwards as superior of the convent of St. Leucius on Mount Sinai, he was appointed archbishop of Heraclea (before 1354). In 1355 he was employed by the emperor John Cantacuzenus in bringing about a reconciliation between Michael, the son, and John Palaeologus, the son-in-law of the latter; and in the same year he was chosen patriarch of Constantinople, in the place of Callistus, who, however, recovered his see after John Palaeologus had taken possession of Constantinople. Callistus, however, died soon afterwards, and now Philotheus was once more placed in the patriarchal chair, which post he occupied with great dignity till his death, which occurred in 1271, according to Cave, or in 1376 according to the Chronologia reformata of J. B. Riccioli quoted by Fabricius. We append the titles of the most important of the numerous works of Philotheus, very few of which have been printed and even those (see Ammianus Diaconum, printed in Latin in the 26th vol. of Bibl. Nat. Max., i, 153 sq.) which are extant, and of which he finally became a fellow. After leaving Oxford he travelled through Italy, where, on account of his religion, he was brought into danger. On returning to England he re-
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briaries:—Sermo Encomiasticus in tres Hierarchias, Basili- trium, Gregorianum Theologum, et Ioannes Chrysostomum, Latin, in the 26th vol. of Bibl. Nat. Max., Gr. and Lat. by Jac. Pontianus, together with Filippo Solitari Di- optra (Inglodast, 1604, 8vo); by Fronto Dupondius in the 2d vol. of Actauctar. Patr. (Paris, 1624)—Oratio de Croce, Gr. and Lat. apud Gratrac. De Kroce, Inglodast, 1616, fol. vol. ii); there is another Oratio de Croce, in the same volume, which is attributed by some to our Philo-

Philosopher (3) Monachus or Sanctus, an unknown monk, wrote De Mandatis Domini nostri Iesu Christi, ed. Gr. and Lat. in P. Posinianus's Aecetis (Paris, 1684). Although this work bears the same title as the one quoted above under the head Philotheus No. 1, the works are apparently by different authors. See Fabricius, Bibl. Grac. xi, 516; Cave, Hist. Lit. Dissert. in, 1, 17, ed. Oxon.

Philosopher (4), archbishop of Selymbria, of an unknown age, wrote Oratio in T. Agottokinon, which is still extant in MS.

Philothenian Version. See Syriac Versions.

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

Philoxenus of Mabug or Hierapolis, an Eastern prelate of some note, flourished in the second half of the 5th century. He was a devoted Jacobite, and for his zeal in the propagation of their doctrines is reckoned among the fathers of that branch of the Syrian Church. He was bishop of Mabug, to which see he was consecrated by Peter the Fuller, after A.D. 465, though he is said not to have been baptized. He is the author of two Jacobite liturgies, of which only one is authenticated. The other is according to Neale, "a sadly inflated specimen of mediæval taste in the East." He is also noted as the translator of certain portions of the sacred Scriptures into Syrian, and as the supervisor of a general and complete version. Besides, he was the head of the Monophysites about 500, when they fought with Nestorians at the Council of Chalcedon. See Neale, Hist. of the East. Ch. (Introduct.), i, 333; Assenmann, Bibl. Orient., ii, 10; Le Quien, Oriens Christianus, ii, 928; Renaudot, Lit. Orient., ii, 800; Petaevus, De theol. dogmat., lib. ii, cap. xviii; Walch, Gesch. der Ketzer, ii, 553 sq.; vii, 353 sq.; Schmoller, Entwicklungsgesch., ii, 23-46, 152, 168. (J. H. W.)

Philot, John, an English divine of the Reformation period, noted for his learning and his devotion to the Protestant cause, for which he paid his life, was born near Winchester about the close of the 15th century. He was educated at New College, Oxford, of which he entered in 1543, and of which he finally became a fellow. After leaving Oxford he travelled through Italy, where, on account of his religion, he was brought into danger. On returning to England he re-
caused the preference of the archdeaconry of Winchester. During the time of Edward his labors were abundant and incessant; he was with the furnishing both by nature and grace for his calling, and he devoted himself with an uncompromising zeal to the advancement of pure and undefiled religion. After the accession of Mary, Philpot distinguished himself by his bold stand for the Protestant cause. In a convocation of bishops and laity, held for the purpose of changing the established religion from Protestantism to popery, the learned archdeacon, and a few others, bore a noble testimony against the design. For his exertions, notwithstanding the promised freedom of debate, he was called before the court of the queen. He was removable, not perhaps by the king himself, but by Gardiner the chancellor, and was by his order imprisoned a year and a half. He was then sent to bishop Bonner, and other commissioners, who confined him in the bishop's coal-house. Here met with every insult: was once confined from morning till night in the stocks; was examined some fifteen or sixteen times; and, though he firmly and unansweringly defended his cause, was met only with taunts and abusive epithets. Yet in all this persecution the consolations of the Holy Spirit were abundantly administered to him; inasmuch that on one occasion to Bonner he said to him, "I marvel that you are so merry in prison, singing in your naughtiness," etc. Philpot, proving a most uncompromising devotee to the new religion, and a most ingenuous expositor of the law of the land, was regarded by the Papists as a dangerous man to be removed, and he was therefore condemned and hereafter. After his condemnation he suffered many indignities in Newgate. But he was soon brought to the stake. He kissed the wood, and said, "Shall I disdain to suffer at this stake, when my Lord and Saviour refused not to suffer a most vile death on the cross for me?" When he was bound to it, he repeated the 106th, 107th, and 108th Psalms, and prayed most fervently; till at length, in the midst of the flames, with great meekness and joy, he gave up his spirit to God. This occurred at Smithfield, Dec. 18, 1555. For both learning and piety he was esteemed as only next to Ridley among the English Reformers. They had sound and clear views of that Gospel which they sealed with their blood.

Philpot's writings have been collected and published under the title, *Examinations and Writings*, edited for the Parker Society by the Rev. R. Eden (Camb., 1842, 8vo.). There is also a brief aside in *A Historical Account of Philpot: Notices of the Bishops and other Clergy, etc. Who Examined Philpot in 1555; The Process and History of Master John Philpot, examined, condemned, and martyred; Disputation in the Consecration House, October, 1555; An Apology for Mr. Sparrow on an Arrian Defence of the True and Old Authority of Christ's Church*, by Siculus Succulius Curato, translated by John Philpot. See also Richmonds's *Father's*, iv. 385; *British Reformers*, vol. iii; *Fox, Acts and Monuments*, anno 1555; *Strype, Memorials*, and his *Crumer*; *Fuller, Abbe Radicous*: *Wood, Athenae Oxoni.; Bickersteth, Christian Student*, p. 328; *Middleton, Evangel. Egoi, 428 sq.; Burnet, Hist. of the English Ref.; Soames, Hist. of the Ref.; Harwick, Hist. of the Ref.* p. 216; *Froude, Hist. of England* (see Index in vol. vii); Hook, Eccles. Egoi. viii. 74. (J. H. W.)

**Philopoth.** See **Philpot.**

**Philiter, Philtre** (vīl. φίλτρον, love-charm, love-potion). A superstition believed the efficacy of certain artificial means of inspiring and securing love seems to have been generally prevalent from very early times; and among the Greeks and Romans (among the latter, in the later days of the republic, and under the emperors) love-charms, and especially love-potions, were in continual use; but it is not certainly known of what these love-potions were composed. See also the entire references on the details given us on this subject by classic writers, and their commentators in later time—but there is no doubt that certain poisonous or deleterious herbs and drugs were among their chief ingredients, to which other substances, animal as well as vegetable, are said to have been added, coupled with some rites of magic. Thus they had the credit of producing the most potent herbs, and her people were notorious as the most skilful practitioners of magic arts, whence the well-known "Thessal philus" of Juvenal (v. 610). These potions were violent and dangerous in operation, and in their use, apart from the working of the natural powers, madness, and death, instead of the purpose for which they were intended. Lucretius is said to have been driven mad by a love-potion, and to have died by his own hand in consequence—though the story does not necessarily imply that he was not perhaps beforehand given to morbid fancies. The craziness of the emperor Caligula was attributed by some persons to love-potions given him by his wife Cesonia—by which also she is said to have preserved his attachment till the end of his life. In the corrupt and licentious days of the Roman empire the manufacture of love-charms of all kinds was a secret, and were carried on as a regular trade; the purchasers, if not the makers of them, being chiefly women. The use of philters seems to have been not unknown during the Middle Ages; and in the East, the nurse of superstition of all kinds, belief in the power of love-potions lingers probably down to the present day.

**Philumenia**, one of the youngest, and in Italy one of the most revered of saints, especially as the protector of the imprisoned, deserves to be mentioned here; one of the most extravagant examples of Romish credulity and superstition. Her remains were reported to have been exhibited in 1809 from the catacomb of St. Priscilla (q. v.) at Rome. Her history is claimed to have been revealed at the time to three different persons, and according to this was the descendant of a Greek prince, and in her thirteenth year was brought to Rome as a Christian devotee, and placed under the notice of the emperor Diocletian, who desired her for wife—an honor which she refused on the ground that she had two years previously wedded herself to her Lord in her virginity. For this refusal the emperor condemned her to death by martyrdom. In 1805 her remains were removed to her supposed birthplace—Mugnano, twenty miles from Naples. The wonder brought at her tomb were related far and near, and soon her resting-place became the object of many pilgrimage, and she is now known as the "wonder-worker of the sixteenth century." Pope Gregory XVI put her in the calendar of saints, and she is commemorated Aug. 11. See Sinzelt, *Verzeichung der heil. Philomena* (Munich, 1844); Wetter u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, xiv. 984 sqq.; Abel, *Die Legende vom hl. Johann v. Nepomuk* (Berlin, 1850), p. 6. (J. H. W.)

**Philon (Φίλων)**, the Greekized form of the Heb. name *Philhæus* (q. v.). a. The son of Eleazar, son of Aaron, was the great hero of the Jewish priesthood (1 Esdr. v. 5; vii. 2, 29; 2 Esdr. i. 2, b; Esclus. xlv, 23; 1 Macc. ii. 26); b. The son of Eli (2 Esdr. i. 2, a): but the insertion of the name in the genealogy of Ezra (in this place only) is evidently an error, since Ezra belonged to the line of Eleazar, and Eli to that of Ithamar; c. A priest or Levite of the time of Ezra, father of Eleazar (1 Esdr. viii. 63).

**Phion (Φιόν)**. In 1 Esdr. vi. 31 it stands for *Philæus* (q. v.) of the Heb. text ( Ezra ii. 49).

**Phinehas** (Heb. *Phineas*, פְּנֵיהָשׁ, month of brass [Gesen.], or of utterance [First]; Sept. Φινήσεας v. Φινῆεσας; Josephus, *Phinias*), the name of two or three Hebrews: 1. Son of Eleazar and grandson of Aaron (Exod. vi. 25). His mother is reckoned as one of the daughters of Hutiel, an unknown person, who is identified by the Talmud with the Myriam of Exod. vi. 25; Wagenmaler, *Sote*, viii. 6. Phinehas is memorable for having while quite a youth, by his zeal and energy at the critical moment of the licentious idolatrous
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The tomb of Phinehas, 1 place of great resort to both Jews and Samaritans, is shown at Avertah, four miles south-east of Nablus. It stands in the centre of the village, enclosed within a little area or compound, which is overshadowed by the thickly trellised foliage of an ancient vine. A small mosque joins the wall of the compound. Outside the village, on the next hill, is a larger enclosure, containing the tomb of Eleazar, and a small cave ascribed to Eleazar. On the hill, down towards the terebinth-trees, surrounded by arcades, and forming a retired and truly charming spot. The local tradition asserts that Avertah and its neighborhood are the “Hill of Phinehas.”

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

Phinehas, Clement, an American Free-will Baptist preacher, noted especially as an evangelist, was born in Gorham, Me., Aug. 16, 1780. He possessed a good physical constitution, a large share of good-nature and cheerfulness, as well as a pronounced common-sense appreciation of the value of music. He was remarkable. When a youth his talent of song made him a favorite with both old and young. In 1806 he was converted, and after his talents had been consecrated to God his gift of song became instrumental in awakening in the human heart responses to the calls of the divine Word. He sang with the Spirit and with power, which at times produced wonderful effect. He received ordination in 1816, and feeling called of God to labor as an evangelist, declined the work of the pastorate. He seemed to be specially qualified by nature and grace for the work of winning souls to Christ, and God gave him many as seals of his ministry—thousands were awakened by his earnest and affectionate ministrations. Though his advantages for an education were limited, yet college professors and other learned men were frequently found among his local and traveling critics. He was a devoted friend of the slave, and, with the leaders of his denomination, early espoused the anti-slavery cause. His amiability, integrity, wisdom, and purity of character won for him universal confidence and esteem. He died at Portland, Me., where he had performed the most of his public labors, full of years and abounding in faith.
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He is distinguished as the writer of eight important theological tracts (Lond. 1767-96), of which we mention here, Brief Remarks on the Common Arguments now used in Support of divers Ecclesiastical Impositions in this Nation (1769, 8vo):—The Original and Present State of Man briefly considered, wherein is shown the Nature of his Fall, and the Necessity, Means, and Methods in which it is effected. A reply to the Additions made by the Author of some Remarks on the Arguments of Samuel Newton, of Norwich (1773, 8vo):—A Reply to a late Publication of S. Newton, untitled An Appendix, etc.; in Answer to which it is plainly shown that the Quakers are not Cuiuscenst, that the whole whole system of them is Words, and that the Spirit of Truth is to be experienced and sensibly felt in the Minds and Consciences of Men (1774, 8vo):—An Address to the Youth of Norwich (1776, 12mo):—Discussions on the Nature and Effect of Christian Baptism, Christian Communion, and Religious Worship upon God; to which are added a few Reflections on the Observation of Public Fasts and Festivals (1781, 8vo).

Ph'is'ion (Φισίων, a Grecized form (Ecles. xxiv, 25) of the name of the river Phison (q. v.).

Phlegéthon, a river in the infernal regions, according to the system of ancient heathenism. It was one of the four rivers which the dead must cross before finding a resting place to the realms of Orcus. See Garden, Fratas of the World, ii, 655.

Phle'gon (Φλεγών, burning), one of the Christians of Rome to whom Paul sent his salutations (Rom. xvi, 14). A.D. 55. The legend (apud Dorotheus) makes him to have been one of the seventy disciples, and bishop of Phlegone (Apul. Alex. Hymn. xliii). To the like purpose, is also the story of Phlegon, from the Chronicle of Eusebius (p. 185, ed. Pentz., Burdig. 1601), the passage occurs as follows: "And so writes Phlegon, an excellent compiler of the Olympiads, in his thirteenth book, saying, 'In the fourth year of the two hundred and second Olympiad there was a great and extraordinary eclipse of the sun, distinguished among all that had happened before, as being an hour in which the day was turned into dark night, so that the stars in the heavens were seen, and there was an earthquake in Bithynia which overthrew many houses in the city of Nice.'" (comp. Origen, Contra Cels. lib. ii, § 33, p. 80; § 39, p. 96; and other authorities quoted by Lardner.)

This passage was the origin of a controversy in England in the early part of the last century between Mr. Whiston, Dr. Sykes, Mr. Chapman, and others, and a long and complete account of which may be found in the English translation of Dr. Boyle's Dictionary Historique, a.v., and in Chaussie's Supplement to it. The immediate cause of the controversy was the omission of the passage in the eighth edition of Dr. S. Clarke's Boyle Lectures, published soon after his death in 1752, although it had been inserted in the first page, which was cut out in 1766. This was done at the persuasion of Dr. Sykes, who had suggested to Clarke that an undue stress had been laid upon the passage. Whiston, who informs us of this affair, expresses great displeasure against Sykes, and calls "the suggestion groundless." Upon this Sykes published A Dissertation on the Eclipse mentioned by Phlegon, in his Oration to the Quakers, which happened during the last Summer, on the Eleventh Day of June 1732, which was printed at London in 1733. Many pieces were written against Sykes, who replied to some of them, but it may well be considered as a controversy still unsettled. The principal objections against the authority of the passage in question are thus briefly summed up by Dr. Adam Clarke (Comment, on Matt. xxvii, 45): 1. All the authors who quote Phlegon differ, and often very materially, in what they say was found in him. 2. He says nothing of "Judaea," what he says is that in such an Olympiad (some say the one hundred and second, others the two hundred and second) there was an eclipse in Asia Minor, and an "earthquake at Nice." 3. He does not say that the earthquake happened at the time of the eclipse. 4. He does not intimate that this "darkness" was "extraordinary," or that the eclipse happened at "the full of the moon," or at its "last quarter" three hours. All of which circumstances could not have been omitted by him if he had known them. 5. He speaks merely of an ordinary though perhaps total eclipse of the sun, and cannot mean the darkness mentioned by the evangelists. And, 6. he speaks of an eclipse that happened in some year of the one hundred and second or two hundred and second Olympiad, and therefore, upon the whole, little stress can be laid on what he says as applying to this event. Some fragments of his works are all that remain, the longest belongs to a treatise, Pipoi βραχονιος, De Mirabilibus. It is a curious work, divided into thirty-five chapters (some of which are very short), and containing (as might be expected from the title) a great many absurd fables. The same may be said of a shorter fragment of four chapters, Πας νεφελους, De Longesoria. The third fragment that remains is a chapter, Πας των λειψανων, De Olympeia, De Salmusore. The entire work, or more probably a part of it, was executed, by Salmusore (Ad Spuriurn, p. 43) to be the preface to a lost work, De Olympimicas. These fragments were first published in 1568 (Basil. 8vo, Greek and Latin), by Xylander, together with Antonini Liberalis, Transformat. Conger., i, 292, and later repeated in Hist. Mirab., and M. Antonius, De Vitâ nû. An improved edition, with notes by Meursinus, appeared in 1620 (Ludg. Bat. 4to, Greek and Latin), which is reprinted by Gronovius in his Theatrum, antiquit. Graec. viii, 2690 sq., and 2575, and ix, 1293 sq.; and also inserted among the works of Meursius, vii, 77 sq. The best edition is by Westermann, in his Scriptores Rerum Mirabilium Graeci (Brun. 1839). See, besides the references already given, Engl. Cyclop., s. v., Gen. Biol., Dict. s. v., Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biol. and Mythol. s. v.

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

Pho'bos (Φοβός), the personification of Fear among the ancient Greeks. He is said to have been the son of Ares and of Astarte, and a constant companion of his father. He was worshipped by the Romans under the equivalent name of Metus.

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

1. Samuel of Warselaw, flourished in the last quarter;
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of the 17th century, was rabbi at Fürth and
Schildow, and wrote, הגדת שרגי, a commentary on the
codex Eben-exer, making use of other commentaries
on the same, as the ירח הלוי of Chajim Cohen, etc.
(Drydenfurt, 1689; corrected edition, Fürth, 1894; Wil-
na-Grohne, 1819)—a commentary on the codex Orach
Chayyim,—a commentary on יורה דעה.—Discourses on
the Pentateuch, which have not been printed.
2. SAMUEL ben-Joseph ha-Kohen Pulik, of Vienna, died
in Palestine, where he went after the Jews had been
expelled from Vienna in 1670. He wrote, פנהאוש
a kind of haggadistic dictionary of proper names, where-
un in he speaks in alphabetical order of בַּיָּר, בָּנִי, בַּיָּר
etc. collected from different sources (Venice, 1684)—:
ָני פָּרָת, discourses on the Pentateuch (ibid.
3. UTEN-ABRAHAM ha-Lexer, a typographer at Am-
sterdam, was born in 1622, and was still living in 1718.
He published the Hebrew Old Testament, with many
additions of Jacob Blitz, and a Preface in Judeo-Ger-
man by the editor (Amsterd. 1672). He also published
A New Hebraico-German dictionary, a prayer-book, in Judeo-German
(ibid. 1677). See Gratz, Gesch. des Juden, x, 329 sq.
4. UTEN-DAVID, flourished in the middle of the 17th
century, was rabbi at Polnow, in Lithuania, and wrote,
אֶנָב, an exegetical and allegorical commentary
on the Pentateuch, with additions of Sam. Eli. Edeler
(Leblin, 1672). See Wolf, Bibl. Hebr., i, 131, iii, 84.
5. UTEN-ADONAI, rabbi at Metz, wrote halachic dis-
cussions, haggadistic dissertations, and discourses, under
the title הֶשֶּכֶד הָרָקְבָּן (Metz, 1788).
6. UTEN-ADONAI, of Brussels, is the author of,
Ivri-Geerman Dictionary (Drydenfurt, 1778):
—דְּוִי־הַיָּבִונית, in two parts, the first gives the six
hundred and thirteen precepts according to the Pente-
taeuch, the second, under the title הַיָּבִונית
contains these precepts in a metrical form (ibid. 1812).
7. UTEN-SIMEON, of Beelen, who lived in the middle
of the 16th century, published הֶבָּרֹה אָשֶׁר, remarkable
epistles of pious and distinguished Israelities in
Palestine, written for pilgrims. After it had been
published by an anonymous author in 1587, Uri Phobus
pretended to be the author, and published it at Saflod,
after having visited and seen himself the different places.
It was then published again in Venice in 1599, and often,
It was translated into Latin by Hottinger, in his Cippi
Hebraici (Heidelberg, 1593—1603); into French by Cam-
prey (in Revue Orient., [Brussels, 1848—1849] iii, 99—207);
and into Dutch by a Tzouem, which has been translated
into Latin by Jac. Christmann, under the title Calendarium
Palestinorum et universorum Judaeorum ad annum 40 sup-
punctum, auctore Uri fil. Sim. Judaeo Palalstino, nunc
primum ex servorum Hebraeo in Latinum conversum, ex ocliliis utibus maximeque necessario illustratum
(Frankf. a. M. 1594). See Wolf, Bibl. Hebr., i, 139 sq.;
iii, 84 sq. First, Bibl. Jud. iii, 96 sq. (B. P.)
Phocas, a Christian martyr of the early Church,
flourished as bishop of Pontus in the 3rd century. He
was condemned to death for his refusal to sacrifice to
Neptune, and was put to death by being first cast into
a hot limekiln, and afterwards thrown into a scalding
bath (Fox, p. 16).
Another martyr of the same name flourished near
the opening of the 4th century. He was put to death
in A.D. 303. He was inserted in the list of martyrs in
the days of the emperor Constantine. This Phocas is to
the Greek Christians the Caspar of the Pollex of an-
cient Greek shipping, the mariners revered his memory and pray
for his intercession. He is commemorated by the Ro-
manists July 14.
Phocas, JOHN, a noted Eastern monastic, flour-
lished at Crete near the middle of the 12th century.
He is especially distinguished by his description of a
visit to Palestine, which work is entitled "Extrakus
ou σημειών εκθέσεις μετ' ἑπεξεργασίαν του και χειρο-
τοις Χριστοῦ και ἐν τοῖς ναοῖς Πα-
λατρευτῷ ἀγίων τῶνων (ed. Gr. et Lat. Leo Allatius,
Colom. 1658). This is a most important contribution to
the department of Biblical geography, and is prized even
in our day. See Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. ii,
601.
PhoebADIUS, an eminent prelate of the 4th cen-
tury, flourished as bishop of Agen, in Gaul. He was
living in 392, when Jerome wrote his Catalogue, but was
then in extreme old age. He is noted as the author of
iv, 500; Bibl. Patr. Gall. v, 293; Athanasi, Dialogi v,
1570, 8vo).
Phoebé (φωβία, radiant), a deaconess of the
Church at Cenchreae, recommended to the kind atten-
tion of the Church of Rome by Paul, who had received
hospital treatable from her (Rom. xvi, 1). A.D. 55.
Her name occurs first in the long list of Christian men
and women of Ephesus, mentioned in the Epistle to
the Ephesians. For the most part these were persons who had been
previously known to Paul, and had some connection with
him in his apostolic labors, but were at the time resid-
ing in Rome. Phoebe, however, was in the neighbor-
hood of the apostle, probably still in Cenchreae, when
she was on the eve of setting out for Rome—on what business
it is not said; but that she had some thing of import-
ance in hand is evident from the request of the apostle,
that the Christians at Rome would "receive her in the
Lord, and assist her in whatever business she had need
of them" (ver. 2). See PAUL. It is probable that she
was the bearer of the Epistle to the Romans. See Ro-
MANS, EPISTLE TO. "What is said of her is worthy of
especial notice, because of its bearing on the question
of the deaconesses of the Apostolic Church. On
this point we have to observe, (1) that the term, ἐνάκτος,
here applied to her, though not in itself necessarily an
official term, is the term which would be applied to her
if it were meant to be official; (2) that this term is ap-
p lied in the Apostolical Constitutions to women who
ministered officially; the deaconesses being called ἡ ἐν
κόσμῳ, as the deacon is called ἡ ἐνκόσμῳ; (3) that it is
now generally admitted that in 1 Tim. iii, 11 Paul
applied it so himself; (4) that in the passage before us
Phoebe is called the ἐνκόσμῳ of a particular Church,
which seems to imply a specific employment; (5) that
the Church of the Ephesians, to which she went, could
well have been only a small Church: whence we may draw
a fair conclusion as to what was customary, in the mat-
ter of such female ministration, in the larger churches;
(6) that, whatever her errand to Rome might be, the
independent manner of her going there seems to imply
(especially when we consider the secluded habits of
Greek women) not only that she was a widow or a woman of
mature age, but that she was acting officially; (7) that she
had already been of great service to Paul and others
(προσέχεις, συμπληρών, καί ἐμεῖν αὐτῷ), either by her wealth or her energy, or both; a view which
closely corresponds with the description of the qualifications
of the enrolled widows in 1 Tim. v, 10; (8) that the
duty which we here see Phoebe discharging implies a
personal character worthy of confidence and respect." See DRAcones.
Phoebus (φωβίς, bright), a title, and subsequently
a name, of Apollo. It had reference both to the
youthful beauty of the god, and to the radiance of the
sun, when, latterly, Apollo became identified with Hel-
ios, the sun-god.
Phoebus, WILLIAM, a Methodist Episcopal min-
ister, was born in Somers County, N. C., April 15,
1818. In 1838 he was admitted to the Conference, and preach-
ed in various places until 1798, when he located in the
city of New York, entering upon the practice of medi-
cine. In 1866 he was readmitted into the New York
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Conference, laboring effectively till 1821, after which time he was either supernumerary or superannuated. He died in New York Nov. 9, 1881. He was a sound preacher and an excellent man.—Minutes of Conferences, ii, 162; Sprague, Am. of the Amer. Pulpit, vii, 87.

Phœnicós [some Phœnice], or, rather, PHOENIX (Φωινής, a palm-tree [q. v.], which Theophrastus says was indigenous there), a town and harbor in the island of Crete, which the vessel in which the apostle Paul sailed was attempting to reach when driven away by the eucalydon and wrecked (Acts xxvii, 12). The harbor or "haven" (λιμής) is described by Luke as βιοισθήσασθαι καὶ ἱσταμεν τὰς ηλιόστρωσις, which the A. V. renders "lieth towards the south-west and north-west." But Mr. Smith contends that καὶ in connection with winds means "in the same direction as." Thus βιοισθήσασθαι καὶ ἱσταμεν would not mean, as is generally supposed, that the haven looked to the point from which the hills blows, but to the point towards which it blows. Consequently the haven looked towards the north-east and the south-east (Smith, Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul, p. 86 sq., 2d ed.). In this rendering Mr. Smith is sustained by ancient authorities, and also by some of the best modern critics (Alford, ad loc.; Conybeare and Howson, Life of St. Paul, ii, 324, note; see, however, for the contrary opinion, Hacket On Acts, ad loc.). It is certain that one meaning of καὶ with the accusative is "opposite," or "over against," as it is correctly translated in ver. 7 of this very chapter. Schweighäuser, in his Lexicon Hierodotum, has pointed out some very instructive instances of this in Herod. ix, 31, where καὶ is used indiscriminately with ἀπίστως and ἀπείχος. In this sense, βιοισθήσασθαι καὶ ἱσταμεν, etc., would be equivalent to βιοισθήσασθαι πρὸς ἱσταμεν, etc., a phrase as to the meaning of which there could be no doubt (Xenophon, Mem. iii, 8, 9). Καὶ with an accusative also often signifies "down." But the objection to translating it so in this passage is that it would thus, with extreme awkwardness, inferentially mean the exact contrary of what it directly means in its other acknowledged sense, as marking the local relation between two objects.

Both Ptolemy and Strabo mention a town Φωινή; while Ptolemy alone mentions a haven, of a similar name, which he calls in the accusative Φωινίουσα. Strabo locates it on the southern coast, at the narrowest part of the island (x. 4, p. 473). Hierocles identifies it with Araduena, and seems to place it opposite the island of Claudia ( Vet. Rom. Itin. ed. Wessel. p. 650, 651); and Stephen of Byzantium identifies Araduena and Acropolis (s. v.). On the south coast of Crete, at the narrowest part of the island, and opposite the island of Claudia, is the harbor of Lutro. It is open to the east; but, as a little island lies almost in front of it, there are many entrances, one looking to the north-east, and the other to the south-east. It is thus described by captain Spratt: "Having in 1825 examined generally the south coast of Crete, I was fully convinced that Lutro was the Phœnicia of St. Paul, for it is the only bay to the westward of Fair Havens in which a vessel of any size could find any shelter during the winter months. By sailing inside the island, and securing to the south shore of the bay, a vessel is nearly land-locked. South-east and east winds only could endanger her; but with the former, where the fetch is greatest, the wind would not blow home against such a mountain as the White Mountains, so immediately over the bay, and rising to an elevation of 9000 feet" (Smith, p. 89). Mr. Brown, who since visited it, adds: "It is the only secure harbor, in all winds, on the south coast of Crete" (Ibid. p. 256).

This identification is confirmed by the researches of Mr. Pashley (Travels in Crete, ii, 257), who discovered, a short distance above Lutro, a village called Acropolis ("upper city"), and another near it called Aradheana. Captain Speak also (Researches in Crete, ii, 249) asserts that the name Phœnicia is still currently applied to Lutro, and that a Latin inscription found there, dating from the emperor Nerva, shows that ships from Alexandria resorted to this harbor. Leceler, on the other hand (Die Apostelgesch. 1869, p. 400), maintaining the usual interpretation of καὶ here (towards), suggests that Luke is only reporting a popular opinion as to the situation of Phœnicia, which Paul's company did not reach; and that hence we are not to look for the usual accuracy of the writer. See SHIPWRECK (of PAUL).

Phœnicia (Φωινίκια), a country whose inhabitants necessarily held important and intimate relations, not only to the Hebrews, but to all antiquity. The latest and most complete authority on this subject is Rawlinson's History of Phœnicia (London, 1869).

1. The Land.—1. Name.—"Phœnicé" was not the name by which its native inhabitants called it, but was given to it by the Greeks, who called those merchants who came from that coast of the Mediterranean Sea which runs parallel with Mount Lebanon Phœnicia. In Cicero (De Fin. iv, 20) there occurs the doubtful reading Phœnicia (comp. the Vulgate in Numb. xxxii, 51). However, this latter form of the name has come into
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general use (comp. Gesenii Monmenta Phenicia [Leips., 1837], p. 338: Forbiger, Handbuch der alten Geographie [ibid. 1842-1844]), p. 639 sq.). This name has been variously derived. It is possibly from Pheniz the son of Agenor and the brother of Castus. It perhaps arose from the circumstance that the chief article of the commerce of these merchants was gourc. The word ψηφος means blood-red, and is probably related to ψηφος, mariner. This derivation of the name is alluded to by Strabo (i, 42). Others imagine as naturally that the color does not give name to the people, but is named after them: as our damask, from Damascus; or our "calico," from Calicut. The term, as an epithet of color, may also apply, as Kenrick supposes, to the sun-burnt complexion of the people. But after all, in the opinion of others, a Greek derivation may not be admissible, for the name may be original or Semitic—though it is ridiculous in Scaiger, Fuller, and Glaseis to identify it with ποτηρία, "to live luxuriously," in allusion to the results of Phenician wealth and merchandise. Strabo, however, maintains that the Phenicians were called Φήνιες, because they resided originally on the coasts of the Red Sea. Bochart, in his Canaan (i, 1), derives the name from the Hebrew פינא, son of Anak. Baland, in his Palestine ex Monumentis Veteribus Illustrata, derives it from φηνάς, palm-tree; and this is the etymology generally acquiesced in. The palm-tree is seen, as an emblem, on some coins of Arados, Tyre, and Sidon; and there are several palm-trees within the circuit of modern Tyre, and along the coast at various points; but the tree is not at the present day one of the characteristic features of the country. The native name of Phenicia was Κανάνεα (Canaan) or Κάνα (Kana), signifying Lowland, so named in contrast to the adjoining Αραμ, i.e. Highland, the Hebrew name of Syria. The name Kenian is preserved on a coin of Laodicia of the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, whereon Laodicia is styled "a city of the Canaan," (Canaan) or Κάνα (Xan). Knd or Khw (Xew) is mentioned distinctively by Herodotus the grammarian as the old name of Phenicia. Hence, as Phenicians or Cannaenites were the most powerful of all tribes in Palestine at the time of its invasion by Joshua, the Israelites, in speaking of their own territory as it was before the conquest, called it "the land of Canaan." See CANAAN.

In the O. T. the word Phenogacia does not occur, as might be expected from its being a Greek name. In the Apocrypha it is not defined, though spoken of as such, with Galilea-Syria, under one military commander (1 Macc. vii, 8; viii, 9; xi, 11; 3 Macc. iii, 15). In the N. T. the word occurs only in the title of the city of Phenicia (Acts xix, 19; xv, 3; xxi, 2); and not one of these affords a clue as to how far the writer deemed Phenogacia to extend. On the other hand, Josephus possibly agreed with Strabo; for he expressly states that Cesarea is situated in Phenogacia (Ant. vi, 8, 1); and although he never makes a similar statement respecting Joppa, yet he speaks, in one passage, of the coast of Syria, Phenogacia, and Egypt, as if Syria and Phenogacia exhausted the line of coast on the Mediterranean Sea to the north of Egypt (War, ii, 3, 2).

The Phenicians in general are sometimes called Sidonians (comp. Gesenii Monmenta Phenogacia, ii, 267 sq.: Thesaurus Linguae Hebraicae, under the word ונידא). Justinus (xviii, 3) alludes to the etymology of this name: "A city being built which they called Sidon, from the abundance of fishes; for the Phenogaci call a fish sidon." This statement is not quite correct. But the root וי, which in Hebrew means only to catch beasts and birds, can also be employed in Arabic to mean "fishing of fishes" spoke of. This root occurs also in the Arabic, in the signification of both hunting and fishing (comp. the act. Zidin).

3. extent.—Phenogacia in general is named as applied to a country on the coast of Syria, bounded by the Mediterranean Sea on the west and Lebanon on the east; Syria and Judaea forming its northern and southern limits respectively, situated between about 34° to 36° N. lat., and 56° to 36° E. long. Yet the extent of the country varied so considerably at different times that the geographical definitions of the ancient writers differ in a very remarkable manner. Thus, while in Gen. x, 19 Canaan does not reach afterwards beyond Sidon—a place in which early times gave the name to the whole people (המגנ קאנת, Deut., Judg.), and by Berosus and Belzoni are considered as lying beyond it (Gen. x. 15 sq.; Josh. xii, 3), it comprised in the Persian period (Herod. iii, 91) Postassium, as high as 55° 52'. Later still (Pliny, Strabo, Ptolemy) the Eleutherus (34° 60') and subsequently (Mela, Stephanus) the island of Arados (84° 70') were considered its utmost northern limits. To the south it was at times Gaza (Gen. x. 19; Zeph. ii, 5; Herod., Philo, Eustath.), at Saphos (Numm. xxiv, 5; Josh. xvi, 4, 7); Strabo, Procop, etc.; and, from the Macedonian period chiefly, Cesarea is mentioned as its extreme point. Eastward the country sometimes comprised parts of Syria and Palestine, beyond the mountain-ridges of the former and the hill-chains of the latter.

It will thus be seen that the length of coast to which the name Phenogacia was applied varied at different times, and may be regarded under different aspects before and after the loss of its original influence. It may be termed Phenogacia proper was a narrow undulating plain, extending from the pass of Ras el-Beydah or Abyad, the "Promontorium Album" of the ancients, about six miles south of Tyre, to the Naher el-Auly, the ancient Besotenus, two miles north of Sidon (Robinson, Bib. Resa, ii, 478). The plain is only twenty-eight miles in length, and, considering the great importance of Phenogacia in the world's history, this may well be added to other instances in Greece, Italy, and Palestine, which show how little the intellectual influence of a city or state has depended on the extent of its territory. Its average breadth is about a mile (Porter, Handbook for Phenogacia, ii, 396); but near Sidon the mountains retreat to a distance of two miles, and near Tyre to a distance of five miles (Kenrick, Phenogacia, p. 19). The whole of Phenogacia, thus understood, is bounded by Josephus (Ant. vi, 8, 1) the great plain of the city of Sidon (הרי שדניא פלורה קדום). In it, near its northern extremity, was situated Sidon, in the north latitude of 33° 34' 05"; and scarcely more than seventeen geographical miles to the south was Tyre, in the latitude of 33° 17' (admiral Smyth's Mediterranean) 17'; and in a straight line those two renowned cities were less than twenty English miles distant from each other. Zarephath, the Sarepta of the N. T., was situated between them, eight miles south of Sidon, to which it belonged (1 Kings xvii, 9; Luke iv, 26). (2) A still longer district, which afterwards became a city entitled to the name of Phenogacia, extended up the coast to a point marked by the island of Arados, and by Antarpus towards the north; the southern boundary remaining the same as in Phenogacia proper. Phenogacia, thus defined, is estimated by Mr. Grant (Hist. of Syria, iii, 354) to have been about one hundred and twenty miles in length; while its breadth, between Lebanon and the sea, never exceeded twenty miles, and was generally much less. This estimate is most reasonable, allowing for the bends of the coast, as the difference in latitude between Tyre and Antarpus (Tartus) is equivalent to one hundred and six English miles; and six miles to the south of Tyre, as already mentioned, intervene before the beginning of the pass of Ras el-Abyad. Hence of this entire district to the name of Phenogacia rests on the probable fact that the whole of it, to the north of the great plain of Sidon, was occupied by Phenician colonists; not to mention that there seems to have been some kind of political connection, however loose, between all the inhabitants
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(Diodorus, xvi, 41). Scarcely sixteen geographical miles farther north than Sidon was Berytus; with a roadstead so well suited for the purposes of modern navigation that, under the modern name of Beirut, it has become the port of Lebanon, the ancient port of Sidon and Tyre. This city, according to the范文, is "situated on the seacoast of Asia Minor, south of the mouth of the river, the shores of which are covered with numerous small islands." Whether this Berytus was identical with the Beruth or Beroth of Ezek. xxiii, 9, inhabited by seamen and calkers. Its inhabitants are supposed to be alluded to in the word Gliba, translated "stone-scutters" in the A. V. of 1 Kings v, 18 (32). It still retains in Arabic the kindred name of Jebel. Then came Tripolis (now Tarabulus), said to have been founded by colonists from Tyre, Sidon, and Aradus, with three distinct towns, each a forlorn gap from another one, each with its own walls, and each named from the city which supplied its colonists. General meetings of the Phoenicians seem to have been held at Tripolis (Diod. xvi, 41), as if a certain local jealousy had prevented the selection for this purpose of Tyre, Sidon, or Aradus. Lastly, towards the extreme point north was Aradus itself, the Arav of Gen. x, 18 and Ezek. xxiii, 8, situated, like Tyre, on a small island near the mainland, and founded by exiles from Sidon.

During the period of the conquest of Canaan by the Israelites, which terminated the following towns, which we will enumerate successively in the direction from south to north: Dora (\(\text{Dora}\), Josh. xi, 2; xvii, 11 sq.); Potelma (\(\text{Potelma}\), Judg. i, 38); Ecdippa (\(\text{Ecdippa}\), Josh. xix, 29); Tyre (\(\text{Tyre}\), Josh. xix, 29); Sarepta (\(\text{Sarepta}\), 1 Kings xvii, 9 sq.; Luke iv, 28); Sidon (\(\text{Sidon}\), Gen. x, 15); Berytus (\(\text{Berytus}\), Ezek. xvii, 16; 2 Sam. viii, 8); Byblus (\(\text{Byblus}\), Josh. xiii, 5); Tripolis, Simyra (\(\text{Simyra}\), Gen. x, 18); Arka (\(\text{Arka}\), Gen. x, 17); Simna (\(\text{Simna}\), Gen. x, 16); Aradus (\(\text{Aradus}\), Gen. x, 18). Comp. the respective articles on these towns. Sidon is the only Phoenician town mentioned in Homer (see Iliad, vi, 239; xxiii, 743; Odyssey, xxv, 415; xxv, 424).

S. Geographical Features.—The whole of Phoenicia proper is well watered by various streams from the adjoining hills; of these the two largest are the Khasimt-yeh, a few miles north of Tyre—the ancient name of which, strange to say, is not certain, though it is conjectured to have been the Leontes—and the Bostreans, although north of Sidon, of which the soil is fertile, although now generally ill-cultivated; but in the neighborhood of Sidon there are rich gardens and orchards. The harns of Tyre and Sidon afforded water of sufficient depth for all the requirements of ancient navigation, and the neighboring range of the Lebanon, in its extensive forests, furnished what is termed a nearly inexhaustible supply of timber for ship-building. To the north of Bostreus, between that river and Beirut, lies the only desolate and barren part of Phoenicia. It is crossed by the ancient Tamyras or Damara, the modern Nahr ed-Damara. From Beirut the plains are again fertile. The principal streams are the Lyces, now the Nahr el-Keb, not far north from Beirut; the Adonis, now the Nahar Ibrahim, about five miles south of Gebal; and the Eleutherus, now the Nahar el-Kebir, in the bend between Tripolis and Antedrus.

The climate of Phoenicia—an item of immense moment in the history of a nation—varies very considerably. Near the coast, and in the lower plains, the heat in summer is at times tropical, while the more mountainous regions enjoy a moderate temperature, and in winter even heavy falls of snow are not uncommon. In the southern parts the early rains begin in October, and are, after an interval of dry weather, followed by the winter rains, which last till March, the time of the "latter" rains. From May till October the sky remains cloudless. The difference of temperature found in so small a compass is thus greatly diminished. If the heat of July is oppressive, a six hours' journey
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given them by late Phoenician colonists. Some have seen in them the Hyksos driven to Syria. Without entering any further into these most difficult, and, in the absence of all trustworthy information, more than vague speculations, so much appears certain, that many immigrations of Semitic branches into Phoenicia, at different periods and from different quarters, have taken place, and that these gradually settled into the highly civilized nationality which we find constituted as early as the time of Abraham (Gen. xvi, 11) and already, (comp. Allen-Exra, ad loc., and Spinoza, Tract. Theol. Pol. ch. viii.). It would be extremely vain to venture an opinion on the individuality of the different tribes that, wave-like, rushed into the country from various sides, at probably widely distant dates. The only apparently valuable tradition on the subject seems contained in the above-quoted passage of Gen. x, 15-18. But there is one point which can be proved to be in the highest degree probable, and which has peculiar interest as bearing on the Jews, viz. that the Phoenicians were of the same race as the Canaanites. This remarkable fact, taken in connection with the intercourse of the Phoenicians, leads to some interesting results, is rendered probable by the following circumstances: 1st. The native name of Phoenicia, as already pointed out, was Canaan, a name signifying "lowland." This was well given to the narrow slip of plain between the Lebanon and the Mediterranean Sea, in continuous elevated mountain range adjoining; but it would have been inappropriate to that part of Palestine conquered by the Israelites, which was undoubtedly a hill-country (see Movers, Das Phönikische Alterthum, i, 5); so that, when it is known that the Israelites at the time of their invasion found in Palestine a powerful tribe called the Canaanites, and from them called Palestine, the land of Canaan, it is obviously suggested that the Canaanites came originally from the neighboring plain, called Canaan, along the sea-coast. 2d. This is further confirmed through the name in Africa whereby the Carthaginian Phoenicians called themselves, as attested by Augustine, who states that the peasants in his part of Africa, if asked of what race they were, would answer, in Punic or Phoenician, "Canaanites" (Opera Omn., iv, 1355; Exp. Epist. et Rom., § 18). 3d. The conclusion thus suggested is strongly supported by the tradition that the names of persons and places in the land of Canaan—not only when the Israelites invaded it, but likewise previously, when "there were yet but a few of them," and Abraham and Isaac and Jacob heard of the Phoenicians or Hebrews, as, for example, as Abimelech, "father of the king" (Gen. xx, 2); Melchizedek, "king of righteousness" (Gen. xviii, 18); Kirjath-sepher, "city of the book" (Josh. xv, 15). As above observed, in Greek writers also occurs the name Φοινίκη for Phoenicia (comp. Gesenii Thesaurus Linguae Hebrewae (Leips. 1839-43, i, 626, and Gesenii Monumenta Phoenic. p. 570 sqq.). The dialect of the Israelites perhaps resembled more the Aramaean, and that of the Phoenicians more the Arabic; but this difference was nearly effaced when both nations resided in the same country, took the same Phoenician or Hebrew tongue, and, for example, as Abimelech, "father of the king," (Gen. xx, 2), Melchizedek, "king of righteousness," (Gen. xviii, 18); Kirjath-sepher, "city of the book" (Josh. xv, 15). As above observed, in Greek writers also occurs the name Φοινίκη for Phoenicia (comp. Gesenii Thesaurus Linguae Hebrewae (Leips. 1839-43, i, 626, and Gesenii Monumenta Phoenic. p. 570 sqq.).

2. Government.—Two principal divisions existed anciently among these Canaanites: these were those of the interior of Palestine, and the tribes inhabiting the sea-coast, Phoenicia proper. By degrees three special tribal divisions were distinguished: the Danites, the nucleus around which the multitude of minor ones gathered and became one nationality, viz. the inhabitants of Sidon, of Tyre, and of Aradus. Three principal elements are to be distinguished, according to classical evidence (Castor, comp. Serner. ad Ann. iv, 882), in the constitution of Phoenician states: 1. The monarchy, consisting of certain families of noble lineage, which were divided into tribes (בניהם, families (בניהם, Phoen. בנים), and gentes (בניאים), the latter generally of the number of 800 in each state or colony. Out of the "tribes" were elected thirty princes (Phoen. בנים), who formed a supreme senate; besides which there existed another larger representative assembly of 300 members, chosen from the gentes. 2. The lower estates of the people, or "plebs’’ itself, who do not seem to have had their recognised special representatives, but by constant opposition, which sometimes broke out in open violence, held the nobles in check. 3. The kingdom, an aristocratic, hereditary, afterwards became elective. Nor must the priesthood be forgotten; one of the most powerful elements in the Phoenician commonwealth, and which in some provinces even assumed, in the person of the high-priest, the supreme rule. There was a kind of federal union between the different states, which, according to their importance, sent either their kings or their judges, at the head of a large number of their senators, to the general councils of the nation, held at stated periods either at Sidon or Tyre. The colonies were as much as the home-country, except that local affairs and the executive were intrusted to two (annual, as it would seem) judges (בניאים, suffetes) elected by the senate—an institution which for some time also replaced the monarchical form in Tyre. When Tripolis was founded by Tyre, Sidon, and Aradus, as a place of joint meeting for their hegemony, every one of these cities sent 100 senators to watch her special interests at the common meeting; and generations after the 4th century B.C., at least, to have consisted of 500 to 600 elders, some of whom were probably selected more for their wealth than for their noble lineage. The king sometimes combined in his person the office of high-priest. The turbulent seething mass of the people, consisting of the poorer families of Phoenician descent, the immigrants of neighboring tribes, the strangers, and the whole incomming mass of workmen, traders, sailors, that must have abounded in a commercial and maritime nation like the Phoenicians, and out of whose midst must have arisen at times influential men enough—was governed, as far as we can learn, as "constitutionally" as possible. The unruly spirits were got rid of in Roman fashion somehow in the colonies, or were made silent by important places being intrusted to their care, under strict supervision from home. Only once or twice do we hear of violent secessions, for example, 52 B.C., in consequence of one of which it was mockingly said that Phoenicia had lost all her aristocracy, and what existed of Phoenicians was of the lowest birth, the offspring of slaves. As the wealth of all the world accumulated more and more in the Phoenician ports, luxury, and too great a desire to rest and enjoy their wealth in peace, induced the dauntless old pirates to intrust the guard of their cities to the mariners and mercenary soldiers, to Libyans and Lydians—2d they of Persia and of Lydia, and Phoenicians proper, and a small remnant of it, although the wild resistance which this small territory offered in her single town to the enormous armies of Assear, Babylonia and Greece shows that the old spirit had not died out. The smaller states were sometimes so much oppressed by Tyre that they preferred rather to submit to external enemies (comp. Herodotus, Hist., iv, 19 sqq.; Beck, Anleitung zur genauen Kenntnis der Welt- und Volksgeschichte, p. 252 sqq., and 581 sqq.).

3. History.—One of the most powerful and important nations of antiquity, Phoenicia has yet left but poor information regarding her history. According to Josephus, every city in Phoenicia had its collection of registers and public documents (comp. Targum to Kirjath-jeearim, Judg. i, 11, 15). Out of these, Menander of Ephesus, and Dias, a Phoenician, compiled two histories of Tyre, a few fragments of which have survived (comp.
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Josephus, *Contra Ap. i., 17, 18; Ant. viii., 5, 8; xiii., 1 sq.; ix, 14, 2; Theopil. *Ad Abyd. iii., 22; Synkellos, *Chron. p. 182.*] Sancioniatho is said to have written a history of Phenicia and Egypt, which was recast by Philo of Byblius, under the reign of Hadrian, and from his work Forphyrus (4th century A.D.) took some com- mon results, which were afterwards transcribed into the Euse- bus (Euseb., *Prep. Evang. i., 10.* Later Phenician histori- ans' works (Theodotus, Hesychates, Moschos, mentioned as authors on Phenicia by Tatianus, *Contra Graecos, p. 87.*) are likewise lost. Gesenius mentions, in his *Monumenta Phenica* (p. 362 sq.), that some later Phenician authors, who do not touch upon historical subjects. Thus noth- ing remains but a few casual notices in the Bible, some of the Church fathers, and classical writers (Josephus, Synkellos, Herodotus, Diodorus, Justin), which happen to throw some light upon the history of that long-lost commonwealth. A great part of this history, however, being identical with that of the cities mentioned, in which by turns the hegemony was vested, fuller infor- mation will be found under their special headings. The names of the kings from Hiram to Pygmalion are pres- ented to us by Josephus (Ant. ii., 18), and we are left to conjecture from the history of Tyre by Manander of Ephesus. We give them with the communications of the reigns by Movers (*st. sup. ii., 1, 140, 143, 149,* Duncker (*Gesch. des Alterthums* [3d ed. Berlin 1862-7.], i, 526 sq.), and Hitzig (*Urgesch. und Mythol. der Philister,* p. 191.) See also Herzog, *Encyclop. xi., 620.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Movers.</th>
<th>Duncker.</th>
<th>Hitzig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hiram I....</td>
<td>84 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baalzebul</td>
<td>7 (17 years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahabstuart</td>
<td>9 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1805-919</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astartus</td>
<td>12 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phæles</td>
<td>8 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ithobal</td>
<td>6 (12 years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balzebul</td>
<td>6 (12 years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myttunus</td>
<td>9 (20, 29 years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pigmalmion</td>
<td>47 (40, 45, 48 years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Broadsly speaking, we may begin to date Phenician history from the time when Sidon first assumed the rule, or about B.C. 1500. Up to that time it was chiefly the development of the immense internal resources, and the commencement of that gigantic trade that was dest- ined soon to overspread the whole of the then known world, which seem to have occupied the attention of the early and peaceful settlers. The sylvanial repre- sentatives of the countries and the dynasty that period, El, or Belitan, builder of cities, supreme and happy riler of men. The conquest of Canaan by the Israelites marks a new epoch, of which lists of kings were still extant in late Greek times. We now hear first of Sido- nian colonies, while the manufactures and commerce of the city seem to have reached a high renome throughout the neighboring lands. The Israelites drove out Sidonian settlers from Laish, near the sources of the Jordan. Some later (beginning of 15th century), Sidonian colonization spread farther west, founding the (Island-) city of Tyre and Girumia or Ciremia on the coast of Africa. About 1209, however, Sidon was defeated by the king of Askalon, and Tyre, occupying the ascen- dency, ushered in a third period, during which Phenicia reachted the summit of her greatness. At this time, chiefly under the brilliant reign of Hiram, we hear also of a close alliance with the Israelites, which eventually led to common commercial enterprises at sea. After Hiram's death, however, political disensions began to undermine the unparalleled peace and power of the country. His four sons ruled, with certain interruptions, and the history of the period is then assumed by Ethbaal, the father of Jezebel. His grandson, Mattan, left the throne to his two children, Pymalmon and Dido (Elissa). The latter, having been excluded from power by her brother, left the country, together with some of the aristocratic families, and founded Carthage (New-Town), about B.C. 813. Of the century that fol- lowed, little further is known save occasional allusions in Joel and Amos, which tell of the piratical commerce of Tyrians and Sidonians. Asyrian, Chaldean, Egyptian invasions followed each other in turns during the last phase of Phenician history, dating from the 16th century, and reducing the country to insignificance. Deeds of prowess, such as the thirteen years' siege sustained by Tyre against overwhelming forces, could not save the doomed country. Her fleet destroyed, her colonies wrested from her or in a state of open rebellion, torn by internal factions, Phenicia was ultimately (together with what had been once Nebu- chadnezzar's empire) embodied with Persia B.C. 538. Once more, however, exasperated by the enormous taxes imposed upon them, chiefly during the Greek war, together with other galling measures issued by the successive satraps, the Phenicians, under the leader- ship of Sidon, took part in the revolution of Egypt against Axartexeres Mennon and Ochus, about the middle of the 4th century B.C., which ended very unhappily for them. Sidon, the only city that refused to submit at once, at the request of the Persians, was shortly there- after quelled, the citizens themselves setting fire to it, and more than 40,000 people perished in the flames. Ab- though rebuilt and repopulated shortly afterwards, it yet never again reached its ancient grandeur, and to Tyre belonged the entire coast, until, after a seven years' siege, to Alexander, who through the battle on the Issus (B.C. 333) had made all Phenicia his as part and parcel of the gigantic Persian empire. Under Antiochus the Great, all except Sidon became subject to Seleucidian rule. Pompey, incorporating Phenicia with Syria (B.C. 65), made it a Roman prov- ince. During the civil wars of Rome, when Cassius divided Syria into small provinces, and sold them separ- ately, Tyre again became for a short period a princi- pality, with a king of its own. Cleopatra in her turn received Phenicia as a present from Rome. The shadow of independence was still left to the two ancient cities was taken from them by Augustus (A.D. 20). Tyre, however, retained much of her previous impor- tance as an emporium and a manufacturing place through the various vicissitudes of Syrian history during the sixeneen centuries that followed, until the Ottoman Turks conquered the country, and the opening up of the New World on the one hand, and of a new route to Asia on the other, destroyed the last remnant of the primitive grandeur of one of the most mighty empires of the an- cient world. The instrumentality of one of the largest shares to the civilization of all mankind.

4. Occupations.—Commerce and colonization were the elements by which this grandeur was chiefly accomplis- hed. Regarding the former, we have already hinted at the overflowing wealth and almost unparalleled variety of home products which this small country furnished forth, and which, far too abundant for their own consumption, easily suggested the idea of exportation and traffic of exchange. Their happy maritime position further en- abled them to do that which Egypt and Assyria, with all their perfection of art, were barred from doing; partly, it is true, through their isolated habits and narrow laws, but chiefly by the natural limit- ats of their countries. To Phenicia alone it was given to supply the link that was to connect the East with the West, or at least with European Western Asia. Communicating by means of Arabia and the Persian Gulf with India and the coast of Africa towards the equator; and on the north, along the Euxine, with the borders of Scythia, beyond the Strait of Gibraltar, with Britannia, if not with the Baltic, their commerce di- vides itself into two great branches according to those natural highways. From the countries on the Persian Gulf and the Red Sea, the coasts of Arabia, Af- rica, and India, they exported spice, precious stones, myrrh, frankincense, gold, ivory, ebony, steel, and iron, and from Egypt embroidered linen and corn. In ex-
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change they brought not only their own raw produce and manufactures, but gums and resins for embalming, also wine and spices. From Mesopotamia and Syria came the emeralds and corals of the Red Sea; from Babylon the Leonard cloth emblcements; wine and fine wool from Acharn and the Persian Gulf; India, Arabia, and the finest wheat, grape-honey, oil, and balm. Another remote region, Armenia, furnished troops of riding and chariot horses and mules; and this same country, or, rather, the south-eastern coast of the Euxine, further furnished the Phoenicians emporiums with slaves of a superior sort, and slaves of the finest type. From Judea the Phoenicians went hand in hand with their maritime calling— with copper, lead, brass (or chalcum), and tannins, which they also fetched, together with conger-eels, from the Atlantic coast. Their extensive early commerce with Greece is frequently alluded to Homer, and is further shown by the remarkable fact of the abundance of Syrian or Phoenician words in Greek for such things as precious stones, fine garments, vessels, spices, and Eastern plants in general, musical instruments, weights and measures, etc. (comp. μουρά, μέρις; κίνασαν, κίνσαν; κίνασαν, κίνσαν; κίνασαν, κίνσαν; κίνασαν, κίνσαν; κίνασαν, κίνσαν; κίνασαν, κίνσαν; κίνασαν, κίνσαν; κίνασαν, κίνσαν; κίνασαν, κίνσαν; κίνασαν, κί
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but his feet was wrecked at Ezion-geber (1 Kings xxiv, 49). The names of mercantile establishments on the coasts of Arabia along the Persian Gulf have partly been preserved to the present day. In these places the Phoenicians exchanged the produce of the West for that of the East, for spices, the celebrated Samaria incense, gold, and precious stones. The Midianites (Gen. xxvi, 28) and the Edomites (Ex. xxvi, 16) effected the transit by their caravans. The fortified Idumean town Petra probably contained the store-houses in which the produce of southern countries was collected. From Syria the Phoenicians also traded extensively in byssus (ver. 7) for wine. According to an ancient tradition, the tyrant of Thebes, Busiris, having soiled his hands with the blood of all foreigners, was killed by the Tyrian Hercules. This indicates that Phoenician colonists established themselves and their civilization successfully in Upper Egypt, where all strangers had usually been persecuted. At a later period Memphis was the place where most of the Phoenicians in Egypt were established. Phoenician inscriptions found in Egypt prove that even under the Ptolemaic the intimate connection between Egypt and Phoenicia still existed (comp. Gesenii Monumenta Phoenic., xxiii, 224 sq.). From Palestine the Phoenicians imported, besides wheat, especially from Judea, ivory, oil, and balm; also wool, principally from the neighboring nomadic Arabs. On the Phoenician ware have been found (Gen. 6, 6, 17, 18, 21), and the mountains of Syria wood. The tribes about the shores of the Caspian Sea furnished slaves and iron; for instance, the Tubarens (Τυβάραν), Median and Moehi (Μωνέβα, Meshech). Horsemen, horses, and mules came from the Armenians (Παρόβος, Togarmah) (see Heeren, p. 86-180). The treasures of the East were exported from Phoenicia by ships which sailed first to Cyprus and then to the mountains of Phoenicia from the Phoenician coast. Citium was a Phoenician colony in Cyprus, the name of which was transferred to the whole of Cyprus, and to some neighboring islands and coasts called Cypria (Gen. x, 4; Isa. xxiii, 1, 12). Hence also סיכרים, the name of a Canaanitic tribe (Gesenii Monumenta Phoenic., p. 160). Cyprus was subject to Tyre up to the time of Alexander the Great. There are still found Phoenician inscriptions which prove the connection of Cyprus with Tyre. At Rhodes (Ῥόδος) also are found vestiges of Phoenician influence. From Rhodes the mountains of Crete are visible. This was of great importance for the direction of navigators, before the discovery of the compass. In Crete were the islands of Knossos and Gortyn, and the Isles, are the vestiges of Phoenician settlements. On the Isle of Thassos, on the southern coast of Thrace, the Phoenicians had gold-mines; and even on the southern shores of the Black Sea they had factories. However, when the Greeks became more powerful, the Phoenicians sailed more in other directions. They occupied also Sicily and the neighboring islands, but were, after the Greek colonization, confined to a few towns, Metya, Soloes, Panormus (Thrycylides, vi, 2). The Phoenician mercantile establishments in Sardinia and the Balearic Isles could scarcely be called articles, and the Phoenician colony, which probably soon became important by commerce with the interior of Africa, and remained connected with Tyre by means of a common sanctuary. After Phoenicia had been vanished by the Assyrians, Babylonians, and Persians, the settlements in Sicily, Tunisia, and Spain became the power of Carthage. The Phoenicians had for a long period exported from Spain gold, silver, tin, iron, lead (Ezek. xxxviii, 18), fruit, wine, oil, wax, fish, and wool. Their chief settlement was Tarshish, (תורשש), subject, from the root תרש, he vanquished, subjected. The Arameans pronounced it תרשש; hence the Greek Tarshesos. This was probably the name of a town situated to the west of the Pillars of Hercules (Capo
and Abyla, now Gibraltar and Ceuta), and even more west than Gades, at the mouth of the Bestis (Herod. iv, 62; Scymnus Chius, v, 161 sq.). This river was also called Tarceus (Arist. Meteor. ii, 10; Pausan. vi, 19, 5; Strabo, iii, 11, 1). Also, Herodotus obtained likewise the Phoenician name Carthage, from מַרְכָּת, town (Strabo, iii, p. 151). There are other names of towns in Spain which have a Phoenician derivation: Gades, גַּדֵּס, part of; fence (comp. Gesenius Monumenta Phoenicia, p. 304 sq., 349); Malaga (גַּלָּג), on account of much salt fish thence exported; or, according to Gesenius (id. p. 812 sq., and 358), from מַעֲמִיל, factory, or manufacture of other metals, on account of the mines to be found there; Belon, בֵּלְוָן, city id. p. 311 sq., and 348). The voyage to Tarshish was the most important of those undertaken by the Phoenicians. Hence it was that their largest vessels were all called ships of Tarshish, although they sailed in other directions (1 Kings ii, 92). It appears also that the Phoenicians exported fin from the British Isles, and amber from the coasts of Prussia. Their voyages on the western coasts of Africa seem to have been merely voyages of discovery, without permanent results. The Spanish colonies were probably the principal sources of Phoenician wealth, and were founded at a very remote period. The migration of the Phoenician, Cadmus, into Boetia likewise belongs to the earlier period of Phoenician colonization. Homer seems to know little of the Sidonian commerce; which feature may be explained by supposing that the Phoenicians avoided all collision and competition with the increasing power of the Greeks, and preferred to direct their voyages into countries where such competition seemed to be improbable.

Herodotus shows the Phoenicians as beginning soon after their settlement to occupy themselves in distant voyages (i, 1). From the construction of rude rafts, they must speedily have reached to a style of substantial ship-building. Their commercial vessels are represented either as long in the bow, and fat in the stern, with eighty oars—"ships of Tarshish"—or as rounder in form, and more capacious in stowage, but slower in speed—tubs or coating-vessels—bearers of cargo on short voyages. Xenophon (Economica, viii) passes a high eulogy on a Phoenician vessel, where the greatest quill was fifty feet long; and he remarks that the Phoenicians were experts in stoneworking, being skilled separately in the smallest stonework. Their merchants also carried arms for defence, and had figures on their prows, which the Greeks named rameae. They steered by the Cynosure, or the last star in Ursa Minor; and they could cast reckoning from the combined application of astronomy and arithmetic (Strabo, xvi, 2, 21). This nautical application of astronomy is ascribed by Callimachus to Thales, a Phoenician by descent (frag. ed. Blomfield, p. 218; Dioq. Laert. Thales). Lebanon supplied them with abundance of timber, and Cyprus gave them all necessary equipments, from the keel to the topmasts—a fundamento ipeo carinum ad supremos ipos carbasos (Amm. Marcell. xiv, 8-14). These daring Phoenician navigators in the reign of Pharaos—Necho circumnavigated Africa—departing from the Red Sea and returning by the Strait of Gibraltar. They reported that in sailing round Libya they had the sun on their right hand—a story of which Herodotus says, "I, for my part, do not believe them," and yet it is the positive proof that they had gone round the Cape (Herod. iv, 42). Dioecides speaks also of Phoenician mariners being driven westwards beyond the Pillars of Hercules into the ocean, and reaching at length a very fertile and beautiful island—a dwelling of gods rather than of men—one probably of the Azores or Canary Islands. The Phoenicians furnished to Xerxes shipwrights and mariners, who, driven westwards beyond the Pillars of Hercules, turned back and built the fortresses of Salamis. It is said that of all the nations employed in digging the famous canal across the isthmus of Athos, they alone had sufficient engineering skill to begin its banks on their section at a slope, and thus prevent caving in (vii, 23). The remote periods of Phoenician commerce and colonization are wrapped in myths. They have for a long time been considered the discoverers of Asia and Egypt; but their own wares and manufactures were soon largely exported by them (Ezek. xxxviii). The commerce of Tyre reached through the world (Strabo, iii, 5, 11). There was also a great trade in the tunny fisheries, and the Tyrians sold fish in Jerusalem (Neh. xiii, 16). Phoenicia excelled in the manufacture of the purple dye extracted from the shell-fish murex, so abundant on parts of its coasts. This color in its richest hue was at length appropriated to imperial use, and the silk so dyed was of extraordinary value. The glass of Sidon was no less famous than the Tyrian dye—the fine white sand used for the process being very abundant near Mount Carmel. Glass has been found in Nineveh, and glass-blowing is figured at Beni-Hassan in Egypt. The art might have come from Egypt, but the discovery in Phoenicia is represented as accidental. The pillar of fire brightening faintly in the night, which Herodotus speaks of as being in the temple of Hercules, was probably a hollow cylinder of glass with a lamp within it (Kenrick, Phoenicia, p. 249). Phoenicia produced also drinking-cups and writing-ink in works of brass. Its building-stone was not of very good quality, but cedar-wood was largely employed. When stone was used the joints were bevelled—a practice which also characterizes Hebrew architecture, and gives it a panelled appearance. The mining operations of the Phoenicians were also celebrated. Herodotus says they turned a mountain over in the search for gold. Mines were wrought in the various colonies—in the Cretan islands and in Spain—by processes much the same as those employed in more modern times. The marine knowledge and experience of Phoenicia led to the plantation of numerous colonies in Cyprus, Rhodes, Cilicia, and the islands of the Aegean—the Cyclades and Sporades (Thucyd. i, 8)—in Sicily, in Sardinia, the Balearic Islands, and in Spain. Strabo says that the Phoenicians possessed the best parts of Iberia before the days of Homer (iii, 22, 14). One principal colony was in Northern Africa, and Strabo asserts that they occupied the middle part of Africa soon after the Trojan war. The story of Dido and the foundation of Carthage is well known, the event being placed by some in the 20th century, by others in the 16th, by some in the 18th, by others in the 14th century. The name of Carthage, which the city was built, denoted a fortress, being בֹּרָצָה (Bozrah), the name also of the Idumean capital; though its Greek form, Bupora, gave rise to the story about the purchase of as much land as a hide would measure. Carthage means "new town" (ср. בֵּית מֹשֶךְ, and Punics is only another spelling of Phoenici). Intercourse with many strange and untutored races led the Phoenicians to indulge in fictions, and love of gain taught them mercantile deceit and stratagems. Phoenician figures of speech—"famine was a sitting biologist's tale, was proverbial in former times, like fides Punicus at a later period (Strabo, xii, p. 55). The Etnymologium Magnum bluntly defines φινικείς by χαρός, the lie. In the Odyssey they are described as "crafty" ποιονομαντεροι (Odys. xii, 415), or as "crafty and wicked. As a trading nation they were ready sometimes to take advantage of the ignorant and savage tribes with which they bartered, and they cared nothing for law or right on the high seas, where no power could control or punish; so that Ulysses uses the phrase Φινικῳς σπουδασταμανις ἐπόμενον ὁ θεός ποτὲ ὡς πιστῷ καὶ πλούσιῳ. As a trading nation they were ready sometimes to take advantage of the ignorant and savage tribes with which they bartered, and they cared nothing for law or right on the high seas, where no power could control or punish; so that Ulysses uses the phrase Φινικῳς σπουδασταμανις ἐπόμενον ὁ θεός ποτὲ ὡς πιστῷ καὶ πλούσιῳ.
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means, "I become a trader." But the phrase seems to indicate that the Phoenicians were not only traders, but also other names for a huckster, or a peddler going from house to house, as in Prov. xxxii. 24. Nay, the prophet Hosea (xii. 7) says, "He is a Canaanite," or "Phoenician," or "as for Canaan, the balances of deceit are in his hand: he loveth to oppress." And Ephraim said, "Yet the Lord found out our out substance." A common proverb expressive of fraud matching fraud was Σίμων πρὸς Φωνιάκας. No coined money of Phoenicia is extant prior to its subjugation by the Greeks. The standard seems to have been the same as the Jewish; the shekel being equal to the Attic tetradrachm; and the zuz, which occurs on the tablets of Marcellus, being of the value of a denarius. One of the tablet letters "silver" occurs, with the probable ellipse of "shekel," as in Hebrew. Foreign silver money ("Ty") is also there referred to. Among the antiquities dug up in Nineveh are several bronze weights in the form of lions; having both cuneiform legends with the names of the respective kings, and also Phoenician or cursive Semitic inscriptions (Layard, Nine., and Bab. p. 601). The cun was a Phoenician measure, the same as the Hebrew mina (pint), and holding ten Attic metates, each metates being equal to about ten and a half gallons. The arithmetical notation was carried out by making simple strokes for the units; 10 was a horizontal stroke or a semicircle, and 100 was a special sign, the unit strokes added to it denoting additional hundreds (Geeni Monumenta Phoen.), p. 85.

It appears almost incredible how, with the comparatively small knowledge of natural science which we must attribute to them, the Phoenicians could thus on their frail rafter-traversed vessels, means almost from one end of the globe to the other, with apparently no more difficulty than their inland caravans, their chapmen and dealers, found in traversing the neighboring countries. Yet it must not, on the other hand, be forgotten that their ships appear to have been an uncommon knowledge of astronomy and physical geography—witness their almost scientifically planned voyage of discovery under Hiram—and that, above all, an extraordinary amount of practical sense, of boldness, shrewdness, unscrupulousness, unriveting energy, and happy genius, went far to replace such deficiencies and enable their modern descendants to make our mariners familiar. These qualities also made and kept them the unrivaled masters of ancient commerce and navigation. They were, moreover, known rather to destroy their own ships and endanger their lives than let others see their secret way and enterprise; and it would be very surprising if theirs had not been also the greatest discoveries, the greatest riches and splendor and power for many a long century, though they owned but a small strip of country at home. Well might Tyre once say, "I am of perfect beauty."

Phoenician cities (xxvii, 30), and as Pharaoh's Sin-don, "Behold, thou art wiser than Daniel, there is no secret they can hide from thee: with thy wisdom and thine understanding thou hast gotten thee riches, and hast gotten gold and silver into thy treasures: by thy great wisdom and by thy traffic hast thou increased thy riches, and thine heart is lifted up because of thy riches" (xxviii, 3-5). There can, indeed, not be fancied a fuller and more graphic account of the state of Phoenicia, especially as regards her commercial relations, than the two chapters of Ezechiel (xxvii and xxviii) containing the lamentation on Tyre, which, indeed, form our chief information on this point.

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

(l.) Up to the time of David, not one of the twelve tribes seems to have possessed a single harbor on the sea-coast: it was thus possible that they would become a commercial people. It is true that according to Judg. i. 31, combined with Josh. xix. 26, Accho or Acre, with its excellent harbor, had been assigned to the tribe of Asher; but from the same passage in Judges it seems certain that the tribe of Asher did not really obtain the possession of Accho, which continued to be held by the Canaanites. However wistfully, therefore, the Israelites might regard the wealth accruing to their neighbors the Phoenicians from trade, to vie with them in this respect was out of the question. But from the time that David established Edom, an opening for trade was afforded to the Israelites. The command of Ezion-geber, near Elath, in the land of Edom, enabled them to engage in the navigation of the Red Sea.

As they were novices, however, at sailing, as the navigation of the Red Sea, owing to its currents, winds, and rocks, is dangerous even to modern sailors, and as the Phoenicians, during the period of the independence of Edom, were probably allowed to trade from Ezion-geber, it was politic in Solomon to permit the Phoenicians of Tyre to have docks and build ships at Ezion-geber on condition that his subjects might profit by the benefit of their experience. The results seem to have been strikingly successful. The Jews and Phoenicians made profitable voyages to Ophir in Arabia or India, whence gold was imported into Judea in large quantities; and once in three years still longer voyages were made, by vessels which might have reached Ophir, though their imports were not only gold, but likewise silver, ivory, apes, and peacocks (1 Kings x, 22). See TAMRISH. There seems at the same time to have been a great direct trade with the Phoenicians for cedar-wood (ver. 27), and generally the wealth of the kingdom reached an unprecedented point. If the union of the tribes had been maintained, the whole sea-coast of Palestine would have afforded additional sources of revenue through trade; and perhaps even ultimately the "great plain of Sidon" itself might have formed part of the united empire. But if any possibilities of this kind existed, they were destroyed by the disastrous secession of the ten tribes; a heavy blow from which the Hebrew race has never yet recovered during a period of nearly 3000 years.

(2.) After the division into two kingdoms, the curtain falls on any commercial relation between the Israelites and Phoenicians until a relation is brought to notice, by no means brotherly, as in the fleets which navigated the Red Sea, nor friendly, as between buyers and sellers, in order to purchase presents of war as slaves and as such the Phoenicians, during the period of the independence of Edom, were probably allowed to trade from Ezion-geber, it was politic in Solomon to permit the Phoenicians of Tyre to have docks and build ships at Ezion-geber on condition that his subjects might profit by the benefit of their experience. The results seem to have been strikingly successful. The Jews and Phoenicians made profitable voyages to Ophir in Arabia or India, whence gold was imported into Judea in large quantities; and once in three years still longer voyages were made, by vessels which might have reached Ophir, though their imports were not only gold, but likewise silver, ivory, apes, and peacocks (1 Kings x, 22). See TAMRISH. There seems at the same time to have been a great direct trade with the Phoenicians for cedar-wood (ver. 27), and generally the wealth of the kingdom reached an unprecedented point. If the union of the tribes had been maintained, the whole sea-coast of Palestine would have afforded additional sources of revenue through trade; and perhaps even ultimately the "great plain of Sidon" itself might have formed part of the united empire. But if any possibilities of this kind existed, they were destroyed by the disastrous secession of the ten tribes; a heavy blow from which the Hebrew race has never yet recovered during a period of nearly 3000 years.

(2.) After the division into two kingdoms, the curtain falls on any commercial relation between the Israelites and Phoenicians until a relation is brought to notice, by no means brotherly, as in the fleets which navigated the Red Sea, nor friendly, as between buyers and sellers, in order to purchase presents of war as slaves and as such the Phoenicians, during the period of the independence of Edom, were probably allowed to trade from Ezion-geber, it was politic in Solomon to permit the Phoenicians of Tyre to have docks and build ships at Ezion-geber on condition that his subjects might profit by the benefit of their experience. The results seem to have been strikingly successful. The Jews and Phoenicians made profitable voyages to Ophir in Arabia or India, whence gold was imported into Judea in large quantities; and once in three years still longer voyages were made, by vessels which might have reached Ophir, though their imports were not only gold, but likewise silver, ivory, apes, and peacocks (1 Kings x, 22). See TAMRISH. There seems at the same time to have been a great direct trade with the Phoenicians for cedar-wood (ver. 27), and generally the wealth of the kingdom reached an unprecedented point. If the union of the tribes had been maintained, the whole sea-coast of Palestine would have afforded additional sources of revenue through trade; and perhaps even ultimately the "great plain of Sidon" itself might have formed part of the united empire. But if any possibilities of this kind existed, they were destroyed by the disastrous secession of the ten tribes; a heavy blow from which the Hebrew race has never yet recovered during a period of nearly 3000 years.

(2.) After the division into two kingdoms, the curtain falls on any commercial relation between the Israelites and Phoenicians until a relation is brought to notice, by no means brotherly, as in the fleets which navigated the Red Sea, nor friendly, as between buyers and sellers, in order to purchase presents of war as slaves and as such the Phoenicians, during the period of the independence of Edom, were probably allowed to trade from Ezion-geber, it was politic in Solomon to permit the Phoenicians of Tyre to have docks and build ships at Ezion-geber on condition that his subjects might profit by the benefit of their experience. The results seem to have been strikingly successful. The Jews and Phoenicians made profitable voyages to Ophir in Arabia or India, whence gold was imported into Judea in large quantities; and once in three years still longer voyages were made, by vessels which might have reached Ophir, though their imports were not only gold, but likewise silver, ivory, apes, and peacocks (1 Kings x, 22). See TAMRISH. There seems at the same time to have been a great direct trade with the Phoenicians for cedar-wood (ver. 27), and generally the wealth of the kingdom reached an unprecedented point. If the union of the tribes had been maintained, the whole sea-coast of Palestine would have afforded additional sources of revenue through trade; and perhaps even ultimately the "great plain of Sidon" itself might have formed part of the united empire. But if any possibilities of this kind existed, they were destroyed by the disastrous secession of the ten tribes; a heavy blow from which the Hebrew race has never yet recovered during a period of nearly 3000 years.
friendship of the kingdom of Israel; and the Israelitish king, Ahab, had a Sidonian princess as his wife (1 Kings xvi, 31). Now, not improbably in consequence of these relations, when Jehoshaphat, king of Judah, endeavored to remain neutral in the conflict of the Jews in the Red Sea, and in this purpose built large ships at Ezion-geber to go to Ophir for gold, he did not admit the Phoenicians to any participation in the venture, and when king Ahaziah, Ahab’s son, asked to have a share in it, his request was distinctly refused (xxiii, 48, 49). That attempt to renew the trade of the Jews in the Red Sea failed, and in the reign of Jehoram, Jehoshaphat’s son, Edom revolted from Judah and established its independence; so that if the Phoenicians wished to despatch trading-vessels from Ezion-geber, Edom was the power which it was mainly their interest to conciliate, and not Judah. Under these circumstances the Phoenicians seem, not only to have purchased and to have sold again as slaves, and probably in some instances to have kidnapped inhabitants of Judah, but even to have sold them to their enemies the Edomites (Joel, Amos, as above). This was regarded with reason as a departure from the old brotherly covenant, when Hiram was a great lover of David, and subsequently had the most friendly commercial relations with David’s son; and this may be considered as the original foundation of the hostility of the Hebrews towards Phoenician Tyre (Isa. xxviii; Ezek. xxviii).

(8.) The only other notice in the Old Testament of trade between the Phoenicians and the Israelites is in the account given by the prophet Ezekiel of the trade of Tyre (xxvii, 17). While this account supplies valuable information respecting the various commercial dealings of that most illustrious of Phoenician cities [see Tyre], it likewise makes direct mention of the exports to it from Palestine. These were wheat, honey (i.e. sirup of grapes), oil, and balm. The export of wheat deserves attention [concerning the other exports, see Balm; Honey; Oil], because it shows how important it must have been to the Phoenicians to maintain friendly relations with their Hebrew neighbors, and especially with the adjoining kingdom of Israel. The wheat is called wheat of Minnith (q.v.), which was a town of the Ammonites, on the other side of the Jordan, only once mentioned elsewhere in the Bible: and it is not certain whether Minnith was a great inland emporium, where large purchases of corn were made, or whether the grain yielded to it was in quantity good, and gave its name to all wheat of a certain fineness in quality. Still, whatever may be the correct explanation respecting Minnith, the only countries specified for exports of wheat are Judah and Israel, and it was through the territory of Israel that the wheat would be imported into Tyre. This is suggested by the fact that the Philistine (especially in his Hebrew form, Ptoleric Researches, ii, 117) that the fact of Palestine being thus, as it were, the granary of Phoenicia, explains in the clearest manner the lasting peace that prevailed between the two countries. He observes that with many of the other adjoining nations the Jews lived in a state of almost continual warfare; but that they never once engaged in hostilities with their nearest neighbors the Phoenicians. The fact itself is certainly worthy of special notice; and is the more remarkable, as there were not wanting tempting occasions for the interference of the Phoenicians in Palestine if they desired it. When Elijah at the brook Kishon, at the distance of not more than thirty miles in a straight line from Tyre, put to death 450 prophets of Baal (1 Kings xxviii, 40), we can well conceive the agitation and anger which such a deed must have produced at Tyre. At Sidon, more especially, which was only twenty miles farther distant from the scene of slaughter, the first impulse of the inhabitants must have been to march forth at once into battle array to strengthen the hands of Jezebel, their rival and her enemy, and of the Phoenician god. When again afterwards, by means of falsehood and treachery, Jezu was enabled to massacre the worship-

pers of Baal in the land of Israel, we cannot doubt that the intelligence was received in Tyre, Sidon, and the other cities of Phoenicia, with a similar burst of horror and indignation to that with which the news of the massacre of the 200 prophets of Baal spread among the Protestant countries; and there must have been an intense desire in the Phoenicians, if they had the power, to invade the territories of Israel without delay and inflict signal chastisement on Jehu (2 Kings x. 18-29). The fact that Israel was their granary would undoubtedly have been an element in restraining the Phoenicians, even on occasions such as these: but probably still deeper motives were likewise at work. It seems to have been part of the settled policy of the Phoenician cities to avoid attempts to make conquests on the continent of Asia. For this there were excellent reasons in the position of their small territory, which, with the range of Lebanon on one side as a barrier, and the sea on the other, was easily defensible by a wealthy power having command of the sea, against second or third rate powers, but for the same reason was not once considered as a probable object of offensive war on the land side. It may be added that a pacific policy was their manifest interest as a commercial nation, unless by war they were morally certain to obtain an important accession of territory, or unless a warlike policy was an absolute necessity to prevent a powerful neighbor on their land front from becoming too powerful a neighbor. At last, indeed, they even carried their system of non-intervention in continental wars too far, if it would have been possible for them by any alliances in Syria and Cilicia-Syria to prevent the establishments on the other side of the Lebanon of one great empire. For from that moment their ultimate doom was certain, and it was merely a question of time as to the arrival of the fatal hour when they would lose their independence. But too little is known of the details of their history to warrant an opinion as to whether they might not have been weaker states at any time by such a policy of raised up a barrier against the empire of the Assyrians or Chaldeans. See Commerce.

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

estine, retailing their home or foreign produce. What degree of perfection they had reached in metallurgy may be seen in the minute description of the mining process contained in Job (xxviii, 1-11), probably derived from mines which they worked in the Lebanon, Cyprus, Tyros, and Sidon, and whose existence was long supposed. That they had acquired a high standing
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in what we should call the fine arts may be gathered from the fact that not only architects, but skilful work- ers of all kinds, had carried on their work. The Temple of the Lord was not forgotten, and, when Solomon willed to build a magnificent and splendid temple worthy of his golden reign. Their sculptures — what there has been found of them — do not, it is true, give us a very high notion of their artistic perfection; but, for all we know, these may be only the archaic beginnings, or the remnants of a corrupt age or unskilful hands. Better things may come to light any day. There certainly exist some exceedingly skilful engravings of theirs on gems among the few works that have been preserved. For instance, a fine goblet, with a gold-veined silver bowl, for instance, given to Télémachus by Menelaos, which had been previously given to Hepeustos by the king of the Sidonians; the silver vase offered by Achilles as a prize at the funeral games for Patroclus; the columns and the magnificent vessels cast for the Temple of Jerusalem by Tyrian artists, and the like — that they manufactured all kinds of beautiful vessels and ornaments in gold, silver, and ivory, and knew how to extract perfumes from the lily and cy- press, but, as in every other respect, in this province also be declared to have been only the skilful appropriators of the knowledge of others, of which, however, they made use with a diligence and perseverance entirely unparalleled.

In broadly recapitulating the routes their vessels took around the earth, we have indicated the line of their colonization. We cannot do more in this place than hint at the wanderings of Baal (q. v.), Astarte (q. v.), and Melkarth (q. v.), as the principal allegories in which the myth coched the primitive traditions of their settle- ments abroad. The whole of the Mediterranean, with its islands and coast, had been made theirs by rapid strides. Commencing with neighboring Cyprus, they proceeded to Cythium, to Rhodes, Crete, the Cycladic and Sporadic Isles, Sicilia, Lycia, and Caria, Chios, Samos, Tenedos, Bitinia, the Ægin, Samothrace, Lemnos, Thasos (whether they had come in search of Eu- rope), Boeotia, and Euboea. More difficult was the occupation of Sicily and the neighboring islands, where Motya, Machanetti, Panormus, and other cities, testify to their successful settlements. Thence also, by way of Malta, they sailed to Africa, and founded Carthage, which afterwards possessed herself of all the colonies in Sicily, Sardinia, and Spain. In Sardinia and the Balearic Islands they had commercial establishments at Caralis (Cagliari), Minorca, Ivisa, Elbe. Spain was one of their earliest and principal settlements, where they founded the large and flourishing cities of Belon, Alcántara, and others. It is also more than probable, although we have no distinct evidence on the point, that they had colonies in the tin districts of Cornwall and the Scilly Islands, as also on the Baltic. They settled, further, both on the northern shores of Africa (Tunisia, Gifone), and on its north coast (Hippo, Utica, Leptis, Hadrumetum). How far Phoenicians may have had a more than temporary sojourn in India (Ophir? = Abhira), whither they went by way of the Red Sea, we are unable to determine.

5. Religion. — The same lack of genuine and authentic information, of which we have spoken before, baffles our endeavors to arrive at anything like a proper understand- ing of the real character of the religion of the Phoenicians. The mutilated scraps contained in classical writers can be of little use for its full reconstruc- tion as the uncertain allusions of the Bible. As to Samsoniah, extracts of whose Phoenician writings (in Philo of Byblos' Greek version) are, as has been mentioned above, supposed to have survived in Euse- bius, and are a very queer compilation, more than mean reasons to suspect both the author, the translator, and the Church father, not of wilful mis- interpretation, but of a certain want of candor in doing that full and fair justice to both sides which we expect from a historian of our day. A few broken votive and sacrificial stones, a few coins and unshapely images, make up the rest of our sources of information for the present. A few years hence, however, we may, if our excavations are carried on with unflagging zeal, and are as successful as they have been of late years, have as ample a supply to work upon as we have now respect- ing the history of the Phoenician Age, and many more known land of Nebuchadnezzar and Sennacherib, if not with respect even to Greece and Rome. It will be suf- ficient, however, that Phoenician, like Canaanitic religion, in general consisted in a worship of the pow- ers of nature under their favorable or creative (= female) aspect, and unfavorable or destructive (= male) aspects. Still more concretely were these repre- sented in the different phases of life, as child (Adonis), youth (Eskum), man (Ebal-Heracles), or old man (Be- litian); again, as kings (Moloch) or queens (Astarte), and other characters most fitting to the idea symbolized in them. Their chief (visible) representatives — the sun, the moon, the planets, and the elements — were re- vered as supreme deities, who, at the same time, were also the special Numina of particular tribes, places, and seasons, and some of their general designations, such as King (אֲלֹהֵי הַשָׁמַיִם, Lord (יהוה), Almighty (הֵא), etc., are also found in the Bible. To the supreme class of deities (אֱלֹהֵי הָאָרֶץ) belong Baal and his retinue, each with their different attributes and ramifications, e. g. Baal samim, בָּאָל סֵם; Ἀρχέας, Optimus Max- imus, Basitan, Basilam, Basal Mon; Basal Melkarth, בָּאָל מֶלְכָּרֶת, king of the city (Tyre); Astarte = Tanith, תוֹנִית, generally with the epithet παράδεισος, the great one, who appears identical with the Egypto-Persian war- and moon-goddess Tanait. Corresponding to this triad in the Syro-Sidonian worship, we meet in Northern Phoenicia with the two Sidonian tribes: El ( весьма) or Kronos, the founder of Byblius and Berytus; Basilia (ברון, my lady) = Aphrodite (Astrone, Beruth); and Adonis (Gauss, Eljum, Eskum, etc.). Besides other well-known deities, such as Moloch and Dagon (Der- keto, Atergatis) — for all of which we refer the reader to the articles treating of them — we find a certain mysterious number of minor gods, variously denominated the strong ones (Kabiri), or the children of the Just One (Zadik, זַדִּיק, the principal patrons of the seafarers, worshipped alike by all the Phoenician tribes (Diocuri, Putaci: Chausor - Phtha (Chusartha), Astarte, Casimus (אשתר, my lady) = Aphrodite (Astrone, Beruth); and Adonis (Gauss, Eljum, Eskum, etc.). These, together with the inferior or Chaositic deities, Mortal Death, -- literally, the goddess known only to us as "Persephone" (daughter of Ijpheta with the Samaritan Schemites), or Dido (ὕππη του έλληνος, "the wandering one"). As exactly as Elothi- my lady, my goddess, etc., are, as far as we know at present, the chief representatives of the Phoenician Pantheon, which, it is observed by the way, appears to have been almost as catholic in the reception of foreign deities as that of imperial Rome. Like the Greeks, and after them the Romans, the Phoenicians also sufficed certain natural phenomena and "elements" (sun, moon, stars, water, fire, earth, air), personal attributes, abstract ideas, allegories, the seasons of life, of the year, of the day, trades and professions, and even animals; prob- ably as symbols only at first. The serpent (Agiatho- demos, Eskum, Typhon), the bull (Asteroth-Karn- im), the lion, the ass (symbol of Semitic Baal-worship), the dog, fishes, doves, goats, etc., are found either represent- ing divinities, or merely sacred to them. Anything like an investigation into the various phrases of the Pho- nician mythology, which, stretching from the remotest prehistoric days far into the first Christian centuries, must needs contain the most contradictory, apparently irreconcilable, elements and data, lies beyond the scope
of this article. We shall only mention that Sanchoniasmato distinguishes—a sure sign of the consciousness on the part of native writers of the hopeless confusion in the religious notions and traditions of their time—three periods in each, with distinct circles of deities of special classes and families. The first period contains twelve families of gods. In the second three dynasties follow each other, and there are twenty-two supreme deities (according to the letters of the Phoenician alphabet), at the head of whom stands El or Kronos, etc., as follows:

N. El, Kronos.

Of the third period only fragments of Sanchoniasmato have come down, but it would appear as if Zeus Belus had in this assumed the chief rank, equal to Kronos of the second period. These gods and goddesses were portrayed in various ways, but chiefly by sacrifices, which consisted on certain occasions of first-born male children (לְבֶן-לוֹקֶם לְאָדָם). Prostitution (נָשָׁה) in honor of Astarte was considered another praiseworthy act. Among the rites of sacrifice and expiation must also be enumerated circumcision, which was not practiced with all the Phoenician tribes, but seems to have been a ceremony peculiar to the worshippers of El, the special deity of Byturus and Byblus. Whether, however, as has been held, it is to be considered analogous to this prostitution of virgins in the service of Astarte, we shall not here investigate. The country abounded with places of worship, for every grove and every height, every river and every well, were adapted for the purpose, if it could be fancied a dwelling-place for some deity. See IDOLATRY. Nor were special buildings (sanctuaries, temples), with all their accessories of arks and priestly, wells and fires, wanting: as indeed the Phoenicians are supposed to have been the first who erected such permanent sanctuaries. Their construction was in accordance with their destination, which was not to be houses of prayer, but the seat of honor of the special deity. They were divided into two parts, the first of which contained the statues and symbols which were the relics of public worship. The second, the Adyton, on the other hand, contained such symbols which were not to be seen constantly, but were reserved for certain special festive occasions; besides the holy ark with its mystical contents, and the holy vehicles upon which these sacred objects were carried about. The walls were covered with the symmetrical representations of the deities; and in this place also the priests kept their archives. Something of the abhorrence of all visible representations of the Deity which seems in the first stages of their existence to have filled the minds of all Semitic nations—an abhorrence erroneously taken of late to indicate their monotheistic propensity (comp. Rihan's and Munk's Inaugural Lectures) —is also noticeable with the Phoenicians, whose gods were legion. No paintings, statues, or other likenesses of deities are recorded as found in the ancient temples of Gades, Tyre, Samaria, Paphos, etc. There were, however, pictures of women (the female Numen, Astarte), of stone, פָּסְדָּבָה (for Baal), of gold or emerald (תָּחַבִּים), together with phallic representations, found in and before the Phoenician sanctuaries. Another kind of divine mementos, as it were, were the Betylia (בְּטַלְיוֹת), probably meteors, for which a fetch-like reverberation was shown, and which were called by the names of Father, Mighty Father (בּוֹשֶׁה בּוֹשֶׁה יַיִרְתּ), and at the time of Augustine there were still a number of priests engaged in Punic Africa to wait upon these idols and to elicite oracles from them (Eucadiurus). Among the principal festivals, with some of which, as with those of the Hebrews, were connected pilgrimages—from the farthest colonies even—are the "awakening" and the "self-destruction by fire" of Hercules, a certain festival of "staves," a vintage-feast in honor of the Tyrian Bacchus, and certain others in honor of Astarte, celebrating her disappearance, flight, and wanderings, the Adonis, etc. An account of the different Phoenician gods named in the Bible will be found elsewhere (see BAAL; ASHIBAROTH; BAAL), but it will be proper here to point out certain effects which the circumstance of their being worshipped in Phoenicia produced upon the Hebrews.

(1.) In the first place, their worship was a constant temptation to polytheism and idolatry. It is the general tendency of trade, by making merchandise in contact with different countries and various modes of thought, to enlarge the mind, to promote the increase of knowledge, and, in addition, by the wealth which it diffuses, to afford opportunities in various ways for intellectual culture: and as the Phoenicians were, from the first, scarcely to be doubted among the most civilized of these circumstances, the Phoenicians, as a great commercial people, were more generally intelligent, and as we should now say civilized, than the inland agricultural population of Palestine. When the simple-minded Jews, therefore, came in contact with a people so much more versatile and, apparently, more enlightened than themselves, but who nevertheless, either in a philosophical or in a popular form, admitted a system of polytheism, an influence would be exerted on Jewish minds, tending to make them regard their exclusive devotion to their own one God, Jehovah, however transcendent his attributes, as unsocial and morose. It is in some such way that we must account for the astonishing fact that Solomon himself, the wisest of the Hebrew race, to whom Jehovah is expressly stated to have appeared twice—once, not long after his marriage with an Egyptian princess, on the night after his sacrificing 1000 burnt-offerings on the high place of Gibon, and the second time after the consecration of the Temple—should have been so far beguiled by his wives in his old age as to become a Polytheist, worshipping, among other deities, the Phoenician goddess Astarte. (1 Kings xiv. 18-24; lxi. 1-5; ix. 2; xi. 1-5). This is not for a moment to be so interpreted as if he ever ceased to worship Jehovah, to whom he had erected the magnificent Temple, which in history is so generally connected with Solomon's name. Probably, according to his other erroneous conception, he never ceased to regard himself as a loyal worshipper of Jehovah, but he at the same time deemed this not incompatible with sacrificing at the altars of other gods likewise. Still the fact remains that Solomon, who by his Temple in its ultimate results did so much for establishing the doctrine of one only God, became himself a practical Polytheist. If this was the case with him, polytheism in other sovereigns of inferior excellence can excite no surprise. With such an example before him, it is no wonder that Ahab, an essentially bad man, should after his marriage with a Sidonian princess not only openly tolerate, but encourage the worship of Baal; though it is to be remembered even in him that he did not disown the authority of Jehovah, but, when rebuked by his great antagonist Elijah, he rent his clothes and put sackcloth on his flesh, and lay down on the ground. (1 Kings xvii. 1-4). This is a deed deemed sincere (1 Kings xvi. 81: xxii. 22-39). Finally, it is to be observed generally that although, before the reformation of Josiah (2 Kings xxiii.), polytheism prevailed in Judah as well as Israel, yet it seems to have been more limited and universal in Israel, so that it had not been expected from its greater proximity to Phoenicia; and Israel is sometimes spoken of as if it had set the bad
example to Judah (2 Kings xvii, 19; Jer. iii, 8); though, considering the example of Solomon, this cannot be accepted as a strict historical statement. (2.) The Phoenician religion was likewise in other respects deleterious to the inhabitants of Palestine, being essentially immoralizing. For example, it sanctioned the dreadful practice of sacrificing children as sacrifices to a Phoenician god. "They have built also," says Jeremiah, in the name of Jehovah (xix, 5), "the high places of Baal, to burn their sons with fire for burnt-offerings unto Baal, which I commanded not, nor spake it, neither came it into my mind" (comp. Jer. xxxii, 35). This horrible custom was probably in its origin founded on the idea of sacrificing to a god what was most valuable in the eyes of the suppliants; but it could not exist without having a tendency to stifle natural feelings of affection, and to harden the heart. It could scarcely have been first adopted otherwise than in the infancy of the Phoenician race; but grown-up men and grown-up nations, with their moral feelings in other respects cultivated, are often the slaves in particular points of an early implanted superstition, and it is worthy of note that, twenty years after the death of Jeremiah, the Carthaginians, when their city was besieged by Athacli, offered as burnt-sacrifices to the planet Saturn, at the public expense, two hundred boys of the highest aristocracy; and, subsequently, when they had obtained a victory, they sacrificed the most beautiful captives in the like manner (Diod. xx, 14, 65). If such things were possible among the Carthaginians at a period so much later, it is easily conceivable how common the practice of sacrificing children may have been at the time of Jeremiah among the Phoenicians by sea and land; and this surely must have been certain to prevail among the Israelites who worshipped the same Phoenician gods: especially as, owing to the intermarriages of their forefathers with Carthaginians, there were probably few Israelites who may not have had some Phoenician blood in their veins (Judg. iii, 5). Again, parts of the Phoenician religion, especially the worship of Astarte, tended to encourage looseness in the relations of the sexes, and even to sanctify improprieties of the most abominable description. Connected with her temples and images there were male and female prostitutes, whose polluted gain formed part of the sacred fund appropriated to the service of the goddess; and, to complete the defamation of immorality, they were even known by the name of the "consecrated." Nothing can show more clearly how deeply this abominable worship prevailed among the Israelites than the repeated denunciations of the Hebrew prophets, than the almost incredible fact that, previous to the reformation of Josiah, this class of persons was allowed to have houses or tents close to the temple of Jehovah, whose treasures was perhaps even replenished by their gains (2 Kings xxvi, 7; Deut. xxiii, 17, 18; 1 Kings xiv, 24; xx, 12; xxxii, 46; Hose. iv, 14; Job xxxvi, 14; comp. Lucian, Lucius, c. 55; De Ded Syr., c. 27, 51; Gene- sis, Theaurus, a. v. θηματισμος, p. 1196; Movers, Phthi., ii, 65, etc.; Spencer, De Legibus Hebraeorum, i, 561).

A few words may be added here on Phoenician theology and cosmogony, which, as far as they are known to us, give evidence of the enormous amount of thought bestowed by the thinkers of that people on the enigma of creation. The Deity was, in accordance with the antique mind, presupposed. Speculation never questioned its eternal existence, the original quality of each of its two principal—male and female—sides, and the way in which, out of their union, sprang the universe. According to the system of Eudemus, Time, Desire, and Mind formed the first triad of existence; and from the embrace of the last two sprung air and "motion of air," out of which again was produced the mundane egg. The cosmogony, according to Sanchoniatho on the other hand, assumes, in the beginning of all things, a gloomy and agitated air, and a turbid chaos of thickest darkness, which for a long course of ages was without limits. The wind becoming enamoured with its own essence, Mot sprang into being, as a kind of thick, putrid fluid, which contained all germs. The first beings created from this were without intellect; and from them, again, came intellectual beings, Semiramis, the first woman, and brothers of the heavens. "And it began to shine Mot, also the sun and the moon, the stars and the great planets. The glowing sun, heating sea and earth, raised vapors, which produced clouds and winds, lighting and thunder, and at their crash the beings began to awake in terror, and male and female from earth and sea." The wind Kolpis further produced with Beza (בזא of Genesis) Aion and Protophos, the first mortals. Aion first discovered the art of nourishment from fruit-trees: and their children, Genos and Genea, who dwelt in Phoenicia, first worshipped Baalamin, or the sun. Genos begat Light, Fire, and Flame, out of whom came giants, Cassios, Libanios, Antillibanus, and Brathys. Their sons invented the art of cultivating vineyards and oliveyards, and the art of making coverings for the body out of the skins of wild beasts. After them the inventors of hunting and fishing, the discoverers of iron, of the art of navigation, etc. One of their descendants was Elies, who was the first who contrived an instrument of gold with which he could distinguish the Good priest was Melchisedec, Gen. xiv, 18, etc.; Abraham, in his reply to the king of Sodom, emphatically adds "Jehovah" to El-Elyon, who with his wife Beruth begat an Autochthon, afterwards called Uranos (heaven), and his sister Ge (earth). They had issue four sons, Ibis, Belythus, Dagon, and Atlas; and three daughters, Astarte, Rhea, and Diane. Chronos deposited his father, subsequently killed him, and travelled about in the world. He then assigned the whole of Phoenicia to Astarte, to Athens he gave Attica, and to Taut Egypt. The country being involved in war, he divided it among his sons and his eight daughters, and then, and his eight sons, and his eight nephews: and that was the beginning of the gentile race, and Amos. Two sons, Jud and Muth (Mith, Pluto), in expiation. He afterwards bestowed the city of Byblos upon the goddess Baalitis (Dione), and Berytus upon Poseidon and the Kakbris. Taut made the first images of the countenances of the gods Cronus and Dagon, and formed the sacred characters of the other elements; and the Kakbris, the invention of the Hellenic language, and the brother of China, the first Phoenician.

5. Language.—The most important intellectual invention of man, that of letters, was universally asserted by the Greeks and Romans to have been communicated by the Phoenicians to the Greeks. The earliest written statement on the subject is in Herodotus (v, 57, 58), who incidentally, in giving an account of Harmodius and Aristogeiton, says that they came from Phoenicians, and the prophets who presided over the mysteries, and to their successors, one of whom was Iasis, the inventor of three letters, the brother of China, the first Phoenician.
of which invented them, or on the universal belief of antiquity that the knowledge of them was communicated to the Greeks by the Phoenicians. The answer is as follows: Hebrew literature is as silent as Greek literature respecting the precise date of the invention of letters; of the name of the inventor or inventors; but the names of the letters in the Hebrew alphabet are in accordance with the belief that the Phoenicians communicated the knowledge of letters to the Greeks: for many of the names of letters in the Greek alphabet, though without meaning in the Hebrew, have a meaning in the corresponding letters of Hebrew. For example: the first four letters of the Greek alphabet, Alpha, Beta, Gamma, Delta, are not to be explained through the Greek language; but the corresponding first four letters of the Hebrew alphabet, viz. Aleph, Beth, Gimel, Daleth, being essentially the same words, are to be explained in Hebrew. Thus in Hebrew Aleph or Eleph means an ox; Beth or Bayith a house; Gamal, a camel; and Daleth a door. The same is essentially, though not always so clearly, the case with almost all the sixteen earliest Greek letters said to have been brought over from Phoenicia by Cadmus, Α Β Γ Δ Ε Ζ Κ Μ Ν Ο Π Ρ Σ Τ (and called on this account Phoenician or Cadmean letters (Herodot. l. c.; Pliny, Hist. Nat. vii, 57; Jelf, Greek Gram. i, p. 2). The sixth letter, afterwards disused, and generally known by the name of Delta (from Deltus, i. 20), was unquestionably the same as the Hebrew letter Yav (a hook). Moreover, as to writing, the ancient Hebrew letters, substantially the same as Phoenician, agree closely with ancient Greek letters—a fact which, taken by itself, would not prove that the Greeks received them from the Phoenicians, as the Phoenicians possibly might have received them from the Greeks; but which, viewed in connection with Greek traditions on the subject, and with the significance of the letters in Hebrew, seems reasonably certain. Two of the letters were transported from Phoenicia into Greek. It is true that modern Hebrew writing and the later Greek writing of antiquity have not much resemblance to each other; but this is owing partly to gradual changes in the writing of Greek letters, and partly to the fact that the character in which Hebrew Bibles are now printed, called the Assyrian or square character, was not the one originally in use among the Jews, but seems to have been learned in the Babylonian captivity, and afterwards gradually adopted by them on their return to Palestine (Gesenius, Græck. der hebr. sprache und schrift, p. 150). See Alphabet.

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

It may not be unimportant to observe that, although so many letters of the Greek alphabet have a meaning in Hebrew or Phoenician, yet their Greek names are not in the Hebrew or Phoenician, but in the Aramaic form. There is a peculiar form of the noun in Aramaic called by grammarians the status emphaticus, in which the termination d (נ) is added to a noun, modifying it according to certain laws. Originally this termination was probably identical with the definite article "ha;" which, instead of being prefixed, was subjoined to the noun, as is the case now with the definite article in the accentuating and vocative cases. This form is not to exist in the oldest specimen of Aramaic in the Bible, יִֽעֲרָן sakudath, in Gen. xxxi, 47, where sakudath, testimony, is used by Laban in the status emphaticus. Now it is worthy of note, that the names of a considerable proportion of the "Cadmean letters" in the Greek Aramaic form, such as Alpha, Beta, Gamma, Delta, Eta, Theta, Iota, Kappa, Lambda, and although this fact by itself is not sufficient to support an elaborate theory on the subject, it seems in favor, as far as it goes, of the conjecture that when the Greeks originally received the knowledge of letters, the names by which the several letters were taught to them were Aramaic.

It has been suggested, indeed, by Gesenius, that the Greeks themselves made the addition in all these cases, in order to give the words a Greek termination, having been acquainted with other Phoenician words, as mele, μᾶλα, melē, melē. But, if, however, a list is examined of Phoenician words naturalized in Greek, it will not be found that the ending in a has been the favorite mode of accommodating them to the Greek language. For example, of the words specified by Hesychius (Ambigua in loc. 69) as having been communicated through the Phoenicians to the Greeks (see above), it is remarkable that only four end in a in Greek which have not a similar termination in Hebrew; and of these four one is a late Alexandrian translation, and two are names of musical instruments, which, very probably, may first have been communicated to Greeks, through Syrians, in Asia Minor. Under any circumstances, the proportion of the Phoenician words which end in a in Greek is too small to warrant the inference that any common practice of the Greeks in this respect will account for the seeming fact that nine out of the sixteen Cadmean letters are in the Aramaic status emphaticus.

The inference, therefore, from their endings in a remains unshaken. Still this must not be regarded in any way as proving that the alphabet was invented by those who spoke the Aramaic language. This is a wholly distinct question, and far more obscure; though much deference on the point is due to the opinion of Gesenius, who, from the internal evidence of the names of the Shemitic letters, has arrived at the conclusion that they were invented by the Phoenicians (Pudographia, p. 29). The strongest argument against the Aramaic invention of the letters is that, although doubtless many of the names are both Aramaic and Hebrew, some of them are not Aramaic—at least not in the Hebrew signification; while the Syrians use other words to express the same ideas. Thus לִבְנָן in Aramaic means only 1000, and not an ox; the word for "door" in Aramaic is לְבָנָה, but לִבְנָן; while the six following names of Cadmean letters are not Aramaic: תַּוָּן, דֵּגְגֶפֶּה, נַדְּ, מַסְסָמִית. As this obviously leads to the conclusion that the Hebrews adopted Phoenician as their own language, or, in other words, that what is called the Hebrew language was in fact "the language of Canaan," as a prophet called it (Isa. xix. 18), and this not merely poetically, but literally and in philological truth; and as this is repugnant to some preconceived notions respecting the Hebrews and Semitic people, the question as to the reason why the Israelites might not have translated Canaanitish names into Hebrew. On this hypothesis the names now existing in the Bible for persons and places in the land of Canaan would not be the original names, but merely the translations of these names. To this question is. 1. That there is not the slightest direct mention, nor any indirect trace, in the Bible, of any
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such translation. 2. That it is contrary to the analogy of the ordinary Hebrew practice in other cases: as, for example, in all ancient languages, as for instance, the Persian monarchs (perhaps of a foreign dynasty) Pul, Tigrath-Piasek, Sennacherib, or of the Persian monarchs Darius, Ahasuerus, Artaxerxes, which remain unintelligible in Hebrew, and may only be understood through other Oriental languages. 3. That there is an absolute silence in the Bible as to there having been any difference whatever in language between the Israelites and the Canaanites, although in other cases where a difference existed that difference is somewhere alluded to, as in the case of Egypt (Isa. xxi, 8), the Ammonites ( Isa. xxi, 11), and the Chaldees (Jer. v, 15). Yet in the case of the Canaanites there was stronger reason for alluding to it; and without some allusion to it, if it had existed, the narrative of the conquest of Canaan under the leadership of Joshua would have been singularly imperfect.

The Phoenician language, however, certainly belonged to that family of languages which, by a name not altogether free from objection, but now generally adopted, is called "Semitic." Under this name are included all the languages of the Semitic and Roman races, which besides Æthiopic is an offshoot of the Southern Arabic or Himyartic. A. Aramaic, the vernacular language of Palestine at the time of Christ, in which the few original words of which Hebrew have been preserved in writing appear to have been spoken (Matt. xxvii, 46; Mark viii, 28), is a Semitic language, which is not fully significant either in Greek or Hebrew. Aramaic, as used in Christian literature, is called Syriac, and as used in the writings of the Jews has been very generally called Chaldee. C. Hebrew, in which by far the greater part of the Old Testament was composed. Now one of the most interesting points to the Biblical student connected with Phoenician, is, that it does not belong to either of the first two branches, but to the third, and that it is in fact so closely allied to Hebrew that Phoenician and Hebrew, though different dialects, may practically be regarded as the same language. This may be shown in the following way: (1) In passages which have been frequently quoted (see especially Gesenii Monumenta Scripturae Linguanae Pheneciaric, p. 291), testimony is borne to the kinship of the two languages by Augustine and Jerome, in whose time Phenician or Carthaginian was still a living language. Jerome, who was a good Hebrew scholar, after mentioning, in his Commentaries on Jeremiah (lib. v, c. 25) that Carthage was a Phoenician colony, proceeds to state (lib. vi, c. 50) that in the Carthaginian "appellantur, quorum lingua Hebrew lingue magis ex parte confinis est." Augustine, who was a native of Africa and a bishop there of Hippo, a Tyrian colony, has left on record a similar statement several times. In one passage he says of the two languages, "Istae linguae non multum inter se different" (Quaestiones in Heptateuchum, vii, 16). In another passage he says, "Vulgata sunt istae lingue et vicine, Hebrew, et Punica, et Syra" (In Jeroam. Tract. 15). Again, on Gen. xviii, 9, he says of a certain mode of speaking (Gen. viii, 9), "Quod verbum Phoenicius ex eis est, et quod verbum Hebrew ex eis est, "et quod verbum Hebrew ex eis est," (Contra Helers Petri- lian, ii, c. 104). (2) These statements are fully confirmed by a passage of Carthaginian preserved in the Pseudo Plantus (act v, scene 1), and accompanied by a Latin translation as part of the play. There is no doubt that the Carthaginians and the Phoenicians were the same nation, and that the Carthaginian extract is undoubtedly intelligible through Hebrew to Hebrew scholars (see Bochart's Canaan; and especially Gesenii Monumenta Pheneciaric, p. 857-862, where the passage is translated with notes, and full justice is done to the previous translation of Bochart). (3) The close kinship of the two languages is, moreover, strikingly confirmed by very many Phenician and Carthaginian names of places and persons, which, destitute of meaning in Greek and Latin, through which languages they have become widely known, and having sometimes in those languages occasionally false etymologies, become really significant in Hebrew. Thus through Hebrew it is known that Tyre, as Tidur, signifies "a rock" referring doubtless to the rocky island on which the city was situated: that Sidon, as Teidon, signifies "Fishing" or "Fishery," which was probably the occupation of its first settlers: that Carthage, or as it is finally called, "Carthada," means "New city," or "New town" in Byrras, which, as a Greek name, suggested the mythological mythus of the Bull's Hide (Aeneid, i, 386, 387), was simply the citadel of Carthage—"Carthagini accem," as Virgil accurately termed it: the Carthaginian name of it, softened by the Greeks into Byrrhes, being merely the Hebrew word Botzrah, "citadel," identical with the word called Bokrath in the English Version of Isa. xxvii, 1. Again, through Hebrew, the names of celebrated Carthaginians, though sometimes disguised by Greek acquisitions, e.g., and Roman writers, e.g., which belong to the same root as David, "beloved," meaning "his love" or "delight:" i. e. the love or delight either of Baal or of her husband: Hasdrubal is the man whose help Baal is: Hamilcar the man whom the god "Milar graciously granted" (comp. Haman); and, and, which means "beloved of El or God," the name of the renowned Hannibal is found to be identical in form and meaning with the name of Hannibal, who is mentioned in Num. xxxiv, 28 as the prince of the tribe of Manasseh: Hanniel meaning the grace of God, and Hannibal the grace of Baal. (4) The same conclusion arises from the examination of Phenician inscriptions, preserved to the present day; all of which can be interpreted, with more or less certainty, through Hebrew. Some of these will be more particularly noticed below.

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

An important Phenician literature seems to have been extant as late as the 1st century A.D., but it has disappeared from the face of the earth. After the second half of the 8th century the language had vanished entirely in the country itself, and Jerome, who lived in Palestine, mentions the Punics, but never the Phenicians.

In the West it was received by the Romans, who, after returning from Mauritania and Numidia it remained, in a corrupted form, the reigning tongue as late as the 4th century A.D.; and Augustine draws his explanations of Scripture from the Punics current in the 5th century. There was a translation of the whole Bible for the use of the Latin churches; and in and near Tripolitania was the language of the common people up to a late period. From the 6th century, however, it rapidly died out, chiefly in consequence of the Vandals, Goths, Moors, and other foreign tribes overrunning the country, and interfering with the use of the language.

The literature of Phenicia, in its original form, has, as we have said, perished entirely. What traces and fragments we have of it have survived in Greek translations. But from even these small remains we can
easily imagine the extreme antiquity, and the high importance and vast extent of these productions, which, at first, seem to have been chiefly of a theological or theogonical nature. Their authors are the gods them- selves, and the writings are only accessible to the priest, and to those initiates in the mysteries. From the allegorical explanations of these exalted personages sprang a new branch of sacred literature, of which those fragments of cosmogony mentioned above are derived. To the literary age of Tassus, Cadmus, Opilion, Eumaeus, etc., succeeded Thalion, Iariz, Sanchoniatho, and Mo- chus, who founded the schools of priests and propheta. These cultivated the sciences, chiefly the occult ones, magic, and the like. Nearest to the sacred literature stands didactic poetry, somewhat related to the Orphic, whose chief representatives are Sisê, Jopas, etc. The erotic poetry is characterized as of a very sensuous na- ture, both in Phoenicia and the colonies. Of historians are mentioned Mochus, Hyphasis (Sanchoniatho?) Theodotos, Philostratus, Menander, and others; but these are mere Greek versions of their Phoenician names, and absolutely nothing has been preserved of their writings. Punic literature is also frequently men- tioned by Greek and Roman writers. Geography, his- tory, agriculture, were the fields chiefly cultivated by the colonists of Carthage and the West generally.

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

before my time, in the flood of days—in dumbness ceases the son of gods. Dend do I lie in this tomb, in the grave, on the soil which I have built. I myself declare that all the nobles and all the people shall not open this place of rest; they shall not seek for treasures and not carry away the sarcophagus of my resting-place, and not disturb me by mounting the couch of my slumberers. If people should speak to thee in the presence of all the people, do not listen to them. For all the nobles and all the people who shall open this sarcophagus of the place of rest, or carry away the sarcophagus of my resting-place, may they find no rest with the depart- ed; may they not be buried in a tomb, and may no son and successor succeed them in their place,” etc. (see Thomson, Land and Book, i, 198 sq.)

The votive tablets bear the same character through- out, differing only with respect to the name of the man or woman who placed it in a certain sanctuary in accordance with his or her vow. Their material is mostly limestone or fine sandstone, rarely marble, and they vary from 5 to 15 inches in height, from 4 to 7 in width, and from 1½ to 4 in thickness. Beginning in most cases with the dedication to a god or goddess, or both, thus: “[Sacred] To the god . . . . [this tablet] which vowed N. son (daughter) of X. When he (she) heard my voice and bless’d: I heard your voice and bless’; etc.

The sepulchral tablets generally run somewhat in this fashion. Other stones erected to . . . . who lived . . . . years. Much yet remains to be done. Even the palæographical side has, notwithstanding all the ready means at our mete- rial, not been settled satisfactorily yet. One point, however, is indis- putably even now. There are at least 2,742 names in this Phoenician writing to be distinguished most clearly. The older, purer, more orthographical, and more neatly executed, is found in the inscriptions of Phoenicia her- self, of Malta, Athens, Citium, and Carthage; the younger, corrupted not only with respect to the grammar and lan- guage, but also with respect to the form of the letters, which are less carefully executed, and even exhibit some strange, probably degenerate characters, is found chiefly on the monuments of Cyprus, Cilicia, Sardinia, Africa, Spain, Numidia, and the adjacent parts. Besides these languages for the language, there are a few remnants of it embedded, as we said, in ancient non-Phoenician writings. The Old Testament alone, however, has preserved its words—proper nouns chiefly—unalterated. Later eastern writers even, not to mention the Greeks and Romans, have corrupted the spelling to such a degree that it is often most puzzling to trace the original Semitic words. Phoenician names occur in Suidas, Dioscorides, Apuleius, in martyrlogies, calendaries, Acts of Councils, in Church fathers (Au- gustine, Priscianus, Servus), etc. The only really important remains of preserved—all fear- fully mutilated and Latinized—in Plautus’s Ponzus, act v, scene 1 of which contains, in sixteen lines, the Phoenician translation of the Latin text, with more than one hundred Phoenician words. Several other phrases and words are embodied in act v, scenes 2 and 3 of the same play. Yet, although there is very little
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with which the British Museum (now the wealthiest in Phoenician monuments) has lately been enriched, as mentioned before. The emblems on it are symbolical, and refer to the deities invoked. The lower part is mutilated, but easily supplied. The date is uncertain, perhaps the 2d or 3d century B.C. The second is a trilingual inscription from a base of an altar recently found at Pauli Gerrei, in Sardinia, and has been fully explained by Deutsch (see Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature, 1864). Its contents are briefly this: A certain Cleon, Phoenician by religion, Greek by name, Roman by nationality, a salt-farmer, vows an altar—material and weight of which are only given in Phoenician: viz. copper, a hundred pounds in weight—to Sheshmun-Akelepios “the Hicher” (the Phoenician Merroch, clumsily transcribed Merre in Latin, and Mirre in Greek), in consideration for a cure to be performed. The date, given in Phoenician, viz. the year of two, apparently annual, entirely unknown judges, given no clue to the time. Palaekographical reasons, however, would place it in the 1st century B.C.

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

In English, see Kenrick’s Phœnicia (Lond. 1855); in Latin, the second part of Bochart’s Geographia Sacra, under the title “Canaan,” and Gesenius’s work, Scriptura Lingvæque Phœniciorum Monuments quosquot superstant (Leips. 1837); in German, the exhaustive work of Movers, Die Phönizier und das Phönizische Altreich (Berlin, 1841-1856, 5 vols.); Gerhard, Kunst der Phönizier (ibid. 1848); an article on the same subject by Movers, in Erch and Gruber’s Encyclopædia, and an article in the same work by Gesenius on Polychrographe. See likewise Gesenius, Gesch. der Hebräischen Sprach und Schrift (Leips. 1815); Bleek, Einleitung in das Alte Testament (Berl. 1860). Phoenician inscriptions discovered since the time of Gesenius have been published by Judas, Études de philologie, de la langue Phénicienne et de la langue Libyque (Paris, 1847), and forty-five other inscriptions have been published by the abbe Bourgade (ibid. 1862, fol.). In 1846 a votive tablet was discovered at Marseilles, respecting which see Movers, Phönizische Texte (1847), and Judas, Analyse (Var. 1857), and Études (ibid. 1857). On the sarcophagus of Ezzan-asser, see Dietrich, Zwei Sidonische Inschriften, und eine alte Phönizische Königsinschrift (Marburg, 1850), and Ewald, Erklärung der grossen Phönizischen Inschrift von Sidon (Göttingen, 1856, 4to; from the seventh volume of the Abhandlungen der Königl. geograph. Gesellschaft zu Göttingen). Information respecting these works, and others on Phoenician inscriptions, is given by Bleek, p. 64, 65. See also Barthélemy, Monumenta Phœniciorum (Paris, 1793), Hamaker, De Monumenta Phœnícia (Leips. 1822), Rasoul, Rocchetto, Monumenta Phœnícia (Paris, 1829), Davis, Carthage (Lond. 1861); Wilkins, Phœnicia and Israel (Lond. 1871); Rénan, Mission de Phœniçie (Paris, 1864).

PHOENIX,

the name of a mythical Egyptian bird, supposed by some to be a kind of plover, like the ibis, often depicted with human arms, and called in hieroglyphs ṭtu. Others consider it to be the borus, or nycticorax, a bird sacred to Osiris, and represented watching in the tamaraik over his coffin. The first of these representations has sometimes a star upon the head, supposed to indicate the astronomic period of its appearance. It visited Egypt after the death of its father, and entered the shrine particularly dedicated to it at Heliopolis, and there buried its parent, putting the
body into an egg or case made of mvrrh, and then closing up the egg. Another account is that the Phenix, when about to die, made a nest for itself in Arabia, from which a new Phenix sprang of itself. This bird proceeded to Heliopolis, and there burned and buried its father. But the more popularly known version is that the Phenix burned itself, and a new and young Phenix sprang from the ashes. A less received version is that a worm crawled out of the body of the dead Phenix, and became the future one. The Phenix was, according to the most authentic accounts, supposed to visit Egypt every five hundred years; the precise period, however, was not known at Heliopolis, and was a subject of contention till its appearance. The connection of the Phenix period with that of the Sothic cycle, appears to be generally received by chronologists, as well as the statement of Horapollo, that it designated the source of the waters of the Nile. A great difference of opinion has prevailed about the Phenix period: according to Elian, it was a cycle of 500 years; Tactius seems to make it one of 250 years; Lepsius, a cycle of 1500 years. The Phenix was said to have four times appeared in Egypt: 1, under Setosis; 2, under Amasis, 860-525 B.C.; 3, under Ptolemy Philadelphia, 284-246 B.C.; and lastly, 34 or 36 A.D., just prior to the death of Tiberius. The Phenix also appears upon the coins of Constantine, 354 A.D., viz. 300 years after the death of Christ, who was considered the Phenix by the monastic writers. It is supposed by the rabbinists to be mentioned in the Bible (Job xxix. 18; Ps. cxxii. 5). See Herodotus, ii, 73; Achilles Tatius, iii, 25; Tactius, 4th vi, 29; Telztes, Chil. v, 397; Lepsius, Einzelt, p. 183; Archæologia, xxx. 256. The East is full of fables resembling the phenix. Thus the Simorg of the ancient Persians is said to have witnessed twelve catastrophes, and may yet see many more. It has built its nest on Mount Kaf, and perched upon the branches of the Yodgar, or tree of life; it predicts good or evil to mortals. Similar legends seem to be found connected with the Robh of the Arabians and Smeruol of the Hindos. The Jews also have their sacred bird Teisl. See Gardner, Faith of the World, ii, 655, 656.

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

Phorcos or Phorcys, a Homer sea-god, to whom a harbor in Ithaca was dedicated. He is said to have been the son of Pontus and Ge, and to have been the father, by his sister Ceto, of the Gorgons, the Hesperian dragon, and the Hesperides. By Hebe he was the father of Seyla.

Poros (πόρος), an incorrect Greek form (1 Esdr. v, 19; ix, 26) of the Heb. name (Ezra ii, 3; viii, 3)

Parosi (q. v.).

Phos (φῶς, light), and its allied term Photisma (Illumination), are generally applied in the ancient Christian Church to baptism, from the great blessings supposed to arise from it. Hence baptized Christians were sometimes called ψωφικούς, the enlightened, and the baptistery ψωφιστερία, place of enlightenment. The same terms were also applied to the Lord’s Supper.

Riddle, Christian Antiquities, p. 484, 485, 553. See also Baptism (Names of 5).

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

Photia Hagia (φωτια για, holy light), a term anciently used to denote the festival of Epiphany, as being commemorative of Christ’s baptism. See Epiph.

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

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

Photisma. See Phos.

Photisterion (φωτιστηρίων), a place of illumination, being a term frequently used in the ancient Christian Church to denote the baptistery, or the place of baptism, that ordinance being supposed to be attended with a divine illumination of the soul. See Phos. This name might also be used for another reason, namely, because baptisteries were the places in which instruction
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was communicated previous to baptism, the catechumen mortised his 8th of the 4th century. In the Acta Andreas, i., 574, etc., is given an account of the martyrdom of St. Lucillius, and several others who are said to have suffered at Byzantium under persecution under Aurelian. The account bears this title: "Φυλάττω τοῦ μακροπάθους σεμελόροκά τῶν Ἀγίων Ἀγαθάνων καὶ λογοδίη τῆς ημῶν ἑρωτάρατος Νουκλάκεως; Sancti Martyri Lucilliæ Exomia, auter brevissima Photii, Sanctorum Apostolorum Speciosissimae ac Logothetae. Of the writer Photius, nothing further appears to be known than is contained in the title, namely, that he was keeper of the sacred vessels in the great church of the Apostle at Constantinople, which was second in importance only to that of St. Sophia; and that he must be placed after the time of Constantine, by whom the church was built. The Ex omia is given in the Acta Sanctorum in the original Greek, with a Commentarius prærior, a Latin version, and notes by Conrado Jamnngus. See Fabricius, Bibl. Græcæ, 2, 271, 678; Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. s. v.

PHOTIUS OF CONSTANTINOPLE (2), also an Eastern ecclesiastic, flourished in the 5th century as presbyter of the Church at Constantinople, and was one of the most decided and active supporters of the unfortunate heresiarch Nestorius (q. v.). When Antonius and Jacobus were sent, some time before the Council of Ephesus, A.D. 431, to convert, by persecution, the Quartemicians and Novatians of Asia Minor, they were sent to some of their converts at Philadelphia, not the Nicene Creed, but one that contained a passage deemed heretical on the subject of the Incarnation, which excited against them a charge of heresy, which was brought before the Church at Philadelphia. In these proceedings Antonius and Jacobus were supported by Photius, who, not only gave them letters at the commencement of their mission, attesting their orthodoxy, but procured the deposition of their opponents. Chargés, who then presented a complaint to the Council of Ephesus (Concil. vol. iii. col. 673, etc., ed. Labbe). Tillemont is disposed to ascribe to Photius the answer which was drawn up to the Epistola ad Superioris of Cyril of Alexandria. A certain Photius, a supporter of Nestorius, was banished to Petra, about A.D. 438 (Lupus, Ad Epistulæ Constantin. P. xlv. Epistulae, cap. cxxxviii), whom, notwithstanding the objections of Lupus (not in loc.), we agree with Tillemont in identifying with the presbyter of Constantinople (Tillemont, Mémoires, xiv, 300, 332, 494, 607, 775).

PHOTIUS OF CONSTANTINOPLE (3), one of the most eminent men whose names occur in the long series of the Byzantine annals, flourished in the 9th century. In the preparation of this article we depend very largely upon Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. s. v.

Lifr.—The year and place of his birth, and the name of his father, appear to be unknown. His mother's name was Irene: her brother married one of the sisters of Theodora, wife of the emperor Theophilus (Theoph. Contin. lib. iv. 22); so that Photius was connected by affinity with the imperial family. We have the testimony of Nicetas David, the Papaglou, that his lineage was illustrious. He had at least four brothers (Montagu, Not. ad Epist. Photii, p. 138), one of whom, the eldest, enjoyed the dignity of patronian. Photius himself, in speaking of his father and mother, celebrates their crown of martyrdom, and the patient spirit by which they were adorned, during the reign of Theophilus or some other of the Iconoclastic emperors. This is the more likely, as Photius elsewhere (Epist. 2, Encycl. § 45, and Epist. ad Nicol. Popam) claims as his relative Tarsius (probably great-uncle), patriarch of Constantinople, who was one of the great champions of imperial worship, who shows the side taken by his family in the controversy. The ability of Photius would have adored any lineage, and his capacious mind was cultivated, as the testimony even of his opponents and his extant works show, with great diligence. "He was accounted," says Nicetas David, the biographer and panegyrist of his contemporary Ignatius, "one of the most eminent for his secular acquirements, and his understanding of political affairs. For so superior were his attainments in grammar and poetry, in rhetoric and philosophy, yea, even in medicine, and in almost all the branches of knowledge beyond the limits of theology, that he not only appeared to excel all the men of his own day, but even to bear comparison with the ancients. For all things combined in his favor: natural adaptation, diligence, wealth, which enabled him to form a comprehensive library; and more than all these, the love of glory, which induced him to pass whole nights without sleep, that he might have time for reading. And when the time came (which ought never to have arrived) for him to intrude himself into the Church, he became a most diligent reader of theological works" (Vita Ignatii aphor. Cod. vol. viii, ed. Labbe). It must not, however, be supposed that Photius had wholly neglected the study of theology before his entrance on an ecclesiastical life: so far was this from being the case, that he had read and carefully analyzed, as it were, his Bibliotheca. His chief work was a Greek ecclesiastical writers of all ages, so that his attainments in sacred literature might have shamed many a professional divine. Thus highly connected, and with a mind so richly endowed and highly cultivated, Photius obtained high advancement at the Byzantine court. He held the dignity of a proto- or chief-secretary, and chief-justice (Codex. In offic. CP. p. 86, ed. Bonn); and, if we trust the statement of Nicetas David (L.c.), of protopatrabius, a name originally denoting the chief sword-bearer or captain of the guards, but which became, in later times, a merely nominal office (Codex. ed. p. 285). To these dignities may be added, on the authority of Anastasius Bibliothecarius (Concil. Octavi Hist. apost Concin. vol. viii, 962, ed. Labbe), that of senator; but this is, perhaps, only another title for the office of proto- or chief-secretary (Greiser, et Gaur. Not. in Cod. p. 242). Besides these official duties at the capital, he was also occasionally employed on missions abroad; and it was during an embassy "to the Assyrians" (a vague and unsatisfactory term, denoting apparently the court of the caliph, or of some of the other powers of Upper Asia) that he read the works enumerated in his Bibliotheca, extracted from the critical notices of them which that work contains—a striking instance of the energy and diligence with which he continued to cultivate literature in the midst of his secular duties and when away from home. Of the date of this embassy, while engaged in which he must have resided several years at the Assyrian court, as well of the other incidents of his life before his elevation to the patriarchate of Constantinople, we have no knowledge. He could hardly have been a young man at the time he became patriarch.

The patriarchal throne of Constantinople was occupied in the middle of the 9th century by Ignatius (s. v.), who had the misfortune to incur the enmity of some few bishops and monks, and also of Bardas, who was all-powerful at the court of his nephew Michael, then a minor. Ignatius had excommunicated Bardas on a charge of incest, and Bardas, in retaliation, caused the patriarch's deposition, and the election of Photius in his place. Though a layman, and, according to some statements, under excommunication for supporting Gregory, less than a week sufficed, according to Nicetas David (ed.), for the casting off of the excommunication, and the establishment of the needful subordinate gradations: the first day witnessed his conversion from a layman to a monk; the second day he was made reader; the third day deacon; the fourth, presbyter; and the sixth (Christmas-day, A.D. 858) beheld his promotion to the
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patriarchate, the highest ecclesiastical dignity in the empire. Nicetas (ibid.) states that his office was irregularly committed to him by secular hands. Photoius himself states that his bishopric was confirmed by the apostolic see, and by the pope Nicholas I (apud Baron. Amul. ad Ann. 859, § 16, etc.), states that the patriarchate was pressed upon his acceptance by a numerous assembly of the metropolitans, and of the other clergy of his patriarchate; nor is it likely that the Byzantine court would fail to secure a sufficient number of subsevzont bishops to give to the appointment every possible appearance of regularity. A consciousness that the whole transaction was violent and indefensible, whatever care might be taken to give it the appearance of regularity, made it desirable for the vicious party to obtain from the deposition of Photoius a resignation of his office; but Ignatius was a man of too lofty a spirit to consent to his own degradation. Photoius, however, retained his high dignity; the secular power was on his side; the clergy of the patriarchate, in successive councils (A.D. 858, 859), confirmed his appointment, though we are told by Nicetas David that the metropolitans exacted from him a written engagement that he would treat his deposed rival with filial reverence, and follow his advice; and even the legates of the Holy See were induced to side with him, a subversive action which might have been of value to the cause of the deposed patriarch of Alexandria Nicholas I. The engagement to treat Ignatius with kindness was not kept; in such a struggle its observance could hardly be expected; but how far the severities inflicted on him are to be ascribed to Photoius cannot be ascertained. The;. complexion of the latter would be likely to aggravate any disposition which he might feel to treat his rival harshly; for Nicholas, in a council at Rome (A.D. 862), embraced the side of Ignatius, and anathematized Photoius and his adherents; various enemies rose up against him among the civil officers as well as the clergy of the empire, and the minds of many, including, if we may trust Nicetas (ibid.), the kindred and friends of Photoius himself, were shocked by the treatment of the unhappy Ignatius. To add to Photoius's troubles, the Caesar Bardas appeared to have had disputes with him, either inflamed by the natural jealousy between the secular and ecclesiastical powers, or, perhaps, disappointed at not finding in Photoius the subserviency he had anticipated. The letters of Photoius addressed to Bardas (Epiatdate, 8), are marked with complaints against the diminution of his authority, of the ill-treatment of those for whom he was interested, and of the inefficacy of his own intercessions and complaints. However, the opposition among his own clergy was gradually weakened, until only five bishops remained who supported the cause of his deposed rival. The remaining bishops seceded from the deposed patriarch, Photoius labored zealously for a restoration of friendly feelings between himself and the Western patriarch Nicholas, however, spurred all advances, and in A.D. 863 anathematized and deposed Photoius anew. Of course the Roman patriarchate, failing to secure the aid of the Eastern emperor, could not give practical effect to the deposition, and Photoius remained in his place. In order to retaliate on Rome, he now assembled a council of the Eastern clergy at Constantinople (A.D. 867), in which the question was removed from the region of a personal dispute between the bishops to a controversy of doctrine and discipline between the churches of the East and West themselves. This council Photoius first brought forward distinctly certain grounds of difference between the churches, which, although considerably modified, afterwards led to their final separation. In all these doctrinal differences, the council condemned the Western Church, excepted Nicholas and his abettors, and withdrew from the communion of the see of Rome. The charge of heresy against the Church of Rome in general was embraced in the following articles: 1. That the Church of Rome kept the Sabbath as a fast; 2. That it permitted milk and cheese in the first week of Lent; 3. That it prohibited the marriage of priests; 4. That it confined the rite of anointing persons baptized to the bishops alone; 5. That it had corrupted the Nicene Creed by the addition of a new article which had the secular power whereby to carry its sentence into effect, the separation of the Eastern and Western churches became simply a schism, and as such lasted until the actual deposition of Photoius, A.D. 869. Of the conduct which controlled Photoius as a patriarch, in matters not connected with the struggle to maintain his position, it is not easy to judge. That he aided Bardas, who was elevated to the dignity of Caesar, in his efforts for the revival of learning, perhaps suggested those efforts to him, is highly probable from the bishops' letters to Photinius on the Contin. De Mich. Theophili Filo, c. 36. That he possessed many kindly dispositions is indicated by his letters. The charges of the fury of letters, and of cruelty in his struggles with the party of Ignatius, are, there is reason to believe, too true; but as almost all the original sources of information respecting his character and conduct are from parties hostile to his claims, we cannot confidently receive their charges as true in all their extent. The murder of Cesar Bardas (A.D. 866 or 867), by the emperor's order, was speedily followed by that of the second deposed patriarch of Constantinople, A.D. 867, and the accession of his colleague and murderer, Basil I (the Macedonian). Photoius had consecrated Basil as the colleague of Michael; but after the murder of the latter he refused to admit him to the communion of the Church, recommending him to the senators and to the people, and unworthy to partake of the sacred elements. Photoius was for this offence immediately banished to a monastery, and Ignatius restored: various papers which the servants of Photoius were about to conceal in a neighboring reed-bed were seized, and afterwards produced against Photoius, first in the senate of Constantinople, and afterwards at the council held against him. This hasty change in the occupants of the patriarchate had been too obviously the result of the change of the imperial dynasty to be sufficient of itself. But the imperial power had now the same interest as the Western Church in the deposition of Photoius. A council (recognised by the Romish Church as the eighth ocumencal or fourth Constantinopolitan) was therefore summoned, A.D. 869, at which the deposition of Photoius and the restoration of Ignatius were confirmed. The council was in fact assisted by the circumstance that Ignatius took his place as patriarch at the commencement of the council. Photoius, who appeared before the council, and his partisans were anathematized and stigmatized with the most opprobrious epithets. He subsequently acquired the title of Nestorian, and was deposed from his see; for we can hardly give credence to the strange tale related by Nicetas (ibid.), who ascribes it to the fury and interpretation by Photoius of a certain genealogical document containing a prophecy of Basil's exaltation. It is certain, however, that he gained the favor of the emperor, but that he soon acquired a complete ascendancy over him; he was appointed tutor to the sons of Basil, had apartments in the palace assigned to him; and on the death of Ignatius, about A.D. 877, was immediately restored to the patriarchal throne. With writers of the Ignatian party and of the Romish Church this restoration is, of course, nothing less than a new irritation of the wolf into the sheepfold. According to Nicetas, he commenced his patriarchate by beating, banishing, and in various ways afflicting the servants and household of his deposed rival, and by using ten thousand arts against those who objected to his restoration as uncanonical and irregular. Some he bribed by gifts and honors, and by translation to wealthier or more eligible sees than those they occupied; others he terrified by reproaches and accusations, which, on their exposure, were refuted and altogether dropped. That, in the corrupt state of the Byzantine empire and Church, something of this must
ever, was Photius from joining in the designs of Santabarren, that it was chiefly upon his urgent entreaties the emperor spared the eyes of Leo, which he had intended to put out. Basil died A.D. 866, and Leo V succeeded to the throne. He immediately sent word to Photius, that Santabarren; and, forgetful of Photius's interference, scrupled not to involve the patriarch in his fall. Andrew and Stephen, two officers of the court, whom Santabarren had formerly accused of some offence, now charged Photius and Santabarren with conspiring to depose the emperor, and to place a kinsman of John's on the throne. The charge appears to have been utterly unfounded, but it answered the purpose. An officer of the court was sent to the church of St. Sophia, who ascended the ambo, or pulpit, and read to the assembled people articles of accusation against the patriarch. Photius was immediately thrown into confinement, first in a monastery, afterwards in the palace of Pege; and Santabarren was brought in custody from Euchaita and confronted with him; the two accusers, with three other persons, were appointed to conduct the examination, a circumstance sufficient to show the nature and spirit of the whole transaction. The firmness of the prisoners, and the impossibility of proving the charge against them, provoked the emperor's rage. Santabarren was cruelly beaten, deprived of his eyes, and banished; but was afterwards recalled, and sent to Sclavonia, where he survived till the reign of Constantine V, the successor of Leo. Photius was banished to the monastery of Bordi, in Armenia (or rather in the Théma Armeniacum), where he seems to have remained till his death. He was buried in the church of a nunnery at Merdasgersia. The year in which his death occurred is not ascertained. Pagi, Fabricius, and Mosheim fix it in A.D. 891; but the evidence on which their statement rests is not conclusive. He must have been an aged man when he died, for he must have been in middle age when first chosen patriarch, and he lived after that event thirty years, and ninety years, it is said, was succeeded in the patriarchate by the emperor's brother Stephen, first his pupil, then his syneculus, and one of his clergy. (Theoph. Continu. lib. v. c. 100; lib. vi. c. 1-5; Symeon Magister, De Basili. Maced. c. 21; De Leone Basili. fil. c. 1; Geogr. Monarch. De Basili. c. 24; De Leone, c. 1-7.)

The character of Photius is by no means worthy of much respect. He was an able man of the world, but not influenced by the high principles which befitted his sacred office. Yet he was probably not below the average of the mendicant orders of his time, and certainly was not the monster that the historians and other writers of the Romish Church, whose representations have been too readily adopted by some moderns, would make him. A writer in the Edinburgh Review, xxxi, 829, says, "Very few men have been so very low as Photius—wicked—a great scholar and a consummate hypocrite—not only neglecting occasions of doing good, but perverting the finest talents to the worst purposes." This is unjust; he lived in a corrupt age, and was placed in a trying position; and, without bribing or extenuating his crimes, it must be remembered that his private character remains unimpeached: the very story of his being a eunuch, which, though not having the appearance of truth, shows at least that he was not open to the charge of licentiousness; his firmness is attested by his refusal of Basil from the communion of the Church, and his mercifulness by his intercession for the ungrateful Leo. It must be borne in mind also that his history has come down to us chiefly in the representations of his enemies. The principal ancient authorities have been silent on the course of this interesting period, and we have by no means cited all the places. We may add, Leo Grammaticus, Chronographia, p. 463-476, ed. Paris: Zonar. xvi, 4, 8, 11, 12; Codren. Compend. p. 551, 569, 573, 698, ed. Paris: ii, 172, 205, 218, 248, ed. Bonn; Glycis, Aesop, pars iv, p. 235, 294, 297, p. 225, 226, 280, 287, ed. Paris: 544, 547, 692, ed. Bonn; Genesis, Repus, lib. iv, p. 48. ed. Venice: p. 160,
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Various notices and documents relating to his history generally, but especially to his conduct in reference to the schism of the churches, may be found in the Concilium, vol. ii, p. 115, and in the works of Hardouin; vols. xi, xvi, xvii, ed. Mans. Of modern writers, Baronius (Ann. Eccles. A.D. 858-886) is probably the fullest, but at the same time one of the most unjust. Hankius (De Byzantinae. Rerum Scriptoribus, pars i, c. 18) has a very ample memoir of Photius, which may be advantageous-ly compared with that of Baronius, as its bias is in its opposite direction. See also Dupin, Nouvelle Bibliothèque des Auteurs Ecclésiastiques, Siécle xi, p. 270, 4d ed. 1698. An essay by Francesco Fontani, De Photio Nova Roman Imperio Episcopi episcopi Scriptor Disputato, prefixed to the first volume of his Nova Kirchtoni Delici (Florence, 1765, 12mo), is far more candid than most of the other works by members of the Romish Church; and is in this respect far beyond the Mémoire sur le Patriarche Photius, by M. Weggelin, in the Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, année 1777 (Berlin, 1779, 4to., p. 440, etc. Shorter accounts may be found in Moeslein (Eccles. Hist., by Murdock, bk. iii, cent. ix, p. ii, c. iii, § 27-32), and in the works cited at the close of this article. Fabri (Liber ad litteras) lists the soundest of the questions arising out of the struggle of Ignatius and Photius for the patriarchate, or out of the contests of the Eastern and Western churches with regard to Photius. He has also given a list of writers respecting Photius, divided into 1. Those hostile to Photius; and 2. Those more favorable to him. Of the historians of the lower empire, Le Beau (Bib Empire, lib. xix, xx, etc.; Ixii, lxii, i-3) is outrageously partial, inflaming the crimes of Photius, and rejecting as untrue, or passing over without notice, the record of those incidents which are honorable to him. Gibbon (Decline and Fall, c. 53, 60), more favorable, has two separate, but brief and unsatisfactory, notices of the patriarch.

Writings.—The published works of Photius are the following: i. Мεμρηοδοδοι ή Βιβλια Μεροιοδο ης Μυριβολ ής ή σευ Βιβλιοθηκα. This is the most important and valuable of the works of Photius. It may be described as an extensive review of ancient Greek literature by a scholar of immense erudition and sound judgment. It is an extraordinary monument of literary energy, for it was written while the author was engaged in his embassy to Constantinople. At the request of his brother, Tarasius, who was much grieved at the separation, and desired an account of the books which Photius had read in his absence. It thus conveys a pleasing impression, not only of the literary requirements and extraordinary industry, but of the fraternal affection of the writer. It opens with a prefatory address to Tarasius, recapitulating the circumstances in which it was composed, and stating that it contained a notice of two hundred and seventy-nine volumes. The extant copies contain a notice of two hundred and eighty: the discrepancy, which is of little importance, may have been the mistake of Photius himself, or in some alteration of the editions by some transcriber. It has been doubted whether we have the work entire. An extant analysis, by Photius, of the Historia Ecclesiastica of Philostorgius (q. v.), by which alone some knowledge of the contents of that important work has been preserved to us, is so much fuller than the brief analysis of that work contained in the present text of the Bibliotheca, as to lead to the supposition that the latter is imperfect. "It is to be lamented," says Valaesi (De Crit. i, 29), "that many such judgments and collections of extracts are now lost. If these were extant in the state in which they were completed by Photius, we should grieve less at the loss of so many ancient writers." But Lelio has shown (Distratto in Phot. Biblioth.) that we have no just reason for suspecting that the Bibliotheca is imperfect; and that the fuller analysis of Philostorgius probably never formed part of it, but was made at a later period. The two hundred and eighty divisions of the Bibliotheca must be understood to express the number of volumes (códices) or manuscripts, and not of writers or of works. In some cases, the g. of Philo Judeus (cod. 103-105), occupy several divisions; and, on the other hand, one division (e. g. cod. 125, Justini Martyris Scripta Varia), sometimes comprehends a notice of several different works written in one codex. The writers examined are of all classes: some authors, however, are theologians, writers of ecclesiastical history, and of the biography of eminent churchmen; but several are secular historians, philosophers, and orators, heathen or Christian, of remote or recent times, lexicographers, and medical writers; only one or two are poets, and those on religious subjects, and there are also one or two writers of romances or love tales. There is no formal classification of these various writers: though a series of writers or writings of the same class frequently occurs, e. g. the Acta of various councils (cod. 15-20); the writings of the Lives and Legends of saints (cod. 21-24); the secular historians of the Byzantine empire (cod. 62-67). In fact, the works appear to be arranged in the order in which they were read. The notices of the writers vary much in length: those in the earlier part are very briefer, and held to determine the works of a recent perusal apparently enabling the writer to give a fuller account of them; so that this circumstance confirms our observation as to the arrangement of the work. Several valuable works, now lost, are known to us chiefly by the analyses or extracts which Photius has given of them; among them are the Periarch and Indices of Ctenias (q. v.), in cod. 72; De Rebus post Alexandrum Magnum gestis, and the Parthica and the Bibliotheca of Arrian, in cod. 53, 92, and 93; the Historiae of Olympiodorus (q. v.), in cod. 80; the Narrationes of Conon, in cod. 166; the Nova Historia of Pro- emy Hephæstion, in cod. 190; the De Heroicis Pontica Rebus of Memnon, in cod. 224; the Vita Isidori by Dama- nicus, in cod. 242; the lost Declarationes of Hime- rus, in cod. 248; the lost books of the Bibliotheca of Diodorus Siculus, in cod. 244; the De Eregionia (a Ru- bro) Maria of Agatharchides, in cod. 250; the anonymous Vita Pauli Cepidam and Vita Athanassii, in cod. 257 and 258; the lost Orations, genuine or spurious, of Antiphan, Isocrates, Lysias, Isaeus, Demosthenes, Hyperides, Deinarchus, and Lycusius, in cod. 259-266; and of the lost Homilies of Peter of Caesarea, in cod. 279; besides several theological and ecclesiastic- al and some medical works. The above enumeration will suffice to show the inestimable value of the Bibliotheca of Photius, especially when we reflect how much the value of his notices is enhanced by the soundness of his judgment. The first edition of the Bibliotheca was published by David Horschelius, under the title of Bibliotheca Photii, or Πεζοι, Λοιπον έιοπ Βιβλιον Patriarchia Excerpta et Censura (Augusta, 1601, fol.). Some of the Epitome of Photius were subjoined. The text of this edition is that of the first four MSS., and was accompanied with notes by the editor; but there was no Latin version. A Latin version and scholia, by Andreas Schottius of Antwerp, was published (thid. 1606, fol.) but the version is inaccurate, and has been severely criticized. It was, however, re- printed, with the Greek text, under the title of Πεζοι Μεροιοδοι δια Ηιβλοθηκον, or Ποτα Μυριβολ ις Ψευδον μειδρα ις Bibliotheca (Geneva, 1612, fol., and Rouen, 1658, fol.). This last edition is a splendid one, but inconvenient from its size. An edition, with a revised text, formed on a col- lation of four MSS. (whether any of them were the same as those employed by Horschelius is not mentioned), was published by Immanuel Bekker (Berlin, 1824-25, 2 thin vols. 4to.); it is convenient from its size and the copiousness of its index, but has neither version nor notes.
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2. Ἐντομοὶ ἐκ τῶν ἐκλειστικῶν ἱστορῶν Φιλοσο-

ηργογίου ἐντὸς ἐνυφῆς Φαύσιον ναύαρχου, Compendium

historiarum Ecclesiasticarum. Philologorum quod dictavit Phot-

ius patriarcha. Case regards this as a fragment of another

work similar to the Bibliotheca, but his con-

jectures concerning the date of this fragment are

not very important, as preserving to us, though very

imperfectly, an Arian statement of the ecclesiastical

transactions of the busy period of the Arian controversy

in the 4th century. It was first published, with a Latin

version and copious notes, by Jacobus Golosynas (Go-

defrozi) (Geneva, 1643, 4to); and was reprinted with the

other ancient Greek ecclesiastical historians by Hen-

ricus Valesius (Vehubio Valvis) (Paris, 1673, fol.) and by

Reading (Cambridge, 1720, fol).

3. Νομοκονομος or Νομοκονομος, Nomocanon, of, No-

morion, of, Nomonomos, of, Canones Ecclesiasticorum

et Legum Imperiiustitum de Ecclesiasticis Disciplina

Concilii a. Harmonicia. This work, which bears am-

sible testimony to the extraordinary legal attainments of

its author, is arranged under fourteen τίτλοι, Tituli, and

was prefixed to a Συντομία τῶν συνόδων, Συ-

νομομ Συνομογονα, or collection of the Canones of the apos-

tles and of the ecclesiastical councils recognised by the

Greek Church, compiled from Photius; from whichcir-

cumstance it is sometimes called Προκομον, Prokonon.

It has been repeatedly published, with the commenta-

tories of Theophanes, who annotated it, in preference to similar works of an earlier date: it

appeared in the Latin version of Gentianus Hervetus

(Paris, 1651, fol.), and in another Latin version of Hen-

ricus Agyraeus (Basle, 1651, fol.), and in the original

Greek text with the version of Agyraeus, edited by

Christophorus Justellus (Paris, 1615, 4to). It was

reprinted, with the version of Agyraeus, in the Bibliotheca

Juris Canonici, published by Guillelmus Vellius and

Henricus Justellus (Paris, 1661, fol.), II, 785, etc. The

Nomocanon was annotated by several of the same

kinds of legal works mentioned by Photius, and by

several of the same authors.

4. Περὶ τῶν 3 οἰκουμενικῶν συνόδων, De Septem

Concilii Ecumenici. This piece, subjoined, with a Latin

version, to the Nomocanon in the Paris editions of

1615 and 1661, and often published elsewhere, is

really part of one of the Epitola of Photius, and is no-

ticed in our account of them.

5. Εντομοὶ, Epitola. There are extant a con-

siderable number of works of a similar character,

containing them are enumerated by Fabricius (Bibl.

Græc. xi, 11). It is much to be regretted that no com-

plete collection of them has been published. David

Heschelius subjoined to his edition of the Bibliotheca

(Augsburg, 1801, fol.), mentioned above, thirty-five let-

ters selected from a MSS. collection which had belonged

to Maximus Marginus, bishop of Cergo, who lived

about the end of the 16th century. One consolatory

letter to the nun Eusebia on her sister's death was pub-

lished by Conrad Rittershausius, with a Latin version,

with some other letters (Nürnberg, 1601, 8vo). Of this

the largest collection is that prepared with a Latin ver-

sion and notes by Richard Mountagu (Latinum Mon-

tagius), bishop of Norwich, and published after his

death (London, 1651, fol.). The Greek text was from a

MS. in the Bodleian Library. The collection comprehends

two hundred and forty-eight letters translated by the

bishop, and five letters supplied from the east by

Christianus Ravius, of which also a Latin version

by another person is given. The first letter in

Mountagu's collection is addressed to Michael, prince

of the Russians, and is a letter which is not now

found to have formed a third part (Proetas, to Porson's

edition). The Lexicon of Photius was first published,

from Continental MSS., by Goethebus Herrmannus (Leip-

gre, 1688, 4to). It formed the third volume of a set,

of which the first two volumes contained the MS. lexi-

con to Joannes Zonaras. The publication of the Lex-

icon of Photius
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icon was followed by that of a Libellus Animadversionum od Photii Lexicon (Leips. 1810, 4to), and Curae Noticiorum exc. Appendit Notarum et Emendationum in Photii Lexicon (Leips. 1812, 4to), both by J. Fried. Schleuenter. But the edition of Hiermann having failed to satisfy the wants of the learned, an edition from a transcript of the Codex Galaeus, made by Porson, was published after the death of that eminent scholar (Lond. 1822, 4to and 8vo).

(Comp. Edin. Res. xxxi, 299, etc. No. 42, July, 1813, Class. 1. c. 1.)

7. Amphilochia. Amphilochia. This work, which Al- latius, not a friendly censor, declared to be "a work filled with vast and varied learning, and very needful for theologians and expositors of Scripture," is in the form of answers to certain questions, and is addressed to Amphilochius, archbishop of Cyrus. The answers are said in one MS. (apud Fabricius, Bibl. Græc. xi, 26) to be two hundred and ninety-seven in number; but Mont- fauccon (l. c.) published an index of three hundred and eight, and a Vatican MS., according to Mai (Script. Vet. Nova Collectio, vol. i, Proleg. p. xxxix), contains three hundred and thirteen. Of these more than two hundred and twenty have been published, but in various fragmentary portions (Mai, l. c.). The first portion which appeared in print was in the Lectiones Antiquae of Cani- sius, vol. ii. p. 722, and is signed by a Latin version, by Franciscus Turrianus, of six of the Quaestiones; but the work to which they belonged was not mentioned. In the subsequent edition of the Lectiones by Bassage (Amst. 1725, 4to, vol. ii, pt. ii, p. 246, etc.), the Greek text of five of the six was added (the original of the sixth seems never to have been discovered), as well as the Greek text of a seventh Quaes- tio, De Christi Voluntatisse Gnomica, of which a Latin version by Turrianus had been published in the Actu- arium Antiquarum Canisii Lectiunum de Jesuit Petrus Stewartius (Incolae Græc. 1716), without notice, that it was from the Ampliolum. Further additions were made by Combeba, in his SS. Patrum Amphi- locii, etc., Opera (Paris, 1644, 2 vols. fol.) (by a strange error he ascribed the work not to Photius, but to Amphilochius of Iconium, a much older writer, from whose works he supposed Photius had made a selection), and in his Novum Auctarium (Paris, 1648), 2 vols. fol.; by Montfauccon, in his Bibliotheca Coelestium (Paris, 1715, fol.); and by Jo. Justus Spier, in Wittgenbergiani Anmerkungen über theologische, philosophische, historische, pothecariae Specimenes Anthologiae, etc., vol. ii. (Harl. Intro. in Historiae Lingue Græc. Supplem. ii, 47). But the principal addition was made by Jo. Chr. Wolff, of forty-six Quaestiones, published, with a Latin version, in his Curae Philologicae (Hamb. 1725, 8vo), vol. ii., which was reprinted in the Bibliotheca Patrum of Galland (Venice, 1778, fol.), vol. xiii. A further portion of Eighteen Questions, under the title Ece των Φωτιον Αμπλιλοχίων των, Ex Photii Amphilochiis quaestionum, was published, with a Latin version, by Angelus Antonius Schottius (Naples, 1617, 4to); and a second portion, one of twenty Quaestiones, with a Latin version by Mai, in his Scripturum Vetern Nova Collectio, i, 193, etc., and another of a hundred and thirty Questions, in i, x, i, etc. As many of the Questions were more extracts from the Epitoma and other published works of Photius, Mai considers that with these and with the portions published by him, the whole of the Ampliolum has now been published. He thinks (Scriptor. Vet. Nova Collect. vol. i, Proleg. p. xl) that the patriarch, towards the close of his life, compiled the work from his own letters, homilies, commentaries, etc., and addressed it to his friend Amphilochius, as a mark of respect, and not because the questions which were solved had actually been proposed to him by that prelate; and he thus accounts for the identity of many passages with those in the author's other writings.

8. Admiranda Manichaeos et Paulicenios Libri Quattuor. No Greek title of the whole work occurs, but the four books are respectively thus described: 1. Διήγησις της Μανιατικής αναβασισμάτων, Narratio de Mani- cheismi recepta repellendis. 2. Κατά της και λόγιας των Μανιατικῶν, Dicta et dictationes Manichaeorum. 3. Ταύτης των Μανιατικῶν εἰς, Photii Sermo III. 4. Κατά της των Μανιατικῶν ἀργύρων πλανής, Αρουρία τήν ἀγωνίαν μοναχοῦ προσβεβλητήν και ἑγομένην τῶν ἱερών, Contro repellendam Manichaorum errores, et, in Arsenium Monachum Sanctorum Predications et Præ- spectum Sermoonum. The title of the second book is con- sidered by Wolff to apply to the second, third, and fourth books, which formed the argumentative part of the work, and to which the first book formed a historical introduction. The second book is intended to show that the same God who created spiritual intelligences also created the bodies with which they are united, and the material world generally; the third vindicates the divine origin of the Old Testament; and the fourth reiterates some points of the second and third books, and answers the objections of the Paulicians. The first book has several points in common with his historical work of Petrus Siculo on the same subject, so as to make it probable that one writer used the work of the other, and it is most likely Photius availed himself of that of Petrus. This important work of Photius was prefixed in an Ancedot. Græc. vol. i, and Fabricius, Bibl. vili, 829x; xi, 18), but they were prevented from death from fulfilling their purpose. Montfauccon published the first book, with a Latin version, in his Bibli- theca Coelestium (p. 845, etc.); and the whole work was given by Jo. Christoph. Wolff, with a Latin version and notes, in his Ancedota Graeca (Hamb. 1722, 12mo), vols. i, ii, from which it was reprinted in vol. xiii of the Bibliotheca Patrum of Galland (Venice, 1779, fol.). A sort of epitome of this work of Photius is found in the Panoplia of Euthymius Zigabenus. Oudin contended that the work of Metropoles of Smyrna, on the Mani- chaeans and on the Holy Spirit, was identical with this work of Photius; but this opinion is erroneous.

9. Κατά της τῆς παλαιας Ὀρθος ὅτι ἐν Πατριαρ- μαύνου εσιτερίζεται τὸ Πάντα τὸ ἄμα πάντα καὶ τὸ ἔξω. Adversus Latinos de Processione Spiritus Sancti a solo Patre. This work is incorporated in the Greek text of the Panoplia of Euthymius Zigabenus (Tergovist. 1710, fol. p. 112, 113), of which it constitutes the thirteenth rixvo section. It is omitted in the Latin versions of Photius. The author proves, by means of a number of synecologic propositions, which are quoted and answered seriatim in the De Unione Ecclesiarum Oratio I, of Jo- annes Vescus, published in the Grecia Orthodoxa of Allatius (Rome, 1632, 4to), i, 154, etc. It is apparently the work entitled Contra Manichaeos de Compendiario de Processione Spiritus Sancti a solo Patre.

10. Ὁμλογία, Homilia. Several of these have been published: (1) Ἐκφρασις τῆς ἀγαθῆς τῆς ἔνωσις τῆς ἡμῖν ἀληθείας τῆς θεοῦ ἡμᾶς ἡμῶν τῶν Μακεδῶν αἰσθανομένης, Descriptio Nova Sacramenti Dei in Patribus Graecis. (2) Εἰς τοὺς ἑτέρους ἑρωδοτο- done extracta; a discourse delivered on the day of the dedication of the church described. It was first printed by Lambebus, in his notes to the work of Georgius Codinus, De Origines Coptorum (Paris, 1635, fol.), p. 167, and is contained, with a Latin version, in the Beirut reprint of Codinius (1829, 8vo). It is also contained in the Origines Coptorum Manuscript of Combeba in Auctorium Novum (Paris, 1648, fol.), vol. i, col. 1583, and in a Latin version, in his Bibliotheca Patrum commis- soriae (Paris, 1602, fol.). Both text and version are repeated in his Bibliothecher in Patrum (3. 2.) In Sepulturarum Domini; a fragment, probably from this, is given by Mai (Script. Vet. Nova Collect. Pro-
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(5. 4.) Πως τού μεν δύον πρὸς τὸν λοιπόν ιοσαρίσιον έχειν, θαυμάσσει ουδεποτέ ουδεποτέ (Vita Photii) έλεος Μολομοσσίως αττητικίως. This piece, which is perhaps not a homily, but the fragment of a letter, was published in the Eclogae Graecae Monumenta of Cotelierus, and has already been noticed in speaking of the Epitome of Photius. 11. Εκκλησία τίνα εἴτε τίνας τίνας απειραίως, Interrogationes decem sive totidem Responsoriius, s. Συναγωγή και αποδίκης ακρίβες συνηγγραμμένα τινὰς συνεδρίων και συναντησιων γράφων τὶς ισπανοὺς και ῥωμανους και λοιπὸν ἀληθείας ἐπιστολὰς τοὺς ψεύτης καὶ τὸν τὸν Θριάμβον της Θριάμβου τῆς Επίσκοπος καὶ Μεταποιείς καὶ τῆς καθολικῆς αὐτοκράτορος Quaestiones ex Synodica et Historica Monumenta excerpta. This piece was published, with a Latin version and notes, by Francesco Fontani, in the first volume of his Novae Eruditorum Deliciae (Florence, 1766, 12mo). The notes were such as to give considerable offence to the stricter Romanists. (Mai, Scriptor. Vet. Nov. Collect. Proleg. ad vol i. p. xlv.)

12. Κύθνῳ τῶν οὖν καρπῶν, In Locum Expositioes. Some brief scholia on the Gospel of Luke from MS. in the British Museum; and the first of three in the volumine Scriptorum Veterum Nova Collecta of Mai, p. 189, etc., but from which of Photius' works they are taken does not appear.

13. Canonica Responsa, addressed to Leo, archbishop of Calabria; also published, with a Latin version, by Mai (Med. p. 969), from a Palimpsest in the Vatican Library.

Many works of this great writer still remain in MS.: 1. Commentarius in D. Pauli Epistolam, a mutilated copy of which is (or was, according to Cave) in the public library at Cambridge. It is largely cited by Eusebius. 2. Catena in Psalmo, formerly in the Cossilian library, of which, according to Montfaucon, died in the Bibliotheca, p. 58, 59, Photius appears to have been the compiler. But the Commentary on the Prophets, Prophetae Liber, ascribed to him by Cave, Fabricius, and others, appears to have no real existence; the supposition of its existence was founded on the misapprehension of a passage in Possidinius' Apparatus Sacer (Mai, Proleg. ut sup. p. 1.). 3. Homiliae XIV, extant in MS. at Rome, of the subjects of which a list is given in the American Antiquarian Society. Nine are extant in the Bibliotheca at Paris; and three in an ancient Barberini MS. at Rome. The latter are described by Mai (Proleg. p. xlvii) as of moderate length, and written in pleasing verse. Some Epigrammata of Photius are said to be extant (Montfaucon, Bibl. Cossin. p. 239); but the Syriac, in Methodius C.Pol., said to be given in the Acta Sanctorum, Junii, i. 969, is not to be found there. 4. Εὐδοκία τῶν πρακτικῶν τῶν ἑκάστου εὐκοσμούντων συνεδρίων, Epitome Actuum Conciliorum septem Generationum. Nine are extant in the Bibliotheca at Paris; two in the Bibliotheca at Florence; and two or three in the Bodleian Library at Oxford. They are as different from the published piece (No. 4, above). Some critics have doubted whether it is different from the similar work ascribed to Photius of Tyre; but as this prelate lived in the time of the third or fourth councils, he could not have epitomized the Acts of the 6th, 6th, and seventh. Thus the Epitome cannot be by Photius of Tyre, whatever doubt may be as to its being the work of our Photius.

5. The Synopsis Canonum has already been mentioned in speaking of the Nomocanon. 6. Περὶ τῆς τοῦ ἀγίου κατακεραυνούμενος ἤτοι Δαμασκίνου, In Spiritum Sancti Diviæ Aegypti, s. Peri τοῦ ἄγιου καὶ διακριτοῦ καὶ παρεμποροῦντος Πνεύματος, Liber de Spiritu Sancto, addressed to a bishop Bedas, and different from the published work (No. 9). It is described by Mai, who has given some extracts (Proleg. p. xlvii), as "liber luculentus, varius, profundus. It is ascribed to one MS., but by an obvious error, to Metrophanes Smariosus.

8. Τὰ παρὰ τῆς ἑκκλησίας τῶν αὐτῶν αἰτίας μεταξύ, Adversus Latinorum Ecclesiæ Criminalia Particulares. 9. Contrae Franciæ et Latino (ibid. p. xlviii); a very short piece. Various other pieces are mentioned by Cave, Lambrius, Fabricius, and Mai, as extant in MS.; but some of these are only fragments of the published works (ibid. p. i) enumerated by mistake as separate works. The work in Catalogi Aristoteles, now or formerly extant in Vienna and Paris, is apparently a part of the piece mentioned by Cave in connexion with the works of Eusebius, andreligion aliis necessarissi Quaestiones ex Synodica et Historica Monumenta excerpta. This piece was published, with a Latin version and notes, by Francesco Fontani, in the first volume of his Novae Eruditorum Deliciae (Florence, 1766, 12mo). The notes were such as to give considerable offence to the stricter Romanists. (Mai, Scriptor. Vet. Nov. Collect. Proleg. ad vol i. p. xlv.)

12. Κύθνῳ τῶν οὖν καρπῶν, In Locum Expositioes. Some brief scholia on the Gospel of Luke from MS. in the British Museum; and the first of three in the volumine Scriptorum Veterum Nova Collecta of Mai, p. 189, etc., but from which of Photius' works they are taken does not appear.

13. Canonica Responsa, addressed to Leo, archbishop of Calabria; also published, with a Latin version, by Mai (Med. p. 969), from a Palimpsest in the Vatican Library.

Many works of this great writer still remain in MS.: 1. Commentarius in D. Pauli Epistolam, a mutilated copy of which is (or was, according to Cave) in the public library at Cambridge. It is largely cited by Eusebius. 2. Catena in Psalmo, formerly in the Cossilian library, of which, according to Montfaucon, died in the Bibliotheca, p. 58, 59, Photius appears to have been the compiler. But the Commentary on the Prophets, Prophetae Liber, ascribed to him by Cave, Fabricius, and others, appears to have no real existence; the supposition of its existence was founded on the misapprehension of a passage in Possidinius' Apparatus Sacer (Mai, Proleg. ut sup. p. 1.). 3. Homiliae XIV, extant in MS. at Rome, of the subjects of which a list is given in the American Antiquarian Society. Nine are extant in the Bibliotheca at Paris; and three in an ancient Barberini MS. at Rome. The latter are described by Mai (Proleg. p. xlvii) as of moderate length, and written in pleasing verse. Some Epigrammata of Photius are said to be extant (Montfaucon, Bibl. Cossin. p. 239); but the Syriac, in Methodius C.Pol., said to be given in the Acta Sanctorum, Junii, i. 969, is not to be found there. 5. Εὐδοκία τῶν πρακτικῶν τῶν ἑκάστου εὐκοσμούντων συνεδρίων, Epitome Actuum Conciliorum septem Generationum. Nine are extant in the Bibliotheca at Paris; two in the Bibliotheca at Florence; and two or three in the Bodleian Library at Oxford. They are as different from the published piece (No. 4, above). Some critics have doubted whether it is different from the similar work ascribed to Photius of Tyre; but as this prelate lived in the time of the third or fourth councils, he could not have epitomized the Acts of the 6th, 6th, and seventh. Thus the Epitome cannot be by Photius of Tyre, whatever doubt may be as to its being the work of our Photius. 6. The Synopsis Canonum has already been mentioned in speaking of the Nomocanon. 7. Περὶ τῆς τοῦ ἀγίου κατακεραυνούμενος ἤτοι Δαμασκίνου, In Spiritum Sancti Diviæ Aegypti, s. Peri τοῦ ἄγιου καὶ διακριτοῦ καὶ παρεμποροῦντος Πνεύματος, Liber de Spiritu Sancto, addressed to a bishop Bedas, and different from the published work (No. 9). It is described by Mai, who has
PHOTIUS or TYRE, another Eastern ecclesiastic, flourished near the middle of the 6th century. On the deposition of Ireneus, bishop of Tyre, in A.D. 448, Photius was appointed his successor. Evagrius (Hist. Eccles., i, 10) makes the deposition of Ireneus one of the acts of the notorious Council of Ephesus, held in A.D. 449, and named as the "Concilium Lactacianum;" but Tillemont more correctly considers that the council only confirmed the previous deposition (Mémoires, xv, 268). Photius of Tyre was one of the judges appointed by the emperor Theodosius II, in conjunction with Eustathius, bishop of Berytus, and Uranias, bishop of Himera in Sicily, to hear the charges against Ibas, bishop of Edessa. Photius, Eustathius, and Uranias met at Berytus, and Photius and Eustathius again met at Tyre, in the year 448 or 449, heard the charges, acquitted Ibas, and brought about a reconciliation between him and his accusers, who were presbyters of his own Church at Edessa (Concil. vol. iv, col. 627, etc., ed. Labbe; vol. ii, col. 505, etc., ed. Hardouin). There is a considerable difficulty as to the chronology of these meetings, which is discussed by Tillemont in two of his careful notes (Mém. xx, 897, etc.). Photius was present at the Council of Chalcedon, known as the "Concilium Lactacianum," where he joined in acquitting the archimandrites Eutyches, and restoring him to his ecclesiastical rank from which he had been deposed (Concil. vol. iv, col. 260, ed. Labbe; vol. ii, col. 220, ed. Hardouin). About the same time Photius had a contest with Eustathius, bishop of Berytus, who had obtained an edict of the emperor Theodosius II, erecting Berytus into a metropolitan see, as to the extent of their respective jurisdictions. Tillemont judges that the dignity accorded to the see of Berytus was designed to be merely titular, and that the struggle was occasioned by the attempt of Eustathius to assume metropolitan jurisdiction over some bishops previously under the jurisdiction of Tyre. In this attempt, being supported by the patriarch Anastasios of Constantinople and Maximus of Antioch, he effected his purpose; and Photius, after a struggle, was constrained, not so much by an excommunication, which was speedily recalled, as by a threat of deposition, to submit. The jurisdiction of the dioceses abraded was, however, restored to Photius by the Council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451 (Concil. vol. iv, col. 509, etc., ed. Labbe; vol. ii, col. 455, ed. Hardouin). Photius was among those who at the same council voted that Theodoret was orthodox, and should be restored to his see (Concil. col. 619, ed. Labbe; col. 495, ed. Hardouin). He also took part in some of the other transactions of the assembly. Nothing further is known of him. There is extant one piece of Photius, entitled Ἀποκεφαλή, Proces s. Supplev. Libellus, addressed to the emperors Valentinian III and Marcian, respecting the dispute with Eustathius of Berytus. It is given in the Acta Quarta of the Council of Chalcedon (Concil. vol. iv, col. 514, etc., ed. Labbe; vol. ii, col. 436, etc., ed. Hardouin). A Synopsis de Concilia, extant in MS., is ascribed to Photius of Tyre: this cannot be, as some have supposed, the same work as the Epitome Actorum Conciliorum, also extant in MS., and ascribed to the more celebrated Photius, patriarch of Constantinople. See Tillemont, Mém. l. c.: Cave, Hist. Lit. ad ann. 451, i, 443; Fabricius, Biblioth. Græc. x, 678; xii, 538; Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog., and Mythol. s. v.

Photicsomboloi (φωτισμούσιοι, enlightened), a term frequently used among the early Christians to denote the baptized as being initiated in the mysteries of the Christian religion. See Phos.

Phrat. See Euphrates.

Phrenology (from φρέν, the mind, and λόγος, a discourse), an empirical science, which claims to rest on the vital peculiarities of individuals by means of the external developments of the skull. It had its origin with Franz Joseph Gall, a physician of Vienna, who first made it generally known by Dr. Spurzheim, of the same country, and by George and Andrew Combe, of Scotland. In this country it has been chiefly popularized by the late L. N. and O. S. Fowler. There is a sprightly periodical, called the Phrenological Journal, published in New York, devoted to its advocacy. In accordance with its theory of the special functions of particular portions of the brain, it has mapped out the cranium into various "organs," as amativeness, philoprogenitiveness, etc., in the animal order; ideality, veneration, etc., in the animal and vegetable; figure, time, motion, etc., in the perceptive, and so on. It has largely been used by itinerant lecturers as a method of indicating the character of unknown persons, somewhat after the fashion of fortune-telling. Its claims to scientific value are not generally admitted by sound physiologists and mental philosophers, as neither its craniological nor its psychologico-anatomical theory and analysis agree with the best settled principles of either of those departments of self-knowledge. Its theological bearings are decidedly materialistic. For a fuller exposition the reader is referred to the works of the writers above cited. See also Psychology.

Phrontisterion (φροντιστήριον, a place of meditation), a name anciently applied to a place of retreat as being peculiar to meditation and schools of learning. Baptisteries were also occasionally called by this name, the catechumens being there educated in religious truth.

Phrygia (Φρυγία, perhaps from φρύγιος, hence parcelled), an inland province of Asia Minor, bounded on the north by Bithynia and Galatia, on the east by Cappadocia and Lycaonia, on the south by Lycia, Pisidia, and Isauria, and on the west by Caria, Lydia, and Myra. Perhaps there is no geographical term in the New Testament which is less capable of an exact definition. Many maps convey the impression that it was co-ordinate with such terms as Bithynia, Cilicia, or Galatia. But in fact there was no Roman province of Phrygia till considerably after the first establishment of Christianity in the peninsula of Asia Minor. The word was rather ethnological than political, and denoted, in a vague manner, the western part of the central region of that peninsula. Accordingly, in two of the three places where it is used, it is merely a term not intended to be precise (κατὰ διάφορα τῆς Φρυγίας καὶ τῆς Γαλατακῆς χώρας, Acts xvi, 6; εὑρίσκομενος κατὰ θύρας τῆς Γαλατακῆς χώρας καὶ Φρυγίας, Acts xviii, 23), the former having reference to the second missionary journey of St. Paul, the latter to the third. Nor is the remaining passage (Acts ii, 10) inconsistent with this view, the enumeration of those foreign Jews who came to Jerusalem at Pentecost (though it does follow, in some degree, a geographical order) having no reference to political boundaries. By Phrygia we must understand an extensive district, which extended its boundaries to several Roman provinces, and varying portions at different times. In early times Phrygia seems to have comprised the greater part of the peninsula of Asia Minor. It was subsequently divided into Phrygia Major on the south, and Phrygia Minor or Epicetus (acquired) on the north-west. The Romans divided the province into three districts: Phrygia Salutaris on the east, Phrygia Pacatiana on the west, and Phrygia Katakekaumene (the burnt) in the middle. The country, as defined by the specified limits, is for the most part level, and very abundant in corn and vines. It had a peculiar and celebrated breed of cattle, and the fine rawen-black wool of the sheep around Laodicea on the Lycus was in high repute. The Meander and the Hermus were its chief rivers. The Phrygians were a very ancient people, and are supposed to have been, along with the Galatae and the Phrygians, the aborigines of Asia Minor. Jews from Phrygia were present in Jerusalem at the
PHYGrians or Cataphrygians (q. v.), a sect in the 24th century B.C., called Pythagoras, the country of Phrygia. They were orthodox in everything, setting aside this, that they took Montanus for a prophet, and Priscilla and Maximilla for true prophetesses, to be conscripted in everything relating to religion; as supposing that the Holy Spirit had abandoned the Church. See Montanism.

Phthas or Phthas, the supreme god of the ancient Egyptians, in the first four dynasties or successions of kings, extending about 3215 years. This god seems, however, in later times to have been degraded from his high position and become a secondary god. No image of this, nor indeed of any other god or goddess, is found upon the most ancient Egyptian monuments. The worship of Phthas passed from Egypt into Greece, and was altered into Hephaestus. "When, in later times," says Mr. Osborn, in his Religions of the World, "pictures and images of the gods made their appearance on the ruins of ancient Egypt, Phthas was represented as a tall youth, with handsome features, and a green complexion, denoting the swarthy, sallow hue which the burning sun of Africa had already impressed upon the skins of Phut and his descendants. He was swathed in white linen like a mummy to denote that he had been dead, but his hands had burst through the wrappings, and grasped many symbols, to denote that he has risen again. This god is made the son of many divine parents, according to the later fables, both of the monuments and of the Greek authors, most of them prompted by political motives: but not on the monuments of all epochs. The image of Phthas of Memphis is enclosed in a shrine, to denote that he claimed affinity with no other god, and that his real parentage was unknown or forgotten.

Phthartodocceus (from φθάρτος, destructible, and θοι, to seem). One of the numerous Monophysite sects. They were so called because they maintained that the body of Christ was truly corruptible before his resurrection. They opposed to another sect which affirmed that the body of Jesus was rendered incorruptible in consequence of the divine nature blended with it: these were called Aphthartodocceus, Phantasia, etc., and were likewise divided into parties, some of which debated whether the body of Christ was created or uncreated. See APHTARTODECEUS; MONOPHYSITES.

Phthartolatreo (φθάρτολατρευo, to worship), a term of reproach applied to the Severians (q. v.) in the 6th century, who maintained that Christ's body was corruptible of itself, but by reason of the Godhead dwelling in it was never corrupted.

Phud (Φυός), an incorrect Greek form (Jud. ii. 23) of the Heb. name (Ezek. xxvii, 10) Phut (q. v.).

Phurah (Heb. Perah, דַּבֶּר, bongh; Sept. Phaep), the servant of Gideon, who went with him by night to spy the camp of the Midianites (Judg. vii, 10, 11). I.C. 1362.

Phurmim (Esth. xi. 1). See PERIM.

Phut (Heb. פּוֹעָת, פְּעַת; Sept. Phoós or Phóur, but usually Ἐβρος, and so Josephus, Ant. i. 6, 2), the name of a people mentioned in connection with Miriam and Cush as third among the descendants of Ham (Gen. x. 6; "Put", 1 Chron. i. 8), elsewhere applied to an African country or people (Jer. xlvi. 9; Ezek. xxvii, 40; xxx v; xxxviii, 5; "Put", Nah. iii, 9. Comp. also Jud. ii, 28, in the Greek and Syriac). In all of these passages Phut or Phut is named with Cush, Ludim, and, Lumb. Putites served in the Egyptian army (Jer. l. c.; comp. Ezek. xxx, 6), and the Tyrian name (Exod. xxxvii, 20, and are numbered among the army of Gog (Ezek. xxviii, 5). Josephus (Ant. i. 6, 2) understands here the Mauritanian. He also mentions a river bearing the same name, in the territory of the Mauri, which is called Put by Flury (p. 342, ed. Hart.), and flows into the Atlantic. Ptolemy (iv. 1, 2) calls it Phokhoun (long. 74°, lat. 30°S), in Mauritania Tingitana (comp. Michael. Spicil. i. 160 sq.). These traces of the name, however, are not needed. That it is a name of Libya is sufficiently obvious from the Sept. in Jeremiah and Ezekiel, and from the fact that Ptolemaic is a Coptic name for Libya in Egypt—that is, for that part of Lower Egypt which lies west of the Canopic mouth of the Nile, so called (see Gesen. Thesaur. ii, 1093).

More recently Hitzig would identify with Put the tribe of Potyig, mentioned in the inscriptions at the tomb of Darius, and refers to Putes (Hieroc.), a city on the west bank of the river, in northern Africa (Ptol. iv. 8, 30). But no weight can be given to his remark that a people which served in the Egyptian army in foreign expeditions must not be sought in Western Africa—Winer. ii, 229. See LIMYA.

"In the above geographical lists Pthas, Phut, and Miriam, and precedes Canaan. The settlements of Cush extended from Babylonia to Ethiopia above Egypt, those of Miriam stretched from the Philistine territory through Egypt and along the northern coast of Africa to the west; and the Canaanites were established at first in the land of Canaan, but afterwards were spread abroad. The order seems to be ascending towards the north: the Cushite chain of settlements being the most southern, the Mirzaite chain extending above them, though perhaps through a smaller region, at least as far as the Canaanites holding the most northerly position. We cannot place the tract of Phut out of Africa, and it would seem that it was almost parallel to that of the Mirzaite, as it could not be farther to the north: this position would well agree with Libya. But it must be recollected that the order of the nations or tribes of the stocks of Cush, Miriam, and Canaan is not the same as that we have inferred to be that of the principal names, and that it is also possible that Phut may be mentioned in a supplementary manner, perhaps as a nation or country dependent on Egypt. The Hebrew names in the Bible clearly indicate, as already remarked, a country or people of Africa, and it must be added, probably not far from Egypt. It is noticeable that they occur only in the list of Noah's descendants and in the prophetic Scriptures. Isaiah probably makes mention of Phut as a remote nation or country, where the A. V. has Put, as in the Masoretic text (Isa. lxvi, 19). Nahum, warning Nineveh by the fall of No-Amon, speaks of Cush and Miriam as the strength of the Egyptian city, and Phut and Lubim as its helpers (iii. 9). Jeremiah tells of Phut in Nebuchadrezzar's war with Cush and Ludim (xlv. 9). Ezekiel speaks of Phut with Persia and Land as supplying mercenaries to Tyre (xxvii, 10), and as sharing with Cush, Lud, and other helpers of Egypt, in her fall (xxx, 5); and again, with Persia, and Cush, perhaps in the sense of mercenaries, as warriors of the army of Gog (xxxviii, 5). From these passages we cannot infer anything as to the exact position of this country or people; unless indeed in Nahum, Cush and Phut, Miriam and Lubim, are respectively connected, which might indicate a position south of Egypt. The serving in the Syrian army, and impact of Phut to Egypt, make it reasonable to suppose that its position was very near.

"In the ancient Egyptian inscriptions we find two names that may be compared to the Biblical Phut. The tribes or peoples called the Nine Bows, IX Petu or
IX Na-Petu, might partly or wholly represent Phut. Their situation is doubtful, and they are never found in a geographical list, but only in the general statements of the power and prowess of the kings. If one people be indicated by them, we may compare the Naphthuhi of the Bible. See Naphthuhi. It seems unlikely that the Nine Bows should correspond to Phut, as their name does not occur as a geographical term in use in the directly historical inscriptions, though it may be supposed that several well-known names there take its place as those of individual tribes; but this is an improbable explanation. The second name is that of Nubia, To-per, "the region of the Bow," also called Tomeru-per, "the region, the island of the Bow," where we conjecture the name of Merioneth to come. In the geographical lists the latter form occurs in that of a people, Ana-meru-per, found, unlike all others, in the lists of the southern peoples and countries as well as the northern. The character we read Pet is an unstrung bow, which until lately was read Kene, as a strung bow is found following, as if a determinative, the latter word, which is a name of Nubia, perhaps, however, not including so large a territory as the names before mentioned. The reading Kene is extremely doubtful, because the word does not signify bow in Egyptian, so far as we are aware; and still more because the bow is used as the determinative of its name Pet, which from the Egyptian usage as to determinatives makes it almost impossible that it should be employed as a determinative of Kene. The name Kene would therefore be followed by the bow to indicate that it was a part of Nubia. This subject may be illustrated by a passage of Herodotus, explained by Mr. Harris, of Alexandria, if we may premise that the unstrung bow is the common sign, and, like the strung bow, so used as to be the symbol of Nubia. The historian relates that the king of the Ethiopians unstrung a bow, and gave it to the messengers of Cambyses, telling them to say that when the king of the Persians could pull so strong a bow so easily he might come against the Ethiopians with an army stronger than their forces (iii, 21, 22, ed. Rawlinson: Sir G. Wilkinson's note). For the hierarchical names, see Brugsch, Geogr. Inscr. ii, 15. The Coptic Piphaitat must also be compared with Phut. The first syllable being the article, the word nearly resembles the Hebrew name. It is applied to the western part of Lower Egypt beyond the Delta; and Chompet, the Egyptian conjectures it to be the Libyan or part of Egypt, so called by the Greeks, comparing the Coptic name of the similar eastern portion, Phypabia or Tapapia, the older Arabic part of Egypt and Arabic Nome (L'Egypte sous les Pharaons, ii, 28-31, 243). In this sense we would connect it with Naphthuhi than to Phut. To take a broad view of the question, all the names which we have mentioned may reasonably be connected with the Hebrew Phut; and it may be supposed that the Naphthuhi were Mizraites in the territory of Phut, perhaps intermixed with peoples of the latter stock. It is, however, reasonable to suppose that the Pet of the ancient Egyptians, as a geographical designation, corresponds to the Phut of the Bible, which would therefore denote Nubia or the Nubians, the former, if we are strictly to follow the Egyptian usage. This identification would account for the position of Phut after Mizraim in the list in Genesis, notwithstanding the order of the other names; for Nubia has been from remote times a dependency of Egypt, excepting in the short period of Ethiopian supremacy, and the longer time of Ethiopian independence. The Egyptian name of Cane, Khes, is applied to a wider region well corresponding to Ethiopia. The governor of Nubia in the time of the Pharaohs was called Prince of Kesh, perhaps because his authority extended beyond Nubia. The identification of Phut with Nubia is not repugnant to this conception; on the contrary, the great importance of Nubia in their time, which comprehended that of the Ethiopian supremacy, would account for their speaking of Phut as a support of Egypt, and as furnishing it with warriors. The identification with Libya has given rise to attempts to find the name in African geography, which we shall not here examine, as such mere similarity of sound is a most unsafe guide.

The name of Pitha, the chief deity of Memphis, has been considered by some Egyptologists to be the hieroglyphic transcription of Phut, the son of Ham, whose descendants were named in the names of the Libyan desert, as is demonstrated by the circumstance that the country named after Phut, in the Hebrew, is translated Libya by the Sept. (see Gesenius, Lexicon, s. v. פיתא). "The name Phut, in its change to Pitha," says Osnabruck, "has undergone an extraordinary process, highly characteristic of the modes of thought that prevailed in very ancient times. Written with the final a, which may be added to a Hebrew word without altering the sense, it represents the consonants of the verb 'to reveal,' which in the Coptic sense is 'to write hieroglyphics.' A still stranger use has been made of this pun upon the name of Phut. His animal representative has been named after the sacred dog, and there is a direct antagonism with that of the human original. The hieroglyphic name of the bull Apis, ḫp, is the Coptic verb ḫet, 'to hide,' which is a mere transcription of the ancient verb ἁφή, ἁφεῖν, with the same meaning. The comparison of the two groups renders this contrast very apparent. It will be seen that one group is as nearly as possible an inversion of the other. Both the names are in like manner in the state of exesis. In the bull Apis, therefore, were concealed the attributes which were revealed in Pitha" (Mon. Hist. of Egypt, ch. v).

Some late Egyptologists, however, regard Pet as a merely Egyptian pronunciation for Pa-un (Bunbury, Egypt, ii, 204), which is in direct antagonism with that of the human original. The hieroglyphic name of the bull Apis, ḫp, is the Coptic verb ḫet, 'to hide,' which is a mere transcription of the ancient verb ἁφή, ἁφεῖν, with the same meaning. The comparison of the two groups renders this contrast very apparent. It will be seen that one group is as nearly as possible an inversion of the other. Both the names are in like manner in the state of exesis. In the bull Apis, therefore, were concealed the attributes which were revealed in Pitha" (Mon. Hist. of Egypt, ch. v).

Phu'vah (Heb. פועסח, פועס, פועש, Sept. Φωυχα), the second named of four sons of Issachar (Gen. xlvi. 13). B.C. 1900. This name is also written "Pusa" in the A.V. (Numm. xxxvi. 23), and "Puesch," margin "Pruvah." (1 Chron. vii. 1). His descendants are called "Punites" (Numm. xxxvi. 23).

Phygel'ius (τός, φυγελίας, perh. s. fagevī), a Christian of Asia, who being at Rome during Paul's imprisonment, deserted him in his necessity (2 Tim. i. 15). A.D. 64. "It is open to question whether this repudiation of the apostle was joined with a declension from the faith in the doctrine of Christ, Excl. Apostles, ii, 310), and whether the open display of the feeling of Asia took place—at least so far as Phygelius and Hermogenes were concerned—at Rome. It was at Rome that Oneiphorus, named in the next verse, showed the kindness for which the apostle spoke in his blessing on his household in Asia: so perhaps it was at Rome that Phygelius displayed that change of feeling towards Paul which the apostle's former followers in Asia avowed. It seems unlikely that Paul would write so forcibly if Phygelius had merely neglected to visit him in his captivity at Rome. He may have forsaken (see 2 Tim. i. 16) the apostle at some critical time when his support was expected; or he may have been a leader of some party of nominal Christians at Rome, such as the apostle describes at an earlier period (Phil. i, 15, 16) opposing him there?" (Dean Alford, on 2 Tim. i. 15). In accordance with the ancient Greek commentators as to the exact force of the phrase 'they which are in Asia,' states various opinions concerning their aversion to Paul. The apostle himself seems to have foreseen it (Acts xx, 30); and there is nothing in the fact inconsistent with the general picture of the loss of Asia at a later period which we have in the first three chapters of the Revelation.

Phylactery (φυλακτήρος), a receptacle for safe
The slip is rolled up, put inside, tied with white and well-washed hairs of a calf or cow, generally obtained from the tail, and put into the box; a flap connected with the brim is then drawn over the open part and sewed firmly down to the thick leather brim, in such a manner as to form a loop on one side, through which passes a very long leather strap (נשף), wherewith the phylactery is fastened to the arm.

Phylactery for the Arm.

The box of which the phylactery for the hand (_pushqat) is made has on the outside to the right the regular three-pronged letter Shin, being an abbreviation for הַלּוֹ, the Almighty, and on the left side a four-pronged letter Shin (Sabbeth, 28 b). In the inside are four cells, in which are deposited four slips of parchment, whereon are written the same four passages of Scripture as on the one slip in the phylactery for the hand. The box is closed in the same manner, and a thong passes through the loop with which it is fastened to the head.

The phylacteries, like the Mesuah, i.e. the scrolls on the door-posts, must be written in Hebrew characters, while the law may be written in Greek (Mishna, Megila, i, 6). Every Jew, from the time that he is thirteen years of age, when he is considered a member...
of the long leather strap three times around his middle finger, and the remainder around the hand, saying, "I will betroth thee unto me forever, yea, I will betroth thee unto me in righteousness and in judgment, and in loving-kindness, and in mercy, and thou shalt know the Lord" (Hos. ii. 19).

There is no special canon about the size of the boxes (םִנְיִי) which contain the slips, and thus constitute the phylacteries. They are generally made an inch and a half square, and are worn during morning prayer, except on Sabbaths and festivals, because these days belong themselves a sign (תָּמִיד) require no other sign or pledge (Maimonides, ibid. iv. 10). The pious Jews who are engaged in the study of the law, and in meditations, also wear them during these hallowed engagements; they make the phylacteries a little larger than the ordinary ones to give more space, and hence more distinctness to every letter and word composing the writing inside, and walk with the phylacteries on from one place to another. The hypocrites among the Pharisees imitated this, and made their phylacteries more than ordinarily large, so as to make them conspicuous and visible to any one at a distance, thereby to indicate that they were praying or in holy meditation, which our Saviour rebuked (Matt. xxiii. 5). If the phylacteries are written by an infidel they must be burned; and if written by a Samaritan, an informer, a slave, a woman, or a minor, it is unlawful and must be burnt up (Maimonides, ibid. i. 13). The Sadducees wore the phylacteries on the forehead or brow, and on the palm of the hand (Maimonides, ibid. iv. 8).

3. Origin and Design of the Phylacteries—It is the unanimous voice of Jewish tradition that the phylacteries are enjoined in Exod. xiii. 9, 16; Deut. vi. 8; xi. 18. It is true that Rashbam and Ahen-Ezra (on Exod. xiii. 9), who are followed by De Lyra, Calvin, bishop Patrick, H. Michaelis, Keil, etc., take the passages in question in a figurative sense. But against this the advocates of the usage urge that—(1.) It is inconceivable that the same declaration should be used four times figuratively, there being no parallel for such a usage throughout the whole Pentateuch. (2.) In two cases out of the four (Deut. vi. 9; xi. 20), the injunction is immediately followed by the command about the mezuzah, which is generally admitted to be literal [see Mezuza], and it is against all sound rules of exegesis to take one command in a figurative and the other in a literal sense. (3.) In every one of the four instances wherein the injunction is given, the expression הָנָךְ is used, which in all other passages of Scripture invariably denotes a visible sign, given either to attest an event or doctrine stated, or to forego passage, and at the same time to have remembrance. Now, on the supposition that the whole commandment is to be taken figuratively, it would be no sign whatever, and the term הֶשְׁכֵּר could not have been substituted for the technical expression הָנָךְ, as it is in Exod. xiii. 9. (4.) The end of the external action enjoined in the first clause of Exod. xiii. 9 is immediately introduced in the second clause by הָנָךְ, "that the law of the Lord may be in thy mouth," whereas, as Philo unnecessarily remarks, the simple command "thou shalt remember" would be required if the preceding words had the same internal figurative meaning. (5.) It was a common custom in ancient days for those who engaged in military service, or devoted themselves to the worship of a special deity, to be marked either on the forehead or on the head, or on both (Veges. de Mit. ii. 5; Herod. ii. 113; Lucian, De Igr. Dec. 59; Agost. Rev. vii. 281 sqq.). Thus the high-priest, as being especially consecrated to the service of Jehovah, had inscribed in the plate on the front of his head "Holiness to the Lord" (Exod. xxvii. 8), the ordinary servants of Jehovah were commanded to have a mark (Ezek. ix. 4, 9), and the gathering of Israel we are told that even the horses shall have written upon their bells "Holiness to the
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Lord" (Zech. xiv. 20); while the worshippers of the breast are represented as bearing his inscription on their foreheads and arms (Rev. vii. 3; xiii. 16-18; xiv. 9-11; xvi. 2; xix. 20; xx. 4). The Moaemon, Nusaireh and Bedawin Arabs, to the present day, either tie, or have tattooed, on their arms or the brow, the terms of the Tephillin, of the Koran. It was therefore natural that the Moaemon law, which forbids tattooing (Lev. xix. 28), should appropriate, for the service of the Most High, the innocent and generally prevailing custom, which the law-giver could not eradicate, of wearing ornamental tokens with inscriptions declaring that they belonged to Jehovah, and that the Lord is their Releemer. This universal custom would of itself be sufficient argument for taking the injunction in its literal sense, even if we had not the support of the ancient versions and the undeviating practice of the synagogue; and be it remembered that even the Sadducees, who rejected tradition and adhered to the simple meaning of the law, also wore phylacteries. As to the phrase "οὗτος ὁ ἐκ τῆς ἐδιδακτος us not to the "external front of the breast," but the tabulet which the ancients wore on their hearts. It is the same as αὐθηρία, which so frequently occurs in the Mishna (comp. Ked. xiv. 5, 6), and which the Targum and the Romanos Pugillares. This tabulet, when made of wood, was called τιμάλιον (Sir. xvi. 8; Habak. ii. 2); when of metal, it was termed ἡμετήρας (Sir. viii. 1), and when it was made of stone it was denominated θυρύρα ν. The argument of Spencer, that because the Sept. renders ἤπειρον αὐθηρίαν, and not φαλάκρινα, therefore this version did not understand it literally, "inter eos (qui legem illam sensu tantum metaphoricum exponendum consentent) LXX cum primum notandi venient, qui quod in Moesi est ἄθροιζεν ἐποιεῖ φαλάκρινα s. d. αὐθηρίαν translaturum" (De Leg. Hebr. ritus lib. iv. c. 2), ignores the fact that φαλάκρινα is a term which obtained at a much later period as an equivalent for ἦπειρον. Josephus, too, who like all the ancient and modern Jews takes the injunction literally, does not render ἦπειρον by φαλάκρινα. (Ant. iv. 8, 13). The fact is, that in very early days there was no fixed and technical term for these fringes. Hence Herzelf (Gesch. des Volkes Israel, ii. 223) has pointed out that the phylacteries are mentioned in 2 Kings xi. 12, where the high-priest is said to have put upon Joash "the crown and the ἄθροιζας and the ἀνάκαθις and the Tephillin and the Targum" supposes that the Tephillin are meant by ἄθροιζας (Isa. viii. 16). The injunction about the phylacteries was so generally observed among the Jews after the Babylonian captivity, that the writers of them found it most lucrative business. Hence we are told that "twenty-four fast days were ordained by the Great Synagogue, in order that the writers of the scrolls of the law, the phylacteries, and the mezuzah, might not grow rich, inasmuch as they were not allowed to write on these days" (Peschmich, 50 b). In harmony with the designation of the phylacteries, Maimonides propounds their utility, when he remarks: "The sacred influence of the phylacteries is very great; for as long as one wears them on his head and arm he is obliged to be meek, God-fearing, must not suffer himself to be carried away by laughter or idle talk, nor indulge in evil thoughts; but must turn his attention to the words of truth and uprightness." (Kitto). Not only would the later appendages, being regarded more or less in the light of amulets, engender superstition, has led interpreters generally to view the sacred injunction as a spiritual or figurative precept. This is the opinion of the Karaites, Goezeus, Schottgen (Her. Hist. i. 196), Rosenmuller, Hengstenberg (Pent. i. 486 sqq.), and most others. In Matt. xxiii. 5 only they are called φαλάκρινα, either because they tended to promote observance of the law (αὐθηρίαν ἐχεῖν τὸν Θεὸν, Just. Matt. Dial. c. Typh., p. 205, for which reason Luther happily renders the word by Dendeketel), or from the use of them as amulet (Lat. probat, Gr. ἁμαρτανέσθαι, John, xix. 35). Φαλάκρινα is the ordinary Greek word for an amulet (Plutarch, ii. 878 B, where φαλ = the Roman bull), and is used apparently with this meaning by a Greek translator (Ezek. xxiii. 18) for Διόνυσος, cushions (Rosenmuller, Schol. ad loc. i; Schleusner, Lex. in N. T.). Jerome (on Matt. xxiii. 5) says they were thus used in his day by the Persians, and he adds that the Christians in Persia and India invented certain Christian "mulicurae" for similar use of the Gospels ("παραμάνωσι, ἐπειδὴ ὁ Προερ. στὸν Ἰ. (comp. Chrysost. Hom. in Matt. 78). The Koran and other sacred books are applied to the same purpose by this day (Hottinger, Matt. Orient. i. 8, p. 301; De summis Orient. xvii s. q.). "The most esteemed of all Chessas is a Mūshaf, or copy of the Koran," Lane, Mod. Egypt. i. 388). Scaliger even supposes that phylacteries were designed to supersede those amulets, the use of which had been already learned by the Jews in Egypt. See AMULET. There was a spurious book called Phylact. Angelorum, where pope Gelasius evidently understood the word to mean "amulets," for he remarks that Phylactria ought rather to be ascribed to devils. In the holy places they were expressly forbidden by pope Gregory ("Si quis . . . phylactria usus fuerit, anathema sit," Sixt. Senens. Bibl. Sanct. p. 92; comp. Can. 86, Conc. Lat.). The expression "they make broad their phylacteries" (παραμάνωσι τὰ φαλάκρια τοῦ Θεοῦ, Matt. xxiii. 5) refers not so much to the broadening itself, which is as if it has been of a prescribed breadth, as to the case of the (παραμάνωσι) in which the parchment was kept, which the Pharisees (among their other pretentious customs, Mark vii. 3, 4; Luke v. 33, etc.) made as conspicuous as they could (Reland, Antiq. ii. 9, 15). Missed probably by the term παραμάνωσι, and by the mention of the ἄθροιζα, or fringe (Numb. xv. 38, Sept. μεμορφανον παραμάνωσι εἰς τα κράσια τῶν τερεμῶν) in connection with them, Epiphanius says that they were ἐπίστραμα παραμόρφωσεν, like the Romanos Pugillares, or the stripe on a Diocletian cloak (τὰ διέριζε τα τοποφορηματα φαλάκρινα εἰς ὄλους τοὺς ζευγαριδίους μοιομολογούς, c. Hier. iv. 38, Sixt. Sen. L. c.). He says that these purple stripes were worn by the Pharisees with fringes, and four pomegranates, that no one might touch them, and hence no one knew their name (Reland, Antiq. ii. 9, 15). But that this is an error is clearly shown by Scaliger (Elsch. Trikar. viii. 66 sqq.). It is said that the Pharisees wore them always, whereas the common people only used them at prayers, because they were considered to be even holier than the γυαλι, or golden plate, on the priest's tiara (Exod. xxviii. 86), since that had the sacred name once engraved, but in each of the Tephillin the tetragrammaton recurred twenty-three times (Carpov, App. Critic. 196). Again the Pharisees wore the tephalides above the elbow, but the Sadducees on the palm of the hand (Goodwyn, l. c.). The modern Jews only wear them at morning prayers, and sometimes at noon (Leo of Modena, l. c.). In our Lord's time they were worn by all Jews, except the Karaites, women, and slaves. Boys, when (at the age of thirteen years and a day) they become γυαλι, are taught (sons of the commandments), were bound to wear them (Baba Berac. fol. 22, 1, in Glossa), and therefore they may have been used even by our Lord, as he was by no means discommended their abuse. The suggestion was made by Scaliger (l. c.), and led to somewhat idle controversy. Lightfoot (Hor. Heb. ad Matt. xxiii. 5) and Otho (Lob. Rob. p. 636) agree with Scaliger, but Carpov (l. c.) and others strongly deny from this belief that the entire use of phylacteries arose from an error.
The rabbins even declared that God wore them, arguing from Isa. lix. 8; Deut. xxxiii. 2; Isa. xlix. 16. Perhaps this was a pious fraud to induce their use; or it may have had some mystic meaning (Zohar, pt. ii, fol. 2; Carpoz, c. c.), but the rabbins disapproved the application of them to charm wounds or to lull children to sleep (Ibid. Leg. 253; Maimonides, De Idol. ii). He who wore them was supposed to prolong his days (Isa. xxxvi. 18), but those who did not was doomed to perdition, since he thereby broke eight affirmative precepts (Maimonides, Tracth. iv, 26). We have a specimen of this style of interpretation in the curious literalism of Kimchi's comment on Ps. i. 2. Starting the objection that it is impossible to meditate in God's law day and night, because of sleep, domestic cares, etc., he answers that for the fulfillment of the text it is sufficient to wear tephillins! In spite of these considerations, Justin (Dial. c. Tract. L. c.), Chrysostom, Euthymius, Theophylact, and many moderns (Baumgarten, Comm. i, 479; Winer, a. v. Phylact.), prefer the literal meaning. It rests, therefore, with them to account for the entire absence of allusion to phylacteries in the O. T. The passages in Proverbs (ut sup.) contain no such reference, and in Ezek. xxxvi. 17, "עון" means not a phylactery (as Jarchi says), but a turban (Genan. Theurun. p. 1889).


Phylllobia (from φύλλον, a leaf, and βιβλίον, to throw), a custom which existed among the ancient heathen nations of throwing flowers and leaves on the tombs of the dead. The Greeks were wont to lie on his funeral bed as if asleep, wearing a white robe and garland, the purple pall half hidden by numerous chaplets, and so was carried out to his burial before the dawn of day. The Romans, deriving the custom from the Greeks, covered the bier and the funeral pile with leaves and flowers. It is in an ancient custom in certain parts of England in our day to spread flowers on and around the body when committing it to the coffin. In Wales also, when the body is interred, females hasten with their aprons full of flowers to plant them on the grave. The practice of connecting flowers with the dead seems to have been of great antiquity, for an Egyptian of high rank was wont to be carried to his sepulchre in a sarcophagus adorned with lotus, had his tomb decked with vases and vases, and in great quantity covered with acacia leaves and flowers. The use of such occasions was no doubt connected with the idea of life after death.

Physician (σαφτός, rophé, a curer; iatropo). Among the Hebrews, as among the ancients generally, medical remedies (Exod. xxi. 19) were early (comp. Pliny, xxix, 5) dispensed by a special class, who probably derived their skill from the Egyptians (Gen. i. 1; comp. Herod. ii, 84; i. 1, 59; Jos. i. 39; 2 Kgs. ii. 14, 25; ii. 21; 1 Kgs. iv. 11; 5, 35), and eventually medical practitioners could be found even in the smaller cities of the land (Josephus, Life, 72; comp. Ant. xiv, 13, 10). Their remedies consisted mostly in salves (especially balsam, Jer. viii. 22, xlii. 11, ii. 8); comp. Prov. Alpin. Med. xiv. 118 sq.; and Luke x. 24; Mithus, Subb. xxiv. 4; including the oil, Josephus, War, i, 38, 5; Mithus, Berachoth, i, 2); leaves (Ezek. xxvii. 12, plasters (e. g. aqo, 2 Kings xx. 7); comp. Pliny, xxiii, 83; Strabo, xv, 718), and bathing in mineral springs (Josephus, Ant. xvi. 6, 5; Life, 16; War, i, 38, 5; ii. 21, 6); comp. John v. 2), or in flowing streams (2 Kings v. 10). Internal nostrums are again and again recommended in the Talmud (see the Mithus, Subb. xxiv. 3, xxvi. 11; Joma, viii, 6); in the Old Test. honey only is mentioned (Prov. xvi. 24), which still holds a conspicuous place among medicinal compounds in the East. Specimens of the Jewish prescriptions may be seen in Lightfoot on Mark v. 26 (the formula of the Recipe in Toorah). Surgical operations are mentioned in the Mithus (Subb. xxii. 5, 6; Chebuli, ii. 4; comp. Subb. vi. 5). Great curative virtue was attributed to anemias (Mithus, Subb. vi. 2, 10), incantations, charms, the touch of certain individuals, and other superstitions of a like character (2 Kings v. 11 (comp. Rosenmüller, Morgenst. iii. 227)); Josephus, Ant. xvi. 5, 11; especially in cases of hypochondria it suppose demonic possession. See Ant. iii. 7. DOMONIAC.

The priests (Luke xii, 14) were appointed by the law (Lev. x. xii) the civil health-warriors, not so much for the cure as for the inspection of the sick, or of persons suspected of certain maladies, and the instructions given to them, especially respecting endemic diseases, exhibit

Ancient Egyptian Doctors (or Barbers?) and Patients.

mous for their medicines (Odysse, iv. 229). Their aid was at first made use of, as among common people at all times, for surgery, and in the hospitals (and in medicine (Exod. i. 15: the "stools," "Αίματα," there spoken of were, according to Gesenius, Thea. Heb. p. 17, benches or seats on which the parturient females were seated; but the word, see Studien u. Krif, 1834, p. 81, 625, 641; 1842, p. 1048, will scarcely bear this signification, for, see Ewald, Gesch. Jer. i. 481, and Lengerke, Kenan, p. 387) were regularly employed (see Kall, De obliterat., matron. Heb. in Rph. Hambl. 1746). In later times Hebr. prescriptions obtained, which the prophets sometimes applied (2 Kings iv. 21; v. 10; viii. 7, xx; 7, xxvi. 19; which cases, although miraculous, excise the custom of seeking relief from that class of person); mostly for external injuries or complaints (Isa. i. 6; Ezek. xxx. 21; 2 Kings viii. 29; ix. 13), but sometimes for internal maladies (2 Chron. xvi. 12), and even for mental diseases (1 Sam. xvi. 16; comp. Josephus, Ant. vii. 2, 5); but these never reached any extensive degree of science (see Buxtorf, Lex. Chald. s. v. ΜΕΝ). The resort to physicians was very general before and especially after the exile (2 Chron. xvi. 12; Jer. viii. 22; Sir. xxxviii. 1; Mark v. 26; comp. Luke iv. 29; v. 21; viii. 43; see John vi. 2; 21, 6); and eventually medical practitioners could be found even in the smaller cities of the land (Josephus, Life, 72; comp. Ant. xiv, 13, 10). Their remedies consisted mostly in salves (especially balsam, Jer. viii. 22, xlii. 11, ii. 8); comp. Prov. Alpin. Med. xiv. 118 sq.; and Luke x. 24; Mithus, Subb. xxiv. 4; including the oil, Josephus, War, i, 38, 5; Mithus, Berachoth, i, 2); leaves (Ezek. xxvii. 12, plasters (e. g. aqo, 2 Kings xx. 7); comp. Pliny, xxiii, 83; Strabo, xv, 718), and bathing in mineral springs (Josephus, Ant. xvi. 6, 5; Life, 16; War, i, 38, 5; ii. 21, 6); comp. John v. 2), or in flowing streams (2 Kings v. 10). Internal nostrums are again and again recommended in the Talmud (see the Mithus, Subb. xxiv. 3, xxvi. 11; Joma, viii, 6); in the Old Test. honey only is mentioned (Prov. xvi. 24), which still holds a conspicuous place among medicinal compounds in the East. Specimens of the Jewish prescriptions may be seen in Lightfoot on Mark v. 26 (the formula of the Recipe in Toorah). Surgical operations are mentioned in the Mithus (Subb. xxii. 5, 6; Chebuli, ii. 4; comp. Subb. vi. 5). Great curative virtue was attributed to amulets (Mithus, Subb. vi. 2, 10), incantations, charms, the touch of certain individuals, and other superstitions of a like character (2 Kings v. 11 (comp. Rosenmüller, Morgenst. iii. 227)); Josephus, Ant. xvi. 5, 11; especially in cases of hypochondria it suppose demonic possession. See Ant. iii. 7. DOMONIAC.
a very careful observation, and afford apt and accurate symptoms. See LIPPMANN; PLAGUE. For the priests themselves, who, in consequence of being obliged to perform their services barefoot, were often liable to catch cold (see Kall, morbus sacerdotium, 1745), a special physician (medicus vicarius) was (in later times) appointed at the Temple (Lightfoot, p. 781). The priests must have obtained considerable anatomical knowledge (comp. the Talmudic abstract on osteology in the Mishna, Kolokoto, i. 9) from the daily slaughter of the animal sacrifices. On the subject generally, see Börner, Diss. de statu medicina ap. vet. Ebr. (Viteb, 1735); Lindingler, De Hebr. et. arte medicina (1774); Spengel, De medicinis Ebraior. diss. (Hal. 1789); comp. Schmidt’s Bibl. Medicum (Tull. 1745); also Norberg, De medicinis Arab. (in his Opusc. acced. iii. 404 sq.); Wundt, Biblisch-talmudische Medizin (Riga, 1859).

See MEDICINE.

The superstitious credulity of modern Orientals as to curative means is proverbial, and has been proved by all travelers. The Arabs are ready to put faith in almost any Frank as a professional “medicine man” or khan (literally “wise man”), as they term all physicians. Prescriptions of all sorts are at once taken by them, however absurd; but they are generally unwilling to exercise the patience, care, self-restraint, and especially the cleanliness necessary to the duties of medicine. They expect sudden and immediate restoration, and invariably prefer extraordinary to simple remedies. All this is in keeping with the supernatural character of the no- trons ordinarily employed by them. Indeed, fatalism being the basis of Mohammedanism, a resort to direct divine power might naturally be expected. See Superstition.

“IT is a very prevalent notion among the Christians of Egypt that the Muslims are enemies to almost every branch of knowledge. This is an erroneous idea; but it is true that their studies, in the presence of war, are confined within very narrow limits. Very few of them study medicine, chemistry (for our first knowledge of which we are indebted to the Arabs), the mathematicas, or astronomy. The Egyptian medical and surgical practitioners are mostly barbers, miserably ignorant of the sciences which they profess, and unskillful in their practice; partly in consequence of their being prohibited by their religion from availing themselves of the advantage of dissecting human bodies. But a number of young men, natives of Egypt, are now receiving European instruction in medicine, surgery, anatomy, surgery, and other sciences, for the service of the government. Many of the Egyptians, in illness, neglect medical aid, placing their whole reliance on Providence or charms. Alchemy is more studied in this country than pure chemistry, andastrology more than astronomy” (Lane, Mod. Egypt., i. 239).

Physiognomy (from φυσις, nature, and γνωμον, an index), a method, rather than a science, of discovering the human character by means of the features, especially of the countenance. To some extent this is instinctively practiced, as all have learned to read the natural language of the tones, expression, gesture, etc., which sometimes accompany our emotions. There can be no doubt also that passions or states of mind habitually indulged imprint themselves upon the lineaments of the face, and so become an indication of character. But when it is claimed that this is invariably the case, and that it may be reduced to fixed rules of interpretation which will serve as an unerring guide, the principle becomes proverbially deceptive. Laverter is especially famous for his fanciful scheme on this basis; and by Campe the so-called “facial angle” was relied on for determining the comparative intellectual capacity of individuals; but experience has demonstrated the fallacy of all such arbitrary systems of physiognomy.

Physiology (from φυσις, nature, and λόγος, a discourse), the science of the animal constitution, especially in man. This branch of self-knowledge is evidently of the highest temporal importance, and lies at the basis of the practice of medicine. Modern education has recognized its claims by incorporating it among the common-school studies; and few of the coming generation, it is hoped, will be so ignorant as to labor under the popular delusions and superstitions to which its neglect in former ages has led.

PIAGGIA, TERAMO or ERASMO (also called Teramo di Zogoli), an Italian painter, was born at Zogoli, in the Genoese state, near the beginning of the 16th century. He was a friend of Giovio Brera, and died at Genoa in 1547. In conjunction with Antonio Semini he painted several pictures for the churches at Genoa, the most esteemed of which is an altar-piece of the Martyrdom of St. Andrea, in the church of that saint. Lanzi says: “None can witness this very beautiful altar-piece without seeing traces of Bra’s style, already enlarged and changed into one more modern.” He also painted several pieces by himself, at Genoa and at Chiavari.

PIASNENIC, JEAN JACQUES, a French canonist, was born in 1730 at Mur-de-Barrez (Aveyron). Being received as a lawyer in the Parliament of Paris (1747), he formed a connection with Claude Mey, one of the supporters of Jansenism, and both gave a great number of consultations and took a very active part in the affairs of the Jansenists. When one of the councils of public law and jurisdiction, the other gave himself entirely to practice relating to benefices. Although Pienses lost his sight in 1768, he lost nothing of his zeal for the cause which he maintained, and M. Dupin says, “There is no counsellor in the world who dictated more consultations.” He died in Paris Aug. 4, 1789. Unforeseen changes in ecclesiastical matters have rendered his works useless; they are, Traité de la Collation des Bénéfices (Par. 1754 and 1755, 5 vols. 12mo.) — De la Provisoire de la Cour de Rome à l’âge de Préséance (2 vols. 12mo.) — De la Succession, du Découlo et des Voeux (Paris, 1757, 5 vols. 12mo.) — De l’Incapacité des Grands (1758, 6 vols. 12mo.) — Des Commerces et des Réserves (3 vols. 12mo.) — Des Réparations et Reconstructions des Églises (Par. 1762, 4 vols. 12mo.; 1788, 5 vols. 12mo., ed. given by Camus). The first volume (the only one which appeared) of the Histoire de la Fête de la Conception is attributed to Piasnes. See Journal Chérétien (1758 and 1759); Camus et Dupin, Biblioth. chioise des Livres de Droit; Picot, Mémoires Ecclé. tom. iv; Feller, Dict. Hist.—Hoefler, Nouw. Dig., Générale, s. 32.

PIANO, GIOVANNI MARIA DELLE (called IL Molinaretto), a Genoese painter, was born at Genoa in the year 1660. According to Ratti, he studied under GIO. Battista Gaulli, whose style he adopted, and distinguished himself by some excellent works which he executed for the churches at Genoa, but more by the excellence of his portraits. Lanzi highly extolls his Decollation of St. John the Baptist, at Sestri di Ponente. He also says that he was particularly excellent in portraits, and that Genoa is full of his works in this branch. He was also invited to Parma and Piacenza, where he furnished the court with portraits, and executed some works for the churches. He was afterwards invited to Naples by king Charles of Bourbon, who appointed him his painter, with a liberal pension, and he continued in this service till his death in 1745.

PIARISTS is the name of a Roman Catholic order which was founded by St. Joseph Calasanza or Calasan- tius, a Spanish nobleman and priest, at Rome in 1607, and was approved by pope Gregory XV in 1622 as a congregation of regulated clergy, under the name Pitrae scholasticorum pueri novum, but under the name of the order itself Pitrae scholasticorum pueri novum, but under the name of the order itself. Paul V was the first pontiff to give encouragement to the work of this new celebrated order. Until that time
Calasanz labor at Rome only, and was so remarkably successful in getting children for instruction under himself and his associates that his work was gladly accepted as that of a religious order by 1622. Calasanz was the first general of the congregation, and under his management it spread through Poland, Germany, Italy, and other countries. In 1680 the Frariesta had 38 houses in Germany, 29 in Italy, 82 in Hungary, 14 in Poland, and at least 2 in Spain. In Italy they have since been suppressed; and the only country in which the Frariesta conduct, at present, educational institutions of note is the Austro-Hungarian monarchy. In Cis-Lithuanian Austria, in 1570, they had 29 houses with 276 members; included in which were 4 under-gymnasia. The Frariesta take in their orders the usual monastic vows, a fourth—that of free instruction of youth. Pope Innocent XII granted them the privileges of the Begging Monks. Their dress is a long, black coat, like the overcoat of the Jesuits, and a mantle like theirs. At the head of the congregation stands the general, who is elected for six years, and to whom are subject the generals of the different societies or countries in which the order prevails. (J.H.W.)

PIAZZI, Girolamo Bartoloméo, an Italian Dominican, was born in the first quarter of the 17th century. He was highly esteemed by his confreres, and was at one time judge of the Inquisition. But the cruelty and injustice of the Roman Ultramontanists caused him to withdraw from the Church of Rome. He went over to England, and was admitted into the Church of England. He lived there many years at Cambridge, and died there about 1745. He is the author of A Short and True Account of the Inquisition and its Proceedings, as it is Practised in Italy, set forth in some Particular Cases (Engl. and Fr. Lond. 1729). See Quelch and Échard, Scriptores ordinis Predicationis, s.v.

PIAZZA, Paolo (commonly called Padre Cosimo), was born at Castelfranco, in the Venetian territory, in 1557. He studied under the younger Palma, and Baglioni commends him as one of his best pupils. He did not follow the style of his master, but adopted one of his own, which, though not distinguished by great richness in color or energy, was graceful and pleasing, and gained him so much reputation that he was successively employed by pope Paul V., the emperor Rudolph II., and the doge Priuli. He executed many works, both in oil and fres~co, for the churches and public edifices of Venice, and other places. He was employed several years by the emperor Rudolph. Among his best works are the Descent from the Cross in the Campodoglio, and the History of Antony and Cleopatra in the Palazzo Borghese at Rome. After Piazza had acquired distinction, he joined the Benedictine friars, and took the name Padre Cosimo, by which application he is usually known. He died at Venice in 1621.

PIAZZETTA, Giovanni Battista, one of the most celebrated of the later Venetian painters, was born in 1682. According to Zanetti, he was instructed in the rudiments of the art by his father, a reputable sculptor in wood, and afterwards became the pupil of Antonio Molinari. His first style was distinguished for a clear and brilliant tone of coloring, but on visiting Bologna he employed himself with Spagnoletto; and by diligently studying the works of Guercino, he imitated his strong contrasts of lights and shadows, and boldness of relief, with considerable success. Lanzi says it is supposed that he had long observed the effects of lights applied to statues of wood and images of wax, and by this means he was enabled to draw with considerable judgment and exact precision the several parts that are comprehended in the shadowing; owing to which art his designs were eagerly sought after, and his works repeatedly engraved by Pitteri, by Pelli, and by Monaco, besides many other masters in Germany and elsewhere. His method of coloring, however, diminished in a great measure the chief merit of his pictures. His shades have increased and changed, his lights sunk, and his tints become yellow; so that there remains an inharmonious and unformed mass. There are a great number of his pictures in good preservation: as the Dedication of St. John the Baptist, in the church of that saint at Padua, placed in competition with those of the first artists in the state, and at that period esteemed best of all. Yet if we follow him closely we will not fail to displeasure us by that coldness in color, and in the lights and yellows, and by that rapidity of hand called, by some, spirit, though to the judicious it often appears neglect, as if the artist were desirous of abandoning his task before it was completed. He executed many chalk drawings, which were greatly valued. He also executed a few plates from his own designs. He died at Venice in 1754. See Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, ii., 690.

PIAZZI, Callisto, an Italian painter, was born at Lodi, and flourished from 1624 to 1656, as appears from
to her. Herodotus considers the goddess Bubastis to be the same as Artemis (ii, 137), and that this was the current opinion in Egypt in the Greek period is evident from the name Seps Artemidos of a rock temple dedicated to Peis, and probably of neighboring city or village. The historian speaks of the festival of the goddess held at Bubastis as the chief and most largely attended of the Egyptian festivals. It was evidently the most popular, and a scene of great license, like the great Moslem festival of the Seyf el-Badawi celebrated at Tanteh in the Delta (ii, 59, 60).

There are scarcely any historical notices of Bubastis in the Egyptian annals. In Manetho's list it is related that in the time of Boethos, or Bochos, first king of the 22d dynasty (B.C. cir. 2281), a chaos of the earth opened at Bubastis, and many perished (Cory's Ancient Fragments, 2d ed. p. 98, 99). This is remarkable, since, though shocks of earthquakes are frequent in Egypt, the actual earthquake is of very rare occurrence. The next event in the list connected with Bubastis is the accession of the 22d dynasty (B.C. cir. 990), a line of Bubastite kings (ibid. p. 124, 125). These were either foreigners or partly of foreign extraction, and it is probable that they chose Bubastis as their capital, or as an occasional residence, on account of its nearness to the military settlements. See Migdol. Thus it must be presumed that in the aspect of the majestic city Bubastis foretold its doom: "The young men of Aven and of Pi-bezet shall fall by the sword: and these [cities] shall go into captivity" (XXX, 17). Helopolis and Bubastis are near together, and both in the route of a vast in-river from the East marching against Memphis. Bubastis was situated on the west bank of the Nile, or Bubastite branch of the Nile, about forty miles from the central part of Memphis, and was the principal town of the Bubastite nome (Pliny, Hist. Nat. v, 9; Ptolemy, iv, 5). Herodotus speaks of its site as having been raised by those members of the gods who dug the Nile, and afterwards by the labor of criminals under Sesostris the Ethiopian, or, rather, under the Ethiopian dominion. He mentions the temple of the goddess Bubastis as well worthy of description, being more beautiful than any other known to him. It lay in the midst of the city, which, having been raised on mounds, overlooked it on every side. An artificial canal encompassed it with the waters of the Nile, and was beautified by trees on its bank. There was only a narrow approach leading to a lofty gateway. The enclosure thus formed was surrounded by a low wall, and behind the inhabited city was the temple, surrounded by a grove of fine trees (ii, 137, 188). Sir Gardner Wilkinson observes that the ruins of the city and temple confirm this account. The height of the mounds and the site of the temple are very remarkable, as well as the beauty of the latter, which was "of the finest red granite." It was surrounded by a sacred enclosure, about 600 feet square, ... beyond which was a larger circuit, measuring 940 feet by 1200, containing the minor one and the canal. The temple is entirely ruined, but the names of Rameses II of the 19th and Amenophis IV (Doechon I) of the 222, and Nekht-har-heb (Nectanebo) I of the 30th, have been found here, as well as that of the eponymous goddess Baste. There are also remains of the ancient houses of the town, and, "amidst the houses on the N.W. side are the thick walls of a fort, which protected the temple below" (Notes by Sir G. Wilkinson in Rawlinson's Hierodotus, ii, 186, plan). Bubastis thus had a fort, besides being strong from its height. The city was taken by the Persians, who destroyed the walls (Diod. Sic. vi. 61); but it has some consideration under the Romans. It was near Bubastis that the canal leading to Arsinoe (Suez) opened to the Nile (Strabo, xvii, 806; Melas, i, 9, 9; Herod. ii, 138); and although the mouth was afterwards often changed and taken more southward, it has continued, to its first locality. The name of Tel el-Wadi commences in the vicinity of Tel Basta. This Tel

PIC, Jean, a young French Christian, suffered martyrdom for his devotion to the Protestant cause. He was born in 1546, and flourished at Tournay. Together with his friend, Hugo Destailleur, accused of heresy, they were imprisoned; when they were released, no one would allow them to publish their writings; and when they attempted to do so, they were imprisoned and finally executed. This was in 1565. The details of their lives and deaths are recorded in *Traité de la Liberté de la Conscience* and the *Biographie Universelle*, s.v.

PICARD, Jean (2), a French humanist, was born in Beaufort in 1516. He was a regular canon of St. Victor, in Paris. He died in 1567. He wrote a number of works, including *De rebus egestatis* (Paris, 1610, 8vo), *De theologia* (Amsterdam, 1612, 8vo); and *De vita et moribus* (Paris, 1615, 4to). His works were edited by the life and historical notes, and that of the *Oeuvres de St. Bernard* (Paris, 1615, fol.). See Morey, *Dict. Hist.* s.v.; Papillon, *Dictionnaire de Bourgogne*, s.v.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Générale*, xlv, 47.

PICARD, John. See PICARDS.

PICARD, Mathurin, a French ecclesiastical who flourished in the early part of the 17th century. He was a curate of Moustier-Jourdain, in the diocese of Evreux. Picard is the author of a quaint book, which has become very rare, *Le Fouet des Paillardes, ou juste Punition des Voluptueux et Charmela* (Rouen, 1623, 12mo). He incurred the same accusers as Urban Grandier, and was doomed to the same penalty. His alleged crime was bewitching the nuns of Saint-Louis de Louviers, and sundry acts of profanation and debauchery. He was as tried after his death, his body was exhumed and burned at Rouen, in execution of a judgment rendered in 1647. See Frére, *Biographie* s.v.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Générale*, xlv, 48.

PICARDET, Charles N., a French priest, was born at Dijon near the beginning of the 18th century. Before the Revolution he was canon of Saint-Jean-Baptiste of Dijon, and prior of Neufly, near that city. He died about 1794. He left a number of works, *Essai sur l'Éducation des petits Enfants* (Dijon, 1745, 12mo) — *Les deux Abondomines* (ibid., 1779, 8vo) — and *Histoire météorologique, cosmologique, et économique pour l'Année 1785*. He had undertaken a considerable work, which, under the title of *Grande Aprologique*, was to contain the refutation of all heresies since the establishment of Christianity. See *Bibl. de la Contemp.*—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Générale*, xlv, 53.

PICARDS, a Christian sect of heretics which arose in Bohemia in the 15th century. John Picard, the founder of the sect, whence their name, drew after him men and women to whom he promised that he would restore them to the primitive state of innocence wherein man was created. With this pretense he taught them to give themselves up to all impurity, saying that therein consisted the liberty of the sons of God, and all those not of their sect were in bondage. He first published his attacks in Germany and the Low Countries, and persuaded many people to go naked, and gave them the name of *Adaminis* (q. v.), and accordingly he assumed the title of *New Adam*. After this he seized on an isal- and in the river Lauenze, some leagues from Tabou, the headquarters of Ziesca, where he established himself and his followers. His men were common, but none were allured, but they took them without much difficulty, so that when any man desired a particular woman he carried her to Picard, who gave him leave in these words: "Go, increase, multiply, and fill the earth." At length, however, Ziesca, general of the Hussites (famous for his victories over the emperor Sigismund), incensed at their abominations, marched against them, made himself master of their island, and put them all to death except two, whom he spared that he might learn their doctrine.

Such is the account which various writers, relying on the authorities of *Eneaus Silvius and Varillas*, have given of the Picards. Some, however, do profess to believe that there was not a sect of this denomination, chargeable with such wild principles and such wild conduct, ever existed. It appears probable that the reproachful representations of the writers just mentioned were calumnies invented and propagated in order to disgrace the sect generally because they deserted the communion and protested against the errors of the Church of Rome. Lutius gives us that Picard, together with forty other persons, besides women and children, settled in Bohemia in the year 1418. Baldinus, the Jesuit, in his *Epistola Peregrina* (Bohemiae, 1744), gives a similar account, and charges the Picards none of the extravagances or crimes ascribed to them by Sylvius, Schelc, secretary of Lalaiss, king of Bohemia, in his letters to Erasmus, in which he gives a particular account of the Picards, says that they considered the pope of Rome as the true antichrist; and the adorers of the consecrated elements in the eucharist as downright idol worshippers. According to this author, the Picards are Vaudois, who fled from persecution in their own country and sought refuge in Bohemia. Beaumont held the same opinion, on the ground that the Vaudois were settled in Bohemia in the year 1178, where some of them adopted the rites of the Greek, and others those of the Latin Church. The former were generally adhered to till the middle of the 14th century, when the establishment of the Latin rites caused great disturbance. At the commencement of the national troubles in Bohemia, on account of the opposition of the papal power, the Picards more publicly avowed and defended their religious opinions; and they formed a considerable body in an island in the river Launis, or Lauenze, in the district of Bechin, and, resorting to arms, were defeated by Ziesca. See Hardwick, *Hist. of the M. A. Church*, p. 456; Ref. p. 99; Mosheim, *Church Hist.* vol. ii.; and the references under ADAMITES (J. H. W.).

PICARD, de Bernard, a famous French engraver, was born at Paris in 1675. He was the pupil of Le Clerc. His best works are those executed in France. Having embraced the Reformed religion, he took up his residence in Holland. In Amsterdam, to which place he accompanied his father in 1687, he worked exclusively for the booksellers, and became renowned, metallic, and merely ornamental. A great many of his prints are from his own designs, in which he imitated the style of composition of Antoine Coypel. He had a facility in imitating the styles of other engravers, and he published many prints of this class which are said to have deceived collectors; Picard used to call them *Impostures innocents*, and they were published under this title, to the number of seventy-eight, with a list of his works (Amsterdam, 1788), after his death. His prints altogether amount to about 1800, and one of the best of them is a *Slaughtre of the Innocents*, after a design of his own: there are various impressions of it. He died in 1788. The French text which Picard's copper-plates were intended to illustrate was written by J. F. Bernard and Bernard de Monbrison. The first and best edition of the work in the original French is that of 1723-37; to which should be added *Supplement* (1748, 2 vols.), and *Superstitions, Anciennes et Modernes*. 
Picolomini, Giacomo, an Italian engraver, was born at Venice in 1517. It is not known by whom he was instructed. He engraved a set of thirty portraits of the principal painters of the Venetian school, for the account of their lives by Ridolfi, published in 1648. He also engraved a few plates after the Italian masters, among which must be named the Holy Family, after P. Liferi; Judith with the Head of Holofernes by her Foot, and The Holy Family, after Titian. His plates are executed in a stiff, disagreeable style. He was living in 1669.

Picolomini, Matteo, a painter and engraver, was born at Ancona, according to Nagler, in 1615. Little is known of him as a painter, save that he flourished at Rome, and was elected a member of the Academy of St. Luke in 1655. Lanzi says he was a fellow-student of Giovanni Antonio Galli. Bartsch gives a list of twenty-three prints by him, among which are the following: St. Luke painting the Virgin, after Raffaelle; The Adoration of the Shepherds, after Raffaelle; The Holy Family, after P. Veronese: The Virgin and Infant Jesus, with St. John, after A. Camassei; The Exposing of Moses in the Waters of the Nile, after A. Camassei.

Piccola, Nicola (or Nicola Lapiccola), a Sicilian painter, was born at Crotona, in Calabria Ulter, in 1730. He studied under Francesco Mancini at Rome, and acquired considerable reputation. He executed several works for the churches in that city, and decorated the cupola of a chapel in the Vatican, which was so much esteemed that it was afterwards copied in mosaic. Many paintings by Piccola are at Yaletri, but none of his works are specified. He died in 1790.

Picolomini, Alessandro, one of the most distinguished of Italian prelates of the 16th century, was born at Siena in 1508. He sprang from the same family as pope Pius II (q. v.), and by his piety, modesty, and scholarship gained great renown; but no events of his life are particularly remarkable. He is to be remembered for the wide extent of his writings, and the esteem in which they were held by his contemporaries and immediate followers. He died in 1578. He was of an original turn of mind, and his writings are almost all in Italian, so that he is among the earliest of those who endeavored to raise the character of vermicular literature by treating all branches of knowledge in modern tongues. His commentaries on Aristotle were prized for their good-sense, and for their abandonment of most of the scholasticisms by which that philosophy was disfigured by commentators. He advocated in 1578 the reform of the calendar, which was afterwards adopted. In his book on the fixed stars and the sphere he adopts the mode of designating the stars by letters—a small matter, but one which makes the greater part of the immortality ofayer, and to which the diagrams of Picocolumini establish his prior claim. His works are of a most miscellaneous character—astronomy, physics, comedies, sonnets, morals, divinity, and commentaries on Aristotle. De Thou speaks in strong terms of the rare union of diversity and depth which his acquirements presented. For a list of his most important works, and an estimate of them, see Fabiani, Vita d'Alessio Piccolomini (Vienna, 1749, 1759, 8vo); Ugelli, Italia Sacra, s. v.; Tiraboschi, Storia della letter. ital. vol. vii, pt. 1, p. 560; Nicéron, Mémoires, vol. xxii, s. v.—Hoefler, Nouv. Biogr. Général, s. v.
Padua, where he pursued his studies, he was condeolecule of Felix Peretti, who became pope under the name of Sixtus V, and who boasted of having worsened him in public disputation. He was promoted professor of philosophy at Siena, Macerata, Perugia (1560), and finally at Padua (1560). His advanced age compelled him, in 1601, to leave the latter city and retire to Siena. He strode both by his lessons and by his writings to restore the philosophy of Plato, and to show that it is compatible after all with the principles of Aristotle. He died at Siena in 1604. He left, **Universa philosophiae de moribus** (Venice, 1583, fol.); the editions of Frankfort (1601, 1611, 8vo) contain besides, under the title of *Comes politici, an answer to the attacks of Zabarella:* *Libri de scientia naturae V partibus* (Frankfort, 1597, 8vo), which is a treatise on natural philosophy: *De arte defiendi et elegantier discurrendi* (ibid. 1600, 4to); *Commentaria in Aristotelem De Ortu et Intersu, De anima et De Celo* (Mentz, 1606, 8vo); each of these commentaries was also published separately. - Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Générale*, xi, 67.

**Picolardi, Carlo** (1) called *The Elder,* an Italian painter, who, according to Zais, flourished at Cremona about 1600. He was of a patentric family, and a favorite pupil of Lodovico Carracci. He executed some works for the churches of his native city; and painted some burlesque histories which gained him considerable reputation. He died young.

**Picolardi, Carlo** (2) called *The Younger,* son of the preceding, was born about 1610. It is not known by whom he was instructed; but, after studying at Rome, he went to Venice, and formed a style of his own, Roman in design and Venetian in coloring. On his return to Cremona he executed some works for the churches and public edifices, but painted most for the collections. Lanzi says he was very successful in burlesque histories, in imitation of the elder Piccolardi. He died about the year 1650.

**Pichler, Alois, Dr.,** one of the most prominent Roman Catholic theologians of Germany, was born in 1833 at Burgkirchen, in the diocese of Passau. He studied at the Passau Lyceum and at Munich, and in 1857 he received the prize for an essay on Polybius. Two years later he was made a priest; in 1861 he was honored with the theological doctorate, and in the following year he commenced his lectures on Church history. In 1869 he was appointed librarian at St. Petersburg; but two years later he was found to be guilty of kleptomaniac propensities in his official capacity, and as he had robbed the library of many valuable possessions, he was brought to trial, found guilty, and condemned to banishment to Siberia, where he remained till 1874, when he was pardoned through the intervention of the Bavarian prince Leopold. Pichler then returned to his native country. He died June 3, 1874, at Siegendorf, near Traunstein. He wrote, *Geschichte des Protestantismus in der orientalischen Kirche im 17 Jahrhund., der Patriarch Cyril Lucaris u. seine Zeit* (Munich, 1861); *Die orientalische Kirchenfrage nach ihrem gegenwärtigen Stande* (ibid. 1861); *Geschichte der kirchlichen Vereinigungserörterungen* (ibid. 1864-65, 2 vols.), which had the distinction of being placed on the Roman Index: *Die Theologie des Leibniz* (1869, sq., 2 vols.); *Die wahren Hinderunssen und die Grundbedingungen einer durchgängigen Reform der Kirche* (1870). Towards the latter part of his life he became estranged from his Church. See Zuchhold, *Bibliotheca Theologica*, ii, 995; *Literarischer Taschenbuch für katholische Deutschland*, 1874, p. 835 sq.; *Kurtz, Lehrbuch der Kirchengesch., 7th ed., ii, 357. (B.P.)*

**Pichler, Veit,** a German Roman Catholic theologian and member of the Society of Jesus, was born at Berchol, Bavaria, in the second half of the 17th century, in the Franciscan province of the Bavarian Jesuits, and was a professor of canonical law at Ingolstadt; became in 1710 professor of jurisprudence at Ingolstadt, and in 1721 he obtained a professorship of jurisprudence at Munich. He died in 1756. We have of him, *Iter polemicum ad Ecclesiam catholica veritatem* (Augsb. 1708, 8vo); *Examen polemicorum adversus *middendorf* (ibid. 1708, 8vo); *Papstum nunnusque errors in propoendis fidei articulis* (ibid. 1709, 8vo); *Lutherianism constantor errors in fidei articulis* (ibid. 1709, 8vo); *Theologia polemica* (ibid. 1719, 4to, and often); *Summa jurisprudentiae sanctae* (ibid. 1729, 5 vols. 8vo); *Juris canonici capitulum* (ibid. 1728, 4to; 1725, 1746, fol.); *Hoefer, Nov. Biogr. Générale*, xi, 77.

**Pichon, Jean,** a French Jesuit, noted as a revivalist, was born at Lyons in 1668. He early became a preacher, but after entering the Society of Jesus in 1667, and obtaining orders, preached in missions at Rheims, Langres, and Metz. Stanislas, duke of Lorraine and Bar, gave him the direction of the missions which he founded in this country with truly royal liberality. To refute some Jansenists, who dissuaded the people from frequent communion by asserting that man must be perfect before approaching the holy table, he published *Esprit d'Evangile et de l'Eglise sur la Communion fréquente* (1745, 12mo). His book caused a great stir. It was attacked by the authors of the *Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques,* condemned by an ordinance of M. de Caylus, bishop of Auxerre (Sept. 27, 1747), and soon afterwards by other prelates, zealous partisans of the "philosophic wall." Jesus and the Gospel, in these attacks united against his book, Picton retracted his obnoxious opinions in a letter to M. de Beaumont, archbishop of Paris, Jan. 24, 1748. He then went to preach at Colmar; but as it soon appeared that he was endeavoring secretly to instigate a number of German priests against the subscription of his work in France, he was banished to Marillac (1748), and soon after compelled to leave France. Having found an asylum in the house of the bishop of Lyons (Valais), he became grand-vicar and general viceroy of his bishopric. He died at Lyons May 3, 1751. - Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Générale*, x, 78.

**Pichon, Thomas-Jean,** a French litterateur, was born in 1731 at Le Mans. Having been ordained a priest, he attached himself to M. d'Avricourt, bishop of Perpignan, by whose protection he became canon and chorister of the Sainte-Chapelle of Le Mans. He was historiographer of the king's brother, whose estate was in that part of France. At the time he composed the constitutional bishopric of Sarthe was offered to Picchon; but he would accept only the situation of administrator of the hospital of Le Mans. He died at that place Nov. 18, 1812. His principal writings are, *La Raison triomphante des Nouveautés* (Paris, 1736, 12mo); it is an attack on the new manners and institutions historique et critique de la Nature de Dieu* (ibid. 1758, 12mo); *Cartel aux Philosophes à quatre Pattes* (Brussels, 1768, 8vo), in which he exposes materialism: *Mémoire sur les Absin du Clarté dans l'Ordre politique* (Amsterdam, 1768, 8vo); this memoir, quite singular and inaccurate, excited some complaints against the author: *La Physique de l'Historie* (La Haye, 1765, 12mo); general considerations upon the temperament and character of people; *Les Droits respectifs de l'État et de l'Eglise rapprochées et de l'Eglise rapprochées et de l'Eglise* (ibid. 1772, 12mo); *Mémoire sur les Absin du Clarté dans l'Ordre politique* (Amsterdam, 1776, 12mo); *Des Études théologiques* (Avignon, 1776, 12mo); researches upon the abuses which opposed the progress of theology in the public schools: *Les Arguments de la Raison en Faveur de la Religion et du Souverain* (Paris, 1766, 12mo); an essay on the treatise *De l'Homme de Héllevius.* Abbé Picchon also published the *Principes de la Religion et de la Morale de Saurin* (Amsterdam, 1768, 2 vols. 12mo), the same work as the *Esprit de Saurin* of J. F. Duran and *La France agricole et marchande de Gleyser* (Paris, 1768, 8vo); *Lettres de Mad Le Sacre et le Couronnement de Louis XV* (1775, 8vo and 4to), to which was added a *Recueil historique de cette ceremonie.* See Desportes.
Pick, a name common to several Hebrew literati, of whom we mention the following:

1. ALEX. — When and where he was born, and when he became a Christian, we do not know. From his publications we see, what he states himself, that he was formerly professor of Hebrew and Chaldee at the University of Prague. He afterwards resided at London, where he published A Literal Translation from the Hebrew of the Twelve Minor Prophets, with Notes and Critical Remarks (London, 1833; 2d ed., without notes, ibid., 1833; 3d ed. 1838): — A Treatise on the Hebrew Accents (ibid. 1837). — The Bible Student's Concordance, by which the English Reader may be enabled readily to ascertain the Literal Meaning of any Word in the Sacred Original (London, 1840, 1860, 4to); a work of little account to scholars. — The Gathering of Israel (ibid. 1845). When Pick died we do not know. See Steinschneider, Bibliographisches Handbuch (Berlin, 1859), p. 111; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s. v.

2. Israel, the founder of the American Congregation, was born at Seufenborn, Bohemia, about the year 1823. After attaining maturity, he obtained his livelihood by writing for periodicals at Vienna till the year 1852, when he received an appointment as rabbi to the new synagogue in Breslau, the chief city of the present Russian Poland. He then proceeded to the Jewry as far as the limits of his mind extended to all his physical habits. In spiritual labors, exercise, diet, sleep, and dress, he followed a fixed course, which scarcely admitted of deviation. Almost unerring prudence marked his life. If not sagacious at seizing new opportunities, he was almost infallibly perfect in that negative prudence which secures safety and confidence. No man who knew him would have apprehended surprise or defeat in any measure undertaken by him after his usual deliberation. His character was full of energy, but it was the energy of the highest order of minds, never impulsive, never hasty. He followed his pre-destined work as if it were his daily life. His sermons were thoroughly "skeletonized." He pretended to no subtility, and was seldom if ever known to preach a metaphysical discourse. The literal import of the Scriptures, and its obvious applications to experimental and practical religion, were the subject of his sermons. Perspicuity of style resulted from this perspicacity of thought. The most unlettered listener could have no difficulty in comprehending his meaning, and the children of his audience generally shared the interest of his adult hearers. See Stevens, Hist. of the Ephr. Epic. Church; N. Y. Methodist, vol. vii. No. 81; Sherman, New England Sketches, p. 399; Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, v. 156-200. (J. H. W.)

Pickering, Robert, a noted Wesleyan preacher, was born at Sancton, Yorkshire, in 1766; was early converted to God, and called to the duties of the Christian ministry. Having for some time labored as a local preacher in the Belle Green, he offered to accompany Dr. Coke as a missionary to the East. But as Coke had obtained his compliance of young men, Pickering regarded this as a providential indication that he was not intended for the mission field. Soon after he passed the required examinations, and at the Conference of 1811 he was placed in a presiding elder's circuit. In November of the same year he was sent as temporary supply to Partington Circuit, and in the following January to Spilsby. At the Conference of 1812 he was appointed to Horncastle; and in 1813 to the Spilsby Circuit. His next appointment was to Colne, where he spent two years. Subsequently he travelled at Todmorden, Barnsley, and Doncaster, and in 1822 was appointed to Colne, where he remained three years. Here
his exertions, both of mind and body, in the erection of a new chapel and two preachers' houses, seriously impaired his health. In 1827 he was stationed at Kettering; next at Norwich, in 1831 at West Bromwich, and there he labored faithfully, although rapidly declining in health. While at Conference in London in 1834 he was taken very ill, and he died August 18. Pickering was a man of genuine piety. As a preacher he was a workman who needed to be handled with care. He was well read in theology and general literature. As a man he was fearless and honorable. What he considered to be his duty he unhesitatingly discharged. See Wesleyan Meth. Mag. 1836, p. 893-896; 1835, p. 719. [J. H. W.]

Pickett, John R., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born April 2, 1814, in Fairfield District, S. C., of godly parentage; was converted in 1831; called of God to the ministry, he began to preach October, 1834, and in the following spring entered South Carolina Conference. He labored faithfully and acceptably for the Church until 1862, when an attack of paralysis obliged him to take a supernumerary's relation. He died March 15, 1870. He was quick in perception, patient in study, strong in will, possessed great powers of analysis, and a lively imagination. In temper he was genial, hearty, self-possessed, and confident. He had the simplicity of a child, both in and out of the pulpit. His manner in the pulpit was self-possessed and deliberate; but as he proceeded in his sermon, he generally warmed with his subject, and his voice assumed a depth and fullness of volume which was wonderful. See Annual Minutes of the Conference of the Meth. Episc. Church, South, p. 420, 421.

Pico. See Mirandula.

Picot, François Édouard, a French painter, was born at Paris in 1786. He was a disciple of Vincent, and in 1811 obtained the second grand prize for paintings in France from the Academy. After studying for some time at Rome, he was intrusted with the execution of a picture representing The Death of Sapphoica (1813) for the church of St. Severin. In the same year he exhibited the tableau of Amor and Psyche, the figures of which, expressive of graceful naïveté, obtained great favor, and which was bought by the duke of Orleans. M. Picot was rewarded at that exhibition by the president of the jury. After this auspicious beginning he executed freely and successfully. Among his works are Raphael and the Fornarina; The Deliverance of St. Peter; The Annunciation; two ceilings in the Louvre, in the Musée des Antiques. Picot had a share in the work of restoration and decoration of the paintings of the Sermontain palace. He executed The Crowning of the Virgin (Notre Dame de Lorette); the paintings of the ship and choir of St. Vincent de Paul, with M. Flandrin; and some pictures in the church of St. Clotilde. M. Picot was received a member of the Académie des Beaux Arts in 1856, in the place of Charles Vernet. He was created an officer of the Legion of Honor in 1882. He died in 1870.—Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xi, 86.

Picot, Michel Joseph Pierre, a French writer of some note, was born March 24, 1770, at Neuville-aux-Bois, near Orleans. He was early destined for the Church, and at the age of thirteen in the house of the bishop of Bayeux. He studied theology at the seminary of Orleans. While professor of humanities at Meung-sur-Loire, he refused the oath required by the civil constitution of the clergy. A warrant being issued against him forbidding him to proceed to Paris, he was invalidated to London, where he engaged in business. He died in 1805. Nagler gives a list of thirty-six prints by him, among which is The Four Evangelists, after Rubens.

Picquet, François (1), a French prelate, was born at Lyons April 12, 1626. The son of a banker, he was destined to a commercial career, and travelled in France, England and Germany. As he returned to France, his name became associated with several influential Parisians, he was in 1652 appointed to the consulsiphip of France at Aleppo; and, although he was only twenty-six years of age, he was so successful in the discharge of his duties that the Dutch republic intrusted him with his own representation in the same city. Although a layman, he displayed extraordinary zeal for the promotion of the missionary work. He received the tonsure in 1660 at the hands of André, archbishop of Syria, who was indebted to him for his elevation. Two years afterwards he resigned the consulsiphip and went to Rome, to give to pope Alexander VII an account of the state of religion in Syria. When he returned to France he received orders, was appointed prior of Grimand (Provençe), and (1663) apostolic protonotarius. He was proposed in 1674 for the apostolic see of the city of Trasimone, was appointed bishop in partibus of Cesaropolis, in Macedonia. In 1679 he embarked for Aleppo with the chevalier d'Arvieux, the new French consul, endowed with unrelenting zeal to revive the faith of the Catholics, and started in May, 1681, as ambassador of the courts of France and Rome in the Levant, to give succour and assistance to the restoration and expansion of the Catholic faith. He arrived at Isphahan July 12, 1682, and soon after-
wards witnessed the celebrations in that city in honor of the passage of the khans of the Tartars, Uesbeck, who was on his way to Mecca. He was granted an audience, bakhshis, crossed the mountainous country, and obtained a promise of protection for the Roman Catholics of his lands. Towards the close of 1688 he took the same royal gift principe from the king of France, and transmitted to his sovereign the answer and presents of the Pope. He was appointed the first bishop of Babylon, and he had arrived at Hamadan, when his impaired health compelled him to stop several months in that city, where he died, Aug. 26, 1686, after writing to the Congregation of the Propaganda for a successor. A special honor was conferred on him by his death, when his body was translated to the Church of St. Bhavani.

Pictet, François (2), a French missionary, was born at Bourg (in Bresse) Dec. 6, 1708. He took holy orders, and for a time preached in the diocese of Lyons, but finally entered the Congregation of St. Sulpice, and in 1723 was sent to the outskirts of Montreal, to assist in the work of the North American missions. Towards 1740 he settled near that city, near the lake of Two Mountains, where he constructed a fort with the money sent for that purpose by Louis XVI, and by requisitions. With the aid of this fort he succeeded in keeping the two roaming tribes, the Algonquins and Nipissings, which took to agriculture. He induced them, as well as the Tecus and Hurons, to submit to France; and during the war of 1742 to 1748, Pictet's measures for the safety of his colony were so effective that it remained unharmed by English invasion. Peace being restored, he founded in 1749 a new mission near Lake Ontario, and called it La Présentation; the point occupied by it is the same where the English afterwards founded Kingston. In 1755 he arrived at Paris, and reported to the minister of the war as to the flourishing state of the colony, which counted already no less than five hundred families. In the war that broke out soon afterwards, he put himself at the head of the Indians which he had trained, destroyed all English forts south of Ontario, and contributed to the defeat of general Braddock. After the defeat of Quebec (1759), Pictet determined to return to France by way of Louisiana. He started with twenty-five Frenchmen and two small troops of savages, which were successively relieved by others in the tribes he met; traversed Upper Canada, reached Michilimackinac, crossed Michigan, and the Mississippi rivers went to New Orleans, where he spent twenty-two months. The English had offered a reward for his head. Pictet had never received any reward, except a bounty of a thousand dollars and some books in 1741. The books he had to sell to enable him to return to France, and he was compelled to live on his scanty inheritance until the assembly of the clergy of France in 1765 presented him a bounty of twelve hundred pounds, which they gave him a second time in 1770. In 1777 he undertook a journey to Rome, where Pius VI, to honor his merits, paid all his expenses, and made him a present of five thousand pounds. Pictet came home to die at Verjouz, near Bourg, the house of his sister, a poor peasant-woman, July 15, 1781.—Hoefer, Nouv. Bioj. Générale, xii, 87.

Pictet, Bexendorf, a learned Swiss divine, was born at Geneva in 1655. He studied there under Francis Taurin, whom he succeeded as professor of theology in 1667, and obtained great celebrity. In 1690 he was rector of the academy; in 1700 pastor of the Italian Church. He died in 1724. Pictet joined to vast erudition a vivid and natural eloquence. A list of his numerous works is given by Niecor. Among these the following are especially valuable: La Morale Chrétienne, ou l'Art de bien vivre (nouv. ed. Gen. 1721, 8 vol., 12mo); Christian Theology (translated from the Latin by the Rev. Frederick Reynoux, B.A., Lond. 1847, sm. 8vo); La Morale Chrétienne, ou l'Art de bien vivre (nouv. ed. Gen. 1721, 8 vol., 12mo);—Dix Sermons sur les Sujets (ibid. 1716, 8vo);—L'Histoire du dixième Siècle (Amst. 1732, 4to);—Quatour Sermons sur divers Sujets (Gen. 1721, 8vo). See Biblioth. Germanique, s. v.; Nicéon, Mémoires, vol. 1; Senebier, Hist. litt. de Genève, xil, 349 sq.; Darly, Cyclop. Bibl. vol. 4; Mosheim, Encycl. hist. vol. iii; Hook, Ecoles. Biog. viii, 92. (J. H. W.)

Pictures, the rendering in the A. V. in three passages of two Hebrew words which are from the same root (בִּיטָה, to look at).

1. Muskil, בִּיטָה, an image; used alone, either literally (plur. "pictures," Prov. xxv, 11) or in the sense of imagination ("conceive," Prov. xviii, 11; plur. "wish," Psa. lxxxiii, 7); with צָרָה, a stone ("image of stone," Lev. xxvi, 1; plur. "pictures," Numb. xxxix, 5); with יִסְתֹּר, on account of (plur. "chambers of imagery" [q.v.], Ezek. viii, 12), it denotes idolatrous images, either independent images, or more usually stones 'portrayed,' i.e. sculptured in low relief, or engraved and colored (Ezek. xxi, 8; Layard, Nin. and Nab. ii, 306, 308). Movable pictures, in the modern sense, were doubtless unknown to the Jews; but colored sculptures and drawings on walls or on wood, as mummiy-casees, must have been familiar to them in Egypt (see Wilkinson, Anc. Egyptians, ii, 277). In later times we read of portraits (נשיכָא), perhaps busts or intagli, sent by Alexander to Antony (Josephus, Anti. xv, 2, 6). The original pictures of silver of Proverbs xxv, 11, were probably wall-surfaces or cornices with carvings, and the 'apples of gold' representations of fruit or foliage, like Solomon's flowers and pomegranates (1 Kings vi, 7). The walls of Babylon were ornamented with pictures on enamelled brick.

2. פִּיטָד, בִּיטָד, the flag of a ship, as seen from afar (plur. "picture," Isa. xi, 16). The Phoenician and Egyptian vessels had their flags and sails of purple and other splendid colors (see Ezek. xxvii, 7; comp. Diod. Sic. i, 51; Wilkinson, Anc. Egypt. iii, 211). See STANDARD.

Pictures, Worship of, in Churchika. The use of paintings and images in churches was introduced as early as the commencement of the 4th century, but was speedily condemned by a council convened by the Arians, in Spain, A.D. 305. Individual writers also during this century bore their testimony against the practice in question. Eusebius of Cesarea, at the beginning of the century, and Epiphanius of Salamis, towards the close of it, denounced the practice as heathenish and unscriptural (see Milner's Hist. of the Church, vol. iv, ch. xiii, p. 423). Nevertheless the practice of hanging up pictures of saints and martyrs, as well as symbolical representations of Scripture histories, prevailed in the 5th century. No images of God or representations of the Holy Trinity were tolerated in churches till after the second Nicene council. Pictures of Scripture scenes were hung on the walls of churches at first to aid those who could not read. The idolatrous devotion with which the Papists bow down before the images and paintings of the dead is a consequence of this practice. See IMAGE-WORSHIP. Besides, the pictures are used by the Romanists for working upon the superstitions belief of the masses. Thus Seymour tells us following the in Picturage: "There is scarcely an incident in the life of our Lord that has not its rival incident or parallel among the legendary life of Mary Christiana, and especially of her as the example to picture, represents an angel announcing to Mary the miraculous conception of the Messiah; it is rivalled by another rep-
receiving an angel announcing to Anna, the legendary mother of Mary, the miraculous and immaculate conception of Mary in the womb. A picture represents the birth of King Solomon; it is paralleled by another representing the nativity or birth of the Virgin Mary. If there is one representing our Lord sitting on the throne and bearing the crown as King of kings, there is a rival picture representing Mary sitting on the same throne, bearing the sceptre, and wearing the crown as Queen of heaven. There are two classes of miraculous pictures. One class comprehends those which are said to have had a miraculous origin; that is, to have been painted in part or in whole by no human hands, but by an angel, or some mysterious visitant from the world of spirits. The other class of miraculous pictures is far more numerous, and comprehends all those which have performed miracles. At the church of St. Giovanni e Paolo, near Rome, is a small picture of the Virgin Mary, which is said to have shed tears on the French invasion of Italy. At Arezzo we were shown a picture in the cathedral church, which wept many tears at the language of some drunkards. It was a Madonna, and the bishop made it the means of collecting sufficient funds to build a new chapel to commemorate it. In the church of St. Pietro de Montorio it is a singularly ugly representation of Mary and child; it is not exactly hideous; but an inscription on a marble slab announces that this 'sacred likeness of the mother of God, holding her son and a book, is illustruous for miracles more and more every day.' In St. Peter's, however, is a very important one, not only for the miracle, but for its authentication. It is in the subterranean chapel, usually called the Grotto. It is a picture of the Virgin with a mark under the left eye, and the following is the inscription: 'This picture of the Most Holy Virgin Mary, which stood between the pillars of the porch of the ancient Basilica, having been struck by an impious hand, poured forth blood (sanguinem fudit) on the stone, which is now protected by a grating.' On one side is a large stone, on the other are two small stones. All three are covered with a strong iron grating, to preserve them, as on them the blood of this miraculous picture is said to have fallen.' See Riddle, Christian Antiquities; Coleman, Christian Antiquities.

Pie is a table or rule which was used in the old Roman offices previous to the Reformation, showing in a technical way how to find out the service which is to be read upon each day, and corresponds to what the Greeks called πίεα, or the index (literally a piana, by meeting, a scattered table or picture); and because indexes or tables of books were formed into square figures resembling pictures or painters' tables hung up in a frame, these likewise were called πίεας, or, being marked only with the first letters of the word, πίς, or pies. 'Pie is the familiar English name for the Romish pica (ordinall, or service-book), which perhaps came from the ignorance of the friars, who have thrust in many barbarous words into the liturgies. Some say that the word pice is derived from litera pieca, a great black letter in the beginning of some new order in the prayer, and among printers that term is still used, the pica type. See Proctor, Book of Common Prayer; Eadie, Eccles. Cyclop. s. v.

Piece of Gold. The A.V., in rendering the elliptical expression "six thousand of gold," in a passage respecting Naaman, relating that he "took with him ten talents of silver, and six thousand of gold, and ten changes of raiment" (2 Kings v. 5), supplies "pieces" as the word understood. The similar passage respecting silver, in which the word understood appears to be shekels, probably justifies the insertion of that definite word. See Piece of Silver. The same expression, if "pieces" be here meant, is also found in the following passage: "And king Solomon made two hundred targets of [of] beaten gold: six hundred of gold went to one target" (1 Kings x. 16). Here the A.V. supplies the word "shekels," and there seems no doubt that it is right, considering the number mentioned, and that a common weight must be intended. That a weight of gold is meant in Num. xxi. 22, is extremely unlikely that coined money was already invented at the time referred to, or indeed that it was known in Palestine before the Persian period. See Daric; Money. Kings or ingots of gold may have been in use; they are scarcely warranted in supposing that any of them bore gold shekels, since the practice was to weigh money. The rendering "pieces of gold" is therefore very doubtful; and "shekels of gold," as designating the value of the whole quantity, not individual pieces, is preferable. See Gotta.

Piece of Money. See Keribah; Stater.

Piece of Silver. The passages in the O. T. and those in the N. T. in which the A. V. uses this term must be separately considered. See Money.

I. In the O. T. the word "pieces" is used in the A. V. for a word understood in the Hebrew, if we except one or two cases to be afterwards noticed. The phrase is always "pieces of gold" or the like "of silver" (Gen. xvi, 16; xxvii, 28; xlv, 22; Judg. ix. 4; xvi. 5; 2 Kings vi, 25; Hos. iii. 2; Zech. xi, 12, 13). In similar passages the word "shekels" occurs in the Hebrew, and it must be observed that these are either in the law, or relate to purchases, some of an important legal character, as, for example, the purchase of the threshing-floor and oxen of Aramah, or to taxes, and the like (Gen. xxiii, 15, 16; Exod. xiii, 22; Lev. xxvii, 3, 6, 16; Josh. vii, 21; 2 Sam. xxiv, 21; 1 Chron. xxiii, 19, 20; 2 Kings xx, 20; Neh. vi. 15; Jer. xxxii, 9). There are other passages in which the A. V. supplies the word "shekels" instead of "pieces" (Deut. xxiv, 19, 20; Judg. xvii, 2, 3, 4, 10; 2 Sam. xviii, 11, 12), and of these the first two require this to be done. It becomes then a question whether there is any ground for the adoption of the word "pieces," which is vague if actual coins be meant, and inaccurate if weights. The shekel, be it remembered, was the common weight of money, and therefore most likely to be understood in an elliptical phrase. When we find good reason for concluding that in two passages (Deut. xxii, 19, 20) this is the word understood, it seems incredible that any other should be in the other places. See Shekki.

One of the exceptional cases in which a word corresponding to "pieces" is found in the Hebrew is in the Psalms, where presents of submission are prophesied to be made of "pieces of silver," פֵּיתֶיםָ בֶּֽשֶּׁר (xviii, 30; 29, 29; 110, 1; Ps. viii, 14, 15), which occurs in a moral and prophetic way, if it preserve its radical meaning, from פֵּיתֶה, must signify a piece broken off, or a fragment: there is no reason to suppose that a coin is meant—Smith. Another exceptional passage is 1 Sam. ii, 26, where the Heb. word rendered "piece of silver" is פֵּיתֶה יִפְרְדוּ, which seems to signify a small piece of money, as וָרָשׁ, or from the idea of collecting (root פָּרַךְ to gather). See Silver. For the "pieces of silver" in Josh. xxiv, 32, see Keribah.

II. In the N. T. two words are rendered by the phrase "piece of silver," drachma, δραχμή, and δραχμᾶ. (1.) The first (Luke xv, 8, 9) should be represented by denarius. It was a Greek silver coin, equivalent, at the time of Luke, to the Roman denarius, which is probably identical with the drachma, but for some time of short duration or almost or almost superseded the former. See Drachma. (2.) The second word is very properly thus rendered. It occurs in the account of the betrayal of our Lord for "thirty pieces of silver" (Matt. xxvi, 15; xxvii, 3, 5, 6). It is evident that this term, being a common coinage, here is intended. If the most common silver pieces bearing, they would be denarii. The parallel passage in Zechabiah (xi, 12, 13) must, however, be taken into consider-
eration, where, if our view be correct, shekels must be understood. It may, however, be suggested that the two thirties may correspond, not as of exactly the same coin, but of the chief current coin. Some light may be thrown on our difficulty by the number of pieces. It can scarcely be a coin, of which "the weight of silver was the price of blood in the case of a slave accidentally killed" (Exod. xxii, 32). It may be objected that there is no reason to suppose that shekels were current in our Lord's time; but it must be replied that the tetradrachmas of deprecitated Attic weight of the Greek-Cities of Syria in this century of our era had the same weight as the shekels which we believe to be of Simon the Maccabee [see Money], so that Josephus speaks of the shekel as equal to four Attic drachmas (Ant., i. 8, 2). These tetradrachmas were common at the time of our Lord, and the piece of money thus assigned of silver, must, from its name, have been of this kind. See Statek. It is therefore more probable that the thirty pieces of silver were tetradrachmas than that they were denarii. There is no difficulty in the use of two terms, a name designating the denomination and "piece of silver," whereas the latter mean the tetradrachm or the denarius, as it is a vague appellation that implies a more distinctive name. In the received text of Matthew the prophecy as to the thirty pieces of silver is ascribed to Jeremiah, and not to Zechariah; and much controversy has thus been occasioned by such an explanation as is suggested by the absence of any prophet's name in the Syriac version, and the likelihood that similarity of style would have caused a copyist inadvertently to insert the name of Jeremiah instead of that of Zechariah. See Silverman.

Pierce, Edward, an English painter who flourished in the reigns of Charles I and II, was eminent both in history and landscape. He also drew architecture, perspective, etc., and was much esteemed in his time. But there is little of his work now remaining, the far greater part being destroyed in the fire of London, 1666. It chiefly consisted of altar-pieces, ceilings of churches, and the like; of these there is one yet remaining, done by him, in Covent Garden Church, where are to be found many admirable parts of a good pencil. He worked some time for Vandyck, and several good pieces by Pierce in this place have been in the Castle, in Leicester.

Pierce, George Edmond, D.D., an American Congregational divine, noted especially as an educator, was born at Southbury, Conn., Sept. 9, 1794. He was educated at Yale College, class of 1816; then studied theology at Andover Theological Academy, class of 1821, teaching at the same time at the Fairfield Academy. In July, 1822, he was ordained pastor of the Congregational Church at Harwinton, where he remained until called to the presidency of the Western Reserve College in 1824. He remained at the head of this high school until 1855, and gave to it an excellent reputation. He died at Hudson, Ohio, May 27, 1871.

Pierce, Gershom, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in the closing quarter of the last century. He was converted about 1800, and called of God to the work of the sacred ministry: joined the Methodist Episcopal Church, and entered in 1808 the New York Conference. His first appointment was at Pittsburgh. In 1804 he preached at Fletcher; 1805, Niagara; 1806, Oswegatchie: 1807, Dunham; 1808, Saratoga: 1808-10, Granville; 1811, Thurman; 1812, Green Gate; 1814, Uxbridge; 1815-16, Montgomery; 1817-18, Sharon; 1819, Albany; 1820, Coeymans; 1821-22, Chatham; 1823-24, Granville; 1825-26, Pittsfield; 1827, Burlington; 1828-29, Redding; 1830-31, Hampstead and Huntington. At the Conference of 1822 he became supernumerary, and continued in that relation to the period of his death. Mr. Pierce was a man of much more than ordinary ability. His intellect, in force and habit, is best described by the expression "long-headed." He was a devout man, at times a most powerful preacher. His sermons, weighty with thought, fervid with feeling, and in power of the Word, Spirit, made a deep and abiding impression on his hearers. He died in its peace at Milan, Ohio, March 23, 1865. See Smith, Sacred Memories, p. 288 sqq.

Pierce, James Edmund, an American divine of note, was born at West Townsend, Vt., in 1899. He graduated at Middlebury College in 1861, and at Auburn Theological Seminary of that city. In 1865 he was elected to a professorship (of the Hebrew language and literature) in the last-named institution, which position he retained till his death (at Auburn, July 15, 1870). He was a close student, a thorough and able teacher, and an impressive and popular preacher. See Appleton's Amer. Cyclop., x, 570.

Pierce, John, D.D., a noted American Congregational minister, was born at Dorchester, Mass., July 14, 1774. He was educated at Harvard University, class of 1798, and then became a tutor in his alma mater. Descended of very humble parentage, he had made his way to college by his own exertions, and his position by the force of his own industry. Feeling persuaded that his work was that of the Christian ministry, he took up the study of theology, and March 15, 1797, was ordained over the First Congregational Church, Brookline, Mass., of which he was the pastor for 50 years. He died in this place Aug. 24, 1849, respected by all who knew him, and greatly mourned by the ecclesiastical body to which he belonged. Dr. Pierce was member of the Academy of Arts and Sciences, and of the Massachusetts Historical Society. For several years he was president of the Massachusetts Historical Society. In all matters appertaining to family and literary statistics he was a prodigy. He had 18 quarto vols. of 600 pages each, of his own MS, containing memoirs and memorabilia. He published Half-century Discourse at Brookline (Mar. 1847) — Sketch of Brookline, in "Mass. Hist. Collections," 2d ser. vol. ii. — Sermon at Ordination of S. Clark (1817) — Dudlaiden Lect. (1821); also occasional Sermons, etc. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, viii, 331; Allibone, Diet. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s. v. (J. H. W.)

Pierce, John J., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Vermont in 1816. He was secured his early education principally by his own exertions; graduated at Princeton College in 1820, and at the theological seminary in the same place in 1823. He was licensed by the New Brunswick Presbytery, and began preaching at Portsmouth, Va., where he remained until 1827, when he left for Clarksville, Tenn. In 1828 he was elected president of an academy at Elkton, Ky., which position he held until 1837. Soon after he occupied temporarily the place of one of the professors in Centre College, Danville, Ky.; then returned again to Elkton; but subsequently left, and spent two years in teaching in Illinois and Missouri. On his return he took charge of Ridgewood Church, Ky., where he continued to labor until his death, March 18, 1861. Mr. Pierce was a pure-hearted, simple-minded man; never attaining any very eminent success in the ministry, but ever contented and happy. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1862, p. 116. (J. L. S.)

Pierce, Thomas, D.D., an English divine of note, flourished near the middle of the 17th century. He was educated at Magdalen College, Oxford, and after graduation was presented with a fellowship. In 1648 he was ejected for nonconformity, but was restored under the Protectorate, and became prebend of Canterbury and Lincoln; in 1661 president of Magdalen College; in 1671 dean of Salisbury. He died in 1691. Dean Pierce was a man of more than ordinary talent and acquisitiveness. In theology he was decidedly Arminian, and published a number of occasional sermons and theolog-
Pierce, Thomas A., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Fauquier Co., Va., Oct. 26, 1819; was converted at the age of twenty; and feeling called of God to the work of the sacred ministry, joined the Virginia Conference at Charlottesville in the fall of 1847. He was appointed to the Stafford Circuit. In 1848 he was sent to Rappahannock and Culpepper; in 1849 he went to King William, where he travelled two years; in 1852 and 1853 he labored on the James City and New Kent Circuit; in 1854, in King George; in New Hampshire: 1856 and 1857, in Hanover. In 1858 he was again in King William; in 1859 he was sent to Greensville; in 1860 and 1861 he had his pastoral charge in Mecklenburg; in 1862 and 1863, in Campbell; 1864 and 1865, in Appomattox. In all of these appointments he labored like a man of God, and was incomparably doing much good. Failing health obliged him in 1866 to take a superannuated relation. He died Feb. 26, 1867. 

Pieritz, Joseph Abraham, a noted Anglican divine, was born of Jewish parentage in the year 1815 at Kieltsko, in Prussia. At the age of twenty-three Pieritz became a Christian by being baptized at London. Four years later "the London Society for Propagating the Gospel among the Jews" appointed him a missionary among his brethren, and for about eight years he faithfully discharged his duty in that relation, residing in different places in the west of England. In the year 1851 he accepted an appointment to a pastoral charge in British Guiana. For about two years he labored as rector of the parish of St. Patrick, in the town of New Amsterdam, in the colony of British Guiana, where he died, Oct. 10, 1870. See Jewish Intelligencer (London), 1888, p. 29; 1870, p. 20; Report of the London Society, 1861, p. 54; Kalkar, Israel and die Kirche, p. 172. (B. F.)

Pierpont, Jesse, a native of Connecticut, and was born about 1791. In 1821 he came to New York state and settled at Rochester, and soon after was ordained a Presbyterian minister. He became pastor of a church in Hopewell, Ontario Co., for several years. He was then called to the pastorate at Avon, and there he lived until about 1861, when he moved to Rochester, N. Y., where he died in 1871, beloved by all his acquaintance, and by many social and spiritual friends. Indeed, none knew him but to honor him, both as a Christian and as a gentleman. "He lived a long life of usefulness as a pastor of the Presbyterian Church, and died full of years, in the blessed consciousness of a blameless life as an honored servant of God's ministry."

Pierpont, James, a noted New England Congregational minister of colonial days, was born in Roxbury, Conn., in 1661. He was educated at Harvard College, where he graduated in 1681; was ordained fourth minister in New Haven, Conn., in 1685, and retained that connection until his death in 1714. In the year 1698 Mr. Pierpont was one of three ministers who conceived the plan of founding a college—a plan which had the effect in the establishment of Yale College in 1700. As one of the original trustees of the institution he was untiringly active; and it was through his influence, in no small degree, that the distinguished individual from whom his name was derived took upon himself the object of his liberal benefactions. Dwight, in his life of Edwards, states that Mr. Pierpont read lectures to the students in Yale College as professor of moral philosophy. This, however, Dr. Bacon considers doubtful, as the college was not removed from Saybrook till after Mr. Pierpont's death. Of the famous eye held at Saybrook in 1708, for the purpose of forming a system that should better secure the ends of Church discipline and the benefits of communion among the churches, Mr. Pierpont was a prominent member. The "Articles" which were adopted as the result of the synod, and which constitute the well-known "Saybrook Platform," are said to have been drawn up by him. The only publication of Mr. Pierpont was a sermon preached at Boston, in Cotton Mather's pulpit, in 1712, entitled Sunday False Hopes of Human Happiness a Decreed. Mather introduces the sermon with a short preface, in which he says of the author, "He has been a rich blessing to the Church of God." New Haven values him, all Connecticut honors him—they have cause to do so. Dr. Bacon writes thus concerning him: 

"That he was able to form so lively an idea of him as of Davenport is partly because his life was shorter, and was less involved in scenes of conflict, and partly, no doubt, because his nature and the early discipline of Divine Providence had less fitted him to make himself conspicuous by the originality and energy of his character, and to leave his large stamp with irresistible firmness on the records of his times. In the pulpit Mr. Pierpont was distinguished among his contemporaries. His personal appearance was altogether prepossessing. He was eminent in the gift of prayer. His doctrine was sound and discriminating, and his style was sound and impressive, without anything of the affected quibbling which characterised some of the most eminent men of that day.


Pierpont, John, an eminent American Unitarian divine, noted especially for his part in temperance and antislavery movements, was born in 1830 at Litchfield, Conn., and educated at Yale College. The years immediately after his leaving college were occupied in teaching, a part of the time at the South and afterwards in New England, and he then studied law and settled at Newburyport. The war of 1812 interfered with his professional prospects, and he foresaw the law for business, but met with indifferent success,
PIERQUIN, Jean, a French ecclesiastic, noted especially as a writer, was born Feb. 15, 1672, at Charleville. After taking holy orders, he was in 1699 appointed canon of Chartres, in the Ardenne, where he spent his whole life, dividing his time between works of charity and literary pursuits. He died March 10, 1742. He published, *Ve de St. Turin, Hermitae* (Nancy, 1722, 2 vols.): *Dissertations physiques-et-théologiques sur la Conversion de St. Paul, met en écla- se dans le Livre de St. Jerome, au mure* (Paris, 1742, 12mo), in which work he gives some physical account of the manner in which the divine act of generation took place, etc.—Hœfler, *Nouv. Biog. Géne- rale*, xl, 128.

PIETRE, St. See Peter.

PIETRE, Jean Baptiste Marie, a French painter, was born at Paris in 1715. It is not known by whom he received his first instruction; but he went, when about nineteen years of age, to Rome, where he remained several years. On his return to Paris he distinguished himself as a historical painter; and executed several works for the churches and public edifices, which gained him great reputation. He was appointed painter to the king, and elected member of the academy at Paris. One of his greatest works was the ceiling of the chapel of the Virgin, in the church of St. Sulpice, which has been engraved by Nicholas Dupuis. He also etched a few plates from his own designs and those of others. He died in 1789.

PIERSON, Abraham, an American Congregational divine and educator, was born at Lynn, Mass., in 1641. Abraham, his father, was first minister of Stow, Mass., 1661 (born in Yorkshire, England, in 1608, died Aug. 9, 1678), was one of the first settlers of Newark in 1677, and was the first minister of that town. He preached to the Indians of Long Island in their own language, and contributed *Some Hints for the Indians in New Hervis and Plate Country to a Further Account of the Progress of the Gospel in New England* (1659). His son, Abraham, Jun., was educated at Harvard University, where he graduated in 1688. After studying theology, he was ordained colleague with his father at Newark, N.J., March 4, 1672, and was minister at Killingworth, Conn., from 1674 until his death, March 5, 1707. Mr. Pierson was identified with the founding of Yale College, was anxiously desired for its first principal, and did instruct for a time at Killingworth, though he never moved to Saybrook, where the commencement of Yale was set for the earliest days, because his parishioners would not suffer him to leave them. He was taken ill in the midst of the agitation regarding his college duties, and died before he could settle the case. President Clapp, in his *History of Yale College*, says of rector Pierson that he was a "hard student, a gentle man, a great deal of work and watching, steady, and judicious gentleman in all his conduct." See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit,,* 116 sq.; Bacon, *Genesis of the New England Churches*. (J. H. W.)

PIETAS, a virtue which denotes veneration for the Deity, and love and tenderness to our friends, and especially dutifulness to parents. It received divine honors among the Romans and was made one of the seven liberal arts. Actius Gabrius first erected a temple to this new divinity, on the spot where a woman had fed with her own milk her aged father, who had been imprisoned by order of the senate, and deprived of all aliment. The goddess is seen represented on Roman coins as a matron, throwing incense upon an altar, and her attributes are a stork and children. See Cicero, *De Div. 1; Val. Maximus, v.;* Pliny, vii, 36; Zumpt, in the *Class. Museum,* iii, 452.

PIETISM is the specific appellation of a phase of religious thought which developed itself especially within the pale of the German Lutheran Church in the 18th century. Like English Methodism, it embraced a period of indifference to religion, and, like it also, aimed to supersede dead faith, knowledge without life, form without spirit, worldliness under the cloak of religion, by life—a spiritual and living faith. Like Methodism, it laid great stress on the necessity of the new birth; it prohibited certain amusements and modes of life until then considered as at least harmless; and it encouraged private assemblies of Christian persons for purposes of edification, such as the study of the Scriptures or the interchange of spiritual experiences. Like Methodism, too, it encountered at first no little ridicule, and even persecution. It was accused of being an attempt to found a new sect, and was vehemently opposed on this ground; but, unlike Methodism, though it did here and there give rise to some insignificant bodies of separatists, it never broke off from the national Church of the country, but remained as a movement within its pale.

The development of German Lutheranism, which really means German Protestantism, repeats in a most peculiar manner the course of the general Church previous to it. As in the first centuries of the production of the spirit of the Church proposed to itself the view of Christianity as a whole, so also was it the time from the beginning of the Reformation to the Augsburg Confession (q.v.) one pre-eminently creative, and it laid the foundation of the Lutheran Church as regards its confession of faith. With the endeavor pervading the 5th, 6th, and
7th centuries more distinctly to work out the single doctrines corresponds the work of the Lutheran Church up to the time of the Formula Concordiae (q. v.), by which the various differences of doctrines were to be settled. As the Church of the Middle Ages had handed down to it, the doctrine was to be preserved and promulgated, not as a matter produced by the fathers and sanctioned by the Church, which scholasticism then undertook to work out and digest in a systematic manner, so there arose in the 17th century—the Protestant Middle Ages—a scholasticism which put into a regular form the Lutheran confession of faith embodied in the Formula Concordiae. As in the Middle Ages, the scholasticism stands side by side with the strict representatives of scholasticism, so the Protestant mystics, Jacob Bohme (q. v.), Arndt, and others, stand by the side of an effete orthodoxy. This mystical tendency acquired an importance about the end of the 17th and the beginning of the 18th centuries. A parallel again between this period and that of the 14th century is obvious. In the 14th century the romantic spirit had become extinct; scholasticism had outdone itself; from France there flowed over Europe a worldly spirit; the Roman spirit had decayed; everything was in dislocation. Then from the reaction against the externalized scholasticism and secularized life there broke forth on all sides and in the most varied forms mysticism, which had in itself a Reformatory feature. In like manner, the 17th century's Wittenberg, the blossom of Germany had withered; the religious spirit, which since the period of the Reformation had been the first power in Germany, had stepped into the background; while, on the other hand, the secular spirit had been let loose, along with a powerful rein of immorality, especially by the preponderance of France under Louis XIV. It was a dreary period in German history.

Politically the empire had fallen asunder into a number of separate despotic little states; and the sentiment of national unity had become so nearly extinct that the loss of a once grateful and beautiful Alsace to France seems to have been viewed with wonderful indifference. Socially the life of the people had greatly deteriorated. The rural population was terribly diminished in numbers and wealth; their means of communication were restricted by the destruction of their homes and the neglect of the roads; their schools had disappeared, and were but very slowly replaced; their new houses and churches were bare and barn-like compared to the old ones; their periodical gatherings for certain purposes of local self-government or for festivities had fallen into disuse. The vegetative sort of life, the life of plants, and the writers of the following age bear testimony to the illiteracy and coarseness of manners which prevailed. Towards the end of the 17th century even among the gentry of the country districts. In the towns things were but little better. The comerce of Germany had received a serious check; her merchant-princes had sunk to the level of petty traders, and adopted the manners and culture of the latter class. Her old free cities were decaying; only a few of the newer ones were growing, and what intellectual life there then existed centred in them, as at Hamburg, as at Hamburgh or Berlin, or at the court of any sovereign who specially protected letters, or still more at the universities. Throughout this period Germany contributed only one really great name to literature—that of Leibnitz; while in France it was the age of military glory and social brilliancy—of Racine and Moliere, of Fenelon and Bossuet, of Bayle and Voltaire. German men and women therefore found their own life mean and tiresome, and were carried away by admiration of their splendid neighbor, till it became the fashion to imitate whatever was French in manners, dress, or tone of thought; and the very language was wretchedly corrupted by the intermixture of French phrases. Of course there was a class, of which king Frederick William I of Prussia may be taken as the type, who hated foreign ways, and upheld whatever was most antediluvian and unrefined as peculiarly German; but in general the tide set in favor of the foreigners. The French were now the great models, and very unfortunate ones for a people whose natural genius was so totally different. German literature reached its lowest ebb under these influences. One of the earliest signs, if not the first, which the great rebellion against French classicism, and an admiration for the master writers of English—Shakespeare and Milton.

Religion suffered under the same depression. On the one hand was a rigid Lutheranism which had petrified what had once been living convictions into dead dogmas, and which was the Vorhangmas. As in the Middle Ages, there sprang up a sect about definitions of doctrines in which the people had ceased to feel a genuine interest. On the other hand was a genteel indifference which idealized "enlightenment" (the favorite watchword of that period), and indemnified itself for its compliance with certain outward observances by laughing at the whole affair in private. Rabener, a satirist of this period, when characterizing the earlier part of the 18th century, says: "There was a time in Germany when no satire could be witty at the expense of anything but the Bible, and there were whole volumes whose subject was the complete satirical condensation in readiness, that their wit might never run dry. . . . If a groom is conscious of possessing a more cultivated mind than the dairymaid, he Startles her by a jest on some text or hymn; all the courtiers receive the next couplet as a gibe at the very cowloppy, and the poor dairymaid, who is not so witty, stands there abashed." When the danger seemed imminent that the great work of the Reformation would prove in vain, and that it would soon come to ruin, providential supply and guidance came in the Pietistic spirit which arose. Indeed, the learned Dorner had, with a large number of others, that this new tendency was a necessary stage in the development of Protestantism—a supplement of the Reformation—and that Spener, the father of Pietism, was the veritable successor of Melancthon. But we must first learn what Pietism proposed to do before we can properly appreciate its historical importance. Pietism commenced upon the principle that the Church was corrupt; that the ministry were generally guilty of gross neglect; and that the people were returned with spiritual death. It therefore proposed, as a theological means of improvement: 1. That the scholastic theology, which reigned in the academies, and was composed of intricate and disputable doctrines, and obscure and unusual forms of expression, should be totally abolished. 2. That the controversies subsisting between Christians of different communions, should be less eagerly studied and less frequently treated, though not entirely neglected. 3. That all mixture of philosophy and human science with divine wisdom was to be most carefully avoided; that is, that pagan philosophy and classical learning should be kept distinct from, and by no means surpasse the Biblical theology; but, 4, that, on the contrary, all those students who were designed for the ministry should be accustomed from their early youth to the personal and study of the Holy Scriptures, or at the least to a plain system of theology, drawn from these unerring sources of truth. 5. That the whole course of their education was to be so directed as to render them useful in life, by the practical power of their doctrine and the commanding influence of their example. But it was destined to confine these reforms to students and the clergy. Religious persons of every class and rank were encouraged to meet in what werecalled Biblical colleges, or colleges of piety (we might call them prayer-meetings), where some exercised in reading the Scriptures, singing, and prayer, and others engaged in the exposition of the Scriptures; not in a dry and critical way, but in a strain of practical and experimental piety, whereby they were mutually edified. This practice, which always more or less obtains where religion flourishes (as, for instance, at the Reformation), raised the same sort of outcry as
the rise of Methodism; and those who entered not into the spirit of the design were eager to catch at every instance of weakness or imprudence, to bring disgrace on that, which, in fact, brought disgrace upon themselves, as lukewarm and formal Christians. "In so saying, Master, thou reproachest us also."

Yet the greatest religious movement was John Amt (1555-1821), who wrote The True Christians, a work as usefully religiously as Bunyan's Pilgrim's Progress or Doddridge's Religion in the Soul. Spener followed (1685-1705). The private religious meetings which he established about 1675, Collegia Pietatis, were the original form of their piety, justified by this important movement. One of his pupils was the saintly A. H. Francke (q. v.). Paul Gerhard, the well-known author of the German hymns, also belonged to the same party. The revival feeling spread rapidly through Germany, where the institution of the "Collegia," being in complete accord with the national instinct, soon attained great popularity. Up to 1686 Pietism had spread without exciting comotion, no persecution having yet been attempted. But when in this year Spener removed to Dresden, and several of his students made bold to follow him, it was really condemned by the moderate and orthodox part of their leader's practice, giving in their lectures particular prominence to the correction of the errors contained in Luther's translation of the Bible, the great body of Lutherans, who had been accustomed to regard this translation and its correction as a matter of no great moment, at such freedom of criticism, and at the practice of these Pietists who lectured in the popular tongue. All kinds of adverse rumors were circulated, they were maligning in many ways, and complaints were made to the university authorities. When these popular agitations were ignored, there followed tumults of so violent a character as to spread throughout Leipsic the seeds and principles of mutiny and sedition, and finally the matter was forced to public trial. Of course the pius and learned men above mentioned were, indeed, declared free from the errors and heresies that had been laid to their charge, but were, at the same time, prohibited from carrying on the plan of religious instruction they had undertaken with such zeal. It was during these troubles and divisions that the inviolable designation Pietists was first invented; it may at least be affirmed that it was not commonly known before this period. It was at first applied by some giddy and inconsiderate persons to those who frequented the Biblical colleges, and lived in a manner suitable to the instructions and exhortations that were addressed to them in these seminars of piety. It was afterward extended to those who were either distinguished by the excessive austerity of their manners, or who, regardless of truth and opinion, were only intent upon practice, and turned the whole vigor of their efforts towards the attainment of religious feelings and habits. But as it is the fate of all those denominations by which peculiar sects are distinguished to be variously and often very improperly applied, so the title "Pietist" was frequently given in common conversation to persons of eminent and useful lives, who were equally remarkable for their adherence to truth and their inculcation of its duties to persons whose motley characters exhibited an enormous mixture of profitigacy and enthusiasm, and who deserved the title of delicious fanatics better than any other denomination. This contest was by no means confined to Leipsic, but spread with incredible celerity through all the Lutheran churches in the different states and kingdoms of Europe. For from this time, in all the cities, towns, and villages where Lutheranism was proscribed, there started up, all of a sudden, persons of various castes and conditions, who, according to the import of the act of the court, that they were called by a divine impulse to pull up iniquity by the root; to restore to its primitive lustre and propagate through the world the declining cause of piety and virtue; to govern the Church of Christ by wiser rules than those by which it was at present directed; and who, partly in their writings and partly in their private and public discourses, pointed out the means and measures that were necessary to bring about this important revolution. Several religious societies were formed in various places, which, though they differed in some circumstances, and were not all conducted by those with equal wisdom, piety, and prudence, were, however, designed to promote the pious and useful purpose. In the mean time these unusual proceedings filled with uneasy and alarming apprehensions both those who were intrusted with the government of the Church and those who sat at the helm of the state. These apprehensions were justified by this important consideration, that the pious and well-meaning persons who composed these assemblies had indifferently admitted into their community a number of extravagant and hot-headed fanatics, who foretold the approaching destruction of Belieb (by which they meant the Lutheran Church), terrified the populace with fictitious visions, assumed the authority of prophets honored with a divine commission, obscured the divine truths of religion by a gloomy kind of jargon of their own invention, and revived doctrines that had long before been condemned by the Leipzig church. "The errors arose in all the Lutheran churches; and persons whose differences were occasioned rather by mere words and questions of little consequence than by any doctrines or institutions of considerable importance, attacked one another with the bitterness, enmity, and imputations with which countries severe laws were at length enacted against the Pietists. These revivers of piety proposed to carry on their plan without introducing any change into the doctrine, discipline, or form of government that were established in the Lutheran Church.

At the head of this movement stood, in Germany, the learned and pious Spener, whose sentiments were adopted by the professors of the new Academy of Halle; and particularly by Francke and Paulus Antonius, who had been invited thither from Leipsic, where they began to be suspected of Pietism. Though few pretended to treat either with indignation or contempt the intentions and purposes of these good men (which, indeed, none could despise without affecting to appear the enemy of practical religion and virtue), yet many eminent Lutheran divines, and especially the professors and pastors of Wittenberg, being of opinion that, in the execution of this laudable purpose, several unorthodox maxims were adopted and certain unwarrantable measures employed, proceeded publicly against Spener in the year 1695, and afterwards against his disciples and adherents, as the authors of those dreams and visions, of erroneous and dangerous opinions. These debates turned upon a variety of points, and therefore the matter of them cannot be comprehended under any one general head. If we consider them indeed in relation to their origin, and the circumstances that gave rise to them, we may be able to reduce them to some fixed principles. We have already said that those who had the advancement of pietism most zealously at heart were possessed of a notion that no order of men contributed more to retard its progress than the clergy, whose peculiar vocation it was to incite and promote it. Looking upon this as the root of the evil, it was but natural that their plans of reformation should begin here; and accordingly they laid it down as an essential principle that none should be admitted into the ministry whose peculiar vocation it was to incite and promote it. Hence they proposed, in the first place, a thorough reformation of the schools of divinity; and they explained clearly enough what they meant by this reformation, as we have seen above. As these maxims were propagated with the greatest industry and zeal, and were explained inadverently by some without those restrictions which prudence seemed to require, these pious patrons and revivers of pietry were suspected of designs that could not
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"but render them obnoxious to censure. They were supposed to despise philosophy and learning; to treat with indifference, and even to renounce, all inquiries into the nature and foundations of religious truths; to despise the zeal and labors of those who defended it against such as either corrupted or opposed it; and to place the whole of their theology in certain vague and incoherent declamations concerning the duties of morality. Hence arose those famous disputes concerning the use of philosophy and the value of human learning, considered in connection with the interests of religion; the dignity and usefulness of systematic theology; the necessity of polemic divinity; the excellence of the mystic system; and also concerning the true method of instructing the people. The second great object that employed the zeal and attention of the persons now under consideration was that the candidates for the ministry should not only for the future receive such an academical education as would tend rather to solid utility than to mere speculation, but also that they should dedicate themselves to God in a peculiar manner, and exhibit the most striking examples of piety and virtue. This maxim, which, when considered in itself, must be considered to be highly laudable, not only gave occasion to several new regulations, designed to restrain the passions of the studious youth, to inspire them with religious sentiments, and to excite them in holy resolutions, but also produced another maxim, which was a lasting source of controversy and debate, viz.: that no person who was not himself a model of piety and divine love was qualified to be a public teacher of piety, or a guide to others in the way of salvation. This opinion was considered by many as derogatory to the power and efficacy of the Word of God, which cannot be deprived of its divine influence by the vices of its ministers, and as a sort of revolt of the long-exploited errors of the Donatists, and what rendered it peculiarly liable to an interpretation of this nature was the imprudence of some Pietists, who inculcated and explained it without those restrictions that were necessary to render it unexceptionable. Hence arose endless and intricate debates concerning the following questions: whether the religious knowledge acquired by a wicked man can be termed theology? whether a vicious person can, in effect, attain a true knowledge of religion? how far the office and ministry of an impious ecclesiastical can be pronounced salutary and efficacious? whether an ungodly man cannot be susceptible of illumination? and other questions of a like nature. These revivers of declining piety went still farther. In order to render the ministry of their pastors as successful as possible in housing men from their indolence, and in stemming the torrent of corruption and impurity which threatened to engulf the churches, and, to a certain extent, Buddhism also, partook of the spirit of pietism. The opposition of the old Lutheran party of other parts of Germany produced controversies which continued till about 1720 (for an account, see Weissmann, Mem. Eccl. Hist. Svec. [1745], p. 1016 sq.). Zurich, where Galen and Cranach held sway, availed itself of it with gladness. It penetrated as far east as the provinces bordering on the Baltic Sea, and as far north as Denmark, Norway, and Sweden. Many of the continental courts welcomed it, and orphan-houses, after the model of Francke’s became the chief feature of the Reformed Church was influenced and impelled by it, and even England and the Netherlands indicated a strong sympathy for its practical and evangelical features. No higher tribute can be paid it than that of Tholuck, who avers that “the Protestant Church of Germany has never possessed so many zealous and instructural ministers and laymen as in the first forty years of the 18th century.” With a new generation of professors at Halle—among them C. B. Michaelis, the younger Francke, Freiherr zu, the elder Francke, and the younger Francke—taking the place of their more vigorous predecessors, Pietism began to lose its first power and earnest spirit. The persistent inquiry into scriptural truth passed over into a tacit acquiescence of the understanding. Reliance was put on the unchanging fruits of study. Spener had blended the emotions of the mind and heart, reason and faith, harmoniously; but
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the later Pietists cast off the former and blindly followed the latter. Hence they soon found themselves indulging in superstition, and repeating many of the errors of some of the most deluded Mystics. Science was frowned upon, because of its supposed conflict with the literal interpretations of Scripture. Science, like all human knowledge, is ever liable to error. The study of Protestantism, the sciences, and the arts, work for the furtherance of civilization, and not for the extent of error. The history of the Church, from the beginning of the 17th century was only the extreme elaboration of an error, the beginning of which we find as far back as Luther's time, and which became more and more a power in the Church through the influence of Melancthon. It was this: Mistaking the faith by which we believe for the faith which is believed. The principle of the Reformation was justification by faith, not the doctrine of faith and justification. In reply to the Catholics it was deemed sufficient to show that this was the true doctrine which points out the way of salvation to man. The great danger lay in mistaking faith itself for the doctrine of faith. Therefore, in the controversies concerning justifying faith, we find that faith gradually came to be considered in relation to its doctrinal aspects more than in connection with the personal, practical, and experimental knowledge of men. In this view pietism is an elaboration of the faith of the 16th century.

... So far from being heterodox, Spener even expressed himself in the most decided manner in favor of the doctrines of the Church. He would make faith consist less in the dogmatism of the denomination than in the personal faith of the heart; he would bring the doctrine away from the angry disputes of the schools and incorporate it into practical life. He was thoroughly united with the reformers as to the real signification of justifying faith, but these controversies which were sought to be re-established he rejected. From Spener's view of a new phase of spiritual life began to pervade the heart. The orthodoxy of the state Church had been accustomed to consider all baptized persons as true believers if only they had been educated in wholesome doctrines. There was a general demand of that time. There was a demand in the world, which was vital in Luther, and had transformed the world. The land, because it was furnished with the Gospel and the sacraments, was considered an evangelical country. The contrast between mere worldly and spiritual life, between the living and dead members of the Church, was practically abolished, though there still remained a theoretical distinction between the visible and invisible Church. As to the world outside the pale of the Church, the Jews and heathen, there was no thought whatever. Men believed they had done their duty and had fulfilled their whole duty when they had sent out Christian missionaries. Thus lived the state Church in quiet confidence of its own safety and pure doctrine at the time when the nation was recovering from the devastations of the Thirty-years' War. In the times succeeding the Reformation, says a Wurttemberg pastor of the past century, 'the greater portion of the common people trusted that they would certainly be saved if they believed correct doctrines; if one is neither a Roman Catholic nor a Calvinist, and confesses his opposition, he cannot possibly miss heaven; holiness is not so necessary after all' "(Aubler, Die geistliche Offenbarung, i, 278-281).

The enemies of pietism have confounded it with mysticism. There are undoubtedly points in common, but pietism was aggressive instead of contemplative; it was practical rather than theoretical. Both systems made the purity of life essential, but mysticism could not guard against mental disease, while pietism enjoyed a long season of healthful life. The latter was far too much engaged in relieving immediate and pressing wants to care for the general good of the Church and the career of the former. Pietism was mystical in so far as it made purity of heart essential to salvation; but it was the very antipodes of mysticism when organized and operating against a languid and torpid Church with such weapons as Spener and his coadjutors employed. Böhme and Spener were both antagonistic to rationalism, but in purity of heart they were beautifully in unison.
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A brief account of pietism is given in Hase’s Church Hist. § 409; and for a fuller account, see Schröckich, Kirchengesch. seit der Ref. viii, 255-291; Pusey, On German Theology, pt. ii (p. 67-118); pt. ii, ch. x: Amand Saintes, Crit. Hist. of Rationalism, ch. vii. Spener’s character and life may be seen in Canstein’s, and Sand’s account of him; and in Weismann, p. 966-972. A philosophical view of pietism, as a necessary stage in the development of German religious life, is given by Dörner in the Stud. u. Krit. 1884, pt. ii, p. 157, “Über den Pietismus.” Kahnis, apostolische Kirche (2nd ed.), p. 102, regards pietism as ministering indirectly to rationalism; much in the same way as bishop Fitzgerald criticized the similar evangelical movement of England (Aids to Faith, p. 49, etc.). The best account of pietism is to be found in Hornbach, spener u. seine Zeit.; Breschneider, Die Grundlage des evangelischen Pietismus; Marklin, Darstellung v. Kritik des modernen Pietismus. See also Hurst, Hist. of Rationalism, ch. ii and iii; Hurst’s Hugenobchen, Church Hist. of the 18th and 19th Centuries; Winkworth, Christian Singers of Germany, p. 251 sq.; Meth. Qu. Rev. April, 1865, p. 318; Bibliotheca Sacra, July, 1865, p. 622; 1866, p. 224; Gass, Dogmengesch.; Haag, Hist. of the Dogmes.

PIETOSI is the name of a celebrated Jewish family, called in Hebrew בני ספרד, which, like the families בני ספרד and בני ספרד, traced their origin to those Jews who were led into captivity after the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus and Vespasian. To this family belong the following:


2. Jacob de, of Italy, wrote בְּנָי אֲרוֹן, a great collectaneum of divinities (Lissone, 1800):—בְּנָי אֲרוֹן, novellas on the treatises Chalilun and Temura (ibid. 1810):—בְּנָי אֲרוֹן, another collectaneum (ibid.).

3. Zidkia de, a brother of Benjamin, wrote בְּנָי אֲרוֹן, on Jewish rites and precepts (Venice, 1546; Sulzbach, 1699; Dubno, 1794). See Wolf, Bibl. Heb., i, 1001; iii, 961; iv, 962; Schott, Krónische Unter suchung über das Werk Schöbels ha-Leket in Zijon (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1841), i, 147 sq.; Furst, Bibl. Jud. iii, 1003. (B. P.)

PIETRO, MICHELE DE, an Italian prelate of note, was born Jan. 18, 1747, at Albano. After defending in public disputation at Rome with great success some theological propositions, he was appointed professor of ecclesiastical history in the Gregorian university, and of canonical law at the Roman archi-gymnasium. He took an important part in the work of the congregation which examined the decisions of the Synod of Pisa, favorable to Jansenism, and contributed with the learned Gerdl to the redaction of the bull Auctoratem fecit (1794). Pius VI, when he left Rome (1798), made him apostolic legate and he had to give his advice in many a delicate question; for instance, in that of the oath of hatred against royalty which was exacted from French clergy men. Pius VII appointed him successively patriarch of Jerusalem, cardinal (Feb. 28, 1801), and legate to the Propaganda. When this pontiff was forced to leave Rome (1809), Pietro was chosen to occupy his place; but he was soon compelled to betake himself to Paris, and upon his refusal to attend the religious celebration of Napoleon’s marriage with Marie Louise, he was punished with banishment, loss of his dignities, and confiscation of his property. He was relegated to Saumur with cardinals Gabrielli and Primizzi, confined in 1810 in the dungeon of Vincennes, he joined the pope in 1813 at Fontainebleau, and was again separated from him in January, 1814. The political situation finally allowed him to return to Rome, and he became grand penitentiary, prefect of the Index, bishop of Albano (1816), and cardinal (1820). He died at Rome July 2, 1821. This prelate, remarkable for his circumspection and flexibility, was considered one of the luminaries of the Sacred College, for his theological lore and administrative abilities. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, iii, 305.

PIETY occurs but once in the A. V. "Let them learn first the precepts of piety at home." (1 Tim. v, 4). The choice of this word here instead of the more usual equivalents of "godliness," "reverence," and the like, was probably determined by the special sense of pietas, as "erga parentes" (Cicero, Pro Polit. 22: Rev. i, 15; In 6, ii, 22). It does not appear in the earlier English versions, and we may recognise in its application in this passage a special felicity. A word was wanted for εὐγένεια which, unlike "showing godliness," would admit of a human as well as a divine object, and this pietas supplied the Smith.

Piety, or godliness, only another name for personal religion, consists in a firm belief, and in right conceptions of the being, perfections, and providence of God; with suitable affections to him, resemblance of his moral perfections in the will, and constant obedience to his will. In the different articles included in this definition, such as knowledge, veneration, love, resignation, etc., are explained in their proper places in this work. For Perverted Piety, see ETHICS.

PIGA, MELETIUS, an Eastern prelate, flourished in the second half of the 16th century. He was in 1591 exarch of the archbishop of Constantinople, and he was chosen patriarch of Antioch after that time was chosen to fill the chair of St. Mark’s. As patriarch of Alexandria, Piga distinguished himself by great devotion to ecclesiastical studies, and as the author of one or two controversial writings for the Slavonic church, which was exposed to the intrusion of Romanism.

PIGENAT, FRANCOIS, a French preacher of the Jesuitic order, was born at Autun near the close of the 16th century. He early became a member of the Society of Jesus, and at Paris was one of the most zealous preachers of the League. In September, 1598, he was, in a somewhat astonishing manner, elected curate of St. Nicolas des Champs, Legesay having been expelled by his parishioners as suspected of Huguenotism. Henry III said on that occasion that "Parisians were kings and popes; and if you only let them have their own way, they will soon dispose of the whole spiritual and temporal power of the realm." In January, 1598, Pigenat preached at Paris the funeral sermon of the duke and cardinal of Guise, assassinated at Blois by order of the king, and gave them the title of martyrs. Pigenat took a conspicuous part in all the absurd and obscene processions of the time. He organized one in his own parish, where over a thousand persons, of both sexes and every age, were marched half naked, the curate himself having only a white robe to cover his body. He was one of the first to sign the deposition of Henry III, and became a member of the council of the Three Musketeers. He was one of the first to make his entrance into Paris. He died in 1598. A—
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corresponding to L'Etoile, he was not destitute of talent and imagination.

His brother, Odon Pigeonat, provincial of the Jesuits and one of the Seize, was also a chief of the League. He died at Bourges of an attack of in rheumatism. A third member of the same family, Jean Pigeonat, lived a much more retired life. He left Avocatages aux Pouvoirs, Histoire, et Mathématiques, etc. (Paris, 1592, 8vo).—Hofeer, Nouv. Brevi. Générale, xii, 265.

Pigeon is the rendering—but only in connection with the epithet "young"—of two very different Heb. and one Gr. word: Ἰερόν, ἀνδρί, ἀντιπότο, a general name for any member of the dove family ("dove") everywhere, except in the Mosaic enactment, Lev. i, 14; v, 7, 11; xi, 6, 8; xiv, 22, 50; xiv, 29, 12; Num. vi, 10; Luke ii, 24; but in Gen. xv, 9; 22, 5a, godzli, the young of any bird, perhaps there correctly of the dove, although in Deut. xxxii the "young" of the eagle is meant. The Biblical passages in which the pigeon is mentioned may be classified as follows:

1. Pigeons or doves were the only birds used for sacrificial, (comp. already Gen. xv, 9), in particular young pigeons (Ἰερόν ὑπ' ἄνδρι, pulis columbarius) and turtle-doves, which were sacrificed, sometimes with other offerings (Lev. xi, 14); in purifying women after childbirth, sometimes alone as free-will offerings made by fire (Lev. i, 14); or were prescribed in the purifications from leprosy (Lev. xiv, 22), from personal uncleanness (Lev. xv, 19); of that of Nazarites (Num. vi, 10), and of women after menstruation (Lev. xv, 25). But in two cases, where poverty interfered with the more costly regulations, these were substituted (Lev. v, 7 sqq.; xi, 8. Comp. Luke ii, 24). Such offerings of birds were also made by the poor in Egypt. (See Paasch, s. v., 89, 92. Comp. Engel, Cypres, ii, 184 sq.) For the purpose of providing these same doves, dealers in pigeons used to sit in the neighborhood of the Temple (Matt. xxii, 12; Mark xi, 13; John ii, 14, 16); and the raising of doves was from an early day a pursuit peculiar to the Jews (Isa. lx, 8. Comp. Rosenmüller, Morganen, vi, 258), although there were also many wild pigeons in Palestine (Ezek. vi, 16, Comp. Schubert, iii, 250), which built their nests in debris of the rocks (Jer. xxxi, 9. Comp. ii, 14; Robinson, ii, 433, or at least sought a refuge there when chased (Ps. xi, 1. Comp. Midr. xxxii, 495 sq.; Quent. Spera, xii, 12 sq.). See Schwobel, De colombinarum et columbariorum cultu. Ed. Wermardt, De colomb. sacra Syro- us (Helmst. 1761).

2. The flight of the pigeon was employed by the poet as a figure for swiftness (Ps. iv, 7; Hosea xi, 11. Comp. Soph., Ed. Col. 1081; Eurip. Bucch. 1590; Robinson, ii, 484, and is understood by many interpreters in several passages of the New Testament (Matt. iii, 16; Mark i, 10; John i, 29) in which the Holy Spirit’s descent is spoken of, but this may be doubted. The figure is carried out still further by Isaiah (ix, 8), and it is true that the pigeon surpasses in swiftness and directness of flight many birds of its size, without, however, being remarkable in this respect (Verg. Aen. v, 213 sq.; Plin. x, 52). The cause of this may be found in its long wings (Rechten, Naturgesch. iv, 2), by means of which it often escapes the birds which would prey upon it (Curtius, i, 47, ed. 1854, and 46, 45). In songs of love, the eyes of the beloved, as expressive of attachment and of innocence, are compared with those of the dove, or, as some say, with little doves (Cant. i, 15; iv, 1). And Cant. v, 12 it is said, "like the vessels of brass, bathed in milk, rating in fulness," a very beautiful description of the swimming apple of the eye. (The explanation of these words by Umbret and Döpke is in better taste than that of Rosenmüller.) The voice of the dove is represented by the poets as an aigis, an expression of sorrow (Num. iii, xxvii, 14; 11x, 11; Nah. ii, 8. Comp. Ezek. vi, 16; Theoc. vii, 141; Verg. Aen. vii, 59; Mar-
to his parents, who were opposed to his design. In 1787 he arrived at the island of Hon-Dat, near the coast of Cochín-China. The apostolic vicar of that mission, M. Fuguet, bishop of Puebla, gave him the direction of his college, which he was then transferring to that place. In 1788 the governor of the province Kan-Rao, to which the island of Hon-Dat belonged, ordered him to be arrested, and sentenced him to the cangue, with another French missionary and a Chinese priest. The cangue was a form of punishment, and after three months' captivity were set at large. Pignone resumed the direction of his college, and transferred it to Pondicherry. In 1770 he was appointed bishop of Adran in partibus, and coadjutor of the apostolic vicar of Cochin-China, whom he soon after succeeded in his office. In 1774 he entered Cochin-China by the Cambodians. He found the whole country in the power of rebels, who had put to death the king and his nephew. The brother of the latter, Nguyén-Auta, who had been imprisoned, escaped and fled to the house of the bishop of Adran, where he was concealed for a month. He succeeded afterwards in bringing together a small force, took possession of Lower Cochin-China, and called to his side his benefactor, and was, in all he did, directed by his advice. In 1783 he was beaten by the rebels, and had to leave theiscopal. Pignone then sailed along the coast of Cambodia, went to the Cambodians, and thence to Siam. Having embarked for Pondicherry, he heard, while sailing along the coast of Cambodia, that Nguyén-Auta was at a short distance on the coast; he joined him, who, having put six hundred Jesuits, was reduced to the last extremity of starvation. He relieved them, with his own provisions, and after spending a fortnight with them, he gained Pulo-Way, a small deserted island, situated sixty leagues from the continent. He stayed there nine months, during which time he wrote, in company with a Cochin-Chinese priest, instructions for the religious worship, and corrected several works translated from the French. In December, 1784, he joined again the king of Cochin-China, and soon after went in person to solicit the assistance of Louis XVI for his friend, taking along with him the six-year-old son of the Asiatic prince. He arrived at Lorient February, 1787. His embassy was a successful one. France engaged to send four frigates and nearly two thousand soldiers to Cochin-China, and obtained in compensation the principal harbor of that country, Tournon. Louis XVI, for whom Pignone had his presents prepared, and had his present prepared by him to Nguyén-Auta. The bishop, who had received rich presents himself, embarked for Pondicherry with the young prince, carrying to Count Thomas Conway, governor-general of the East Indies, the letter which he had obtained from him, with the direction to prepare and command in person the projected expedition; but various obstacles, among others the Revolution, prevented it, and the bishop could only equip two little ships, which loaded with ammunition, guns, etc. Count Conway put also at his disposition a frigate, on the front of which he sailed to Cochin-China, where he joined the king in December, 1789. The arrival of these subsidies, the clever exertions of the French officers, who, in a short time equipped a powerful fleet, and organized an army of six thousand soldiers after the European fashion, gave the victory to the king. The bishop was hopeful of turning to the advantage of religion the influence he had won, when he died of dysentery, Oct. 9, 1799. In August, 1861, the French government restored the tomb of Pignone de Béhaine, and proclaimed it French property.—Hoefer, Nouv. Bioi. Générale, xi, 224.

PIGNONE, Simone, an Italian painter, who, according to Oretti, was born at Florence in the year 1614, studied with Fabrizio Boschi, afterwards with Pasquino, and finally with Francesco Furini, whose manner he thoroughly imbibed although he improved his coloring by visiting Venice, and studying the works of the great masters, particularly those of Titian and Tintoretto. After his return to Florence he distinguished himself by several works which he executed for the churches, and which were greatly admired for the delicacy and beauty of their execution. The best of these are, St. Michael descending the Borea, for the church of the Nunziata; St. Louis, King of France, Distributing his Wealth to the Poor, in S. Felicita; and an altar-piece, Monte Oliveto. His most admired works, however, are to be found in the collections of the nobility. These are of small size, and from sacred subjects. There are also some of his pictures in the Florentine Gallery. He was fond of painting mythological subjects, the peculiar character of which afforded a fine opportunity of displaying his marvellous skill in flesh tints. Lanzi and Carlo Maratta agree as to his being among the best of the Florentine painters of his time. His death occurred in 1598. See Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, ii, 695.

Pignorius, Laurentius, a noted Italian ecclesiastic, celebrated especially as an antiquary, was born at Padua in 1571, and flourished at Treviso, where he held a canonry. He died of the plague in 1631. He collected a cabinet of medals and other curiosities of rare extent and value. His principal work is an attempt to explain the famous Isiac Table, a relic of Egyptian antiquity, covered with figures of divinities, symbols, and hieroglyphics. The table is supposed by Warburton to belong to the latest period of Egypt. Pignorius also wrote a treatise, De Secretis et eorum adpud veteres Ministeriis: Antiquitates of Padua, etc.

Pi-hah'-roth (Heb. Pi-hachiroth, רַע הַחֵרֹת, understood by some to be of Hebrew etymology, and rendered mouth of the gorges; Sept. ἄλοχος τοῦ στόματος Κέμ, of the mouth of Kene; Vulg. Phaciroth), a place before which the Israelites encamped, at the close of the third month, on their way from Baran, when they arrived on the borders of Egypt. Pi-hahiroth was before Migdol, and on either hand were Baal-zephon and the sea (Exod. xiv, 2, 9; Numb. xxxiii, 7, 8). The name is probably that of a natural locality, from the unlikelihood that there should have been a town or village in both parts of the country where it is placed in addition to Migdol and Baal-zephon, which seem to have been, if not towns, at least military stations, and its name is susceptible of an Egyptian etymology giving a sense apposite to this idea. The first element of the word is apparently derived by its pronunciation as a separate word (Exod. xxxiii, 8), and it would therefore appear to be the masculine definite article Pe, Pn, or Pr. Jabalnoci proposed the Coptic pi-achiroth, “the place where a gosp grows,” and this, or a similar name, the late M. Fulgence Fresnel recognized in the modern Gherayeb el-bisz, “the bed of reeds,” near Ras Atakah. There is another Gherayeb el-bisz near Suez, and such a name would of course depend for its permanence upon the continuance of a vegetation subject to change. Migdol appears to have been a common name for a watch-tower. See Migdol. Baal-zephon we take to have had a similar meaning to that of Migdol. See BAAL-ZEPHON. We should expect, therefore, that the encampment would have been in a depression, partly marshy, having on either hand an elevation marked by a watch-tower (Smith). It is evident that so vague a circumstance as the presence of reeds, which are common in any moist place near Suez, cannot serve to determine the locality. This must be fixed by the more definite notices of the narrative, which appear to us to point to the opening of the plain of Elath, between Jebel Atakah and Jabel Abu-Deraj. See EXOD; RED SEA, CROSSING OF.

Pik, also called Jeremiah Berlinh, a somewhat noted Jewish rabbi, flourished at Breslau, in Silesia, where he died, May 13, 1799, after having occupied the rabbinship for about sixteen years. He wrote הַרְבִּין, or notes and corrections to the Talmud, which are generally printed in
the modern editions of the Talmud — פִּלְאָט (v. q.r.), dictionary, called Aruch, but only on the letters א-ה, which were edited by H. W. Günzburg (Breslau, 1860), while the second part, comprising the letters ו-ת, which was prepared by Luzzatto and Hurwitz, was edited by Brönkranz (Vienna, 1859) — פּוֹלֵאָת. I.e. glossaries on the Targum of Onkelos (v. q.r.), edited by D. Sklover (Breslau, 1827, and Vienna, 1856) — פּוֹלֵאָת on the Mishna, printed in the editions of the Mishna (Vienna, 1798; Prague, 1828-30); and with many additions edited by W. Eger, Altona, 1841-46). See Ber, Jüdische Literaturbriefe (Leips. 1867, p. 45; reprinted from Frankel’s Monatschrift, 1853-1854); First, Bibliotheca Judaica, i, 110; Zunz, Die Monats- zeitschrift des Jahres 1863 (Berlin, 1872, p. 27); Eng. transl. by Rev. B. Pick, in the Jewish Messenger (N. Y. 1874); Cassel, Leitfaden zur jüdischen Geschichte u. Literatur (Berlin, 1872), p. 107; Jost, Gesch. d. Juden, u. s. Sekten, iii, 246; Steinmeichel, Bibliograph. Handb. p. 22; Catalogus Libr. Hebrik. Bodl. p. 1885. (B. P.)

Pike, Samuel, an English Dissenting minister, was born at Ramsey, Wiltshire, about 1717. He became master of King’s College, Cambridge, and in 1747 succeeded John Hill at the Three Cranes, London. He died in 1773. Pike was quite a voluminous writer. Among his many productions we mention, Thoughts on such Passages of Scripture as enjoin Affection to the poor (Cambridge, 1754, 12mo).—Philosophia Sacra, or the Principles of Natural Philosophy extracted from Divine Revelation (Lond. 1758, 8vo). A scarce work, written on Hutchinsonian principles:—The Nature and Evidences of Saving Faith; being the Substance of Four Sermons preached in St. Paul’s Church, on Feb. 24, 1; Two of which were Preached at the Mews Gate, London, Pinner’s Hall. With a Preface (Lond. 1764, 8vo):—Religious Cases of Conscience answered in an Evangelical Manner, or the Inquiring Christian Instructed; to which are added Replies to Thirty-two Questions, or the Prefect Christian in the Bar of God’s World; To which is subjoined the Character of the Happy, Honest, and Faithful Man. By Samuel Pike and Samuel Hayward (new ed. Romey, 1819, 8vo; last Amer. ed. with an Intro. by Dr. H. A. Boardman, Phila. 1859, 12mo).—Compendious Hebrew Lexicon (Lond. 1769, 8vo; new ed. 1816, 8vo). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. Auth., s. v.; Darling, Cyclop. Bibl. s. v. (J. H. W.)

Pikollos, a deity among the ancient Wends of Slavonia, who was believed to preside over the infernal regions and the roads of the dead. He was represented as an old man with a pale countenance, and having before him three dead heads. He corresponded to Pluto of the ancient Romans, and to Stera of the Hindos. Like the latter, he desires human blood, and reigns at once over the manes or souls of the dead, and over the metals in the bowels of the earth.

Pilate, Pontius (Πλάτων Πίλατος, Greecized from the Latin Pontius Pilatus), the Roman procurator of Judaea, during the period of our Lord’s public ministry and passion, and chiefly known in history from his connection with the Crucifixion. In the following account we combine Scriptural notices with information from other ancient resources and modern examination.

I. His Name. — His praenomen or first name is unknown. His name on a family-name indicates that he was connected, by descent or adoption, with the gens of the Pontii, first conspicuous in Roman history in the person of C. Pontius Telesinus, the great Samnite general. The cognomen Pilatus has received two explanations. (1) As armed with the pilum or javelin (comp. "pilata agmina," Virg. Aen. xii, 121); (2) As contracted from Pilatus. The fact that the pilum or cap was the badge of manumitted slaves (comp. Suetonius, Nero, c. 57; Tiber. c. 4), makes it probable that the epithet marked him out as a libertus, or as descended from one.

II. His Office. — He was one of the six procurators of Judaea (Matt. xxvii, 2; Mark xv, 1; Luke iii, 1; John xviii, xix), under whom our Lord taught, suffered, and died (Acts iii, 18; iv, 27; xiii, 28; 1 Tim. vi, 15). The testimony of Tacitus on this point is no less clear than it is important; for it fixes beyond a doubt the time when the foundations of our religion were laid. "The author of that name (Christian) or sect was Christ, who was captive in the reign of Tiberius by Pontius Pilate" (Auctor nominis ejus Christus, Tiberio imperante, per procuratorem Pontium Pilatum supplicio aequae censurae exulavit).

A procurator (ἰερώπορος, Philo, Leg. ad Catum, and Josephus, Wur, ii, ii, 2; but less correctly iερωπος, Matt. xxvii, 2; and Josephus, Ant. xviii, 3, 1) was generally a Roman knight, appointed to act under the governor of a province as Pilate of the revenue, and judge in cases connected with it. Strictly speaking, procuratores Caesaris were only required in the imperial provinces, i.e. those which, according to the constitution of Augustus, were reserved for the special administration of the emperor, without the intervention of the senate and people, and governed by his legate. In the senatorial provinces, governed by consuls, the corresponding duties were discharged by quaestors. Yet it appears that sometimes procuratores were appointed in those provinces also, to collect certain dues of the fiscus (the emperor’s special revenue), as distinguished from those of the aerarium (the revenue administered by the senate). Sometimes in a small territory, especially in one contiguous to a larger province, and dependent upon it, the procurator was head of the administration, and had full military and judicial authority, though he was responsible to the governor of the neighboring province. Thus Judaea was attached to Syria upon the deposition of Archelaus (A.D. 6), and a procurator appointed to govern it, with Cæsarea for its capital. Already, during a temporary absence of Archelaus, it had been in charge of the procurator Simonides; then, after Tibereus’s banishment, came Coponius; the third procurator was M. Ambivius; the fourth Annius Rufus; the fifth Valerianus Gratus; and the sixth Pontius Pilate (Josephus, Ant. xviii, 2, 2), who was appointed A.D. 25-26, in the twelfth year of Tiberius. He doubled the office for a period of ten years (Josephus, Ant. xviii, 10, 9). The agreement on this point between the accounts in the New Testament and those supplied by Josephus is entire and satisfactory. It has been exhibited in detail by the learned, accurate, and candid Lardner (i, 150-399, Lond. 1827). These procurators had their headquarters at Cæsarea, which is called by Tacitus Judæa caput; but they took up their temporary abode at Jerusalem on occasion of the great feasts, as a measure of precaution against any popular outbreak. See Procurator.

III. His Life.—1. Of the early history of Pilate we know nothing; but a German legend fills up the gap strangely enough. Pilate is the bastard son of Tyrus, king of Mayence. His father sends him to Rome as a hostage. There he is guilty of a murder, is sent to Pontus, rises in insurrection, and slays the barbarous tribes there; he comes in consequence the new name of Pontius, and is sent to Judæa. It has been suggested
that the twenty-second legion, which was in Palestine at the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, and was afterwards stationed at Mayence, may have been in this case either the bearers of the tradition or the inventors of the tale (comp. Wilmar, Deutsche Nationalliteratur, i, 217).

2. His Official Career.—(1). His Administration in General.—One of Pilate's first acts was to remove the headquarters of the army from Cesarea to Jerusalem.

The soldiers of course took with them their standards, bearing the image of the emperor, into the Holy City. Pilate had been obliged to send them in by night, and there were no bounds to the rage of the people on discovering what had thus been done. They poured down in crowds to Cesarea, where the procurator was then residing, and besought him to remove the images. After five days of discussion he gave the signal to some concealed soldiers to surround the petitioners and put them to death unless they ceased to trouble him; but this only strengthened their determination, and they declared themselves ready rather to submit to death than forego their resistance to an idolatrous innovation. Pilate then yielded, and the standards were by his orders brought back to Cesarea (Josephus, Ant. xviii, 3, 12; War, ii, 9, 2-4). No previous governor had ventured on such an outrage. Herod the Great, it is true, had placed the Roman eagle on one of his new buildings; but this had been followed by a violent outbreak, and the attempt had not been repeated. (The word is used by M. L. Ed. Gesch. Geschicht., iv, 609). The extent to which the scruples of the Jews on this point were respected by the Roman governors is shown by the fact that no effigy of either god or emperor is found on the money coined by them in Judea before the war under Nero (Ibid., x, 33, referring to De Stalsey, Recherches sur la Numismatique judaïque, pt. viii, ix). Assuming this, the denarius with Caesar's image and superscription of Matt. xxiii must have been a coin from the Roman mint, or that of some other province. The latter was probably current for the common purposes of life. The Shchel alone was received as a Temple-offering. See Abomination of Desolation.

Colin of Judea struck under Pontius Pilate.

Observe : ybdhwn Kaiwso ("Of Tiburion Caesar"), with the legend o l6, l. 1, A.D. 19, the year of our Lord's crucifixion. See also a note of the same kind at the foot of a coin struck in the name of Caesar, with three or four cori (coins) together. Probably a quadrans, equivalent to two "missiva" (Matt. xix, 29).

On two other occasions Pilate nearly drove the Jews to insurrection: the first when, in spite of this warning about the images, he hung up in his palace at Jerusalem some gilt shields inscribed with the names of deities, which were only removed by an order from Tiberius (Philo, Ad Caesarem, § 38, ii, 589); the second when he appropriated the revenue arising from the redemption of towns to fortification (Mark vii, 11) to the construction of an aqueduct. This order led to a riot, which he suppressed by sending among the crowd soldiers with concealed daggers, who massacred a great number, not only of ristrers, but of casual spectators (Josephus, War, ii, 9, 4). Ewald suggests that the Tower of Siloam (Luke xii, 4) may have been part of the same works, and that this was the reason why its fall was looked upon as a judgment (Gesch. vi, 40). The Pharisaic reverence for whatever was set apart for the Corban (Mark vii, 11), and their scruples as to admitting into it anything that was impure (Origin, Mark, xiv, 11; Wai, xxvii, 6), may be regarded, perhaps, as outgrowths of the same feeling. See CORBAN.

To these specimens of his administration, which rest on the testimony of profane authors, we must add the slaughter of certain Galileans, which was told to our Lord as a piece of news (ἐγείραν τοὺς ἄνθρωπος, Luke xii, 1), and on which he founded some remarks on the connection between sin and calamity. It must have occurred at some feast at Jerusalem, in the outer court of the Temple, since the blood of the worshippers was mingled with their sacrifices; but the silence of Josephus about it seems to show that riots and similar sudden occasions were so frequent that it was needless to record them all. Ewald suggests that the insurrection of which Mark speaks (xxv, 7) must have been that connected with the appropriation of the Corban (supra), and that this explains the eagerness with which the people demanded Barabbas's, his decision on this latter occasion being recorded, from Barabba's name, that he was the son of a rabbi (Abba was a rabbinic title of honor), and thus accounts for the part taken in his favor by the members of the Sanhedrim. See BARABBAS.

(2). His special Connection with Jesus.—It was the custom for the procurators to reside at Jerusalem during the great feasts, to preserve order, and accordingly, at the time of our Lord's last Passover, Pilate was occupying his official residence in Herod's palace; and to the gates of this palace Jesus, condemned on the charge of blasphemy, was brought early in the morning by the chief priests and officers of the Sanhedrin, who were unable to enter the residence of a Gentile, lest they should be defiled, and unfit to eat the Passover (John xix, 28). Pilate therefore came out to learn their purpose, and was astonished, first to hear that they seemed to have expected that he would have carried out their wishes without further inquiry, and therefore merely described our Lord as a ἀντιτικαυτος (distruber of the public peace); but as a Roman procurator had too much respect for justice, or at least understood his business too well to consent to such a condemnation, and as they knew that he would not enter into theological questions, any more than Gallio afterwards did on a somewhat similar occasion (Acts xviii, 14), they were obliged to devise a new charge, and therefore interpreted our Lord's claims in a political sense, accusing him of assuming the royal title, perverting the nation, and forbidding the payment of tribute to Rome (Luke xxiii, 3; an account plainly presupposed in John xviii, 33). It is evident that from this moment Pilate was distracted between two conflicting feelings: a fear of offending the Jews, who had already grounds of accusation against him, which would be greatly strengthened by any show of lukewarmness in punishing an offence against the imperial government, and a conscious conviction that Jesus was innocent, since it was absurd to suppose him desirous to free the nation from the yoke of authority which was criminal in the eyes of the Sanhedrin. Moreover, this last feeling was strengthened by his own hatred of the Jews, whose religious scruples had caused him frequent trouble, and by a growing respect for the calm dignity and meekness of the sufferer. First he examined our Lord privately, and asked him whether he were a king. The question which he in return put to his judge, "Seargent thou this of thyself, or did others tell it thee of me?" seems to imply that there was in Pilate's own mind a suspicion that the executioners had so far as was he charged with being; a suspicion which shows itself again in the later question, "WARRANT AMID THOU?" (John xix, 8), in the increasing desire to release him (ver. 12), and in the refusal to alter the inscription on the cross (ver. 22). In any case Pilate accepted as satisfactory Christ's assurance that he was not of this world, that is, not worldly in its nature or objects, and therefore not to be founded by this world's weapons, though he could not understand the assertion that it was to be established by bearing witness to the truth. (Comp. Mark, xxv, 5). It is a question of a worldly-minded politician, sceptical because he was indifferent, one who thought truth an empty name, or at least could not see "any connection between διάφανα and Παθητικαί, truth and policy" (Dr. C. Wordsworth, Comm. ad loc.). With this question he
Pilate brought the interview to a close, and came out to the Jews and declared the prisoner innocent. To this they replied that his teaching had stirred up all the people from Galilee to Jerusalem. The mention of Galilee suggested to Pilate a new way of escaping from his dilemma, by sending on the case to Herod Antipas, to treat with him in private, and then releasing Jesus to the feast, while at the same time this gave him an opportunity for making overtures of reconciliation to Herod, with whose jurisdiction he had probably in some recent instance interfered. But Herod, though prompted by this act of courtesy, declined to enter into the matter, and merely sent Jesus back to Pilate dressed in a shining kingly robe (ἐξοδήμα λαμπρόν, Luke xxiii., 11), to express his ridicule of such pretensions, and contempt for the whole business. So Pilate was compelled to come to a decision, and first, having assembled the chief priests and the people, he was probably summoned in the expectation that they would be favorable to Jesus, he announced to them that the accused had done nothing worthy of death, but at the same time, in hopes of pacifying the Sanhedrin, he proposed to release him before he released him. But as the accusers were resolved to have his blood, they rejected this concession, and therefore Pilate had recourse to a fresh expedient. It was the custom for the Roman governor to grant every year, in honor of the Passover, pardon to one criminal condemned to death. The origin of the practice is unknown, though we may connect it with the fact mentioned by Livy (v, 13) that at a Lecture-seminarum vinetia quoca dempta vincula. Pilate therefore offered the people their choice between two, the murder Barabbas, and the prophet whom a few days before they had hailed as the Messiah. To receive their decision he ascended the στήπα, a portable tribunal which was carried about with a Roman magistrate to be placed wherever he might direct, and which in the present case was erected on a tessellated pavement (λαστρωτοὺς in front of the palace, and called in Hebrew גבעוקס, probably from being laid down on a slight elevation) on which he stood. As soon as he had taken his seat, he received a mysterious message from his wife, according to tradition a proselyte of the gate (16ον, χαύρα), named Procla or Claudia Procula (Evans, Nedd, ii), who had "suffered many things in a dream," which impelled her to entreat her husband not to condemn the Just One. But he had no longer any choice in the matter, for the rabble, instigated of course by the priests, was clamorous for the death of Jesus; insurrection seemed imminent, and Pilate reluctantly yielded. But before issuing the fatal order he washed his hands before the multitude, as a sign that he was innocent of the crime, in imitation probably of the ceremony enjoined in Deut. xx1, where it is ordered that when the perpetrator of a murder is not discovered, the elders of the city in which it occurs shall wash their hands, with the declaration, “Our hands have not shed this blood, neither have our eyes seen it.” Such a practice might naturally be adopted even by a Roman, and Pilate, as he stood among the multitude around him. As in the present case it produced no effect, Pilate ordered his soldiers to inflict the scourging preparatory to execution; but the sight of unjust suffering so patiently borne seems again to have troubled his conscience, and prompted a new effect in favor of the victim. He brought him out bleeding from the savage punishment, and decked in the scarlet robe and crown of thorns which the soldiers had put on him in derision, and said to the people, “Behold the man!” hoping that such a spectacle would arouse them to shame and remorse. But (3) his Eventual Fate—Here, as far as Scripture is concerned, our knowledge of Pilate’s life ends. But we learn from Josephus (Ant. xvi, 4, 1) that his anxiety to avoid giving offence to Caesar did not save him from political disaster. The Samaritans were unquiet and rebellious. A leader of their own race had promised to
Pilate led his troops against them, and defeated them easily enough. The Samaritan king, Vespasian, now possessed of Syria, and he sent Pilate to Rome to answer their accusations before the emperor (Jos. 9). When he reached Rome he found Tiberius dead and Caligula on the throne, A.D. 46. Eusebius adds (Hist. Eccles. ii, 7) that soon afterwards, "weary with misfortunes," he killed himself. As to the scene of his death there are various traditions. One is that he was banished to Vienna Allobrogum (Vienne on the Rhone), where a singular monument, a pyramid on a quadrangular base, fifty-two feet high, is called Pontius Pilate's tomb (Smith, Diet. of Christ. Ant. art. Vienna). Another is that he sought to hide himself on the mountain by the lake of Lucerne, now called Mount Pilatus; and there, after spending years in its recesses, in remorse and despair rather than penitence, plunged into the dismal lake which occupies its summit. According to the popular belief, "a form is often seen to emerge from the gloomy waters, and go through the action of one washing his hands; and when he does so dark clouds of mist gather first round the bosom of the Infernal Lake (such it has been styled of old), and then, wrapping the whole upper part of the mountain in darkness prevails as a hurricane, which is sure to follow in a short space" (Scott, *Anne of Geierstein*, ch. i). (See below.)

Pilate's wife is also, as might be expected, prominent in these traditions. Her name is given as Claudia Procula (Nephele, Hist. Eccles. i, 80). She had been a proselyte to Judaism before the crucifixion (Ewog. Niceph. c. 2). Nothing certain is known of her history, but the tradition that she became a Christian as old as the time of Origen (Hom. in Matt. xxvii). The Greek Church has canonized her. The dream has been interpreted by some as a divine interposition; by others as a suggestion of the devil, who wished to prevent the Saviour's death: by others as the unconscious reflection of her interest in the reports which had reached her regarding Jesus. The description of Jesus as "that just man" ( Acts 23:35), it is remarked by Schaff, recalls the celebrated unconscious prophecy of Plato, in his Republic, as to the savior who was, after enduring all possible sufferings, to restore righteousness. In the earlier periods, and indeed so long as the commonwealth subsisted, it was not very unusual for the governors of provinces to take their wives with them (Senec, De Convit., 25), and in the strict regulations which Augustus introduced he did not allow the favor, except in peculiar and specified circumstances (Seuton, Aug., 24). The practice, however, grew to be more and more prevalent, and the interest of the government in it is evident from Tacitus that at the time of the death of Augustus, Germanicus had his wife Agrippina with him in Germany (Annal. i, 40, 41; comp. iii, 38-39; Josephus, Ant. xx, 10, 1; Ulpian, iv, 2). Indeed, in the beginning of the reign of Titus, Germanicus took his wife with him into the East. Piso, the prefect of Syria, took his wife also along with him at the same time (Tacit. Annal. ii, 54, 55). "But," says Lardner (i, 152), "nothing can render this (the practice in question) more apparent than a motion made in the Roman senate by Severus Cestius, in the fourth consulship of Tiberius, and second of Drusus Caesar (A.D. 21), that no magistrates among whom any province was assigned should be accompanied by his wife, except the senate's rejecting it, and that with some indignation" (Tacit. Annal. iii, 53, 54). The fact is too important to be thus incidentally referred to, or rather inexplicable, in Matthew, being thus confirmed by full and unquestionable evidence, cannot fail to serve as a corroboration of the evangelical history. (Comp. Paulus, Comm. iii, 728; Kuinoel, In loc. Mut.; Gotter, De Conjung. genit. in Jona, 1704; Kluge, De Stereo Uxoribus Pl. 11. 1720; Hackett, Examen Sotius Uxorum Pl. Odlemb. 1785.)

IV. His Character.—The character of Pilate may be sufficiently inferred from the sketch given above of his conduct at our Lord's trial. By some he has been described as one of the worst of tyrants; by others, who have perhaps some knowledge of the hard hands of the Romans, have unduly palliated or denied. Tertullian speaks of him as virtually a Christian at heart ("jam pro sua conscientia Christianum,"); and the Ethiopian Church has even made him a saint. We have no reason to suppose that, so far as his general administration went, it differed greatly from that of the other Roman governors of Judaea. He was a type of the rich and corrupt Romans of his age; a worldly-minded statesman, conscious of no higher wants than those of this life, yet by no means unmoved by feelings of justice and mercy. His conduct to the Jews, in the instances quoted from Josephus, though severe, was not thoughtlessly cruel or tyrannical, considering the general practice of Roman governors, and the difficulties of dealing with a nation so arrogant and perverse. Certainly there is nothing in the facts recorded by the gospel writers inconsistent with his desire, obvious from the Gospel narrative, to save our Lord. But all his better feelings were overpowered by a selfish regard for his own security. He would not encounter the least hazard of personal annoyance in behalf of innocence and justice; the unrighteous condemnation of a good man, in comparison with the fear of the emperor's frown and the loss of place and power. While we do not differ from Chrysostom's opinion that he was ψαράπονος (Chrysost. i, 802, A.D. Jud. vi), or that recorded in the Apostolical Constitutions (v, 14), that he was also ψαράπονος, we yet see abundant reason for our Lord's merciful judgment, "He that delivered me unto thee hath the greater sin." At the same time his history furnishes a proof that worldliness and want of principle are sources of crimes no less awful than those which spring from deliberate and reckless wickedness. The unhappy notoriety given to his name by its place in the two universal creeds of Christendom is due, not to any desire of singling him out for shame, but to the need of fixing the date of our Lord's death, and so bearing witness to the claims of Christianity as resting on a historical basis (August. De Fide et Symb., c. v, vol. vi, p. 156; Pearson, On the Creed, p. 239, 350, ed. Burt, and the authorities quoted in note e).

That the conduct of Pilate was highly criminal cannot be doubted. The guilt was right in his condemnation with the atrocious depravity of the Jews, especially the priests. His was the guilt of weakness and fear, their the guilt of settled and deliberate malice. His state of mind prompted him to attempt the release of an accused person in opposition to the clamors of a misguided multitudinous mob; the guilt of the Pilate is evident, when an acquitned person by instigating the populace, calumniating the prisoner, and terrifying the judge. If Pilate yielded against his judgment under the fear of personal danger, and so took part in an act of unparalleled injustice, the priests and their tools, who originated the false accusation, sustained it by subornation of perjury, and when it was declared invalid enforced their own unfounded sentence by appealing to the lowest passions. Pilate, it is clear, was utterly destitute of principle. He was willing, indeed, to do right, if he could do right without personal disadvantage. Of gratuitous wickedness he was perhaps incapable, certainly in the condemnation of Jesus he has the merit of being for a time on the side of innocence. But he yielded to violence, and so committed an awful crime. In his hands was the life of the gracious Saviour; in his hands, contrary to all his proceedings, yet he may equally claim some credit for the apparently sincere efforts which he made in order to de-
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Pilate the malice of the Jews and procure the liberation of Jesus.

If now we wish to sum up the judgment of Pilate's character, we easily see that he was one of that large class of men who aspire to public offices, not from a pure and holy desire of benefiting the public and advancing the good of the world, but from selfish and personal considerations, from a love of distinction, from a love of power, from a love of self-indulgence; being destitute of any fixed principles, and having no aim but office and influence, they act right only by chance and when convenient, and are wholly incapable of pursuing a consistent course, or of acting with firmness and self-denial in causes in which the preservation of integrity requires the exercise of stringent judgment. Pilate was a man of weakness, and therefore, with his temptations, of corrupt character. The view given in the Apostolical Constitutions (v, 14), where unmanliness (ἀναρρηµατικόν) is ascribed to him, we take to be correct. This want of strength will readily account for his failure to rescue Jesus from the rage of his enemies, and also for the acts of injustice and cruelty which he practiced in his government—acts which, considered in themselves, wear a deeper dye than does the conduct which he observed in the case of the Jews. With the same weakness may serve to explain the reader how much influence would be exerted on this unjust judge, not only by the stern bigotry and persecuting wrath of the Jewish priesthood, but especially by the not concealed intimations which they threw out against Pilate that if he liberated Jesus, he was no friend of Tiberius, and must expect to have to account of his conduct at Rome. That this was no idle threat, nothing beyond the limits of probability, Pilate's subsequent deposition by Vitellius shows very plainly: nor could the procurator have been ignorant either of the stern determination of the Jewish character, or of the offence he had by his acts given to the heads of the nation, or of the insecurity, at that very hour, when the conflict between him and the priests was proceeding regarding the innocent victim whom they husted to destroy, of his own position in the office which he held, and, of course, be desired to retain. On the whole, then, viewing the entire conduct of Pilate, his previous iniquities as well as his bearing on the condemnation of Jesus—viewing his own actual position and the malignity of the Jews—we cannot consider, give our vote with those who have passed the severest condemnation on this weak and guilty governor.

The number of dissertations on Pilate's character and all the circumstances connected with him, his "faciae," his wife's dream, his supposed letters to Tiberius, which have been published during the last and present centuries, is quite overwhelming. On this point the student may consult with advantage dean Alford's Commentary; Ellwood, Historical Lectures on the Life of our Lord, sect. vii. Neander's Life of Christ, § 283 (Hamburg); Ewalt, Geschichte, v, 90, etc. See also Müller, De emissa. Fil. Christ. servand. stat. (Hamb. 1761); Tobler, in Pfenniger, Samml. z. christl. Mag. III, ii. (Zurich, 1782); Niemeyer, Charakter, i. 129 sq.; Paulus, Comment., iii. 697 sq.; Lücke, on John xiv. Comp. Schuster, in Ebrard's Bibl. d. bibl. Lit., x, 823; Olahausen, in answer to Tholuck's low valuation of Pilate, Comment., ii. 564 sq. The reader will find a discriminating analysis in Stier, Reden Jhes., vi, 818-882 (ii, 619 sq. of the American translation), and in Dr. Hanna's Last Day of Our Lord's Passion (Cambridge, 1853). See also the Rechlin, J. Friesen's Theol. 1871, vol. iv.

V. Apocryphal Accounts.—We learn from Justin Martyr (Apol. i, 76, 84), Tertullian (Apol. c. 21), Eusebius (P. Eccl. ii, 2), and others, that Pilate made an official communication to the Jewish council; and in a homily ascribed to Chrysostom, though marked as spurious by his Benedictine editors (Hom. viii, in Ps. 968, D), certain tvopvnpaia (Acta, or Commentarii Pilati) are spoken of as well-known documents in common circulation. That he made such a report is highly probable, and it may have been in existence when Chrysostom's time. But the Pilate now extant in Greek, and two Latin epitales from him to the emperor (Fabric. Apocr. i, 237, 298; iii, 111, 456), are certainly spurious. The number of extant "Acta Pilati," in various forms, is so large as to show that very early the demand created a supply of documents manifestly spurious, and we have no reason for looking on any one of those that remain as more authentic than the others. The taunt of Celsius that the Christians circulated spurious or distorted narratives under this title (Orig., c. Cel.) and the complaint of Eusebius (Hist. eccl. iv, 11) that the vehicle of blasphemous calumnies, show how largely the machinery of falsification was used on either side. Such of these documents as are extant are found in the collections of Fabricius, Thilo, and Tischendorf. Some of them are but weakly connected with the history. The most extravagant are perhaps the best interesting, as indicating the existence of modes of thought at variance with the prevalent traditions. Of these anomalies the most striking is that known as the "Pardasos Pilati" (Tischendorf, Evang. p. 326). The emperor Tiberius, startled at the universal darkness that had fallen on the Roman empire on the day of the crucifixion, summons Pilate to answer for having caused it. He is condemned to death, but before his execution he prays to the Lord Jesus that he may not be destroyed with the wicked Hebrews, and pleads his ignorance as an excuse. The prayer is answered by a voice from heaven, assuring him that all generations shall call him blessed, and that he shall be a witness for Christ at his second coming to judge the twelve tribes of Israel. An angel receives his head, and his wife dies filled with joy, and is buried with him. Starting as this imaginary history may be, it has its counterpart in the traditional customs of the Abyssinian Church, in which Pilate is recognised as a saint and martyr, and takes his place in the calendar on the 28th of June (Stanley, Eastern Church, p. 18; Neale, Eastern Church, i, 806). The words of Tertullian, describing him as "sem pro sua conscientia Christianus" (Apol. c. 21), indicate a like feeling, and we find traces of it also in the Apocryphal Gospel, which speaks of him as "uncircumcised in flesh, but circumcised in heart" (Ambrose, Nicod. i, 12, in Tischendorf, Evang. Apoc. p. 296).

According to another legend (Mora Pilati, in Tischendorf's Evang. Apoc. p. 482), Tiberius, hearing of the wonderful works of healing that had been wrought in Judea, writes to Pilate, bidding him to send the man that had made these miracles. Pilate is sent to confess that he has crucified him; but the messenger meets Veronica, who gives him the cloth with which he had received the impression of the divine features, and by this the emperor is healed. Pilate is summoned to take his trial, and presents himself wearing the less tunic. This acts as a spell upon the emperor, and he forgets his wonted severity. After a time Pilate is thrown into prison, and there commits suicide. His body is cast into the Tiber, but as storms and tempests followed, the Romans take it up and send it to Vienna. It is thrown into the Rhone; but the same disasters follow, and it is sent on to Loasania (Lucerne or Lausanne?). There it is sunk in a pool, fenced round by mountains, and even there the waters boil or bubble strangely. The interest of this story obviously lies in its presenting an early form (which the text is of) of the local traditions which connect the name of the procurator of Judea with the Mount Pilatus that overlooks the lake of Lucerne. The received explanation (Ruskin, Modern Painters, v, 128) of the legend, as originating in the distorting condemnation of the same Mons Pilatus (the "cloud-capped"), supplies a curious instance of the genesis of a myth from a false etymology; but it may be questioned whether it rests on suffi-
cident grounds, and is not rather the product of a pseudo-criticism, finding in a name the starting-point, not the embodiment of a legend. Have we any evidence that the mountain was known as "Pilateus" before the leg-
gend? Have we not, in the apocryphal story just cited, the proof that the name of the mountain is the same (comp. Vilmar, Deutsche Nationalliteratur, 1, 217)? The extent to which the terror connected with the belief formerly prevailed is somewhat startling. If a stone were thrown into the lake, a violent storm would follow. No one was allowed to visit it without a special permission from the author-
lities of Lucerne. The neighboring shepherds were deeply bound by a solemn oath, renewed annually, never to guide a stranger to it (Giesner, Descript. Mont. Pilat. (Zurich, 1565), p. 40). The spell was broken in 1584 by Johannes Muller, curé of Lucerne, who was bold enough to throw stones and abide the consequences (Golbery, Universa pittoresque de la Suisse, p. 327). It is striking that traditions of Pilate attach themselves to several localities in the south of France (comp. Murray's Hand-book for France, Route 125).

But whatever we may think of these legends, or even of the apocryphal works that have come down to our own times, there can be little doubt that the original documents referred to by the early Church fathers were genuine (Hennecke, Opusc. Acad. p. 201 sq.). Such is the opinion of Winer (Realwörterb.), Lardner, who has detailed the subject (vi. 920), and concludes that "it must be allowed by all that Pontius Pilate composed some mem-
oirs concerning our Saviour, and sent them to the emper-
or" (vi. 610). Winer adds, "What we now have in Greek under this title (Pilate's Report; see Fabriuci Apocr. i, 287, 292; iii, 436), as well as the two letters of Pilate to Tiberius, are fabrications of a later age." So Lardner: "The Acts of Pontius Pilate, and his letter to Tiberius, which we now have, are not genuine, but manifestly spurious." We have not space here to re-
view the arguments which have been adduced in favor of these documents, but we must add that we attach some importance to them, thinking it by no means unlikely that, if they are fabrics, they are fabricated in some keeping with the genuine pieces, which were in some way lost, and the loss of which the composers of our actual pieces sought as well as they could to repair. If this view can be sustained, then the documents we have may serve to help us in the use of discretion to the substance of the actual Acts. At all events, it seems certain that an official report was made by Pilate; and thus we gain another proof that "these things are written that they might be believed; and that all men who wish to enter into this subject should first consult Lardner (ut super.), and the valuable references he gives. See also Altman, De Epist. Pil. ad Tiber. (Berm. 1755); Van Dale, De Orac. p. 609 sq.; Schmidt, Emeisung ins N. T. ii, 249 sq. Of special value is Hermannson, De Pontio Pilato. (Upsala, 1824); also Burger, De Pontio Pilato. (Misen. 1782). The latest work on the subject is that of Lipsius, Die Pilatus-Acien, kritisch untersucht (Kiel, 1871). See Acts of Pilate.

On the occasion of this article, the reader may refer to German, Doctrue ad loca P. Pilati ficinosa col. (Thurun, 1787); Lengenbeck, De Pilati patris (s. 1767); Gotter, De Conjugia Pilati Somnio. (Jen. 1794); Kluge, De Somnio Uxoria Pilati. (Hal. 1770); Herbert, Ermnenl. Ux. Pilat. (Oxf. 1783); Distell, De Solutie Uxoria Pilati. (All. 1772); Mouin, De Pilati in Cena Suppet. agnodi ratione (1825); Warncke, Pont. Pil. ein Gemälde. (Gotha, 1867); Thol. and i. Journal, April, 1861. Hase, in his Leben Jesu, p. 293, 265 (third ed.), affords valuable literary references on this, as on so many similar subjects. See also the monographs referred to by Volbeding, Index Programmatum, p. 58, 59. See Jesus Christ.

Pilate's Staircase. This celebrated staircase is contained within a little chapel near the church of St. John Lateran, at Rome. It consists of twenty-eight white marble steps, and it is alleged by Romanists that this is the holy staircase which Christ several times as-
cended and descended when he appeared before Pilate, and that it was carried by angels from Jerusalem to Rome. Multitudes of pilgrims at certain periods crawl up the steps of this staircase on their knees, with roses-
runs in their hands, in memory of the humility of the Son of God. On reaching the top, the pilgrim must repeat a short prayer. The performance of this ceremony is re-
garded as peculiarly meritorious, and entitled the dev-
out pilgrim to a plenary indulgence. It was during this act of devotion that Martin Luther, then a monk, was started by this ceremony. "The Pilate staircase," he said, "shall live by faith." He instantly saw the folly of such performances; and fleeing in shame from the place, be-
came from that time a zealous reformer. By the Ro-
mans this staircase is called Scala Santa, or holy stair-
case.

Pil' dea (Heb. Piel'dak, pil'dak, according to Plut., for pil'dach, name of fire; Sept. πυλος), the sixth named of the eight sons of Nahor, Abraham's brother, by his niece and wife, Milcah (Gen. xxii., 22). B.C. cir.
2046. "The settlement of his descendants has not been identified with any degree of probability. Bunsen (Bibelwerk, Gen. xxii, 22) compares Ριπολίας, a place in the vicinity of Nisibis; but the etymology of the two names is probably accidental" (Smith).

Pil' el'a (Heb. Pileka', pil'dak, the altar, or worship; Sept. πυλος), the head of one of the Jewish families who sealed the covenant with Nehemiah (Neh. x. 24 (Heb. 25)). R.C. 445.

Pile. See HEMORROHIDIA.

Pile'ar. See TIOULATH-PILKER.

Pile-tower, or Pele-tower, an architectural term, seems to have signified a small fortress, dwelling, or tower, capable of being defended against any sudden marauding expedition. Church towers appear to have been common in use for the same purpose. In these towers, which were used for habitations, have had additions made to them subsequent to their erection. Heifer-haw tower, near Alnwick, and a tower in Cor-
bridge churchyard, were probably pele-towers only. Pile, a fortress, occurs only in names of places in the Isle of Man, Lancashire, and the neighboring parts, but it is an archaic term not exclusively northern.

Pilgrim is used in the A. V. only in the old sense of sojourner, for παραπτωμα (Heb. xi, 18; 1 Pet. ii, 11; "stranger," 1 Pet. i, 1). Similarly in the O. T. "pilgrim" occurs as a rendering of חborah, magar, which signifies a stay, or an abode in a foreign country, travels "stranger," or "traveller."abler; metaphorically, it is used of the pilgrim journoring on earth; thus the patriarch Jacob says to Pharaoh, "The days of the years of my pilgrimage are a hundred and thirty years (Gen. xlvi., 9). The Psalmist likewise says, "Thy statutes have been my songs in the house of my pilgrimage" (Psal. cxix, 54).

Pilgrim Fathers, a name often given to the early settlers of New England. The term "Mayflower," that bore the first of them, left Plymouth Sept. 6, 1620, and on Dec. 6 the passengers landed on a rock in Cape Cod harbor. The men engaged in the formation of the New England colonies have seldom been sur-
passed in sagacity and prowess, in piety and Benevo-
c lent exertion. Many of them were men of education and rank; they were eminently free from the low and degrading vices of the statesmen of that age. The po-
itical trust committed to them was felt to be an aw-
dest deposit. It was their constant aim, one which they were careful to maintain, with the monarchical chamber, and bore back with them to the closet in their religious exercises, that each colonial should exhibit the lofty mien of a
freeman, and wear the dignity of an heir to heaven; that he should bow the knee to none but God, and bear no yoke but his who is meek and lowly in heart. The grief of bidding farewell to friends, country, and home
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PILGRIMAGES did not produce in them a sentimental lethargy, but was borne with manly courage and Christian heroism. In the long and tedious voyage their hearts sank not. Their spirit did not fail them in the midst of those difficulties and dangers with which foreign adventure abounds. The sultry climate, the swamp and the forest, the solitary wandering of the ladies of gentle birth, and the savages, were calmly and successfully encountered. Like their leaders, the majority of them were men of God. The men that landed from the "Mayflower" on the rock of Plymouth felt themselves to be "chosen vessels," and the consciousness of their solemn consecration was the spring and guidance of their conduct. The preservation of the ordinances of religion was a principal endeavor with them. The first trees of the virgin forest were felled for the sanctuary—"a man was famous according as he had lifted up axes upon the thick trees." Truly did they vow, "If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my hand forget her cunning." Their inner life nourished itself by frequent days of fasting and prayer. These were seasons of coveted enjoyment. Their firmness might be somewhat stern, their rigidity of judgment might generate formality, yet their heart was with God, as we know their work. In every crisis they inquired at the oracle of Jehovah; in seasons of deliverance they entered his courts with praise—"a multitude that kept holiday;" in times of imposing danger they placed themselves under the protection of the church and the Christian dispensation. They were a people worthy of those high-souled patriots who were their leaders, both in civil polity and religion. Few statesmen of that day had the purity of Winthrop, few ministers the learning of Cotton, the zeal of Hooker, or the self-sacrificing spirit of Roger Williams. See PURITANS.

Pilgrim, Religious. See PILGRIMAGES.

Pilgrim, a German prelate of medieval times, flourished from 970 to 991. He was first engaged in missionary work among the Hungarians. He held different ecclesiastical positions, and at last was made bishop of Passau. In 974 he drew up for pope Benedict VI a remarkable report concerning the spread of Christianity in Hungary, but the paper was somewhat exaggerated, and probably prepared by Pilgrim to further some particular interest of his own. The truth is, that, like his predecessors, he was striving to assert his independence of the archbishopric of Salzburg; and he defended the dignity and rights of that ancient metropolis, the long since dilapidated city of Lorca (Laurencum), whose diocese stretched onward to Pannonia. "And so we may suppose," says Neander, "that in his efforts to convince the pope (from whom, in fact, he obtained the fulfillment of his wishes) how necessary the restoration of this metropolis was to Pannonia and to its subordinate bishoprics, he allowed himself to be betrayed into a somewhat exaggerated representation of this new sphere of labor in Hungary." See Neander, History of the Christian Church. iii. 331; Kurz, Lehrbuch d. Kirchengesch. (7th ed., i. 294; Theolog. Univ.-lex. A. V. (R. P.).

Pilgrim, Johann Uelich, an engraver on wood, and the supposed inventor of engraving in chiaro-ocuro. Little is known of him or his works, except a few prints, which are marked with two pilgrims' crosses superimposed, over the initials J. O. V. Among the ten prints mentioned by Bartch are the following: The Crown, with the Magdalen kneeling at its foot, and the Virgin and St. John standing one on either side; The Virgin, seated in a garden, with the Infant on her knees; The Fiji, half-length, with the Infant in its lap; St. Jerome in the Desert, with a book in one hand and a stone in the other; and St. Sebastian, tied to a tree.

Pilgrimage of Grace. The. In the time of Henry VIII, it is said that by the dissolution of the lesser monasteries about ten thousand persons became (rather from choice than necessity, for they had the option of being transferred to the larger houses) applicants for public bounty. These persons, traversing the kingdom, by the detail of their sufferings created extensive dissatisfaction, and popular feeling was with them. Many of the people also sympathized with the inmates of monasteries, some of whom they were taught to regard not as artists and scholars but as pretrained men, and who if their charitable works were suspended they would be left without sustenance. An attempt was made to suppress the growing disturbance by restoring thirty of the less disorderly of the suppressed houses. But the storm broke out first in Lincolnshire, and subsequently in Yorkshire, where forty churls for their reasonable exactions crucified and burned banners before them, calling their expedition the Pilgrimage of Grace, and avowing their object to be the removal of low-born counsellors (Cromwell, the chancellor, was the son of a blacksmith at Putney), the suppression of heresy, and the restitution of the Church. These rebel forces, however, melted away without any action; and their leader Ake, upon a repetition of the outbreak, was beheaded for treason. Many of the abbots and friars were supposed to be implicated in the pilgrimage.

Pilgrimages. See exercises of religious discipline, which consist in journeying to some place of reputed sanctity, frequently in discharge of a vow.

Christian Pilgrimages. The idea of any peculiar sacredness being attached to special localities under the Christian dispensation was very strongly manifested in the search for holy places by devout Christians in their studies and travels. The interest which Christ in his conversation with the woman of Samaria, as recorded in John iv.; and nowhere is the principle on this subject more plainly laid down than in the Lord's statement on that occasion: "The hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth: for the Father seeketh such to worship him." In proportion, however, as Christianity receded from the apostolic age, it gradually lost sight of the simplicity and spirituality which marked its primitive character, and availed itself of carnal expedients for the purpose of elevating the imagination and kindling the devotion of its votaries. Hence, in the 4th century, many, encouraged by the example of the emperor Constantine, whose superstitious tendencies were strong, resorted to the scenes of the Saviour's life and ministry for the nourishing and invigoration of their religious feelings and desires. Helenus, the mother of Constantine, set the first example of a pilgrimage to Palestine, which was soon extensively imitated; partly, as in the case of Constantine, with a desire to be baptized in the Jordan, but still more from a veneration for the spots connected with the events of the history of Christ and his apostles. Thus a superstitious attachment to the Holy Land increased so extensively that some of the most eminent teachers of the Church, as Jerome and Gregory of Nyssa, openly disapproved of these pilgrimages. The most frequent resort of pilgrims was Jerusalem, but to this were afterwards added Rome, Tours, and Compostella. As to the last-named place, we find that in the year 1428, under the reign of Henry VI, abundance of licenses were granted by the crown of England to captains of English ships for carrying numbers of devout persons to the shrine of St. James; provided, however, that those pilgrims should first make oaths not to take anything prejudicial to England, nor to reveal any of its secrets, nor to carry out with them any more gold or silver than would be sufficient for their necessary expenses. In that year 926 persons went from England on the said pilgrimage. In our own times the greatest numbers have resorted to Loreto (q.v.), in order to visit the chamber of the Blessed Virgin, in which she was born, and brought up, and under the sign of Jesus Christ, twelve years of age! or to Parvuy le Monial (q.v.), to pay homage to the Virgin Marie à la Coque (q.v.).

In the Middle Ages pilgrimages were regarded as a mark of piety, but, as might have been expected, they gave rise to the most flagrant abuses. We find ar-
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accordingly pope Boniface, in a letter to Cuthbert, archbishop of Canterbury, in the 8th century, desiring that women and nuns might be restrained from their fre-
quent remarks, to Rome. The Synod of Chartres also, which was held in A.D. 813, denounced in no measured terms the false trust reposed in pil-
grimages to Rome, and also to the church of St. Martin at Tours. "There are clergymen," complains this ecclesiastical synod, "who lead an idle life, and trust thereby to be purified from sin, and to fulfil the duties of their calling; and there are laymen who believe that they may sin or have sinned with impunity because they undertook such pilgrimages; there are great men who, under this pretext, practice the grossest extortion among their people; and there are poor men who em-
ploy the same excuse to render begging a more profit-
able employment. Such are those who wander round about, and falsely declare that they are on a pilgrimage; while there are others whose folly is so great that they believe that they become purified from their sins by the mere sight of the holy places, forgetting the words of St. Jerome, who says that there is nothing meritorious in seeing Jerusalem, but in leading a good life there." It was between the 11th and the 12th centuries, how-
ever, that the rage for pilgrimages came to its height. Among the most celebrated of the pilgrimage centers now referred to was the idea extensively prevailed throughout Europe that the thousand years mentioned in the Apocalypse were near their close, and the end of the world was at hand. A general contamination spread among all classes, and many individuals, partaking with their property and abandoning their friends and families, set out for the Holy Land, where they imagined that Christ would ap-
ppear to judge the world. While Palestine had been in the hands of the caliphs, pilgrimages to Jerusalem had been discouraged as offering them an ample source of revenue; but no sooner had Syria been conquered by the Turks, in the middle of the 11th century, than pil-
grims to the Holy Land began to be exposed to every species of insult. The minds of men in every part of Christendom were now inflamed with indignation at the cruelty and impositions of the Moorish mili-
tary possession of the holy places; and in such circumstances the Church enthusiasts found little difficulty in originating the Crusades (c. v.), and for two centuries vast armies of pilgrims poured into the Holy Land. It was easier for the Crusaders, however, to make their conquests than to defend them; and accordingly, the 13th century had passed away, the Christians were driven out of all their Asiatic possessions, and the holy places fell anew into the hands of the infidels.

In almost every country where Romanism prevails pil-
grimages of more or less importance are usual. In England, at one time, the shrine of Thomas Becket, and in Scot-
land that of St. Andrew, was the favorite resort of devout pilgrims. But even down to the present day there are various places in Ireland where stations and holy wells attract crowds of devout worshippers every year; and many parts of that country are credited with extraordinary wortship and pilgrimage. From the beginning of May till the middle of August every year crowds of pious peni-
tents resort to an island near the centre of Lough Fin, or White Lake, in the county of Donegal, to the amount of three or four thousand. These are mostly of the poorer sort, and many of them are proxies for those who are richer: some of whom, however, together with some of the priests and bishops, on occasion make their appear-
ance there. When the pilgrim comes within sight of the holy lake he must uncover his hands and feet, and never touch the ground, and on his return to the is-
land for sixpence. Here are two chapels and fifteen other houses, to which are added confessional, so con-
trived that the priest cannot see the person confessing. The penance varies according to the circumstances of the pilgrim, some of the poor being required to make three, six, or nine days' fasting, or to abstain on meat, sometimes made into bread. He traverses sharp stones

on his bare knees or feet, and goes through a variety of other forms, paying sixpence at every different confession. When all is over the priest bestows a gimlet-hole through the back of the hand, which the pilgrim must sus-
tend a cross peg; gives him as many holy pebbles out of the lake as he cares to carry away, for amulets to be presented to his friends, and so disposes him, an object of veneration to all other papists not thus initiated, who no sooner see the pilgrim's cross in his hands than they kneel down to get his blessing. But France, even in modern times, remains the special patron of Roman-
Catholic devotees. Thus the N.-Y. Tribune correspondent
writes under Aug. 37, 1875, from Paris: "If half a million was a correct estimate—the faithful will tell you that it was too low—the number of those who had already this year, at the date of my 10th of July letter, gone on foot or wheels to pay their devotions at this, that, and the other French shrine, by this it should be near a million and a half. We are now in the height of the pilgrimage season. Never in modern times, if in any time, was there another like it in the tremendous multi-
titudinous pious peregrination. One day it is 100,000 devotees about Notre Dame de la Garde; on another 20,000 at Cambre, 10,000 at Notre Dame de Liasse, at La Salette, and Lourdes, besides great days and extraordin-
ary days. It is a constant procession of suns and moons, a sprinkling of miraculous cures from the thaumaturgic springs of the last-named places. There is hardly a di-
ocese whose bishop does not exalt the merits of some local shrine for convenience of tenanted-footed or short-
walked devotees of his flock." In Belgium also the same grotto-management prevails. The chief object, of course, the attraction of immense flocks of pilgrims from all parts of the world to enrich from their offerings the deplete coffers of the parsonage, and to incite the popular mind to renewed adoration in the promotion of all the ob-
jects at which Romanism has been wont to aim. See ROMANISM.

Peculiar usages have prevailed from time to time among the pilgrims of Christianity. Thus the English pilgrim's weeds consisted of a hood with a cape, a low-
crowned hat with two strings, a staff or bourn four or five feet long, made originally of ree, sticks swathed together, a bottle strung at their waist-belt, and scrip. Those whose pilgrimage was self-imposed walked bare-
footed, and begged their daily bread, let their beards grow, and wore no linen. The Palmer was distinguished by two strings of beads: the Pilgrim wore the St. Catharine's wheel; he who went to Rome came back with a medal, graven with the cross-keys, or vermicile; the pilgrim to Compostella brought home the scallop-shell of Galicia; those who went to Wal-
singham (Carthusian) wore a small cross of silk. In Cal-
terbury the pilgrim carried, as a memorial, an ampulla full of Canterbury water, which was mingled with one tiny drop of a Becket's blood. Latimer mentions * the piping, playing, and curious singing, to solace the trav-
 Ellis and weariness of pilgrims. At Gloucester the pil-
grims' door, with its colossal iron sticks swathed in the south arm of the transept. In the holy wars the French Crusaders were distinguished by a red, English by a white, and Flemings by a green cross. Penitents paid Peter's pence as a composition for a pilgrimage to Rome, or commuted it by a visit to Peterborough, St. Alban's, or St. David's. In 1606, persons going to visit a saint had the protection of the Church. At Hereford, a canon might be absent on a pilgrimage in England for three weeks; and once in his life for seven weeks to visit St. Denia, ten weeks, Rome and Compostella; eight, Yon-
teeques; and one year, Jerusalem. In some Continental countries pilgrims and priests sometimes inscribed their names on the altar which they visited. These were called inscripta, or literata, but must not be confounded with those bearing the donor's name; the first instance of it was at Mont-Saint-Michel, and the last at Constantinople, as Sozomen relates. The pilgrim's tomb sometimes bore the print of two bare feet, as em-
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bemishtical of his safe return. The pilgrims, having been first shrouded, prostrated themselves before the altar while prayers were said over them, and stood up to receive the priest's benediction on their scripts and staves, which are then thrown upon the ground. To the minister who delivered him his hands. If they were going to Jerusalem, a cross was marked upon their garment; the ceremonial terminated with a solemn mass. In 1222 a priest who betrayed a confession had to go on a pilgrimage as a penance. In 1900 monks were forbidden to become pilgrims. "Divine men and women," said W. Thorne in the 15th century, "have with them both men and women that can well sing wanton songs, some other have bagpipes, so that in every town, what with the noise of their singing and with the sound of their piping, and with the jingling of their Canterbury bells, and with the barking out of dogs after them, they make more noise than if the king came there away with all his clarions and many other instrels."
The staff had sometimes a bronze socket, inscribed with these words in Latin, "May this cross direct thy journey in safety."

Jewish Pilgrimages.—Among the Jews pilgrimages to Jerusalem are made by the most devoted only. The Polish and Russian Jews, greatly oppressed in their homes, occasionally seek relief by a journey to the city of their fathers, and to the scene of the Messiah. That sect of Judaism known as the Chasidim have their yearly processions to Sandez, the nursery of the most absurd superstition. The time for this pilgrimage is generally on the first days of the month of Eli. As soon as the sound of the cornet proclaims the approach of the new year the Chasidim of Galicia and Russian Poland hasten in large numbers to Sandez, to manifest their adoration and veneration by rich presents to the rabbi working miracles, who presides at Sandez. About that time the city authorities and the rabbi assume a very friendly relation, and the quiet life of the place changes into activity by the increase of strangers. The streets are filled with Chasidim, who come from afar off to open their hearts and confide their secret wishes to the wonder-working man.

Mohammedan Pilgrimages.—In Mohammedan countries, pilgrimages are much in vogue. The pilgrimage to Mecca (q.v.) is not only expressly commanded in the Koran, but is regarded by the Arabian prophet as indispensable to all his followers. In his view, a believer neglecting this duty, if it were in his power to perform it, would be a sign of his displeasure with Allah. The Persians, however, instead of subjecting themselves to a toilsome pilgrimage to Mecca, take upon the country of which Babylon formerly, and now Bagdad, is the chief city, as the holy land in which are deposited the ashes of Adam and the rest of the holy martyrs. Not only do the living give to them the dead bodies of their relatives, to lay them in the sacred earth. Pilgrimage is a duty binding upon all Moslems, both men and women. Inability is the only admitted ground of exemption, and Mohammedan customs have determined that those who are incapable must perform it by deputy, and bear the expense of these substitutes. What is principally revered in Mecca, and gives sanctity to the whole, is a square stone building, called the Kaaba (q.v.). Before the time of Mohammed this temple was a place of worship for the idolatrous Arabs, and is said to have contained no less than three hundred and sixty different images, equalling in number the days of the Arabian year. They were all destroyed by Mohammed, who sanctified the Kaaba, and appointed it to be the chief place of worship for all true believers. It is said that the Kaaba must be entered by stepping on the grand platform, to the purpose of them to believe a single sight of its sacred walls, without any particular act of devotion, is as meritorious in the sight of God as the most careful discharge of one's duty for the space of a whole year in any other temple. The Kaaba is the temple of Allah, who has ordered that he be looked upon as completed, though they again visit the Kaaba to take the leave of that sacred building.
Pilgrimage to Mecca was interrupted for a quarter of a century by the Carmathians, and in our own day it has been again interrupted by the Wahabis, and these in turn have been defeated by Mohammed Alvi, who reviving the pilgrimage and attended with his court. In the year 1878, 200,000 pilgrims visited the holy places. But in the present year (1877) pilgrimages to Mecca have been revived in marvellous force, owing to the contest with Turkey and Russia, and it is expected that nearly one half million will now come, and many, many more will bring tribute to the Kaaba, the treasures of which, amounting to over 200,000,000 piasters, or $50,000,000, have been placed at the disposal of the sultan of Turkey, and are to be used in the defence of the Mussulman's faith.

Heathen Pilgrimages. Among heathen nations, also, pilgrimages are practiced. In Japan, more especially, all the different sects have their regular places of resort. The pilgrimage which is esteemed by the Sintuists as the most meritorious is that of Ise, which all are bound to make once a year, or at least once in their life. Another class of pilgrimages is the Sannês, who go to visit in pilgrimage the thirty-three principal temples of Cænon, which are scattered over the empire. Besides these regular pilgrimages, the Japanese also undertake occasional religious journeys to visit certain temples in fullness of worship. These pilgrims travel alone, and almost always running, and, though generally very poor, refuse to receive charity from others (comp. McFarland, Japan, p. 211).

Hinduism has its pilgrimages on a grand scale. Thousands make the long journey to repair to the temple of Jagannáut (q. v.). Equally famed as the resort of multitudes of Hindu pilgrims is the island of Gangá Ságar, where the holiest branch of the Ganges (q. v.) is lost in the waters of the Indian Ocean. To visit this sacred river hundreds of thousands annually abandon their homes, and travel for months amid mud, hardships and dangers, and should they reach the scene of their pilgrimage, it is only in many cases that they may plunge themselves and their unconscious babies into the troubled but, in their view, purifying waters, offering themselves and their little ones as voluntary victims to the holy river. Among the numberless sacred spots in Hindostan may be mentioned Jummontri, a village on the banks of the Jumna, which is so famed as a place of pilgrimage that those who resort thither are considered as thereby almost entitled to divine honors. This, and a town of Húrāpur, may also be noticed to which pilgrims resort from every corner of the East where Hinduism is known; and of such efficacy is the water of the Ganges at this point that even the gullitiest may be cleansed from sin by a single ablution. The Hindus place great importance upon pilgrimages to the holy temples at Bénarés and other sacred shrines. Sometimes these are performed on sandalis with small spikes inserted, every step causing pain to the pilgrim. In other cases, the whole distance of hundreds of miles is travelled by the infatuated facir tumbling over and over like a wagon-wheel, with wheel on his feet; for the greater the pain and suffering with which the pilgrimage is accomplished, the greater is the merit attached to its performance. It often happens that poor pilgrims perish on the road for want of food, or in consequence of sufferings arising from the severe penalty which they inflict upon themselves. But instead of this being a warning to others, it is considered highly meritorious to fall in the effort to fulfil a vow made in honor of their idol gods. The Buddhists, though not so devoted to pilgrimage as the Hindus, are not without their places of sacred resort. One of the most noted is Adam's Peak, in Ceylon, where Gotama Buddha is supposed to have left the impression of his foot. The summit of the peak is annually visited by great numbers of pilgrims. The Lamasists of Tibet also make an annual visit to Lhasa for devotional purposes.

Dr. Johnson gives us some observations on pilgrimages, which are so much to the purpose that we shall here present them to the reader: "Pilgrimage, like many other acts of piety, may be reasonable or superstitious, according to the principles upon which it is performed. It is performed with devotion, and returns commandment; truth, such as is necessary to the regulation of life, is always found where it is honestly sought; change of place is no natural cause of the increase of piety, for it inevitably produces dissipation of mind. Yet since men go every day to view the fields where great acts are done, and return with stronger impressions of the event, curiosity of the same kind may naturally dispose us to view that country whence our religion had its beginning. That the Supreme Being may be more easily propitiated in one place than another is a kind of idle superstition; but that some places may operate upon our own minds in an uncommon manner is an opinion which hourly experience will justify. He who supposes that his vices may be more successfully combated in Palestine, will, perhaps, find himself mistaken; yet he may go thither without folly: he who thinks that his ways will be more freely pardoned dishonors at once his reason and his religion" (Johnson's Rasselas). See Encyclop. Brit. a. v.; Gardner, Faiths of the World, a. v.; British Quatr. Rev., July, 1875, art. v.; Medieval and Modern Scots, p. 112, 159; Baptists Quarterly, p. 89; and Characters and Charters of the Middle Ages (Lond. 1873), essay iii; Lea, Sacerdotal Celibacy; Butler, Church History, i, 410, 447; Riddle, Hist. of the Popery; Gieseler, Ecclesiastical History; Mosheim, Ecclesiastical History, vol. ii; Waltz, Sacred Archael. a. v.

Pilgrims and Strangers. See Strangers.

Pilkington, James, a noted Anglican prelate, who flourished in the great Reformation period of the 16th century, was born of an ancient gentleman's family at Rivington, in Lancashire, in 1520. He was educated at St. John's College, Cambridge, and after graduation took holy orders. Under the reign of king Edward he distinguished himself as one of the disputants against transubstantiation, but under the reign of bloody Mary he was obliged to leave the country, as he was very decided in his Protestant proclivities. He lived for a while at Zurich, and then at Basel. When suffered to return, in 1558, after the accession of Elizabeth, he was made master of his alma mater. He interested himself in educational affairs generally throughout the kingdom, and in his native place established a free-school, which he himself endowed. In 1561 he was elevated to the bishopric of Durham, and became noted for his tolerant views. In 1584, he advocated inducing the Conformists, and to all who scrupled to observe practices or assume obligations having any appearance of popish tendency. Bishop Pilkington died in 1575. He published, Exposition of the Prophet Haggars (Lond. 1560, 8vo):— and by Obadiah (1560), Nehemiah (Camb. 1568, 4to), Ecclesiastes, Epistle of Peter, and Paul to the Gentiles: Def. of the Engl. Service; and, besides, many sermons. His Works were edited, with biographical notices, for the Parker Society, by the Rev. James Scholield, regius professor of Greek, Cambridge (Camb. 1849, 8vo). See Draper's Crammer, Purcell's Essay; Hardwick, Hist. of the Ref. p. 219 et al.; Soames, Elizabeth Ch. History, p. 22, 49, 605ug; Burnet, Hist. of the Ref.; Hook, Eccles. Bldg. viii, 92. (J. H. W.)

Pilkington, Matthew, an English divine, flourished near the middle of the last century as prebend of Lichfield. He is especially noted as a secular writer. He was for some time a medical student at Cambridge, and was afterward a Christian mony (Lond. 1747, fol.), which is executed with great care, and is of some value:—A Rational Concordance (Nottingham 1748, 4to), which is extremely scarce: and Remarks upon several Passages of Scripture (Camb. and Lond. 1728, 8vo), which, according to Orme (Bibl. Bibl. a. v.), "contains much useful matter." Pilkington also published several of his sermons (1738, 4to; 1755, 8vo), etc.
PILLAR

Pillar is a term frequently occurring in the Scriptures, especially of the O.T., where it is used in different senses, and as the rendering of several Heb. and Gr. words, which need to be distinguished both in their meaning and application.

1. Original Words as Translated.—1. From the root סָאֵל, סָאֵל, to station, come the following: סָאֵל, סָאֵל, a rendered "pillar" everywhere in Genesis, and in Exod. xxiv, 4; Deut. iii, 3; Isa. xxix, 19; elsewhere ("image"), a column or image of stone; סָאֵל, סָאֵל, a monumemntal "pillar" (Gen. xxxv, 14, 20; 2 Sam. xvii, 18), once the trunk or stump of a tree ("substance," Isa. vi, 13); סָאֵל, סָאֵל, according to some a military post (as in Isa. xxxix, 5, "mount"), or garrison, according to others a terminal mord (Judg. ix, 6); סָאֵל, סָאֵל, a statue (only Gen. xix, 26, "pillar"), or military officer or garrison (as elsewhere rendered).

2. From other roots: מַעְקֵד, מַעְקֵד, lit. something upright (from משׁקְד, to stand), a column (the usual word for "pillar," and invariably so rendered in the A.V., but meaning an elevated stand or platform in 2 Kings xi, 14; xxiii, 3); מַעְקֵד, מַעְקֵד, a support (from משׁקְד, to prop), a belustron (only 1 Kings x, 9); מַעְקֵד, מַעְקֵד, a column (from משׁקְד, to set up) as a support (fig. 1 Sam. ii, 8), or tropically a creg ("situate," 1 Sam. xiv, 6); מַעְקֵד, מַעְקֵד, a column (only 2 Kings xviii, 16); and מַעְקֵד, מַעְקֵד, a column, in the form of an artificial palm-tree (Cant. iii, 6; Joel ii, 38 [Heb. iii, 3]).

3. In the N.T.: only σταυρός, a column or support (Gal. ii, 9; 1 Tim. iii, 15; Rev. iii, 12; x, 1).

II. Uses.—The essential notion of a pillar is that of a shaft or isolated pole, either supporting or not supporting a roof.

1. Monumental.—Perhaps the votive object was the earliest application of the pillar. This in primitive times consisted of nothing but a single stone or pile of stones. Instances are seen in Jacob's pillars (Gen. xxviii, 18; xxxi, 46, 51, 52; xxxv, 14); in the twelve pillars set up by Moses at Mount Sinai (Exod. xxiv, 4); the twenty-four stone stones erected by Joshua (Josh. iv, 8, 9; see also Isa. xix, 19, and Josh. xxiv, 27).

The erection of columns or heaps of stones to commemorate any remarkable event was universal before the introduction of writing or inscription, and it is still employed for that purpose by many savage nations. See GLEAM.

Monumental pillars have thus been common in many countries and in various styles of architecture. Such were perhaps the obelisks of Egypt (Ferguson, p. 6, 8, 115, 246, 340; Ibn-Batuta, True, p. 111; Strabo, iii, 171, 172; Herod. ii, 106; Amm. Marc. xvii, 4; Josephus, Ant. i, 2, 8, the pillars of Sbeit). See PIRAMIDS.

The stone Exel (1 Sam. xx, 13) was probably a terminal stone or a waymark. See EBENIZER.

The "place" set up by Saul (1 Sam. xv, 12) is explained by St. Jerome to be a trophy, Vulg. Fornicem triumphalem (Jerome, Quest. Hebr. in lib. i, Reg. iii, 1359).

The word used is the same as that for Aba-ron's pillar, יִת, יִת, lit. a hand, called by Josephus λήκον (Ant. vii, 10, 5), which was clearly of a monumental or memorial character, but not necessarily carrying any representation of a hand in its structure, as has been supposed to be the case. So also Jacob set up a pillar over Rachel's grave (Gen. xxxv, 20; and Robinson, i, 218).

The monolithic tombs and obelisks of Petra are instances of similar usage (Burchardt, Syria, p. 422; Roberts, Sketches, p. 103; Irby and Mangles, Traveis, p. 155). See ABRAM'S TOMB.

2. Architectural.—Pillars form an important feature in Oriental architecture, partly perhaps as a reminiscence of the tent with its supporting poles, and partly also from the use of flat roofs, in consequence of which the chambers were either narrower or divided into portions by columns (Judg. xvi, 25). The tent-principle is exemplified in the open halls of Persian and other Eastern buildings, of which the fronts, supported by pillars, are shaded by curtains or awnings fastened to the ground outside by pegs, or to trees in the garden-court (Ezra, i, 6; Chardin, Voy. vii, 387; ix, 460, 470, and plates 39, 81; Layard, Nin. and Bab. p. 580, 648; Burchardt, Notes on Bed. i, 37). Thus Moses was commanded to spread the veil of the tabernacle on four pillars (Exod. xxv, 82, etc.). Thus also a figurative mode of describing heaven is as a tent or canopy supported by pillars (Psa. civ. 2; Isa. xl, 22), and the earth as a flat surface resting on pillars (1 Sam. ii, 8; Psa. lxxv, 5). See TEXT.

It has already been remarked that the word "place," in 1 Sam. xv, 12, is in Hebrew "hand." In the Arab tent two of the posts are called yadh or "hand" (Burchardt, Bed. i, 57). See HAND.

The general practice in Oriental buildings of supporting flat roofs by pillars, or of covering open spaces by awnings stretched from pillars, led to an extensive use of them in construction. In Indian architecture an enormous number of pillars, sometimes amounting to 1000, is found. A similar principle appears to have been carried out at Persepolis. At Nineveh the pillars were probably of wood [see CEDAR], and it is very likely that the same construction prevailed in the "house of the form of Lebanon," with its hall and porch of pillars (1 Kings vii, 2, 6). The "chap- ters" of the two pillars Jachin (q.v.) and Boaz resembled the tall capitals of the Persian palatial columns (Layard, Nin. and Bab. p. 232, 650; Niners, ii, 374; Ferguson, Hist. p. 174, 178, 188, 190, 195, 198, 291-233; Roberts,
3. Idolatries. — The word Mattsebél, “pillar,” is generally rendered “statue” or “image” (e.g. Deut. vii, 5; xii, 3; xvi, 22; Lev. xxvi, 1; Exod. xxii, 24; xxiv, 13; 2 Chron. xiv, 3; xxxi, 1; Jer. xxiii, 13; Hos. iii, 4; x, 1; Mic. v, 13). This agrees with the usage of heathen nations, practiced, as we have seen, by the patriarch Jacob, of erecting blocks or piles of wood or stone, which in later times grew into ornamental pillars in honor of the deity (Clem. Alex. Coh. ad Gent. c. iv; Strom. i, 24). Instances of this are seen in the Attic Hermes (Pausan. iv, 38, 4), seven pillars significant of the planets (iii, 21, 9; also vii, 17, 4, and 22, 2; viii, 37); and Arnobius mentions the practice of pouring libations of oil upon them, which again recalls the case of Jacob (Adv. Gent. i, 335, ed. Gauthier). See Asherah; Phallus.

The term or boundary-marks were originally, perhaps always, rough stones or posts of wood, which received divine honors (Ovid, Fast. ii, 641, 684). See Idol.

But other circumstances contributed to make stones an object of worship. Such phenomena as the rocking stones worshipped by the British Druids would naturally excite the astonishment of an ignorant people, and many commentators are of opinion that the name ebn maskith, image of stone, which the Jews were forbidden to erect (Lev. xxvi, 1), was one of those bowing or rocking stones, especially as the phrase is used in opposition to Mattsebél, which signifies “a standing pillar.” Those rare phenomena, aeroliths, still more easily became objects of idolatry; they were generally of a similar kind to that mentioned by Herod- dian, as being consecrated to the sun under his name of Eleagiabulos, and preserved in his magnificent temple in Syria; “in which,” says the historian, “there stands not any image made with hands, as among the Greeks and Romans, to represent the god, but there is a very large stone, round at the bottom, and terminating in a point of a conical form, and a black color, which they say fell down from Jupiter.” See DIOPEMA. Sacred pillars or stones were indeed frequently worshipped instead of statues by idolatrous nations, and traces of this posterores veneration may still be found in various countries. See Diana. The erection of monoliths or monumental pillars was forbidden to the Israelites, but it appears that they were permitted to erect Cairns or piles of stone to preserve the recollection of great events, as Joshua did at Gilgal (q. v.), that it might be a memorial of his miraculous passage over the Jordan. See Cholmeley.

4. Lastly, the figurative use of the term “pillar,” in reference to the cloud and fire accompanying the Israelites on their march (Exod. xxxii, 9, 10; Neh. ix, 12; Ps. xcix, 7), or as in Cant. iii, 6 and Rev. x, 1, is plainly derived from the notion of an isolated column not supporting a roof. See Pillar of Cloud and Fire. A pillar is also an emblem of firmness and steadfastness (Jer. i, 18; Rev. iii, 12), and of that which sustains or supports (Gal. ii, 9; 1 Tim. iii, 15). In the Apocrypha we find a similar metaphor (Eccles. xxxvi, 24): “He that getteth a wife beginneth a possession, a help like unto himself, and a pillar of rest.” See Architecture.

PILLAR is in architectural language the column supporting the arch. In the Normus style the pillars are generally massive, and are frequently circular, with

St. Peter’s, Northampton, c. 1160.

Sections of Pillars.

capitals either of the same form or square; they are sometimes ornamented with channels, or flutes, in vari-

Druildical Pillars.
PILLAR

In the Decorated style the general form of clustered pillars changes from a circular to a lozenge-shaped arrangement, or to a square placed diagonally, but many other varieties are also to be met with. They sometimes consist of small shafts surrounding a larger one, and are sometimes moulded; the small shafts and some of the mouldings are often filleted; plain octagonal pillars are also very frequently employed in village churches: towards the end of this style a pillar consisting of four small shafts separated by a deep hollow and two fillets is common, as it is also in the Perpendicular style, but the hollows are usually shallower, and the disposition of the fillets is different.

A plain octagonal pillar continues in use throughout the Perpendicular style, though it is not so frequent as at earlier periods, and its sides are occasionally slightly hollowed. In Decorated work a few of the mouldings of the piers occasionally run up into the arches and form part of the archivolt, as at Bristol Cathedral, but in Perpendicular buildings this arrangement is much more common, and in some cases the whole of the mouldings of the pillars are continued in the arches without any capital or impost between them: the forms are various, but in general arrangement they usually partake of a square placed diagonally; sometimes, however, they are contracted in breadth so as to become narrower between the archways (from east to west) than in the opposite direction: the small shafts attached to the pillars in this style are usually plain circles, but are occasionally filleted, and in some instances are hollow-sided polygons.

Pillar of Cloud and Fire. According to Exod. xiii, 21 sq. (comp. xiv, 24; Numb. xiv, 14; Neh. ix, 12, 19), the Israelites during their journey from Egypt through the desert were accompanied in the day by a pillar of cloud, and at night by a pillar of fire (Heb. ה' את, וַיְרָדָה, Sept. στάθηκεν καὶ ἐσκόμματο, πύρος), as a guide (comp. esp. Exod. x, 36 sq.) and protection (comp. Ps. cv, 89; Wisd. x, 17), and this waited over the tabernacle while the people rested (Exod. x, 34 sq.; Numb. ix, 15 sq.). The narrative represents Jehovah himself as in this cloud (comp. also Numb. xiv, 14), and as speaking from it to Moses (Exod. xxxiii, 9 sq.; Numb. xii, 5; Deut. xxxi, 15). Later writers explain this of the "wisdom" of God (Sophia, Wisd. x, 17), or the divine Logos (q. v.; comp. Philo, Opera, i, 501). Toland, again, and after him many others, explained this appearance naturally, and referred it to the fire carried in a vessel before the host, which in the fire served as a guide and signal by its smoke, and at night by its brightness. Von der Hart carried this opinion so far as to hold that this fire carried before the Israelites was the sacred fire preserved upon the altar from the time of Abraham (Ephemerid. Philol. Discurr. vi, 109 sq.; and Philol. Vindic. Helmat. 1696. For the controversy on this view, see Rosenmüller on Exod. xiii, 21; comp. Forster, in Eichhorn's Report, x, 132 sq.). This custom is actually observed by caravans in the East at the present day (Harnack, Observ. i, 488 sq.; Descript. de l'Egypte, viii, 128), and it became at an early day customary with armies.
PILLAR

In the East, especially in traversing an unknown region (Curt. iii, 8, 9; v, 2, 7; but the passages sometimes quoted, Veget. Mil. iii, 5; Frontin. Strateg. ii, 25, do not refer to this. Comp. esp. on the custom, Faber, Arch. p. 293 sq.; Wolfenb. Fragment. p. 108 sq.; Bauer, Hebr. Mythol. i, 281 sq.). Meanwhile we must not forget that this is the evident intention of the historian to narrate a miracle (comp. also Pas. lxxvii, 14; ev, 89; comp. Diod. Sic. xvi, 66; Clem. Alex. Strom. i, 150). The following monographs on this subject are unimportant, which is proved by the silence of Vitruv. (1127); Friderici, De col. ignis et sub. (Leips. 1689); Sahne, De columnar. ignis ac sub. (Gedan. 1702); Münden, De columnar. sub. et igne (Gotlar, 1712); and many others. Following this national recollection, Iaiais (v, 5) has employed the figure of a cloud of smoke and fire hovering over Zion and the Temple as a symbol of the presence of Jehovah, in his picture of the blessedness of theocracy (comp. Ewald, Ist. Gesch. ii, 167 sq.). See SHEKINAH.

Pillar, Plain of the (יוֹרֶם הָרָה). Sept. τῆς βα- λαντικῆς τῆς στέρεως; Alex. omits τῆς κορινθιακῆς; Vulgate, le Betôth, or Mount of the pillar; that is, the real significance of the Hebrew word elôn; a tree which stood near Shechem, and at the mouth of Shechem and the house of Millo assembled, to crown Abimelech, son of Gideon (Judg. ix, 6). There is nothing said by which its position can be ascertained with any probability derived from the name of Matstebôd from a stone or pillar set up under it; and reasons have already been adduced for believing that this tree may have been the same with that under which Jacob buried the idols and idolatrous trinkets of his household, and under which Joshua erected a stone as a testimony of the covenant there re-executed between the people and Jehovah. See MEONEMI. There was both time and opportunity during the period of commotion which followed the death of Joshua for this sanctuary to return into the hands of the mount, and the stone long standing there by Joshua to become appropriated to idolatrous purposes as one of the matstebôdôth in which the religion of the aborigines of the Holy Land delighted. See IDOLATRY. The terms in which Joshua speaks of this very stone (Josh. xxiv, 27) almost seem to overstep the bounds of mere imagery, and would suggest and warrant its being afterwards regarded as endowed with miraculous qualities, and therefore a fit object for veneration. Especially would this be the case if the singular expression, "it hath heard all the voice of God which he spake to us," were intended to indicate that this stone had been brought from Sinai, Jordan, or some other scene of the communications of Jehovah with the people. The Samaritans still show a range of stones on the summit of Gerizim as those brought from the bed of Jordan by the twelve tribes. See OAK.

Pillar of Salt. See LOT.

Pillar Saints, devotees who stood on the tops of lofty pillars for many years in fulfilment of religious vows. The first who originated this practice was Simeon, a native of Syria, who was born about A.D. 390. In early youth he entered a monastery near Antioch, where he devoted himself to the most rigid exercises of mortification and abstinence. Having been expelled from the monastery for his excessive austerities, he retired to the adjacent mountain, where he took up his residence first in a cave, and then in a little cell, where he immured himself for three years. Next he removed to a mount of a mountain near he chained himself to a rock for several years. His fame had now become so great that crowds of visitors thronged to see him. "Incommode by the pressure of the crowd," we are told, "he erected a pillar on which he might stand, elevated at first six cubits and ending with forty. The top of the pillar was three feet in diameter, and sur- rounded with a balustrade. Here he stood day and

night in all weathers. Through the night, till 9 A.M., he was constantly in prayer, often spreading forth his hands and bowing so low that his forehead touched his toes. A bystander once attempted to count the number of these successive prostrations; and still they amounted to 1244. At 9 o'clock A.M. he began to address the admiring crowd below, to hear and answer their questions, to send messages and write letters, etc., for he took concern in the welfare of the churches, and corresponded with bishops, and even emperors. Tow- ards evening he inquired of his intendants in this world, and betook himself again to converse with God till the following day. He generally ate but once a week, never slept, wore a long sheepskin robe, and a cap of the same. His beard was very long, and his frame extremely emaciated. In this manner he is re- ported to have spent thirty-seven years, and at last, in his sixty-ninth year, to have expired unobserved in a praying attitude, in which no one ventured to disturb him till after three days, when Anthony, his disciple and biographer, mounting the pillar, found that his spirit had departed, and his holy body was emitting a de- lightful odor; his remains were borne in pomp to Antioch, in order to be the safeguard of that unwalled town, and innumerable miracles were performed at his shrine. His pillar also was so venerated that it was literally surrounded with chapels and monasteries for some ages. Simeon was so averse to women that he never allowed one to come within the sacred precincts of his pillar. Even his own mother was debarred this privilege till after her death, when her corpse was brought to him, and he now restored her to life for a short time that she might see him, and converse with him a little before she ascended to heaven." Another Simeon Styl- lites is mentioned by Evagrius as having lived in the 6th century. In his childhood he mounted his pillar near Antioch, and is said to have occupied it sixty- eight years. The last example of Simeon's practice was followed, to a certain extent at least, by many persons in Syria and Palestine, and pillar saints were found in the East even in the 12th century, when, the Stylites, as they were termed by the Greeks, were abolished. This order of saints never found a footing in the West, and when one Wulfric is reported to commence the practice in the German territory of Treves, the neighboring bishops destroyed his pillar, and prevented him from carrying his purpose into effect.

Pilled (Gen. xxx, 37, 88) is a rendering of פְּלִיט (pīlāt), to strip off the bark, being the same as "strikes off, cuts, in the same order as מָסַר, to part with." The word, as used by Piel (Isa. xvi, 2; Ezek. xxix, 10), however, is a different word in the original, פָּלַל, mardî, signifying to polish. The verb "to pill" appears in Old English as identical in meaning with "to peel=to strip," and in this sense is used in the above passages from Genesis. Of the next stage in its meaning as = plunder, we have traces in the word "pillage," piller. If the difference between the two forms be more than accidental, it would seem as if, in the English of the 17th century, "peel" was used for the latter signification. The "people scattered and peeled" are generally interpreted to mean those that have been plundered of all they have. Comp. "Peeling their prisoners."—Milton, P. B. iv.

"To peel the chaffe, the people to devour."—Dryden, Homer, Ítad (Richardson).

The soldiers of Nebuchadnezzar's army (Ezek. xxix, 18), however, have their shoulder pikes in a different sense. The skin is worn off with carrying earth to pile up the mounds during the protracted siege of Tyre. See TYRE.

Pillar (also spelled Pilmor), Joseph, D.D., an early Episcopal minister in America, was born at Tadmouth, Yorkshire, England, about 1740, and was educated at Cambridge University, and sur- vived whom he had been previously converted. On com-
pleting his studies, Pilmore became a lay helper in the Methodist itinere ministry, and labored in this way for many years through England, Scotland, and Wales. His ministerial certificate from Mr. Wesley represents him as "having grace, gifts, and success of fruit in the work." He was blessed with skill in all his spiritual career, and his appearance and preaching were impressive. Mr. Pilmore's manly form, tall and erect, his sympathizing spirit, earnest zeal and prayers, all united to make strong and lasting impressions. In 1769 he came to America, and preached throughout the colonies. Stevens says Pilmore had many hair-breadth escapes of life and limb in his wild journeys. At Charleston, S. C., he could find no place to use for preaching except the theatre, and while earnestly delivering a sermon, suddenly the table used for a pulpit, with the cloth, he occupied, all at once disappeared through a trap-door to the cellar.

This was a wicked contrivance of the "basser sort." Nothing discouraged, however, the preacher, springing upon the stage, with the table, invited the audience to the adjoining yard, adding pleasantly, "Come on, my friends, we will, by the grace of God, defeat the devil this time, and not be beat by him from our work," and then quietly finished his discourse. The fruits of his Christian labors appeared in the conversion of many souls. Wherever he appeared large crowds attended his ministrations, and listened to his master's message. With the Wesleyan preachers generally, Pilmore retired from his ministerial work during the troublesome times of the American Revolution. In 1783 he joined the Protestant Episcopal Church, and was soon after ordained. He now became rector of Trinity (Oxford), All Saints (Limerick), and St. Thomas (White marsh). After the establishment of peace in this year he returned to America, and next served St. Paul's, Philadelphia, and thence removed to Christ Church, New York, of which he was chosen rector in 1804.

Now residing on the banks of Old Trinity," he preached with great acceptance and usefulness during ten years, and then was chosen rector of St. Paul's, Philadelphia, in 1814. Mr. Pilmore's congregation in New York became well known for its evangelical piety, and of some of its communicants were on terms of intimate friendship with the members of the old John Street Methodist Episcopal Church. During the year 1781 this faithful and aged minister's mental powers exhibited evidences of failure, and this, with bodily indisposition, made it necessary for him to have an assistant. The Rev. Mr. Benjamin Stevens continued gradually to fail, Pilmore departed this life July 24, 1825. Dr. Pilmore was a faithful minister of God, and wherever he preached gathered a large body of communicants. He left many bequests for charitable purposes. He is the author of a Narrative of Labor in South Wales (1823), and of "A Description of a Journey to Trials and Preaching in the Colonies of New York, New Jersey, Delaware, Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Virginia," which was never published. See Sprague, Amazed of the American Pulpit, v, 366; Disoyaw, in the N. Y. Methodist, 15, 174, Lives of Eminent Philomens (1859), p. 801 (J. H. W.)

Pillow is the rendering in the A. V. of three very different Hebrew and one Greek word. The proper term is in the plural. רהואית (maraashāth) (Gen. xxviii, 11, 18, elsewhere "bolster"), which denotes simply a place for laying the head. In that passage we read that "Jacob took of the stones of that place [Haran], and put them near his pillows, and bowed his head in that place to sleep." The Hebrew word would be more properly rendered "towards the head." Similarly our Lord employed either the bench or possibly some cushion or rug upon it, when asleep upon the boat (προσποδόμα, Mark iv, 38). See Br. The γέττον, κανυστή (also in the pl.), in Exk. xiii, 18, 20, however, designates a cushion or soft pad used in some way for elegant entertainment, perhaps one of the meretricious luxuries of the females alluded to. See ARMHOLE. In 1 Sam. xix, 13, 16, the Heb. word is עֲבָשׁ, kebir, something braided or plaited, hence usually thought to be a quilt or mattress. See BOLSTER.

What kind of pillows the Hebrews used we have no means of knowing, but the ancient Egyptians had pillows of wood formed to receive the head when resting on their couches, and these no doubt had a cushion stuffed with feathers, or other soft material. Specimens of these wooden pillows may be seen in the British Museum (Wilkinson, Anc. Egyptians, 1, 71). "Hardy travelers, like Jacob (Gen. xxviii, 11, 16) and Elijah (1 Kings xix, 6), sleeping on the bare ground, would make use of a stone for this purpose; and soldiers on the march had probably no softer resting-place (1 Sam. xxvi, 7, 11, 12, 16). Possibly both Saul and Elijah may have used the water-bottle which they carried as a bolster, and if this were the case, David's midnight adventure becomes more conspicuously daring. The 'pillow' of goats' hair which Michal's cunning put in the place of the bolster in her husband's bed (xix, 13, 16) was probably, as Ewald suggests, a net or curtain of goats' hair, to protect the sleeper from cold or mosquitoe (Greek, κανυστή, note), like the 'canopy' of Holofernes." See SLEEP.

Ancient Egyptian Wooden Pillow.

PILSBURY, ITHAMAR, an American Presbyterian evangelist and missionary, was born in Dracut, Mass., Aug. 22, 1794. His parents being both very pious, his early discipline and religious training were very strict and thorough. He prosecuted his academic course under many difficulties and discouragements. being obliged to interrupt his studies from time to time and to engage in teaching, in order to raise funds. He entered Union Academy, at Plainfield, N. J., in 1815, graduated at Yale College in October, 1822; studied theology in New York under the direction of Rev. Dra. Gardiner Spring and E. W. Baldwin; was licensed in October, 1824, and on June 19, 1825, was at his own request and by the unanimous vote of the Presbytery ordained as an evangelist. For several months after he labored as city missionary in and around the cities of New York and Boston. The character and results of his labors in those two cities laid the foundation for that extensive system of religious effort which aims at the spiritual good of the poor and destitute, known as City Missions. Desirous of a pastoral charge, in September, 1827, he accepted an invitation to supply the Church at Smithtown, Long Island, for one year, but continued to labor in that capacity until April, 1830, when he was installed their regular pastor. At his own request, in 1830 this relation was dissolved and until May, 1834, he spent the time in travelling as an agent of the American Sunday-School Union. In 1835 he was appointed a commissioner to the General Assembly at Pittsburgh, Pa., after which he started on a tour of exploration to the state of Illinois, with a view to the founding of a colony. In September of the same year he returned to New York, and succeeded in organizing a company with a capital of some $40,000, to be invested "in the purchase of land, and the establishment of a colony for promoting the cause of instruction and piety in the state of Illinois." From this time onward
to the end of his life he was identified with the West, especially in all that pertained to the growth and prosperity of the Presbyterian Church. To the scheme of Christian colonization he gave much thought, time, labor, and prayer. From the spring of 1826 his labors as a missionary and an evangelist fairly set in; and with untiring energy and devotion he addressed himself to his work. He organized fourteen churches, and assisted at the organization of several others. In 1837 he organized the Church at Andover, in the Andover colony, and in 1841 he was installed its pastor, and continued to minister unto it until September, 1849. In May, 1850, he was installed pastor at Princeton, Bureau Co., where he had previously organized a Church; in 1855 he was chosen president of McDonough College, at Macon; in 1856 he began to labor as stated supply in the Presbyterian Church at Macon; in 1860 he returned to Andover, and took charge of the Church which he founded there. He died April 20, 1862. Mr. Fillansbury was a prudent and wise counsellor, a sincere and constant friend, and an able and faithful minister of the Gospel. See Wilson, Probab. Hist. Amaranac, 1863, p. 195. (J. L. S.)

Pilot (πηγή, chōbē, Ezek. xxvii, 8, 27-29), literally a steersman, a mariner, is also rendered in our version (Jonah i, 6) "ship-master;" but in the passage in Ezekiel it is used in a figurative sense for the chief rulers or counsellors of the Tyrians. See SHIP.

Pilbush, Phineas, Elder, a famous early American Baptist minister, flourished in Maine in 1804. He was undoubtedly the ordinary acceptation of the term, but was called "a son of thunder" on account of his boldness and ability. He was extremely eccentric, and many curious incidents in his personal history are told, but nothing can be related here of any interest to the general inquirer.

Pilaeus, Francis, a Flemish painter and engraver who flourished at Ghent about the middle of the 18th century. He studied under Robert van Audenarde. Little is known of his painting; but there are a few prints by him, among which are the following: Virgin and Infant Jesus; Conversion of St. Barca; St. Francis, after Rubens; The Martyrdom of St. Blasius; after G. de Crayer.

Pil'tal (Heb. Pil'tay, פִּילְתַל, my deliverance; Sept. פַּלְטָל), the representative of the priestly house of Modiah, or Maadiah, in the time of Joiakim, the son of Jeshua; apparently one of the priests who returned to Jerusalem with Nehemiah (Neh. xii, 17). B.C. 445.

Pilsart, Abraham Israel, of Amsterdam, a Jewish litterateur, was of Portuguese origin, and flourished in Italy near the opening of the 17th century. He wrote Discours y expositiones sobre la vara de Judas, an exposition of Jacob's prophecy, entitled "the Scepter of Judah," in which he complains of the unfair manner in which Christians expound the Scriptures, of their unfitness for such a task, and the danger of confusing their interpretations. On account of its odious contents it was suppressed by the leaders of the congregation (a MS. copy of this work is to be found in the Saracin Library). See De Rossi, Dizionario storico degli autori Ebrei, p. 264; id. Bibli. Jud. Antichrist. (Paris, 1800), p. 92; Wolf, Bibl. Hebr. iii, 42; De Long, Bibl. Sacra, ii, 594 (where the author is called Pilsario); Lindo, Hist. dei Gesù in Spagna e Portogallo, p. 369. (B. P.)

Pimentel, Abraham ha-Kohen, a Jewish rabbi, flourished about the middle of the 17th century. He was a pupil of Saul Mortera, and afterwards rabbi at the academy Keier Tora of Amsterdam, and lastly rabbi of the congregation of the Sephardim of Hamburg. He wrote on Jewish rites in three parts (Amsterdam, 1668):-academic treatises in the Portuguese language, under the title Questões e discursos académicos, que compostos na ilustre Academia...
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cated Mauclerc, who, having assembled a number of his barons at Redon, decided that the bishops should be banished. Guillaume retired to Poitiers, where he acted, for some time, as confidante of Philippe, bishop of that city, during a severe illness of this prelate (1229). His rights having been recognised by the king and Mauclerc, he returned to his see in 1231, and kept busy during the rest of his life in reforming the abuses which had spread among the clergy during his absence, and continuing the reconstruction of his cathedral. Guillaume Fichon died at St. Brieuc July 29, 1284. He was canonised by Innocent III in 1247. His complete relics were discovered in 1847 in the cathedral. The Church of St. Brieuc and of Tréguier devotes to his memory the 29th of July.—Hoefer, Nouv. Biol. Générale, xi, 248.

PINCKARD, PATRICK M., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born near the opening of the present century. He was converted about 1840, and in 1844 entered the itinerant ranks of the Methodist ministry, and preached successfully until 1870 within the bounds of the Missouri Conference. During this long term of ministerial life he was employed in circuit, station, and district work; also in the agency of Central College, St. Louis, and in the work of the Book-house of Missouri Methodism, in all of which places of trust and responsibility he gained the approval, confidence, and esteem of his brethren and the Church. He died Sept. 25, 1871. See Minutes of Annual Conf. M. E. Church, South, 1872, p. 738.

PINCKNEY Lektionen. A series of sermons, for the congregation of which Charles Pinckney, chief-justice of South Carolina under the provincial government (father of the late general C. C. Pinckney), provided. He died in 1758, and by his last will directed that two sermons, in May and November, annually, be on the first Monday after the second Tuesday in each of these months, should be preached in St. Philip's Church, Charleston, on the "greatness of God, and his goodness to all creatures," with the view, as he states, "to encourage and promote religious and virtuous principles and practices among us, and in order to excite an emulation in my wealthy countrymen, whose abilities and fortunes will better enable them thereto, for establishing lectures among us, in humble imitation of those founded by the Hon. Mr. Boyle in Great Britain." For effecting these purposes, in accordance with his will, "I charge my son and his family, and all my future successors as much as may be, to maintain the lecture house and lecture building, and all necessary expenses therefor; and I direct that the funds and investments thereof be a part of the income of my son and his family," etc.

PINZONCIVAI, a Socinian sect, so named after the town of Pinczow, Poland, where its leaders resided. The Pinczowites were usually called "Unitarian Brethren," but they desired to be called Arians (q. v.) rather than Socinians (q. v.). It is true, some of the principal doctors among them were inclined towards those views of Jesus Christ which afterwards were the common views of the Socinian sect; but the greater part of them agreed with the Arians, and affirmed that the Saviour was produced by God the Father before the foundation of the world, but that he was greatly inferior to the Father, and so also the Holy Spirit was begotten before the Father. This view is not clearly taught by George Schomann in his Tractamentum, published by Sand (p. 194–5): "Sub id fere tempus (A.D. 560) ex rhapsodii Latii Sociani quidam fratres dicebant, Dei filiun non esse secundum Trinitatis personam patri coessentialen et coequalem, sed hominem Jesum Christum, ex Spiritu Sancto conceptum, ex virginis Maria maternis, crucifixum et resuscitatum: a quibus nos commonei, sacras litteras percurrere, permuasi sumus." These words most clearly show that the Pinczowites (as they were called before they separated from the Reformed in 1560) professed to believe in a Divinity of some sort, and did not diverge Jesus Christ of all divinity, besides, Schomann was a doctor of great authority among them; and in the year 1565 (as he himself informs us), he contended at the convention of Petrcow (pro uno Deo patri) for one God the Father, in opposition to the Reformed, who, he says (Dea: trivium defendens), maintained a threefold God. Yet in the following year he, with others, was induced by the papers of Lelios Socinus to so alter his sentiments that he denied Christ to be a divine person. He, therefore, with his Pinczowian flock, before this time must necessarily have been, not a Socian, but an Arius. See Poland. (J. H. W.)

Pindar, John Hothemball, an English divine, was born in 1794. He graduated at Caius College, Cambridge, in 1816, and became principal of Hodderstone College, Barbadoes. He was afterwards canon residentiary and prebendary of Wells Cathedral, and principal of Wells Theological College, which latter office he resigned in 1865. He died at West Malvern, Eng., April 16, 1868. He published a volume of Sermons on Common Prayer:—Sermons on the Ordination Service:—Sermons on the Holy Days of the Church:—Expository Discourses on the Epistle to Timothy; and some Lectures. (Appleton's Annual Cyclop., vii, 592.)

Pinder, Thomas, a Wesleyan preacher of some note, was born at West Stockwhil, near Gainsborough, Eng., Sept. 22, 1774. He was converted through Methodist agency in 1795 at Sheffield. He felt called of God to the work of the holy ministry, and in 1799 was appointed to the Thetford Circuit. Thence for thirty-five years he labored on it, doing exemplary discipline, and pastoral and ministerial functions. In all the circuits in which he travelled he was highly and deservedly esteemed, both in his public and private capacity. As a preacher, though not great, he was striking, faithful, and impressive. As a pastor he was most tender and sympathetic. He died Aug. 27, 1855.—Welsh Meth. Mag. 1836, p. 719; 1838, art. i.

Pineda, Juan de (1), a learned Franciscan monk, was born at Seville in 1557. After entering the order at the age of fourteen, he was carefully advanced in classical learning, and then instructed in theology. As a student, he bore the reputation of great erudition, especially in the Greek, Hebrew, and Oriental languages. He was placed at the head of the Inquisition in Andalusia, and was commissioned by cardinal Zapata to visit the principal libraries of Spain, in order to register those works which might be obnoxious to the Roman Catholic religion. The result of his inquiries is contained in the Index novus Librorum Prohibitarum (Seville, 1631), published by order of cardinal Zapata, grand-inquisitor of Spain. Pineda published a version of Theodore Peltar's Catena Gracorum Patrum in Proverbia Salomonis. He also published Commentarius in Job (Madrid, 1537, 2 vols. fol.)—Praelectiones in psalmos (Seville, 1602) —Salomo Praelatii, qui de Rebus Salomonis Regis (Lyons, 1609, libri octo) —Commentarius in Ecclesiasticum (Antwerp, 1620). He died at Seville Jan. 27, 1637.—Hoefer, Nouv. Biol. Générale, xl, 261.

Pineda, Juan de (2), another Spanish divine, was born at Medina de Rioseco in the 16th century, and has frequently been confounded with the preceding. He belonged to the Order of the Jesuits, and published Historia maravillosa de S. Juan-Baptista (Salamanca, 1574, 4to).—La Monarquia Ecclesiastica, o Historia Universel del Mundo (ibid. 1588, 14 vols. fol.; Barcelona, 1594, 1690).—Agricultura Christiana que contiene seer, discurso familiares (ibid. 1589, 2 vols. fol.). Many other works of his remain unpublished.—Hoefer, Nouv. Biol. Générale, xl, 262.

Pinedo, Thomas dk (called in the synagogue Isaac), a noted Jewish litterateur of the 17th century, was born in 1614 in Spain, but was obliged to leave his native country and seek a refuge in France, where he was inquisitorial persecution. He was more famed for his
PINEO

proficiency in Greek and the ancient classics than as a Jewish theologian. He was descended from the family of Pinheiro of Francozo, in Portugal. His education he received at Madrid, where he was destined to the training of the Jesuits for his literary attainments, of whom he speaks in grateful remembrance. He had already reached a mature age when the suspicions of the Inquisition obliged him to quit the scene of his studies and the society of his learned friends in the capital of Spain, to live in safety in the United Provinces. He belonged to those few who were fortunate enough to evade in safety the clutches of the Inquisition. He differs from Orobo de Castro in this especially, that he never in any of his writings attacked the Christian religion, but, on the contrary, frequently took pleasure in acknowledging its beneficial influences upon society, though he did not spare the tribunal of the Inquisition, of which he says: "Me pudet pigetque profidisse hoc de gente Christiana." At Amsterdam he finished and published, in 1678, his edition of Σημαίνει τινα και πωλείν: Stephanus de Obstena quem Primus Thomas de Pinoelo Ludovici Latii juris donatus et observatorium scutum variarum linguarum ac praecipue Hebraico, Phanisio, Graeco, et Latina dialectis illustratum, and dedicated the work to the marquis of Mondegos, of the house of Minoiro, personally devoted to the encouragement of literature. Pinoelo's work, which is very valuable for Jewish history and archaeology, and was lately edited with a preface by Dindorf (Leips. 1825, 4 vols.), shows that the author was well acquainted with Jewish literature. Besides Josephus, which forms the basis of the whole, Pinoelo quotes Benjamin de Tulde's Itineraries; David Zemach (p. 487, 544); R. Salomo Jarchi, a.v. Antiochus, "quem Hebrei per rotebeth Rashi vocant, celebrissimus in S. S. commentariorum," Kimchi's Commentary on Genesis (p. 467); Ibn Ezra's Commentary on Esther (p. 583); Maimonides, Moseh Nebuchad. R. Azzariah, Min Haudomim (p. 583). In two passages Pinoelo mentions the name of Jesus, viz., when speaking of Bethlehem, he says, after having given the explanation of the text: "Sed multo magis urbem nobilissimam Davidis et Iesu Nazareni natalem," and then, when speaking of Galilee, he adds: "Quia Jesus Nazarenus frequenter in hac regione versabatur, ideo Julianum, ο Παπαισχρης, eum per contemptum Gallus et Christianus Galilæus vocabant. Sic enim vocabatur primum Christiani, qui sub imperatore Claudio, relitto Nazareorum et Gallorum nomine, Christiani diei sunt, ut teustatur Suidas." Pinoelo died Nov. 13, 1679, and the noble marquis whom we have mentioned above warmly expressed in a letter to the Judeo-Spanish poet, De Barros, his regret at the death of Pinoelo, and more especially at his dying in the profession of Judaism. Pinoelo not only left his in Σημαίνει a monument "a se reperimus," but also wrote his own epitaph in the following words:

Advertite Mortales.
Hic jacet
Thomas de Pinoelo Ludovici
Quo primum Orientem vidit
In Lazetanum oppido Francozo.

Orus
Ex nobilibus illis regni familia
Paterna Pinheiro, materna Fonseca
Matritii penes patrium educatus
Letteris apud Jesuitas operam dedicat.

Dando profugus
Nullus crimini ac invidiae rena
Hac orae appallit.
Anteqnam abito ad plures
In an memoriae
Hoc cenotaphum per Stephanae aedificavi.
Id volebat vos seire.

Valete.


Pine-tree. The word "pine" occurs in our translation three times, but in neither case is the pine of our northern regions referred to in the original. The first instance is in Neh. viii. 15 (Sept. Πεύκον παραπληκτον. Vulg. lignum pulcherrimum), where the Hebrew words

Stone-Pine Cone and Nuts.
within the holy circuit. If the former, he can find no place so fitting as the top of the δέλτα, or porch of the Temple; but if the latter, the royal porch or gallery (ναός βασιλείας) is the part he would prefer. He adds that, above all other parts of the Temple, the porch thereof, and indeed the whole porch, might not unfruitfully be called τὸ πτέρυγον τοῦ ἵπτος, the wing (for that is the literal meaning) of the Temple, "because like wings it extended itself in breadth on each side, far beyond the breadth of the Temple." If therefore the devil had placed himself on this part of the Temple, he may well be said to have placed him "upon the wing of the Temple; both because this part was like a wing to the Temple itself, and because that precipice was the wing of this part" (Hor. Hebr. adMatt. iv, 5). Against this interpretation, however, it seems decisive that Jesus, not being its author, had not gained admissitance to the Temple proper; unless, indeed, we understand that he was transported thither and back again miraculously. With regard to the other alternative, it is only necessary to cite the description of Josephus to shew that the situation was at least inappropriate to Satan's object: "On the south part (of the court of the Gentiles) was σώρος βασιλείας, 'the royal gallery,' that may be mentioned among the most magnificent things under the sun; for above the profoundest depth of the valley, Herod constructed a gallery of vast height, from the top of which, if any one looked down, he would become dizzy, his eyes being unable to reach so vast a depth." The same Greek word is used in the Sept. version to render, 1. κόσμος, καθαρός, a wing or border, e. g. of a garment (Numb. xxv, 38; 1 Sam. xxv, 27; xxiv, 4); 2. ἑρώτας, ἐρώτας, fin of a fish (Lev. xi, 9. So Arist. Anim. i, 5, 14); 3. καθαρός, an edge; A. V. end (Exod. xxvii, 38). Hesychius explains πτερύγιον as διάπτερον. Perhaps in any case τὸ πτέρυγον means the battlement ordered by law to be added to every roof. It is in favor of this that the word καθαρός is not used to indicate the top of the Temple (Dan. ix, 27; Hammond, Grotius, Calmet, De Wette, Lightfoot, Hor. Hebr. ad Matt. iv). Eusebius tells us that it was from "the pinnacle" (τὸ πτέρυγον) that St. James was precipitated, and it is said to have remained until the 4th century (Euseb. Hist. Eccl. ii, 29; Williams, Holy City, ii, 388). See Temple.

Pinnacle. In the account of our Lord's temptation (Matt. iv, 5), it is stated that the devil took him to Jerusalem, "and set him on a [rather the] pinnacle of the Temple" (ἐπὶ τὸ πτέρυγον τοῦ ἵπτος). The part of the Temple denoted by this term has been much questioned by different commentators, and the only certain conclusion seems to be that it cannot be understood in the sense usually attached to the word (i.e. the point of a spiral ornament), as in that case the article would not have been prefixed. Grotius, Hammond, Dodridge, and others take it in the sense of balustrade or pinnated battlement. But it is now more generally supposed to denote what was called the king's portico, which is mentioned by Josephus (Ant. xvi, 11, 6), and is the same which is called in Scripture "Solomon's porch." Of this opinion are Wetstein, Kuinöll, Parkhurst, Rosenmüller, and others. Krebs, Schleusner, and some others, however, fancy that the word signifies the ridge of the roof of the Temple; and Josephus (Ant. xvi, 11, 6) is cited in proof of this notion. But we know that iron spikes were fixed all over the roof of the Temple to prevent the holy edifice from being defiled by birds (Joseph. War. v, 5, 6), and the presence of these spikes creates an objection, although the difficulty is perhaps not insurmountable, as we are told that the priests sometimes went to the top of the Temple (Middoth, ch. iv; T. Bab. t. Tamid, fol. 29). Dr. Bloomfield asks: "May it not have been a lofty spiral turret, placed somewhere about the centre of the building, like the spire in some cathedrals, to the topmost limit of which the devil might take in Jesus?" (Recens. Synopt. in Matt. iv, 5). We answer, it is: steeples do not belong to ancient or to Oriental architecture, and it is somewhat hazardous to provide one for the sole purpose of meeting the supposed occasion of this text. The opinion on this point is entitled to much respect, declares his inability to judge whether the part denoted should be considered as belonging to the holy fabric itself or to some building so fit as the top of the δέλτα, or porch of the Temple; but if the latter, the royal porch or gallery (ναός βασιλείας) is the part he would prefer. He adds that, above all other parts of the Temple, the porch thereof, and indeed the whole porch, might not unfruitfully be called τὸ πτέρυγον τοῦ ἵπτος, the wing (for that is the literal meaning) of the Temple, "because like wings it extended itself in breadth on each side, far beyond the breadth of the Temple." If therefore the devil had placed himself on this part of the Temple, he may well be said to have placed him "upon the wing of the Temple; both because this part was like a wing to the Temple itself, and because that precipice was the wing of this part" (Hor. Hebr. ad Matt. iv, 5). Against this interpretation, however, it seems decisive that Jesus, not being its author, had not gained admittance to the Temple proper; unless, indeed, we understand that he was transported thither and back again miraculously. With regard to the other alternative, it is only necessary to cite the description of Josephus to shew that the situation was at least inappropriate to Satan's object: "On the south part (of the court of the Gentiles) was σώρος βασιλείας, 'the royal gallery,' that may be mentioned among the most magnificent things under the sun; for above the profoundest depth of the valley, Herod constructed a gallery of vast height, from the top of which, if any one looked down, he would become dizzy, his eyes being unable to reach so vast a depth." The same Greek word is used in the Sept. version to render, 1. κόσμος, καθαρός, a wing or border, e. g. of a garment (Numb. xxv, 38; 1 Sam. xxv, 27; xxiv, 4); 2. ἑρώτας, ἐρώτας, fin of a fish (Lev. xi, 9. So Arist. Anim. i, 5, 14); 3. καθαρός, an edge; A. V. end (Exod. xxvii, 38). Hesychius explains πτερύγιον as διάπτερον. Perhaps in any case τὸ πτέρυγον means the battlement ordered by law to be added to every roof. It is in favor of this that the word καθαρός is not used to indicate the top of the Temple (Dan. ix, 27; Hammond, Grotius, Calmet, De Wette, Lightfoot, Hor. Hebr. ad Matt. iv). Eusebius tells us that it was from "the pinnacle" (τὸ πτερύγον) that St. James was precipitated, and it is said to have remained until the 4th century (Euseb. Hist. Eccl. ii, 29; Williams, Holy City, ii, 388). See Temple.

Pinnacle is an architectural term used to designate a small turret or tall ornament, usually tapering towards the top, and much used in Gothic architecture as a termination to butresses, etc. Not used in the Norman style, though there exist a few small turrets, of late date, with pointed terminations, which appear to be their prototypes, as at the west end of Rochester Cathedral, and the north transept of the church of St. Stephen at Caen. In the Early English style they are not very abundant; they are found circular, square; some are perfectly plain, as at the east end of Battle Church, Sussex; others are surrounded with small shafts, as in Peterborough and Ely; and in some instances the tops are crocketed. Towards the latter part of this style the system of surmounting each face of the shaft with a small battlement was introduced, and about the same period the shafts began to be occasionally made ofBattle Church, c. 1200.
open-work, so as to form niches for statues. The most learned men of his time spoke in praise of his erudition; and cardinal Sadoleto submitted to him his own works before giving them to the printer. In 1672 a statue of Pius was placed in the Palazzo Publico at Siena, which is attributed to the sculptor at the court of Siena. Jean de Pins wrote in most elegant Latin, and deserved the following eulogy at the hands of Erasmus, who was such a competent judge in the matter: "Potent inter Tulli- aequi dictionum compositorem numerantur Johannem Pinsus." We have of him, Vita Philippo Beralduci majoris (Bo- logna, 1505, 4to) — Vita Sancto Catharinae Severinae (ibid. 1505, 4to) — Diri Rochi Narbonensi Vita (Ven. and Par. 1516, 8vo) — Allobrogici narratorum libellus (ibid. 1516, 4to); this is a kind of novel composed for the instruction of the children of the chancellor Antoine Duprat: De vita ostica (Toulouse, 14to); this work is held in great esteem: De claris feminis (Par. 1521, fol.) — remarkable for the elegance of the compo- sition. Pins died at Toulouse Nov. 1, 1557. — Hoefler, Nova. Biog. Generales, 1, 277.

 pys., Simcha, a noted recent Hebraist, was born at Tarnopol, Austrian Poland (Galicia), in 1801. He was the son of a rabbi [see SHERACH], and was well trained in Hebrew lore. Becoming interested in the doctrines of the Chassidim [q.v.], he joined the ranks of the so-called Hasidim, a heretical party of mystic views, as well as in the practice, favored worldly gayety coupled with cynical elements. At the same time he suffered himself to be drawn into the whirlpool of a noisy commercial life, which induced him to enter upon various large speculations, most of which could not long remain imprisoned in these strange spheres, and, with the loss of his entire fortune, he finally abandoned these schemes. He took up his abode in Odessa, which was then a flourishing town, and filled the situation of Rabbinical secretary, and in spite of the pittance of a salary which was paid him, he was barely enough for his existence, he was always in good spirits. But it was not to be expected that a man of Pinsker's talents should long rest content in such a limited sphere. Perceiving how miserable was the condition, in regard to culture, of the South-Russian Jews, which he had no doubt was due to a faulty, anti-quated education, he determined to exert himself for the establishment of Jewish elementary schools, in which the children could receive a proper religious and securi- ty education, suitable to their ages. Odessa was, at the commercial centre of Southern Russia, seemed to him just adapted for such an institution, and Simcha Pinsker lost no time in communicating this important matter to his friend Isaac Horowitz, a native of Brody, who at once took great interest in the proposition. The two young men known the subject of this paper, and the former had a view to several influential parties, and soon succeeded in gain- ing for their plan the conjunction of eminent men, who made all necessary arrangements with the congrega- tion and the government, and thus readily accomplished the object. Pinsker was placed at the head of the newly founded school, and in that capacity he labored until 1840, when he removed to Vienna on a pension for the remainder of his life. Pinsker is noted, how- ever, not simply as the founder and propagator of a high educational status among his compatriots at Odessa, but rather as one of the best Hebraists of our day. When in 1839 Abraham Korkowitch brought from the Crimea a mass of curious and unknown manuscripts, and, among others, a codex of the later prophets, which had, like several Pentateuch fragments, with Haphta- roth and Targum, a peculiar punctuation—the kernel and accent points deviating in form, placed not un- der, but above the consonants—and which he presented to the Odessa Society for history and antiquities, Pinsker gave himself to the deciphering of this newly dis- covered series of punctuation and never rested till, in 1834-43, he became thoroughly acquainted with the materials before him. He showed the patience of a monk of the Middle Ages, continually making researches
in bibliography, biography, and literary history, and did not even shrink from commencing to study the Arabic, the language in which some of the manuscripts were composed. To acquire the latter was in those days no mean task, especially in a town like Odessa, yet Pinski overcame all difficulties, and by his indefatigable diligence, perseverance, and industry, he made some of those researches and their result were communicated to the world.

Pinski was too modest a man to presume that he had anything at command worth knowing by the rest of the world until Osius Schorr applied to him for a contribution to his critical "Ha-Chalau. For this purpose, Pinski prepared a communication concerning the accomplishments of two Karaites, Moses Darai and Radba (David ben-Abraham), natives of Fez, who lived during the Middle Ages, and stood in great repute for their learning. The result of these labors grew to a great work of comprehensive contents, which he published under the name "Likkute Kadmoniim" ("Collections from Times of Yore"), and also under the title, "The History of Karaitism and the Karaites Literature." In it he describes the development of Karaitism, and notes four consecutive periods: a pre-Anassiit, one of Anassiit, another of the "Bekaraitit" and, last and last the Karaites proper. The latter period brought about the breach concerning the Talmudic tradition, and missionaries were sent to Jewish congregations in order to call the people together to enlist them for the new doctrine (this is held in the Yevamot). When the word Karaita, according to Pinski, was derived. They were the people who laid the foundation-stone for completing the editio of Biblical orthography, grammar, lexicography, and modern Hebrew poetry; and although the text of the Tanakh may be considered in rabbinical circles as the first who wrote a Hebrew grammar and a lexicographer, and Dunash ben-Labrat is looked upon as the first who wrote poetry according to Arabic rules, yet there were already among the Karaites many grammarians, lexicographers, and poets, who made use of the Arabic methods, and of this we find ample proofs in the Likkute. Important Karaita writings are quoted, among which the Lexicon by Radba and the Dicen by Moses Darai are largely treated of. Pinski maintains that the latter lived during the 9th century; and, if so, Darai must have considered the leader of a great poetic period, the value of whose poetical productions was highly appreciated, inasmuch as Gebirol Mose ibn-Ezra, Jehuda ha-Levi, and Abraham ibn-Ezra employed many successful similes, expressions, and even whole strophes, which accord in sound and manner with those of Darai. The "Likkute" and the "Likkutei" are the highest expectations of the author. Nearly all that is known previously in the republic of letters, Pinski became all at once a celebrated name. The extraordinary compilation, the imposing erudition, the superabundance of rich material, the conscientiousness and generality of combinations, were all calculated to cause admiration. Before the work was all published, those, as it were, official representatives of Jewish history, Joseph and Grätz, hastened to declare their acknowledgment. The former with fulsome admiration, in the "Bund Chajye" (1860), and the latter in the preface of the fifth volume of his "History of the Jews." Also Dr. Schmiel (Frankel's "Monatschrift," 1861) signified his appreciation of Pinski. In the year 1863 Pinski published in Vienna his "Mebo ha-Nikud," or, as entitled in German, "Introduction to the Babylonic-Hebreal punctuation system, executed according to the manuscripts for history and antiquities in the Odessa Museum." This work is a masterpiece of critical penetration into the historic developments of the vowel and accentuation points. Every line of the "Bekaraitit" and "Anassiit" is Pinski's inquiring mind as a grammarian, and it was one of his favorite ideas to publish a system of Hebrew grammar, which he was on the point of carrying out when his health began to fail him; and the more he tried to bid defiance to nature, the more inexorably the overtaken mind took revenge on him. He died Oct. 29, 1864. He left in MS. more than eighty works, the most of them having reference to Rabbinical or Karaitic authors, such as Jepheth ben-Ali, Aron the First, Abraham ibn-Ezra, Mainonides—the books Abodah and Con-sovenoth—Kalonymos ben-Kalonymos, Mordecai Contini, Deisenhodio, and many others. Some of these researches and their result were communicated to the world. Pinski was too modest a man to presume that he had anything at command worth knowing by the rest of the world until Osius Schorr applied to him for a contribution to his critical "Ha-Chalau. For this purpose, Pinski prepared a communication concerning the accomplishments of two Karaites, Moses Darai and Radba (David ben-Abraham), natives of Fez, who lived during the Middle Ages, and stood in great repute for their learning. The result of these labors grew to a great work of comprehensive contents, which he published under the name "Likkute Kadmoniim" ("Collections from Times of Yore"), and also under the title, "The History of Karaitism and the Karaites Literature." In it he describes the development of Karaitism, and notes four consecutive periods: a pre-Anassiit, one of Anassiit, another of the "Bekaraitit" and, last and least the Karaites proper. The latter period brought about the breach concerning the Talmudic tradition, and missionaries were sent to Jewish congregations in order to call the people together to enlist them for the new doctrine (this is held in the Yevamot). When the word Karaita, according to Pinski, was derived. They were the people who laid the foundation-stone for completing the editio of Biblical orthography, grammar, lexicography, and modern Hebrew poetry; and although the text of the Tanakh may be considered in rabbinical circles as the first who wrote a Hebrew grammar and a lexicographer, and Dunash ben-Labrat is looked upon as the first who wrote poetry according to Arabic rules, yet there were already among the Karaites many grammarians, lexicographers, and poets, who made use of the Arabic methods, and of this we find ample proofs in the Likkute. Important Karaita writings are quoted, among which the Lexicon by Radba and the Dicen by Moses Darai are largely treated of. Pinski maintains that the latter lived during the 9th century; and, if so, Darai must have considered the leader of a great poetic period, the value of whose poetical productions was highly appreciated, inasmuch as Gebirol Mose ibn-Ezra, Jehuda ha-Levi, and Abraham ibn-Ezra employed many successful similes, expressions, and even whole strophes, which accord in sound and manner with those of Darai. The "Likkute" and the "Likkutei" are the highest expectations of the author. Nearly all that is known previously in the republic of letters, Pinski became all at once a celebrated name. The extraordinary compilation, the imposing erudition, the superabundance of rich material, the conscientiousness and generality of combinations, were all calculated to cause admiration. Before the work was all published, those, as it were, official representatives of Jewish history, Joseph and Grätz, hastened to declare their acknowledgment. The former with fulsome admiration, in the "Bund Chajye" (1860), and the latter in the preface of the fifth volume of his "History of the Jews." Also Dr. Schmiel (Frankel's "Monatschrift," 1861) signified his appreciation of Pinski. In the year 1863 Pinski published in Vienna his "Mebo ha-Nikud," or, as entitled in German, "Introduction to the Babylonic-Hebreal punctuation system, executed according to the manuscripts for history and antiquities in the Odessa Museum." This work is a masterpiece of critical penetration into the historic developments of the vowel and accentuation points. Every line of the "Bekaraitit" and "Anassiit" is Pinski's inquiring mind as a grammarian, and it was one of his favorite ideas to publish a system of Hebrew grammar, which he was on the point of carrying out when his health began to fail him; and the more he tried to bid defiance to nature, the more inexorably the
ed the church and convent of Santa Maria del Popolo, in the church of which he built a beautiful chapel for Domenico della Rovere, cardinal of Sant' Clemente, and, according to Vaasari, nephew of Sixtus IV: he built a palace for the same cardinal at Bocquese. About 1473-1475 he built the old Library of the Vatican: Platina was installed by Sixtus as librarian in 1475. Pintelli restored also the hospital of Santo Spirito in Sassia, which was burned down in 1471. He built also the Ponte Sisto over the Tiber; the churches San Pietro in Vinculis, Sant' Agostino, Santa Maria della Pace, and Sant' Apostolo (since rebuilt); and probably San Pietro in Montorio and San Jacopo were built from his designs. In 1480 Pintelli strengthened the celebrated church and convent of San Francesco at Assisi by raising enormous buttresses against the northern walls. Dr. Gay (Kunstblatt, 1886) attributes some other works in Rome to Pintelli, and he has shown that after the death of Sixtus, in 1484, he went to Urbino to continue the ducal palace of Urbino, which Lucianus Lauranus of Savonia had been engaged upon from 1468 until 1488, for Federigo. Pintelli may have remained at Urbino until 1491, when he built the church of Santa Maria delle Grazie at Sinigaglia, for the duke Giovanni della Rovere. He probably died at Urbino, where he was apparently naturalized, as he took the name of Urban of Urbino. It appears to have been influenced by the style of Brunelleschi in his designs, in which there are still characteristics of the previously prevailing pointed architecture. His works are said to be well constructed, as appears from the cupola of Sant' Agostino and the Ponte Sisto, still in a perfect state of preservation.

Pinto, Isaaco, a Portuguese moralist of Jewish descent, was born in 1716. He first settled at Bordeaux, then went to Holland. He was a learned man, but commenced to write only at the age of about fifty, when he gained some reputation by defending against Voltaire his Jewish brethren, or at least among the Portuguese and Spanish Jews. He wrote in French. We select among his writings, Esquisse sur le luxe (Amster. 1762, 12mo). He thus defines his subject: "Luxury consists in this, that the houses we dwell in, the clothes we put on, the victuals we live on, the equipages we use, are an expense in proportion of our means, that we can no longer discharge our duties towards our families, friends, the country, and the poor" (Apologie pour la nation Juive; Réflexions critiques, etc. [ibid. 1762, 12mo]). Perceire, the instructor of the deaf-mute girls of the asylum of the Châtelet, a friend of the author, sent a copy of it to Voltaire, who thanked him, and promised to notice it in the next edition of his works, which, however, he failed to do. Guénée reprinted the "Apologie" as a kind of introduction to his Lettres de quelques Juifs Portugais:—Un jeu de Cartes (1768, 8vo), a letter to Liderer:—Trésor de la Circulation et du Credil (ibid. 1771, 1773, 1781, 8vo), translated into English and German:—Précis des arguments contre les matérialistes (La Haye, 1774, 1776, 8vo). The complete works of Pinto were published in French (Amster. 1771, 8vo), and in eight volumes in 1778. He died Aug. 14, 1787, at La Haye.—Hoefler, Nouv. Bio., Gen. xl, 282.

Pinto, Josias, ben Joseph, a Jewish rabbi, was born at the beginning of the 17th century at Lisbon, and settled at Damascus. He is also called דניאא, i. e. Rabbi Josias Pinto, and wrote יונתן, "Light of the Eyes," annotations on the Fountain of Jacob, בקעת חלב, by J. Jakob ibn-Chabib (Venice, 1643, and often since);—גין כנץ, "Purified Silver," a diffusive exposition on the Pentateuch (ibid. 1628) —יונתן כנץ, "Choice Silver," a succinct exposition on Genesis and Exodus for the same compiler.—Proved Silver, a commentary on Proverbs (Amster. 1714-15.—יונתן כנץ, legal decisions (Venice, 1694; Smyrna, 1756). See First, Bibl. Jud. iii, 104; De Rossi, Dizionario storico degli autori Ebrei (Germ. transl. by Hamburger), p. 265; Wolf, Bibl. Hebr., i, 899 sqq.; iii, 281 sqq.; Lindo, Hist of the Jews in Spain and Portugal, p. 886; Etheridge, Introduction to Hebrew Lit., p. 487; Sinn, Sephardim, p. 462; Steinmeißner, Catalogus Librar. Hebr. in Bibl. Bodl. p. 1547. (B. F.)

Pinto de Fonseca, Emanuel, grand-master of the Order of Malta, born May 24, 1681, belonged to one of the first families of Portugal. Elected grand-master Jan. 18, 1741, after discharging the functions of vice-chancellor and bailli de grâce, he won by his firmness of conduct the esteem of the sovereigns of Europe, to whom he had been useful. It was during his mastery that the unperceived conspiracy against his order was discovered, June 25, 1742. A number of Turkish prisoners, among them Osman Pasha, governor of Rhodes, were to destroy the knights by the sword and by poison, and take possession of Malta with the aid of the Turkish fleet, with which they were in secret correspondence. In September, 1740, a number of Christian slaves forming the crew of a first-rate ship carrying a valuable freight, and on board of which Mehmet Pasha was going to Stanchio to collect the taxes, made themselves masters of the ship, brought it to Malta, and shared it with the knights. The sultan prepared to wreak terrible vengeance on the order, when Louis XV, king of France, had the vessel redeemed at his own cost and restored to the papacy, Dec. 10, 1761. Pinto suppressed (1769) the Jesuits in all the dominions of his order, but granted them a certain liberty in the exercise of their religion. In 1772 he obtained from king Stanislaus-August of Poland the restitution of considerable donations which had been taken from the order. He died Jan. 24, 1773.—Hoefler, Nouv. Bio., Générale, x1, 281.

Pinturicchio, Bernardino, an Italian painter of much celebrity, was born at Perugia in 1454. His real name was Pietro Vannucci, but he often signed his name, Pintoricchio, from his deafness and insignificant appearance, but Pinturicchio was his usual name. He was a disciple of Pietro Perugino (q. v.). His earlier works no longer exist. He never perfected himself in the use of colors, but was confined to the portrayal of landscapes and temperas. He went to Rome, and probably labored with Perugino in the Sistine Chapel. He afterwards executed almost numberless frescoes in the churches and palaces of that city. He was first patronized by the Roveri, and then by the Ficoroni. For Alexander VII he decorated the Apartamento Borgia in the Vatican: five of these rooms still remain in their original state. His pictures in the Castle of S. Angelo have been completely destroyed. During his engagements in Rome he went twice to Urbino, for the execution of commissions there. The amount of his labors was surprising, but is explained by his great facility of execution and the employment of many assistants. He was not original in his compositions; he loved landscapes, but he cumbered them with too much detail; his figures of virgins, infants, and angels have a certain coarseness; he used too much gilt and ornamentation; his draperies were full, but often badly cast; his works are either too scantily or very sombre, no pleasing medium seeming to suggest itself to him; his flesh has the red outlines of the earliest tempera; and yet with all these faults he painted at a time when the great precepts of art were well known, and his works are good exponents of skilled labor in art without any striking or exceptional power in the artist. It is scarcely possible here to give more than a list of the churches in which he painted: in Rome the spells of Trajano, the Arcelli, S. Cecilia, and S. Maria in Trastevere, the Pontificio, the Santa Croce in Gerusalemme, and S. Onofrio. In 1498 he returned to Perugia, and undertook an altar-piece for S. Maria de' Fossi (now S. Anna), to be completed in two years. This is the most finished of his works, and more full of feeling than any other. He next adorned the collegiate church of S. Maria delle Grazie, but his works there are fast disappearing from the effects of dampness.
PIENY

He was next called to Siena by cardinal Francesco Piccolomini, to decorate the library of the Duomo. Here he painted the ceiling in a variety of designs, with the shield and arms of the Piccolomini in the centre; and the walls with ten scenes from the life of Eneas Sylvius, or Pius II. This work was commenced in 1508, but was interrupted by deaths in the family of his patron, and was not completed until 1507, having filled various other commissions in the mean time. It is said with great probability that he was assisted in the library by the then youthful Raphael, and some critics have been wont to attribute the best features of all Pinturichio's pictures to aid from the same source. But this can hardly have been the case. They were associated more or less, without doubt, and it is not improbable that Raphael was one of the many assistants whom the master had in Perugia for his work in Siena; but there are many reasons why the credit of the best of Pinturichio should not be given to Sanzio, who certainly does not need any such praise. There are many circumstances connected with certain cartoons, many similarities of figures in the works of the two masters, which make us feel sure of their association, but these Sienese frescoes are conceived in the system of Pinturichio. This library is one of the few Italian halls that retain their original character. The frescoes are discolored and injured in parts, but beautifully restored by Baldassare Roppi. It is probable that after the completion of these works the master went to Rome, and returned to Siena in 1509 with Signorelli, who stood as godfather to the son born to Pinturichio in the beginning of that year. He then probably entered the service of Pandolfo Petrucci. His last authentic picture is now in the Palazzo Borromeo at Milan, and is a cabinet piece of Christ bearing his Cross. It was painted in 1518, the year of his death. Dreadful stories have been told of the manner in which his wife Grazia treated him. It is said that when very sick and near death, painted, and then confirmed. His works are seen in all large, and in some smaller collections of Europe. See Clement, Handbook of Sculptors, Painters, etc., s.v.; Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, s.v.

PIY, ALEXANDRE, a French ascetic writer of much celebrity, was born at Barcelonnette in 1640. He joined the Dominicans order, and then taught theology at Aix; he was called to Paris in 1676, and there he resided of the novitiate in the houses of his order. He was more distinguished for the holiness of his life than for his writings. He died at Paris Jan. 29, 1709. Of these we mention Carma philosophica (Lyons, 1670, 5 vols. 12mo)---Carmen S. Thome (Paris, 1689, 4 vols. 12mo)---La Clef du par amour (ibid. 1692, 12mo)---La Vie cachee (Paris, 1685, 12mo), etc.---Hoeber, Nouv. Biog. Generale, xii, 285.

Pinyutus is mentioned by Eusebius (Hist. Eccles, iv, 29.31) as bishop of Cynosus, in the isle of Crete, and as a contemporary of Dionysius of Corinth (q. v.). According to the notices given by Eusebius, Dionysius addressed an epistle to Pinyutus, exhorting him that concerning abstinence (aipriov), not to lay too heavy a yoke on the brethren (peipoi), but rather pay regard to the weakness of the majority. It seems that Pinyutus tried to promote in his congregation a Montanistic or Gnostic ascetic tendency. Pinyutus, however, persevered in his course, and replied to Dionysius that it was time to offer to his congregation a stronger meat than milk. Some have thought that the point of difference between Dionysius and Pinyutus was rather concerning celibacy, which the latter so much as to induce among his clergy; but this is a mistake. In other respects, Eusebius speaks of this rejoinder of Pinyutus as containing the best proof of the latter's orthodoxy, his care for the salvation of the souls committed to his charge, his rhetoric, and understanding of divine things. See Herzog, Real-Encycl. s. v.; Theol. Unser-Lex., s. v.; Ebr. Lex., s. v.; Eusebius, Hist. Eccles, iv, 29, 81. (B. P.)

PIOMBO, Fra SEBASTIANO DEL, an eminent Italian painter, noted in the history of sacred art, was born in 1485 at Venice, whence he was called also "Veneziano." His surname, according to Lanzi, was Luciano, though it does not appear that he was known by it in his own time, or that he ever signed his pictures with it. He acquired his principal reception in oil, the Raising of Lazarus, the words "Sebastianus Venetus faciebat" appear in characters no doubt traced by himself. He was a skilful musician, particularly on the lute, but abandoned that science for painting, the medium of which he acquired under Bellini, but afterwards became the disciple of Giorgione, whose style of coloring he carefully studied and successfully imitated. He first distinguished himself as a portrait-painter, to which his powers were peculiarly adapted. His portraits are boldly designed and full of character; the heads and hands are admirably drawn, with an exquisite tone of color and extraordinary relief. The first historical picture which established his reputation was the altar-piece in the church of San Gio. Crisostomo at Venice, which, from its richness and harmony of coloring, has frequently been mistaken for a work by his master Giorgione. Sebastiano was invited to Rome by Agostino Chigi, a rich merchant who traded at Venice, by whom he was employed in ornamenting his palace of the Farnesina, in conjunction with Raffaello, whose Death of Procris, which he painted, is his celebrated Galatea. Thus painting in competition, he found his own destiny of invention, to remedy which he studied the antique, and obtained the instruction and assistance of Michael Angelo. Indeed it is said that that illustrious painter, growing jealous of the fame of Raffaello, availed himself of the power of Sebastiano as a colorist, in the hope that, assisted by his composition, Piombo might become a successful rival. Michael Angelo accordingly furnished the designs for the Pietà in the church of the Convention a Viterbo, and the Madonna in San Pietro in Montorio at Rome, the execution of which, however, in consequence of Piombo's tedious mode of proceeding, occupied six years. The extraordinary beauty of the coloring, and the grandeur of Michael Angelo's composition and design in the elaborated productions, were the objects of universal surprise and applause. At this time cardinal Julian de' Medici commissioned Raffaello to paint his picture of the Transfiguration, and being desirous of presenting an altar-piece to the cathedral of Narbonne, of which he was archbishop, he engaged Sebastiano to paint the picture of the Raising of Lazarus, of the same dimensions. Vasari states that in the composition of this work he was assisted by Michael Angelo; and in the magnificent collection of drawings belonging to Sir Thomas Lawrence there were two careful sketches of the Transfiguration, made by Michael Angelo, and several smaller ones of other parts of the design. On its completion the picture was publicly exhibited at Rome, in competition with the Transfiguration, and it excited general admiration, although thus brought into direct competition with the crown of his own art, and of Raffaello's pencil. It was sent to the cathedral of Narbonne, for which it was painted, and remained till the middle of the 18th century, when it was removed by the regent of France into the Orleans collection. Having been brought to England with the rest of that collection in 1792, it was purchased for two thousand guineas, and is now deposited in the National Gallery at London. It was painted on wood, but has been transferred to canvas; its size is twelve feet six inches high, and nine feet six inches wide. After the death of Piombo, which occurred in 1538, the pictures which he painted in other churches were in the hands of his executor, whom he designated in a codicil written three years before his death, and which he thus signed and sealed, and thenceforth called Fra Sebastiano del Piombo. His
works were numerous; some fine ones are in Madrid and St. Petersburg; many are in Venice, and they are seen in several Continental galleries. The last work was the chapel of the Chigi family, in Santa Maria del Popolo, which he left imperfect, and it was afterwards finished by Francesco Salviati. He died of a fever, at Rome, in 1547. He is said to have been the inventor of painting upon walls with oil-color, and of preventing the colors from becoming dark by applying, in the first instance, a mixture of mastic and Grecian pitch, or, according to some authorities, a plaster composed of quick-lime, pitch, and mastic. See Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, s. v.; Clement, Painters, Sculptors, Architects, etc., s. v.

Pious Workers, a Roman Catholic congregation, founded in 1621 by Caraffa, an Italian nobleman, who was for a time a Jesuit, was approved by pope Gregory XV, and confirmed in 1634 by pope Urban VIII. This congregation is governed by a superior tribunal, and vows are taken, and they serve in missions and other ecclesiastical functions useful to the Church. Their dress is black cloth, like that of other ecclesiastics.

Pious Worker.

Pipe, Musical (ḥabal), The Hebrew word invariably so rendered (1 Sam. x. 5; 1 Kings i. 40; Isa. v. 12; xxx. 29; Jer. xlviii. 36; so also αὐθὸς, 1 Cor. xiv. 7) is derived from a root signifying "to bore, perforate," and is represented with sufficient correctness by the English "pipe" (or "flute," as in the margin of 1 Kings i. 40). It is one of the simplest, and therefore probably one of the oldest of musical instruments; and in consequence of its simplicity of form there is reason to suppose that the "pipe" of the Hebrews did not differ materially from that of the ancient Egyptians and Greeks. It is associated with the tabret (kaph) as an instrument of a peaceful and social character, just as in Shakespeare (Macbeth, Act ii, 3), "I have known when there was no music with him but the drum and fife, and now had he rather hear the tabor and the pipe"—the constant accompaniment of merriment and festivity (Luke vii. 32), and especially characteristic of "the piping time of peace." The pipe and tabret were used at the banquets of the Hebrews (Isa. v. 12), and their

bridal processions (Mishna, Baba metiv, vi. 1), and accompanied the simpler religious services, when the young prophets, returning from the high-place, caught their inspiration from the harmony (1 Sam. x. 5); or the pilgrims, on their way to the great festivals of their ritual, beguiled the weariness of the march with psalms sung to the simple music of the pipe (Isa. xxx. 29). When Solomon was proclaimed king the whole people went up after him to Gibon, piping with pipes (1 Kings i. 40). The sound of the pipe was apparently a soft wailing note, which made it appropriate to be used in mourning and at funerals (Matt. ix. 23), and in the lament of the prophet over the destruction of Moab (Jer. xlviii. 96). The pipe was the type of perforated wind-instruments, as the harp was of stringed instruments (1 Macc. iii. 45), and was even used in the Temple-choir, as appears from Psa. lxxxvii. 7, where "the players on instruments" are properly "pipers." Twelve days in the year, according to the Mishna (Arach. ii. 8), the pipes sounded before the altar: at the slaying of the First Passover, the slaying of the Second Passover, the first feast-day of the Passover, the first feast-day of the Feast of Weeks, and the eight days of the Feast of Tabernacles. On the last-mentioned occasion the playing on pipes accompanied the drawing in water from the fountain of Siloah (Neh. iv. 1; v. 1) for five and six days. The pipes which were played before the altar were of reed, and not of copper or bronze, because the former gave a softer sound. Of these there were not less than two nor more than twelve. In later times the office of mourning at funerals became a profession, and the funeral and death-bed were never without the professional pipers or flute-players (ἀὐθόργας, Matt. ix. 23), a custom which still exists (comp. Ovid, Fast. vi, 660, "cantabat mostia tibia funeribus"). It was incumbent on even the poorest Israelite, at the death of his wife, to provide at least two pipers and one woman to make lamentation. See Musical Instruments.

In the social and festive life of the Egyptians the pipe played as prominent a part as among the Hebrews. "While dinner was preparing, the party was enlivened by the sound of music; and a band, consisting of the harp, lyre, guitar, tambourine, double and single pipe, flute, and other instruments, played the favorite airs and songs of the country" (Wilkinson, Anc. Egypt, ii,

Ancient Egyptian Pipes: Pips. 1, 2, 3, single pipes; 4 double pipe.

222. In the different combinations of instruments used in Egyptian bands, we generally find either the double pipe or the flute, and sometimes both; the former being played both by men and women, and the latter exclusively by women. The Egyptian single pipe, as described by Wilkinson (Anc. Egypt, ii, 308), was "a straight tube, without any increase at the mouth, and when played was held with both hands. It was of moderate length, apparently not exceeding a foot and a half, and many have been found much smaller; but these may have belonged to the peasants, without mer-

Ancient Egyptian Reed-pipes. (Now in the British Museum. One is 6 in. long, the other 18.)
PIPE 223 PIPHER

The Oriental K' or Flute, with Case.

quarter of an inch at the lower. It is pierced with six holes in front, and generally with another hole at the back. . In the hands of a good performer the reed yields fine, mellow tones; but it requires much practice to sound it well. The double pipe, which is found as frequently in Egyptian paintings as the single one, consisted of two pipes, perhaps occasionally united together by a common mouthpiece, and played each with the corresponding hand. It was common to the Greeks and other people, and, from the mode of holding it, received the name of right and left pipe, the tibba destra and sinistra of the Romans; the latter had but few holes, and, emitting a deep sound, served as a bass. The other had more holes, and gave a sharp tone" (Wilkinson, Anc. Egypt., ii, 909, 910). It was played on chiefly by women, who danced as they played, and is imitated by the modern Egyptians in their zurndr, a double reed, a rude instrument, used principally by peasants and camel-drivers out of doors (ibid., p. 811, 812). In addition to these is also found in the earliest sculptures a kind of flute, held with both hands, and sometimes so long that the player was obliged to stretch his arms to their full length while playing. Any of the instruments above described would have been called by the Hebrews by the general term chaldil, and it is not improbable that they might have derived their knowl-

e of them from Egypt. The single pipe is said to have been the invention of the Egyptians alone, who attribute it to Osiris (Jul. Poll. Omn. hist. iv, 10); and as the material of which it was made was the lotus-wood (Ovid, Fast. iv, 190), it is possible the lotus was sacred, there may be some foundation for the conjecture. Other ma- terials mentioned by Julius Pollux are reed, brass, box- wood, and horn. Pliny (xvi, 66) adds silver and the bones of asses. Bartenora, in his note on Arachis, ii, 5, above quoted, identifies the chaldil with the French chalumeau, which is the German schuette and our shawm or shalm, of which the clarionet is a modern improvement. The shawm, says Mr. Chappell (Pop. Mus. i, 35, note 6), "was played with a reed like the vayte, or hautboy, but being a bass instrument, with about the compass of an octave, had probably more the tone of a bassoon." This can scarcely be correct, or Drayton's expression, "the shrillest shawm" (Polyol. iv, 366), would be inappropriate.—Smith, s. v. As among the Greeks, Romans, and the modern Arabs (see Niebuhr, Res. i, 180, where the cuts are given), so probably among the ancient Jews, there were several kinds of pipe, distinguished chiefly by the number of holes. (See Joseph. War. iii, 9, 5; Pliny, x, 60; Dought- tai Anal. ii, 12; Altmann, in Temp. Hebr., ii, 509 sq.) Yet we must not call to mind the completeness of modern pipes and flutes, obtained by keys, etc. See esp. Meurinus, De tibia collectand. in Ucelino, Theat. ur. xxxii; Bartholin, De tibia ret. Bib. ii (Amstel. 1679). See Flute.

Pipes. Hydraulic. There are three Hebrew words so rendered: א"מ (mutzaqkh, Zech. iv, 2, something cast, as rendered 2 Chron. iv, 3); א"מ (m'kh, prob. a bezel or cavity, Ezek. xxviii, 13); and א"מ (rometer, a tube, Zech. iv, 12; whence kiv'sapoq, confunus).

Pipe, John S., a Wesleyan minister, was born in the last half of the 18th century. He was converted when but a boy. He entered the itinerant ministry in 1790, and for thirty-five years labored most successfully for the Gospel cause. He was generally employed in the most populous parts of the British kingdom, and was much beloved by the people to whom he preached. He died July 21, 1835. "His ministry was faithful, lively, and zealous, and his spirit affectionate, cheerful, and devout."—Westley Meth. Mag. 1835, p. 728.

Pipe (Rev. xviii, 22). See Minstrel; Pipe.

Pipher, William G., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born August 23, 1817, in Hopkinton, N. H. In 1837 he removed to Illinois and entered a school in the town of Ebenezer, near Jacksonville. He was converted Aug. 6, 1838, and believing that he was moved by the Holy Ghost to preach the Gospel, obtained license Aug. 14, 1841. In September of the same year he joined the Illinois Conference, and was appointed to the Rushville Circuit; in 1842 was sent to Carthage; in 1843 he was appointed to Pulaski; in 1844 was reappointed to Rushville; in 1847 to Mount Sterling; in 1846 to Lawrenceville; in 1847 to Hilles- borough; in 1848 was ordained elder; and from 1848 to 1850 held a local relation. In 1851 he was readmit- ted to the Conference, and reappointed to Pulaski; in 1852 to Havana; in 1853 to Athens; in 1854 to Ed- gar; in 1855, his health not being very good, he took a transfer to Kansas, which at that time was just opening for settlement. His first appointment was Topeka Circuit, where he labored with great acceptability, and laid foundations upon which others have since largely built. In 1857 he was sent to Big River Circuit, where he did a good work, organized classes and Sun- day-schools, attending to all the duties of a Methodist preacher. In 1858 he was appointed to the Auburn and Tecumseh Circuit, where he labored the earlier half of the year with some success; but the long rides between appointments, the many exposures to storms, swimming swollen streams, with only such accommoda-
tions as new settlements often afford, and sometimes wandering over the wide prairies until morning, broke him down completely, and at the Conference in 1859 he took a superannuated relation, after which he resided at Baldwin City, Kansas, highly respected and most beloved by those who knew him best. He died there May 13, 1869. See Minutes of Annual Conference, 1870, p. 94.


**Pipping, Henri**, a German theologian and biographer, was born at Leipzig in 1670. He discharged, from the year 1698, several ecclesiastical functions at the church of San Thomas at Leipzig, and became in 1706 preacher at the court of Dresden. Pipping died in 1722. He wrote *Arcaeo Bibliotheca Thomas Lipsiensia sacra* (Leipzig, 1780, 8vo) — *Sacer decumum sepulcrum memoriam theologorum nostrae etate dariassionorum exhibens* (ibid. 1705, 2 vols. 8vo), followed by *Tria decumum* (ibid. 1707, 8vo) — *Sermo universa Biographica selecta* (ibid. 1709, 8vo) — *Simeonis dissertationum* (ibid. 1708 and 1723, 8vo).

**Piquepus** is the name of a French reformed order of Franciscans, which was organized by father Vincent Massart, a Parisian, in 1593. They built their first convent between Paris and Pontoise, and the second at the place called Piquepus, where they finally made their headquarters, and obtained the name by which they are generally known. The strength of the order confined to France is remarkable. They have a house at Rome, but it is the only one sanctioned outside of France, as pope Paul V, who gave authority for the order in 1620, so conditioned. Their dress is a black coat, and a round hood with scapulary. They wear sandalshoes and shave like the Capuchin monks.

**PIRIE**, a native of Maughold, is a name found in the apocryphal account of the family-heads who returned from the Captivity with Zerubbabel (1 Esdr. v. 19); but not contained in the parallel Heb. texts (Ezra ii. 25; Neh. vii. 29), and not originating from a repetition of the name Nephus preceding.

**Pigm. (Heb. Pir'am), נוימ, like a wild ass, i.e. fleet; Sept. Φίδ. v. r. Alex. Φίδαππος, Vulg. Pharam**, the Amorite king of Jarmuth at the time of Joshua's conquest of Canaan (Josh. x. 8). R.C. cir. 1618. With his four confederates he was defeated in the great battle before Gibbon, and fled for refuge to the cave at Makkedah, the entrance to which was closed by Joshua's command. At the close of the long day's slaughter and pursuit, the five kings were brought from their hiding-place, and hanged upon five trees till sunset, when their bodies were taken down and cast into the cave "wherein they had been hid" (Josh. x. 27; Smith. See JARMUTH.

**Pir'athon (Heb. Pirathon), פיראון, Ganen, prince; or, First, a delf or creek; Sept. Φιραώτος, v. r. Φαραώτης and Φαραώτης**, the name of one or two places in Palestine. We read in the book of Judges that "Abdon the son of Hillel, a Pirathonite, judged Israel, . . . and was buried in Pirathon," in the land of Ephraim, in the mount of the Amalekites" (xii. 13, 15). The city is not again mentioned in the Bible; but among David's mighty men was "Benaias the Pirathonite, of the children of Ephraim" (1 Chron. xxvii. 14, xii. 81; 2 Sam. xxiii. 80). The city of Pirathon was therefore situated in the territory of Ephraim, and among the mountains, apparently where a colony of the wandering Amalekites had settled. Jerome mentions it (Onomast. s. v. Frastan), but does not appear to have known anything of it. It is mentioned, however, by the accurate old tradition that Parchi as lying about twelve miles west of Shechem, and called Ferata (Asher's Benjamin of Jud. ii. 426). About six miles W.S.W. of Nabalus, upon the summit of a tell among low hills, still stands the little village of Ferata, which is doubtless identical with the ancient Pirathon (Robinson, Bib. Res. iii. 184). According to Schwartz (Pulver, 1518), it is identified by Astori with the modern village of Petha, on the mountain of Amalek, five English miles west of Shechem, doubtless referring to the same place.

Josephus mentions a Pharathon (Φαραώσις), grouping it between Timnath and Tekoa (Ant. xiii. 1, 3); and the same name occurs in 1 Mac. ix. 50 (Φαραώσις), among the towns whose ruined fortifications were restored by Barcidas, in his campaign against the Jews; but it could scarcely have been identical with the Pirathon of Ephraim, though the names are the same. This city was probably situated somewhere in the wilderness of Judah; but the site has not been discovered. See PIRATHONITE.

**Pirathonite (Heb. Pirathon), פיראון, Φιραώνιτης and Φαραώνιτης, from Pirathon; Sept. Φαραώνιτης, Φαραώνιτης, or Φαραώνιτης**, a native or inhabitant of Pirathon (q. v.); the epithet of the judge Abdon (Judg. xii. 18, 19, 15), and of one of David's officers, namely, Benaias, captain of the eleventh army contingent (1 Chron. xxvii. 14, and a member of the royal guard (1 Chron. x. 81).

**Pire, Alexander**, a Scotch divine, flourished near the opening of the present century. His ecclesiastical connection was first with the Antiburghers, then with the Relief Synod, and finally he joined the Independents. He died at Newburgh, in Fife, in 1804. His
works, collected and published after his death (Edinb. 1805-6, 6 vols. 12mo), contain various treatises, relating to the Jews, to the primitive condition of man, on difficult passages of Scripture, on baptism and the covenant of Sinai, and a dissertation on Hebrew roots. On all these topics, and on other theological speculations, and it is to be regretted that a mind so capable and a life so industrious was spent so largely on trifles, or things of a fanciful nature. His controversial pamphlets are prized because they exhibit his religious modifications.

Pirke Abot is a ceremony among the Buddhists of Ceylon, which consists in reading certain portions of the Sana, for the purpose of appeasing the demons called Yakus, from whom all the afflictions of men are supposed to proceed. This ceremony, which is the only one that professors of Buddhism are supposed to be able to perform, is thus described by Mr. Spence Hardy in his Eastern Monachism:

"About sunset numbers of persons arrived from different quarters, the greater proportion of whom were women, bringing with them coconut-shells and so forth, to be presented as offerings. As darkness came on, the shells were placed in niches in the wall of the court by which the wicket is surrounded; and by the aid of little lights and a little cotton they were soon converted into lamps. The whole scene was beautifully illuminated; as many of the people had brought to light with oil a lamp composed of cotton and resins substances, the whole of the sacred enclosure was illuminated with a blaze of light. The bliss and merryle yam ceremonies of the various groups that were seen in every direction gave evidence that, however solemn the occasion, the people were glad for the celebration of the popularities of this and similar gatherings is that they are the only occasion, marriage festivals excepted, upon which the young people can see and hear what is beyond the television. His soul is thrown off the reserve and restrained it is their custom to observe in the ordinary routine of society intercourse. The service continued eleven days, and on the evening of the furlong ceremony being held on the evening of the second day. The ceremony is conducted in the same manner that in the Sana it is read on other occasions. The officiant is seated on the floor of the small room, enclosed in a basket, and placed upon the platform erected for the purpose; and the presence of this relict is supposed to give the same efficacy to the proceedings as if the great sages were personally there. For the priests who are to officiate another platform is prepared and at the conclusion of the preparatory service a sacred thread, called the pirik, is fastened round the interior of the building, the end of which, after being fastened to the reading-platform, is placed near the relict. At such times as the whole of the people who are present are seated, in chanting the chorus the cord is untied, and each priest takes hold of it, thus making the communication complete between the officiating priest and the deities, and the interior walls of the building. From the commencement, on the morning of the second day, until its conclusion on the evening of the same day, the reading-platform is never to be vacated day or night. For this reason a priestess guards the Saama, and only the sages of the Sana are permitted to officiate. The people, on the other hand, are permitted to be relieved by others, one continues sitting and reading while another goes his seat to his successor, and the second priest does not affect his exchange until the new one has commenced reading. In the same way, from the morning of the second day till the morning of the seventh day, the reading is commenced day and night, without intermission. Not fewer than twelve, and in general twenty-four, priests are in attendance, two of whom are constantly officiating. As they are relieved every two hours, each priest has to officiate two hours out of the twenty-four. In this case, in addition to this, all the sacrificial objects engaged in the ceremony are collected three times in each day: viz., at the beginning, at the middle, and at the end. When they chant in chorus the three principal discourses of the Sana, called respectively Mangala, Kalana, and Karanaya, with a short series of verses from other sources. After this the reading is continued till the series of discourses have been completed, when they are again begun, but no other than those who have officiated in the last series being read until the sixth day, when a new sermon is commenced. On the morning of the seventh day the grand procession of armed and assed men, and a person appointed to act as the deaw-stay, or messenger of the god. This company, consisting of a few of the priests, proceeds to the place where the gods are supposed to reside, inviting them to join them on the occasion of the conclusion of the service, that they may partake of it, and then proceed to the temple. His associate returns the officiating priests remain seated, but the assistants rise. At the temple I attended the messenger was introduced with great ceremony. The scribe was burned before him to make his appearance the more supernatural. One of the priests has proclaimed that the various orders of gods and demons were invited to be present, the messenger replied that he had been deputed by each such and such, repeating their names, to say that they would attend. The threefold protective formula, which forms part of the recitation, was spoken by all present in great chorus. In the midst of much that is superstitious in doctrine or ritual, there is some advice repeated of excellent tendency; but the whole ceremony is conducted in a language that the people do not understand, no beneficial result can be produced by its performance."

Such is the ceremony attending the reading of the ritual of priestly exorcism. This ritual is called Pirwikamu pota. It is written in the Pali language, and consists of extracts from the sacred books, the recital of which, accompanied with certain attendant ceremonies, is intended to ward off evil and to bring prosperity.

Pirke Abot, i.e. capitula patrum (פִּרְקֵה אֲבֹת), or sayings of the fathers, is the name of a tract of the Mishna (ע. c.), and consists of five chapters of chronologically regulated gnomes from the teachers of Israel who flourished within 450 years to receive reward, and ages highly esteemed for their moral character, but in modern times, when a greater interest in Jewish history awoke, they also experienced greater attention on account of their historical value. The Pirke Abot was especially used in solving some historical problems, and several after him found in the tract for chronological suggestions. A very ingenious speculation about the first chapter of the Pirke Abot is brought forward by rabbi Bloch. He asserts that its sentences and rules of life were pronounced on the occasion of the solemn dispensing of the Semicha, the ordination and authorization to the office of rabbi and judge, to the disciples as rules of life in office. With such sentence the teacher discharged his disciple, who was prepared to enter an independent calling. The first chapter was not to be read by the congregation, the text only. The first chapter gives the circumstances under which the ceremony is supposed to have been done, and are the reasons for the rules of life, and the law was delivered from generation to generation. When the men of the great synagogue said, "Be deliberate in judgment, train up many disciples, and make a fence for the law," they could not have intended for every man and for every opportunity, but just for such disciples to whom they dispensed Semicha. When Judah ibn-Tauba taught (ver. 8), "Consider not thyself like a chief-Judge, and when parties are before thee in judgment, consider both as guilty; but when they are departed from thee, consider them both as innocent, if they acquiesced in the sentence," he expressed the sages to be cautious of their words (ver. 11), etc., it appears clearly that they merely addressed persons who have charge of judgments and of the chair. Verse 18, which is taught in the name of Hillel, explains this. In this respect genitizes Saamish rigor, and only the suppositions that these excerpts are direct interpretations, he somewhat explain their rigidity. Especially verse 3 gains clearness, which reports the sentence of Antigones of Socho: "Be not like servants who serve their master for the sake of receiving reward, but be like servants who serve without the condition of receiving reward, let the fear of heaven be upon you." According to the common conception, the last sentence could not be brought into close connection with the foregoing. Clearly Antigones intended to say something else than what his exponents impute to him. By סְאָם he designates a deed of correctness understood earthly reward, and addressed his disciples to exercise their office independently and not with a view to reward, but for the office's sake, and "The fear of heaven be upon you" completes the advice. The chapters following contain rules of life for "every man" (פִּרְקֵה אֲבֹת). When the extemporaic discourses were suspended in the synagogue by the reading of the Hagidah (ע. c.), etc., it became the custom to read in the ceremony a chapter of the Abot (Zana, Gottestdienstl. Vorträge der Juden, p. 424), and this still continues the practice in many countries (Bodenschatz, Kirchl. Ver- saufung der Juden, ii, 151 sq.). The Spanish Jews read
the Abod only on the six Sabbaths between Passover and Pentecost. The Prayer-books have the Abod always as an appendix. A separate critical edition, with German translation, was prepared by rabbi Caro, under the title Minchah Schabath (Krotochin, 1847). See T. R. 1 (1846). W. Pirkheimer, WILHAB, a celebrated German humanist, was born at Eichstätt, Dec. 5, 1470, of an old patrician Nuremberg family. He enjoyed a most refined education; he was at the age of eighteen introduced to the court of the bishop of Eichstätt, where he soon became proficient in every kind of knighthood pursuit, and carefully cultivated his fine native talent for music. Though interrupted by several military expeditions, his literary studies, in which he was guided by Georges von Tegern and the canon Adelmann, were not neglected. In 1490 he went to the University of Padua, where he studied jurisprudence, and got familiar with the Greek language, in which he was taught by Museurus. Three years afterwards he completed his study of jurisprudence at Pavia, under Maino, Lancioli, and Philip Decius. At his return to Nuremberg, 1497, he married Crescencia Ritter, whose influential family soon opened to him the doors of the senate. This assembly soon acknowledged his merit, and, in spite of his youth, intrusted him with several important negotiations. In 1499 he was made the commander of the contingent sent by the city to the emperor Maximilian I against the Swiss cantons, when his brilliant conduct during this campaign, of which he afterwards published an account, won him the favor of the sovereign, who made him his counsellor. Disgusted by the envious attacks of which the imperial favor was fruitful, he resigned in 1501 his functions as senator, but resumed them three years afterwards, when he was again intrusted with the most delicate negotiations, his amiable disposition and persuasive eloquence fitting him especially for this kind of business. In 1512 he was sent as deputy to the diets of Trévès and Cologne. In 1522 Pirkheimer retired into private life, devoting himself to study, and encouraging with all his power throughout Germany the cultivation of literature and science. His library, rich in rare manuscripts, was at the disposal of the public; his opulent mansion became the favorite resort of a chosen phalanx of literati, artists, and other persons of merit. He helped many a poor savant with his purse and his influence. He entertained friendly relations with Erasmus, Conrad Celtes, Reuchlin, Tritheme, Adam von Bredenau, and de la Maupassante. Unfortunately the greater part of his correspondence is lost; but what remains of it proves the truth of the words of Cochlæus in a letter to Pirkheimer, "Eo enim hactenus in erudito fuisti animo, ut communio studiosorum judicio hujusmetuis fuerit et literarum decus et eruditionis variis atque adeo omnium princeps." After greatly improving the condition of the schools of Nuremberg, he made that city one of the most active centres of intellectual culture. Huten likens his influence to that of Erasmus and Reuchlin. His predilection for the classical, especially for the Greek writers, some of which he translated into Latin and German, did not lessen his interest for the history of his own country. Some parts of it he treated with a judicious criticism remarkable for that time. He also endeavored to encourage the study of mathematics and of astronomy; and finally took a most lively interest in all attempts made to reform the Church and its discipline, writing against the degenerated scholastics, and taking the part of Reuchlin against his persecutors in an eloquent pamphlet. He at first enlisted among the partisans of Luther, but soon changed his mind. As an advocate of Erasmus, careful lest the success of the reformation might prove obnoxious to his favorite pursuits. He died at Nuremberg Dec. 22, 1580. His works are Eccles. decret. (1520, 4to), under the pseudonym of T. Fr. Cottalambergus.—Apostolia seu legis podagra (Nuremberg, 1522, 4to); Strassburg, 1526, 1537; Amburg, 1604, 1611, 4to) this humorous pamphlet was translated into German (Nuremburg, 1881, 8vo):—De vera Christi carme, ed Ecologiae respondio (ibid. 1536, 8vo); followed by a second answer, and a pamphlet with the title De comitia monachi illius qui Ecologiae manuoptar (1537, 8vo):—Germania ex variis Scriptoris perennis explostitio (ibid. 1580, 1832, 8vo):—Princorun munorum estimatio (Tübingen, 1588; Nuremburg, 1841, 4to):—Translations of several Opuscula of Plautus, Lucian, St. Nits, St. Gregory Nazianzen, etc. The complete works of Pirkheimer have been collected by Goldast, in four volumes, published in 1587; and were reprinted for the first time by his Hühum Superus seu Helvetiuni anno 1490, translated into German by Munch, which added thereto a life of the author (Nuremberg, 1826). Pirkheimer gave the first edition of Fulgentius (ibid. 1612, 8vo); he also wrote the text to the splendid woodcuts of Albert Dürer's Triumphal Chariot of the Emperor or Maximilian. Some of his letters are to be found in Strobecl's Beiträge und Miscellen, in Waldaus Beiträge, and other collections.

His sister, Charles Pirkheimer, born 1464, after enjoying a most liberal education, entered very young the monastery of Santa Clara at Nuremberg, of which she became abbess in 1504. She read Greek, and wrote in Latin with elegance. Some of her letters in that language to Erasmus and others have been preserved. She died in 1532.—Roeter, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xi, 304.

Pirikning, EHRENKRICH, a German canonist, was born at Niggen, near Frankfort, in 1606. After studying theologies and jurisprudence at Ingolstadt, he entered the Jesuitic order in 1629, and was a professor of morals, canon law, and exegesis in several colleges of his order. Pirking died after 1676. We have of him, Apologia Casuari princeps Catholicorum et ordinum (Cöln, 1652, 8vo):—De juxtrajudicet praetorius et rectorum episcopi inferius (Dillingen, 1668, 8vo):—De juxtrajudicet rectorum delegatii (ibid. 1664, 8vo):—De constitutionibus et commissu- dationibus (ibid. 1664, 8vo):—De remissione lirum (ibid. 1657, 8vo):—Commentaria in Decretales (ibid. 1674, 8 vol. fol.):—In causas canonice expeditas (ibid. 1674-1678, 5 vol. fol.; Venice, 1759).

Pirminius, Sr., a Frankish ecclesiast and bishop of Melzi (Metz, or Metlo in St. Gallen, or Medebach, near Zweibrücken, or Meaux-on-the-Marne), carried the Gospel to the shores of the lake of Constance; and, protected in his labors by Charles Martel, he founded the monastery of Reichenaus. Three years afterwards, however, he was expelled in consequence of a national rising of the Alemanni against the Frankish rule, and he retired to the Rhine and formed the council of monasteries (as Murbach, Schwarzenbach, Neuweiler, Schuttert, Gengebach, etc.), among them Hornbach, in the diocese of Metz, where he died, Nov. 8, 738, after having met shortly before with St. Boniface. A great many legends surround the life of this servant of Christ, which, however, have no historical basis. Pirminius is said to be the author of Liber labelis abbatis Pirminii, de singulis libris canonici sacrae (the latter in medie- val Latin meaning "excerpt"), printed in Maibolin, Vetera Analecta (Paris, 1728, fol.), p. 65-83. See Reitberger, Geschichte des deutschen Rechts, i, 625-59; Fe- lede, Geschichte der Einführung des Christentums im südwestlichen Deutschland (Tubing, 1837); G. Th. Rud- hard, Alte Geschichte Bayerns (Hamburg, 1841), p. 546, 571, 572; M. Göringer, Pirminius, etc. (Zweibr. 1841), p. 364-407; Fe de, in Füger, Gesch. der S. Christian. 1841, xii, 129-134; Kurzer Lehrbuch der Kirchenrecht, vol. i, § 78, p. 1; Herzog, REAL-Encyclopedia, v. s. v.; Jäger, Gelehrten-Lexicon, s. v.; Theologisches Universal-Lexi- kon, v. s. v. (B. P.)

Pirna, JOHN. See PIRNAINANS.

Pirnainsans, a medieval sect, taking its name from John Pirm or Pirnains, an anti-sacerdotal schis- matics of the 14th century (A.D. 1341). Its tenets are those common to the medieval sects, and illustrated especial-
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ly in the Beghards and the Brethren of the Free Spirit. It is thought probable that they were in some way connected with the Strigolati of Russia, although the latter belong to a much more recent time. The Pirmensi
ans regarded the pope as Antichrist, and were especially distinguished by great hatred of the clergy. They dis
appeared on the Continent by merging with the Hussii
ans; but the Francisci, the Brethren of the Free Spirit in Po
land, i. 55; Hamburgh, Hist. of the Church in the Middle
Ages, p. 574.

PIROMALLI, Paolo, an Italian missionary, was born in 1561 or 1562 at Siderno (Utterior Calabria). Having
embraced the rule of St. Dominic, he devoted himself to
preaching, and was in 1589 called to Rome to teach phil
osophy in the monastery of La Minerva. Appointed in
1611 director of the missions of Major Armenia, he
succeeded in gaining for the Catholic faith a number of
schematics and Eutychians, among the latter the patri
archs Cyriac and Moses III. In 1637 he travelled through
Georgia and was twice sent to pacify in Ponto
Armenia the necessities caused by the disputes of the Arme
nians. In 1649 he went to Persia, remaining there ten
years, and then preached the Gospel in several parts of
India. In 1654 he passed over to Africa, with a view of
converting indels, but was captured by Algerian pir
ates. He was afterwards released, and on his return to
Spain, became a most successful professor of theology, a
member of the chapter of the Notre Dame de Paris, and
at last chancellor. It was his regular busi
ness to examine the works and theses of theology. He
published a number of books and pamphlets on the sub
jects of his doctrine. Ferolin gave him his Explication de Maximes des Saints to examine. He approved of it
mostly, after some small changes, going even so far, it is
said, as to call it a golden book; then, under the in
fluence of his previous work, he took back the book, but
wrote against the Explication a censure which was
signed by sixty other doctors. He died at Paris Aug.
4, 1713. With the exception of a Latin speech pro
nounced in 1693, nothing of his exists in print; but
some manuscript pamphlets are mentioned by contempo
raries.

A Jesuit of this name, Firot (Georges), who was born in
1599 in the bishopric of Rennes, is the author of an
Apologie des Casuistes contre les Colomnies des Jansen
istes (1657), a work condemned by Alexander VII and
several bishops. He died Oct. 6, 1659.—Hoefl, Nouv. Biog. Générale, x. 320.

Pisa, a city of Northern Italy, the recent capital of
Tuscany, with a population of about 22,000, is noted in
ecclesiastical history as the seat of several important
Church councils.

1. The first council here (Convocatio Fiscemen) was
carried on by Innocent II in 1134, who presided at the
head of a large assembly of the bishops of France, Germany, and Italy. St. Bernard assisted at their de
liberations. By this body the excommunication of the anti
pope Anacletus was renewed, together with his other
charges. See p. 989.

2. The death of Piazzo, a cardinal in the Church of
the Holy Spirit, in 1650, caused a schism as then existed. It was proposed to judge
between the two competitors for the papacy, and elect one of them to the throne, or set both aside and choose a third party. The council was called under the protection
of King Charles VI of France, and was attended by the cardinals of both rivals to the papal chair.—Ben
dict XIII (v. q.v.) and Gregory XII (v. q.v.). Benedict,
by the advice of several bishops, sent seven legates to
the council; but Gregory, on the other hand, refused to appear either in person or by deputy, although sum
moned in due form. The assembly was finally held in
August and numerous and ever seen in the Church: there were present 22 cardinals; the Latin patriarchs of Al
exandria (Simon), Antioch (Wenceslaus), Jerusalem
(Hugo), and Cædul (Francis Landi); 12 archbishops were
present in person, and 14 by their deputies; 80 bishops, and the procors of 102 absent; 87 abbots, and the pro
ctors of 200 others; besides priors; generals of orders;
the grand-master of Rhodes, with 16 commanders; the
_prior-general of the Knights of the Holy Sepulchre;
the deputy of the grand-masters and Knights of the
Teutonic Order; the archbishops of Bayonne, Narbones,
Cambridge, Paris, Florence, Cracow, Vienna, Prague, and
many others; more than 800 doctors in theology; and
ambassadors from the kings of England, France, Portugal, Bohemia, Sicily, Poland, and Cyprus; from the
dukes of Burgundy, Hamburgh, etc.

The following was the action of each session of this
council:

Session 1. The order of precedence to be observed by
the members of the council was laid down.

Session 2. After the usual prayer and sermon, the arch
bishop of Pisa read the decree of Gregory X upon the
prosecution of the Holy Spirit, to which the Greeks had
advised in the Council of Lyons. A.D. 1274, and the Deut
orius of Toledo relating to the proper order of ecclesiastical
councils. After this the necessary officers were appoint
ed, the letter of conversation read, and the two rival popes
summoned at the gates of the church: no one, however,
appearing for them.

Session 3. A fresh citation was made, and no one having
appeared, the two popes, Pedro of Luna and Angelo Cor
raro, were declared contumacious by a sentence which
was affixed to the church door.

Session 4. Bishop Ullro, the ambassador of Robert, king
of the Romans, and the assembled nobles, endeavored to
frustrate the object of the council.

Session 5. The two opposing parties were again de
clared contumacious, and the promoter of the council
produced against them thirty-seven articles, containing the
whole history of the schism and the wrong-doing of
their cause. Although the facts contained in this
accusation were sufficiently notorious, commissioners
were appointed to prove their truth.

Session 6. The bishop of Sallustia showed that it was
necessary for the council to believe that there was not
merely a partial, withdrawal from the obedience of the
popes, and declared that he had authority from the
king of England to follow out the scheme for unity, and
to consent to whatever the council should determine.

Session 7. The difficulties started by the ambassador
of the king of the Romans were answered.

Session 8. The bishop of Sallustia and Evreux showed
that the union of the two colleges of cardinals could not
be effected while those of the party of Benedict con tinued
to obey him, and that the withdrawal from obedience
must be universal. Whereupon the council of the union
of the two colleges to be lawful, and the council itself duly convicted: and a decree was passed to the ef
fect that each ought to withdraw from obedience to Gregory and Benedict. Since both of them had by this
decree been deprived of the right of sitting in the college
of which they had promised upon oath to make.

Session 9. He was employed in the reading of the decree of the preceding session.

Session 10. The two contending parties were again cited
at the door of the church, in order that they might hear the testimony of witnesses. Then the minutes, containing their deposition, were read; and it was noted down by how many witnesses each article was proved.

Session 11. The reading of the depositions was continued.

Session 12. A decree was published declaring the pain of excommunication, and all contained in the preceding de
positions to be true, public, and notorious.

Session 13. One of the decrees from the University of Paris showed that Pedro of Luna was a heretic and schis

PISA

PISA

matic, and that he had forfeited the papacy: and this he declared to be the opinion of the French universities.

The cardinals were also disagreed upon the doctrine in the council, to the number of three hundred, agreed in this view.

Sess. 14. A declaration was made that the council represented the Roman Catholic Church, that the cognizance of all matters of such importance devolved on the highest authority on earth; also an act of general withdrawal from the obedience of the two contending parties was drawn.

Sess. 15. The definitive sentence was pronounced in the presence of the whole council and of the people who were deputed to enter. The sentence was to the effect that the holy oecumenical synod, representing the Catholict Church, had been assembled in the capacity of and to decide the question, after having examined everything which had been done concerning the union of the Church of St. Peter of Rome, of St. Louis of St. Benedict, and Angelo Corrado, called Gregory XII, to be both of them schismatists, abettors of schism, heretics, and guilty of perjury; that they had given offence to the whole Church by their obstinacy, that they had forfeited every dignity, act of absolution, any form of canon law, and declared the last promotion of cardinals made by them to be null and void.

Sess. 16. A motion was made, on which the cardinals present all promised that, in the event of any one of them being elected pope, he would resign the papal chair, and would conciliate the present council, until the Church should be reformed in its head and in its members; and if one of them should abstain from it, or be accused of belonging to no college of cardinals, were elected, that they would compel him to make the same promise before publishing his election. Afterwards the council ratified the sentence against Angelo and Pedro.

Sess. 17. Certain preliminaries concerning the election were settled.

Sess. 18. A solemn procession was made to implore of the Lord to bestow of his beneficence on the new election to their election.

Sess. 19. The cardinals, to the number of twenty-four, entered into conclave under the guard of the grand-master of Rhoade, and at the end of ten days' confinement, they unanimously elected Peter of Candia, cardinal of Milan, of the order of Franciscan Priests, a man seventy years of age, who took the name of Alexander V.

Sess. 20. As soon as he was elected, John Gerson, chancellor of the University of Paris, delivered a discourse, exhorting him to the faithful discharge of his duty, etc.

Sess. 21. The new pope presided and delivered a discourse. The decree of his election was from read, and on the following Sunday he was crowned.

Sess. 22. A decree was read on the part of the pope, approving and ratifying all the dispensations of marriage, and those relating to the penitentiary, which had been granted by Benedict or Gregory.

Sess. 23. A decree was published on the part of the pope and council, confirming all collations, provostships, townships, and the donation of land, made canonically by two rival popes.

Sess. 24. A decree was read, ordering metropolitans to convolve provincial councils, and the generals of orders to hold convents of canons, according to the pope's appointment. Finally, Alexander ratified all that the cardinals had done in conformity with the above, and what had passed at Pisa. With regard to Church reform, as many of the prelates had left the council, the pope declared that the council must be deputed to the following council, which he appointed to be held in 1415; then he dismissed the assembly, giving plenary indulgence to all who had assisted at it, and to all who had adhered to it.

See Hardoun, Acta, vii, 1929 sqq.; viii, 1 sqq.; Mansi, Concil. xxvi, 151 sqq.; xxvii, 1-522; Labbe, Concil. xi, 2114; Leung, Hist. del Conc. del Pisa (Amsterdam, 1724, 4to); Wesenberg, Die Allgemeinen Concil. des 15 u. 16 Jahrh. ii, 48 sqq.; Hofsch. Commentar, vol. v. For the antecedents of the imbécile conduct of papal affairs under the newly chosen candidate we refer the reader to the art. Alexander V, and the history of his successor, John XXIII (a.v.). In this place we may simply add that the schism, instead of being closed, continued, with three popes in the room of two. The effort also to recall the rank of the pope to a constitutional instead of an absolute monarch, by giving to the councils of the Church the supreme tribunal, to which the pope himself is subordinate and amenable, failed. See Infal- libilist., supra.

III. Another council was convened at Pisa in 1511, at the instigation of the emperor Maximilian and Louis XII of France, who having just cause of complaint against pope Julius II (q. v.), persuaded the cardinals of St. Croix, Narbone, and Coscia to convene a coun-

cil, whose object was set forth to be the reform of the Church in its head and in its members, and to punish various notorious crimes which for a long time had scandalized the whole Church. It was further stated that there was urgent need of such councils, that Ju-

lius had not been able to redress the wrongs he had done in his power to hinder it; and, finally, the pope was in respectful terms cited to appear at the council.

Besides this, in answer to the complaint made against him by Julius, they published an apology for their conduct, which provided the convocation of the Council of Pisa: first, by a special edict, the second, or ninth session of the council; secondly, by the pope's own vow, according to which he had promised to hold a council; thirdly, by the oath of the cardinals, and by the necessity of avoiding so great a scandal. They further showed that this was the power of convoking such councils in the pope, to be understood as speaking of the ordinary state of things, but that cause may arise in which councils may be called and assembled by others than the sovereign pontiff. The pope, in order to carry the blow, voted a rival council to Rome, and cited the three above-mentioned cardinals to appear there within a certain time, under pain of deprivation. The Council of Pisa, however, proceeded, and was opened Nov. 1, 1511. Four cardinals attended, and the proctors of three who were absent, also four French bishops, the French legates, and the pope's nuncios, together with a few abbots and doctors; deputies from the universities of France, and the ambassadors of Louis XII. The following is an account of each ses-

sion's transactions:

Sess. 1. Cardinal St. Croix presided. The convocation of the Council of Pisa, having for its object the reform of the Church, was pronounced to be just and lawful, and all that had been or might be done to its prejudice declared null and void.

Sess. 2. All that related to the order of the assembly was settled: the canon of Toledo read, and officers appointed. The pope was made to assure that the present council could not be dissolved until the reform of the Church had been effected: the subject of the powers of the Council of Constance, relating to the authority of oecumenical councils, was reviewed.

Sess. 3. At this time, the pope heard the opening litany, and entered into a league with Ferdinand and the Venetians, began to attack the state of Florence, and the fathers judged it expedient to transfer the council to Milan, which accordingly was done; and on Jan. 4, 1514, the fourth session was held.

Sess. 4. The assembly was more numerous, the cardinals of St. Severin and St. Angelo joined themselves to the other one, and the general or general-Conclave, which had been made by the antipope's appointment. Finally, Alexander ratified all that the cardinals had done in accordance with the above, and what had passed at Pisa. With regard to Church reform, as many of the prelates had left the council, the pope declared that the council must be deputed to the following council, which he appointed to be held in 1415; then he dismissed the assembly, giving plenary indulgence to all who had assisted at it, and to all who had adhered to it.

See Hardoun, Acta, vii, 1929 sqq.; viii, 1 sqq.; Mansi, Concil. xxvi, 151 sqq.; xxvii, 1-522; Labbe, Concil. xi, 2114; Leung, Hist. del Conc. del Pisa (Amsterdam, 1724, 4to); Wesenberg, Die Allgemeinen Concil. des 15 u. 16 Jahrh. ii, 48 sqq.; Hofsch. Commentar, vol. v. For the antecedents of the imbécile conduct of papal affairs under the newly chosen candidate we refer the reader to the art. Alexander V, and the history of his successor, John XXIII (a.v.). In this place we may simply add that the schism, instead of being closed, continued, with three popes in the room of two. The effort also to recall the rank of the pope to a constitutional instead of an absolute monarch, by giving to the councils of the Church the supreme tribunal, to which the pope himself is subordinate and amenable, failed. See Infal-

libilist., supra.

Sess. 5. A deputy from the University of Paris delivered a discourse, after which the pope Julius was again cited in the usual form; and upon his non-appearance a demand was made that he should be declared contumacious. Several decrees were also published, among other subjects upon the exemplary life which ecclesiastics ought to lead; the form of orders; the election of a pope; with regard to sessions and congregations. The convocation of a council to Rome, made by Julius, was declared null and void.

Sess. 6. The promoters of the council required that Ju-

lius should be declared, through his comity, to have incurred, solo facto, suspension from all administrative acts of the pontifical office. Consequently he was called upon three times from the foot of the tribunal; but the settlement of the question was then deferred till the next session.

Sess. 7. The church was sung by the bishop of Magnelonne (now Montpellier), a decree was made suspending Julins, and the council was reciting all the acts of Pope Boniface IV in order to obtain his protection, excommunicating all cardinals of bishops, princes, and people no longer to recognize Julins as pope, but having been declared heretic, schismatist, author of schism, incurribile and hardened, and having as such incurred the penalties denounced in the decrees of Constance, etc.

Sess. 8. This was the last session of the council, for the French being obliged to abandon the Milanese, the blash-
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ops were compelled to quit Milan: they made an attempt to continue the council at Lyons, but without effect.

See Landon, Conc. xiii, 1486; Dupin, Comp. Hist. iv, 4; Hefele, Conciliorumച.on.

Pisa, Bartholoméo de', an Italian theologian, was born at Pisa near the beginning of the 14th century. He belonged to the Dominican Order, and was often confounded with a Franciscan monk of the same name, who rendered himself famous by his book on the resemblance of Jesus to St. Francis. He died about 1347. He wrote several works of piety and theology; but two only have been printed: Summa de censure, and Opera morales (1423). Of his other works, one is an aurum apocrisæ opus morale (Treviso, 1601, 8vo). See Échard, De Script. Ord. Prædicator.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xi, 330.

Pisa, Samuel Cohen de', a native of Lisbon, was one of the most profound Talmudists of the 17th century. He wrote REDIKE, the "Reveler of Secrets" (Venice, 1661), a commentary on the most difficult passages of Ecclesiastes and Job, in fourteen chapters, which have been made into passages, containing very important questions. Thus, for instance, in the first chapter he treats on the question "whether, in the third chapter of Ecclesiastes, the immortality of the soul is denied," and in the ninth chapter, "whether Job did deny the immortality of the soul and the resurrection of the dead." See Fritsch, Bibl. Jud. 1490. Of his several works still extant, the bronze gates of the Baptistry of St. John at Florence are the most important. These two gates are still perfect; the exact date of their execution is disputed—whether they were finished in 1380, or only commenced in that year. The reliefs are from the life of John the Baptist, and the general design of the gate is said to have been made by Giotto; but Giotto's share, if any, must have been more that of the architect than the sculptor, though even defining the panels and indicating the subjects; he can scarcely have had more to do with the work than this, or his share must have been more intimately associated with them. The work appears to have been modelled by Andrea and his son Nino, and the castings commenced by some Venetian artists in 1380, and the complete gates to have been finished in 1402. It is also certain that some of the most magnificent decorations of the architrave, which were added many years afterwards by Vittorio, the son of Lorenzo Ghiberti, in order to make them harmonize with the other two sets of gates executed by his father. The gates of Andrea were originally in the centre of the Baptistry, opposite to the cathedral, but were afterwards removed to the side, to give place to the more beautiful work of Ghiberti, in the year 1424. All three sets of gates have been well engraved in outline by Lasino, Le tre Porte del Battistero di Firenze (Florence, 1828). Andrea was made citizen of Florence, and died there in 1414; he was buried in the cathedral of Santa Maria del Fiore. See Vasari, Vie de Pritchets, etc. (ed. Flor. 1846 sq.); Cicognara, Storia della Scultura; Rumohr, Italianische For schungen; Rosini, Storia della Pittura Italiana, s. v.

Pisano, Giovanni, the son and assistant of Niccolò, was born at Pisa about 1240. He seems to have inherited the genius and talents of his father's genius, but had an entirely different taste. Gothic architecture was his choice, and he was fond of exaggeration and fantastic action and expression in sculpture. As early as the making of the Siena pulpit he was a master in his own right, and went in 1268 to Naples to fulfil a commission from the Franciscans there; he also designed the Episcopalian Palace. After the death of Niccolò the Pisans were anxious to have Giovanni remain in his native city, where he executed important works. The church of S. Maria della Spina was the first example in Italy of the pointed architecture, and is a most pleasing one. In 1278 he was chosen to build the Pisano Campo Santo; it was the first and finest of all the monuments of the city. It is too well known to be described in our limited space, but it seems that nothing could have been more fitting for its purpose than the plan which he adopted. Many of the sculptures here were also by his hand. The representation of Pisano was the first attempt at making large statues in 1427 by some of the artist's friends. It is strange, and in many respects an ugly work; yet it has great intensity of expression in its principal figure, and displays the originality of Giovanni. He gained much reputation from this, and in 1285 went to Siena, where he was commissioned to build the façade of the cathedral. The people of Siena were very desirous that he should fix his home there; the magistrates made him a citizen, and exempted him from taxes for life; but he remained only three years, and went next to Perugia. In the city he made a monument to Pius IV, which no longer exists. From this time he devoted himself almost wholly to sculpture. At Arezzo he made the shrine of S. Donato for the cathedral, which cost (including jewels for the Madonna, enamels, and silver base-reliefs) 80,000 florins. It was a superb work of art. His next work was done as a memorial to a sculptor who had made a pulpit for the church of S. Giovanni at Pistoia, which was much praised. A new pulpit was also to be made for the church of S. Andrea, and there were those in Pistoia who had so admired Niccolò Pisano that they desired to have Giovanni do it; he excelled his rival in every way, and fully supported the reputation he had gained. Our artist now went to Florence. This was a prosperous time there, and Giovanni remained two years. In 1305 he began the monument of pope Benedict XI, and somewhat later on for St. Margaret in S. Dominica at Perugia. In 1312 he undertook the rebuilding of the cathedral of Prato, and, though he did not live to see it completed, his designs were carried out with precision. He died in 1320. He had many pupils; among them Andrea Pisano (q. v.). See Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, s. v.; Vasari, Lives of the Painters and Sculptors; Cicognara, Storia della Scultura, s. v.

Pisano, Giunta (or GIUNTA DI GIUSTINO OF PISA), is the earliest known Tuscan painter, and flourished in the first half of the 13th century. A crucifixion painted by him in the church of Santa Maria degli Angeli at Assisi, about 1215, until very recently in some of the decorations of the architrave, which were added many years afterwards by Vittorio, the son of Lorenzo Ghiberti, in order to make them harmonize with the other two sets of gates executed by his father. The gates of Andrea were originally in the centre of the Baptistry, opposite to the cathedral, but were afterwards removed to the side, to give place to the more beautiful work of Ghiberti, in the year 1424. All three sets of gates have been well engraved in outline by Lasino, Le tre Porte del Battistero di Firenze (Florence, 1828). Andrea was made citizen of Florence, and died there in 1414; he was buried in the cathedral of Santa Maria del Fiore. See Vasari, Vie de Pritchets, etc. (ed. Flor. 1846 sq.); Cicognara, Storia della Scultura; Rumohr, Italianische Forschungen; Rosini, Storia della Pittura Italiana, s. v.

Pisano, Giovanni, the son and assistant of Niccolò, was born at Pisa about 1240. He seems to have inherited his father's genius, but had an entirely different taste. Gothic architecture was his choice, and he was fond of exaggeration and fantastic action and expression in sculpture. As early as the making of the Siena pulpit he was a master in his own right, and went in 1268 to Naples to fulfil a commission from the Franciscans there; he also designed the Episcopalian Palace. After the death of Niccolò the Pisans were anxious to have Giovanni remain in his native city, where he executed important works. The church of S. Maria della Spina was the first example in Italy of the pointed architecture, and is a most pleasing one. In 1278 he was chosen to build the Pisano Campo Santo; it was the first and finest of all the monuments of the city. It is too well known to be described in our limited space, but it seems that nothing could have been more fitting for its purpose than the plan which he adopted. Many of the sculptures here were also by his hand. The representation of Pisano was the first attempt at making large statues in 1427 by some of the artist's friends. It is strange, and in many respects an ugly work; yet it has great intensity of expression in its principal figure, and displays the originality of Giovanni. He gained much reputation from this, and in 1285 went to Siena, where he was commissioned to build the façade of the cathedral. The people of Siena were very desirous that he should fix his home there; the magistrates made him a citizen, and exempted him from taxes for life; but he remained only three years, and went next to Perugia. In the city he made a monument to Pius IV, which no longer exists. From this time he devoted himself almost wholly to sculpture. At Arezzo he made the shrine of S. Donato for the cathedral, which cost (including jewels for the Madonna, enamels, and silver base-reliefs) 80,000 florins. It was a superb work of art. His next work was done as a memorial to a sculptor who had made a pulpit for the church of S. Giovanni at Pistoia, which was much praised. A new pulpit was also to be made for the church of S. Andrea, and there were those in Pistoia who had so admired Niccolò Pisano that they desired to have Giovanni do it; he excelled his rival in every way, and fully supported the reputation he had gained. Our artist now went to Florence. This was a prosperous time there, and Giovanni remained two years. In 1305 he began the monument of pope Benedict XI, and somewhat later on for St. Margaret in S. Dominica at Perugia. In 1312 he undertook the rebuilding of the cathedral of Prato, and, though he did not live to see it completed, his designs were carried out with precision. He died in 1320. He had many pupils; among them Andrea Pisano (q. v.). See Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, s. v.; Vasari, Lives of the Painters and Sculptors; Cicognara, Storia della Scultura, s. v.

Pisano, Niccolò, a noted Italian architect and
sculptor, was born at Pisa about 1206. At the age of fifteen he was appointed architect to Frederick II, with whom he went to Naples. In the service of this sovereign he passed ten years, and then went to Padua, where he lived in the house of the family of S. Antonio. The first known attempt which he made as a sculptor resulted in his alto-relievo of the Deposition from the Cross which now fills a lunette over a door of the cathedral of S. Martino at Lucca. This is most excellent as the work of an untutored artist, as he was at that time, and it is akin by comparison with works of his contemporaries which are near it. The statuettes of the Misericordia Vecchia at Florence are of about the same merit as this base-relief. In 1248 Niccola went to Florence to assist the Gibellines in their work of destruction; he was commissioned to overturn the tower called Guadalupe in such a way as to destroy the Baptistery; he overturned the tower, but it did not fall in the anticipated direction, and we may believe that this was in accordance with his intention, although it was attributed to a special miracle by Villani. During the twelve succeeding years he was employed in making designs for the building and remodelling of many churches and palaces. The church of Santa Trinita at Florence is one of the best known of his works of this period. In 1260 Niccola established his fame as a sculptor by the magnificent pulpit which he executed for the Baptistery at Pisa. Of course marks of his comparative inexperience can be found in this work, but taken all in all it almost challenges criticism. His next work was the Arcu di S. Domenico at Bologna, which is now surrounded with a maze of beautiful sculptures, of which the Arch is the centre, and is of great interest as illustrating the art of the 13th century. In 1266 Pisanu went to Siena to make the pulpit for the Duomo. This is similar to that of Pisa in many ways, but not so effective, because surrounded by other objects of interest, and in a larger space; but the pulpit seemed almost the only thing to attract the attention. In 1269 he was commissioned to build the abbey and convent of La Scuola, which are now in ruins. In 1274 he commenced the fountain of Perugia, which was his last work. The authorities of the city made severe laws for its preservation, and it was considered the most precious possession of the city. In 1278 Pisanu died, after a life of great usefulness, for his influence had been felt throughout all Italy. His services could never be estimated. He had founded a new school of sculpture; he put behind him sculptures which he had bestowed for the perpetuity of his name in architecture too, the same may be said, and in the words of Mr. Perkins, "He was truly a great man, one to whom the world owes an eternal debt of gratitude, and who looms up in gigantic proportions through the mist of five centuries, holding the same relation to Italian art which Dante holds to Italian literature." In his life he was respected and beloved by all who came in contact with him, be it in patron, friend, or servant.

PIsANT, LOUIS, a French savant, was born in 1646 at Sassetot, near Fécamp. Admitted in 1667 into the Congregation of the Benedictines of Saint-Maur, he was ministered with the rank of superior of several congregations and retired to that of Saint-Ouen. He died May 5, 1726, at Rouen. He wrote, Sentimens d'une Anne pension (1711, 12mo), and Traité historique et dogmatique des Préséges et Exemptions ecclésiastiques (Lumbré, 1715, 4to), a work which found favor and served as the approbation of his congregation.—Hoef. Nouv. Biog. Générale, xl, 380.

PISCATOR, JOHANNES, a German theologian of the Reformation age, is noted for his learning and piety. He was born at Strasburg March 27, 1546. He was from his youth a lover of study, and was soon distinguished in his learning. While engaged in the study of logic, he anxiously sought to reconcile and unite Aristotle and his commentator Peter Ramus (q.v.); and when, after the completion of his university studies at Strasburg and Tübingen, he became professor at the university of his native town, he made this the special subject of some of his lectures, though the department of divinity was his field. Suspected of Zwinglianism, he found his position uncomfortable, and accepted a professorship at Heidelberg in 1574. But here also the severely Lutheran tendency gave him disquiet, and after a short stay at Neustadt in 1578 he went to Nuremberg, where, however, he was not suffered to remain quietly, and in 1584 he finally removed to Herborn as conrector of the Academy, where he taught with so much success that many students flocked thither from Germany, France, Poland, and other northern countries. He was very diligent, and scarcely allowed himself sufficient time for sleep. He wrote extensively, translating the whole Bible with great faithfulness into the German, and making a logical and theological analysis of the greater part (Herborn, 1602-3, 3 vol.; 2d ed. 1604-6; 3d ed. 1624; abridged ed. in Berne, 1681; Dinkelsbühl, 1684). He also published several valuable commentaries on the Old and New Testaments (1618-58), and many dogmatic and polemic writings, of which some on the Lord's Supper, Predestination, Heidelberg Catechism, Justification, and God's will to Humiliation, De mystica Erhebung in Christo, deserve mention. Most peculiar were the views of Piscator on the active obedience of Christ, which he held not to be imputed, but that which Christ for himself owed to God. See SATISFACTION. Piscator died in 1625. See Steubing, in Zeitschrift f. histor. Theol. 1841, iv, 198 sq.; Schröck, Kirchengesch. s. d. Bez. v. 858 sq.; Gass, Prot. Dogmatik, i, 163, 383, 422; Tholuck. Das ausserkundige Leben des 17ten Jahrh. pt. ii, p. 304; Hagenbach, Kirchengesch. vol. v; Bouuet, Variations, vol. ii; Buchanan, Justification (see Index). (J. H. W.)

PISCHON, FRIEDRICH AUGUSTUS, a minister of the German Evangelical Church, and pastor in Berlin, died Dec. 8, 1864. He published, Die heutige Bedeutung der Uebersetzung der Heil. Schrift durch Martin Luther (Berlin, 1854)._—Von der Hälfte, welche die Frauen der Aufklärung des göttlichen Wortes leiten können (ibid. 1856)._—Predigten (ibid. 1857)._—Vorträge über die deutsche und schweizerische Reformierung (ibid. 1846)._—Die Augsburgische Confession u. der Berliner Kirchenrat (ibid. 1858)._—Die Taufnamen. Eine Weihnachtsgabe (ibid. 1857, etc.). He also edited the Monatschrift für die württembergische Kirche, in connection with Eltzer, Jonas, and Seydow. See Zuchholt, Bibliotheca Theol. ii, 899, 927 sq. (B. P.)

Piscina (Lat. = a reservoir of water), originally the reservoir of a church connected with the aqueducts of Rome, but applied in ecclesiastical architecture to a drain formed by a niche or small alcove placed beside or in front of the altar. The word is derived from piscina, a fish pond, and was applied to the water in which the priest washed his hands, as well as to that in which the chalice was rinsed at the time of the celebration of the mass. It is usually annexed to the consecrare or seat of the priests in the ancient churches, and is the most part similarly decorated, and sometimes appearing as an additional compartment. It is sometimes also found alone in the southern walls of chancels and aisles, sometimes in the eastern walls on the right, and there are one or two instances in which it occurs on the left. When two chalices occur in it, one was reserved for the water in which the priest had washed his hands, the other that in which he had rinsed the chalice. Du Cange limits the piscina, as it is restricted above, to the lavacrum. By Bingham it is received in a more extensive sense (1707, 1, 22r), and by large it is applied to the piscina, for which latter name Opitatus affords
Piscina. Piacculi, and Vesica Piscis. The fish is a hieroglyph of Jesus Christ, very common in the remains of Christian art, both primitive and medi eval. The origin of it is as follows: From the name and title of our blessed Lord, Ιησοῦς Χριστός, Θεός Υἱός, Σωτήρ—Jesus Christ, the Son of God, the Saviour—the early Christians, taking the first letter of each word, formed the name İΧΘΥΣ, pike, a fish. See Ichthus. Hence Christians came to be called Pisciculi, little fishes, with reference to their regeneration in the waters of baptism. The Vesica Piscis, which is the figure of an oval, generally pointed at either end, and which is much used as the form of the seals of religious houses, and to en close figures of Jesus Christ or of the saints, also has its rise from this name of Christ, though some say that the vesical Vesica Piscis has no reference except in its name to a fish, but represents the almond, the symbol of virginity and self-production. Clement of Alexandria, in writing of the ornaments which a Christian may consistently wear, mentions the fish as a proper device for a ring, and says that it may serve to remind the Christian of the origin of his spiritual life. See Riddle, Christian Antiquities, p. 185; Siegel, Christl. Alterthümner (see Index in vol. iv). See Ichthus.

Pise, Charles Constantine, D.D., an American Roman Catholic divine of note, was born at Annapolis, Md., in 1802. He was the son of an Italian gentleman of ancient and noble family. His mother was an American lady, a native of Philadelphia. At an early age Charles was placed in the Georgetown College, that famous institution being then as now under the control of the Order of the Society of Jesus. Graduating there most creditably, he went to Rome to pursue his theological studies, but returned after two years, and completed his preparation for the ministry under the tutelage of the Rev. Dr. Bunti, the preceptor of the late archbishop Hughes. On his return to this country Pise taught rhetoric and poetry in the Seminary of Mount St. Mary's, Emmitsburg, Md. He was ordained priest in 1825, and commenced his labors in Frederick, Md., but subsequently removed to Baltimore, where he officiated at the cathedral. The labors of his position, together with the performance of a large amount of religious literary work which he attempted, impaired his health, and he again visited Rome for a respite. While there he was honored with the title of Knight of the Roman Empire. Upon his return to America he settled in Washington, and through the influence of Henry Clay and other warm personal friends he was elected chaplain to the senate of the United States. On the invitation of Dr. Dubois, then bishop of New York, he afterwards removed to New York City, and officiated at St. Peter's, in Barclay Street, till 1849, when he went over to Brooklyn, and purchased the church in Sydney Place, with which he was connected at the time of his death, in 1866. Dr. Pise was acknowledged to be one of the most eloquent and learned divines of his Church in America, as he was one of the most indus-
trious and faithful laborers in it. Aside from his labors with his spiritual charge, he was eminent both as a preacher and a lecturer. He devoted much time to literary pursuits. He was the author of Letters on the Truths of Catholic Doctrines; a History of the Church from its Establishment to the Reformation (1800, 5 vols. 8vo) — The Acts of the Apostles in Verse: The Lives of St. Ignatius and his Companions; and many other volumes in prose and verse. He also edited, many years ago, in company with the late father Felix Varella, D.D., an influential magazine published in New York City, and known as the Catholic Expository. In the volumes of this work will be found many of his happiest efforts both in verse and prose. Among the latter may be mentioned Horae Vagabundae, a series of deeply interesting letters descriptive of his travels in Europe. They were eagerly sought after at the time of their publication. (J. H. W.)

Pis'gah (Heb. Pigsah, פִּזְגַּה, always with the art.), the name of a mountain of Moab. It is in fact an ancient topographical name found, in the Pentateuch and Joshua only, in two connections: 1. The top, or head, of the Pisgah (קֵדְשֵׁה), from which Moses took his dying survey of Canaan (Num. xxii, 20; xxiii, 14; Deut. iii, 27; xxiv, 1); 2. Ashdoth hap-Pisgah, perhaps the springs, or roots, of the Pisgah (Deut. iii, 17; iv, 49; Josh. xii, 3; xiii, 20). See Ashdoth-pisgah. The word hap-Pisgah, פִּזְגַּה, literally in the section, from פָּסְגַּה, to divide, and hence it may mean an isolated hill or peak. The rendering of the Sept. is not uniform. In Deut. iii, 17; xxiv, 1; Josh. xii, 3; xiii, 20, it is פָּסְגַּה; but in Num. xii, 20; xxiii, 14; and Deut. iii, 27, the phrase פָּסְגַּה מִצְגָּה is rendered Koseh tou laothupinou, which is a translation of the Hebrew, top of the cut mountain. The Vulgate has everywhere Pissaha. The reference to the scene of Moses's death by Josephus (Ant. iv, 8, 48) affords no additional light.

"The Pisgah" must have been in the mountain range or district, the same as or a part of that called the mountains of Abiram (comp. Deut. xxxii, 49 with xxxiv, 1). See Abiram. Its situation is minutely described by the sacred writers. It is first mentioned in connection with the approach of the Israelites to Palestine. They marched "from Bamaoth in the valley, that is in the country of Moab, to the top of Pisgah, which looketh towards Jeshimon" (Numb. xxii, 20). Pisgah was thus on the plateau of Moab, and commanded a view of the western desert. See Jeshimon. Another passage (xxxiii, 13, 14) proves that it commanded a view of the Israelitish camp in the valley on the east bank of the Jordan; and from other incidental notices we learn that it was opposite to and in sight of (נֶגֶר לְבֵן) Jericho (Deut. xxxiv, 1), and overlooking the north-eastern angle of the Dead Sea (iv, 49; Josh. xii, 3). The names Abiram, Nebo, and Pisgah are connected in such a way by the sacred writers as to create some difficulty to the geographer. In Deut. xxxii, 49 the Lord commands Moses, "Get thee up into this mountaintop Abiram, Mount Nebo," etc.; and in xxxiv, 1 we read that Moses, obeying, "went up from the plains of Moab unto the mountain of Nebo, the top of Pisgah" (מִן הָרֵי הַבָּא מֵעֵר לְרִי הַבָּא). From these passages we may infer, (1) that Abiram was the name of a range or group of mountains; (2) that Nebo was one of its peaks; and (8) that the name Pisgah was either equivalent to Abiram, or that it is (as represented in some passages in the Sept., and in the margin of the A. V.) a common noun, signifying "an isolated hill or peak." If the latter view be taken, then Deut. xxxiv, 1 may be rendered, "Moses went up to Mount Nebo, to the top of the hill." The construction rather favors the view that Pisgah, like Abiram, was the name of the range, and that Nebo was one of its peaks. Others have taken precisely the opposite view, namely, that Pisgah was a particular summit of Nebo as a range; but in that case Pisgah would not be so often mentioned (as a mountain at the foot of which the Israelitish host encamped, and as furnishing springs of water), while Nebo is but once named (as the peak on which Moses died). (See below.) Upon Pisgah Balaam built altar and offered sacrifices, so that it was probably one of the ancient "high places" of Moab (Numb. xxxiii, 14). From its summit Moses obtained his panoramic view of the Holy Land, and there he died (Deut. xxxiv, 1-5). Beneath the mountains were celebrated "springs" or "torrents" (רִיָּנוֹת), which are several times mentioned in defining the boundaries of Reuben, as Ashdoth-Pisgah (Deut. iii, 17; iv, 49 in the Hebrew; Josh. xii, 8; xiii, 20). Pisgah

View westward from the summit of Mt. Pisgah. (From a sketch taken on the spot.)

therefore lay on the east of Jordan, contiguous to the field of Moab, and immediately opposite Jericho. The field of Zophim was situated on it, and its highest point or summit—its "head"—was the Mount Nebo. If it was a proper name, we can only conjecture that it denoted the whole or part of the range of the highlands on the east of the lower Jordan. In the late Targums of Jerusalem and Pseudo-Jonathan, Pisgah is invariably rendered by ramatho, a term in common use for a hill. It will be observed that the Sept. also does not treat it as a proper name. On the other hand, Eusebius and Jerome (Onomast., s. v. Abaram, Pisga) report the name as existing in their day in its ancient locality. Mount Abaram and Mount Naban were pointed out on the road leading from Livia to Heshbon (i.e. the Wady Heshâb), still bearing their old names, and close to Mount Phogor (Poer), which also retained its name, whence, says Jerome (a. 338), the contiguous region was even then called Pisgah. This connection between Phogor and Pisgah is puzzling, and suggests a possible error of copyists. See Pass.

No traces of the name Pisgah have been met with in later times on the east of Jordan, but in the Arabic garb of Ras el-Peskah (almost identical with the Hebrew Roah hat-Pisgah) it is attached to a well-known headland on the north-westerly end of the Dead Sea, a mass of mountain bounded on the south by the Wady en-Nar, and on the north by the Wady Sidr, and on the northern part of which is situated the great Musliman sanctuary of Nebi Mûsâ (Moses). This association of the names of Moses and Pisgah on the west side of the Dead Sea—where to suppose that Moses ever set foot would be to mutilate the whole narrative of his decease—is extremely startling. No explanation of it has yet been offered. Certainly that of M. De Sauley and of his translator (see De Sauley's Voyage, etc., and the notes to ii, 58-66 of the American edition), that the Ras el-Peskah is identical with Pisgah, cannot be entertained. Against this the words of Deut. iii, 27, "Thou shalt not go over this Jordan," are decisive. See Dead Sea.

The mountain itself is chiefly memorable as the height from which Moses got his most distinct view of the Land of Promise; from thence "the Lord showed him all the land of Gilead unto Dan, and all Naphtali, and the land of Ephraim and Manasseh, and all the land of Judah unto the utmost sea; and the south, and the plain of the valley of Jericho, the city of palm-trees, unto Zoar" (Deut. xxxiv, 1-8). Mr. Tristan (Land of Israel, 1865, p. 533 sq.) describes a visit which he and his fellow-travellers paid to the range of Nebo or Abaram, and the magnificent prospect they had from the height which they supposed might possibly be the Pisgah of Moses. It was about three miles south-west of Heshbon, and one and a half miles due west of Malm. The elevation was considered to be about 4500 feet; yet the ascent was not rugged, and for several hours they rode along the ridge. The day was clear, and to the north and east they saw the hills of Gil'ead, and "the vast expanse of the godly Belka, one waving ocean of corn and grass." Southwards appeared Mounts Hor and Seir, with other granite peaks of Arabia, in the direction of Ahabah. Then, turning westwards, there lay distinctly before them the Dead Sea and the whole valley of the Jordan, "all the familiar points in the neighborhood of Jerusalem." Looking over Jordan, "the eye rested on Gerizim's rounded top; and farther still opened the plain of Esdraslon, the shoulder of Carmel, or some other intervening height, just showing to the right of Gerizim, while the faint and distant bluish haze beyond it told us that there was the sea, the utmost sea." It seemed as if but a whiff were needed to brush off the haze, and reveal it clearly. Northward, again, rose the distant outline of unmistakable Tabor, aided by which we could identify Gilboa and Jebel Dûby (Little Hermon). Snowy Hermon's top was mantled with cloud, and Lebanon's highest range must have been exactly shut behind it; but in front, due north of us, stretched in long line the dark forests of Ajjun, bold and undulating, with the deep sides of mountains, here and there whitened by cliffs, terminating in Mount Gil'ead, behind Es-Salt (Ramoth-Gililean)." This seems to realize to the full what was anciently exhibited to the eye of Moses, and shows the representation given of his extensive prospect to have been no ideal picture.

The spot has more recently been the subject of a considerable discussion by Prof. Paine, of the American exploring party, in report No. 8 of these operations (N. Y. Jan. 1875). Prof. Paine contends that Jebel Neba, the highest point of the range, is Mount Nebo, that Je-bel Siâghah, the extreme headland of the hill, is Mount
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**Map of Mount Pisgah.**
PISGAH

and, that the "mountains of Abarim" are the
cliffs west of these points, and descending towards
the Dead Sea. He maintains these positions by the follow-
ing arguments:

1. That there is an old road leading down to the Jor-
dan valley in this direction, which he thinks the
Israelites pursued on their way from Almon-dibblathaim
to the plains of Moab (Num. xxxiiii, 47, 48). It has
generally been supposed, however, that they took
the route now usual with travellers, through Wady Hasbân.
The position of Jerusalem is unknown. As Almon is there said
to have been before ("יָבְרָא") Nebo, a particle which
generally signifies east and not west. The parallel ac-
count of the station in question (xxii, 29) places it
on "the top of the Pisgah" (בֵית הַכֵּיתֶא דּוֹבַיָּה), and this
certainly disconcerts Paine's location on a lower
peak of the ridge. It is true the phrase is added,
"which looketh towards Jeshimon," i.e. the Ghor or
Jordan valley (see Keil, Comment. ad loc.), but this
may possibly mean only pointing in that direction
from the station last left. The preceding clause, "the valley
that is in the field of Moab," is ambiguous; as it may
qualify either the point of departure, i.e. Bamoth,
or the destination, i.e. Pisgah. The A.V. adopts
the former construction; but this cannot be favored by the
syntax of the adjoining verses, and conflicts with the idea
of a high place (Bamoth), which could hardly be
said to have been in a valley. The latter reference is therefore
adopted by most interpreters, but (as Rosenmuller re-
marks) seems to agree with the phrase "top of
Pisgah." We suggest as the only consistent transla-
tion, "And from Bamoth to the valley which is in the
plateau of Moab (the summit of the Pisgah [range]), and
overlooks the Ghor." This makes Pisgah but
another name for the table-land of Moab
overhanging the Jordan valley or Dead Sea. The particu-
lar top in question was apparently Nebo itself, which
is in fact a crest of the Moabitic table-land, that
shows as a "mountain" only from the western point of
view. The sole considerable "valley" (גִּזְעַת) answer-
ing to this description is Wady es-Sowâniich, which is
the southern head-branch of Wady el-Hesbân, and inter-
sects the plain up to the very crest of Nebo. Prof.
Paine, however, appears to identify it with the valley
in which the "Springs of Moeos" are situated, a deep,
wild, glen hardly answering to the requirements of the
case except as it contains water and looks directly
down upon the Dead Sea. As the route of those who we
have located it, the Israelites would have been
precisely on the route to Heshbon, which they next attacked
(xxii, 21-26), and thence to the Ghor opposite Jericho
(xxiii, 1), by way of Wady el-Hesbân.

2. Paine's next argument is drawn from the history
of Balaam and Balak immediately following the pas-
sages last cited. After lodging at Kirjath-huzoth
(Numb. xxii, 39), which Paine regards as the site of
Kufre or Abi-Bel, just east of the crest of Nebo, the two
proceeded first to "the high places of Baal" (ver. 41),
which the professor deems to be "the extremity of Je-
bel Sâdghâh, the first chief summit of Pisgah"—a de-
cription which, if we could correctly understand the
somewhat confused statements, designates the outer or west-
ernmost peak, as from this "the whole of Israel" could be
seen. Balaam next repaired to a point called "the
top of Pisgah" (ver. 14), which Paine regards as the
third or easternmost peak, because from it only a part of
the Israelitish camp could be seen. Finally, the prophet
ascended "the top of Peor" (ver. 28), which the
professor thinks was the middle or ruin-crowned peak of
Sâdghâh, as from it the various surrounding countries
there enumerated can be seen to advantage. But this
distribution of the several localities seems rather arbi-
trary. The first name is a very indefinite one, being
identified with Baal (Josh. xiv, 17), apparently
nearer the Aroma (Numb. xxii, 29), if not identified
with the Bamoth previously referred to (ver. 20); and surely
there are many spots in the vicinity from which the
"utmost part of the people" could be—seen—a phrase that
designates not the whole, but only the rear. In Numb.
xxiii, 15, where the same expression is used, the same
place is referred to, where the word is עַבּ (báh)
"And Balak said to him, Come now with me to another
place, whence thou mayest see him (only his extremity
cannot thou see) [here], and not all of him cannot thou
see; and thou shalt curse him for me there" (see Keil, ad loc.).
The next locality accordingly was out.
commanding a view of the entire encampment, or only.
"the top of the Pisgah" range, probably Jebel Nebâh
itself. It seems to have been much farther than Paine
makes it from Balak's previous station, for there the
two adjoining eminences are spoken of in very different
phrases ("the high-places of Baal—to a high
place," Numb. xxiii, 41, 42, 38, 3). As this second out-
look of Balaam is called (xxiii, 14) "the field of Zo-
phim," or the watchers, Paine holds that it was Wady
Haisa, which he reports as being partly under cultiva-
tion; but this affords no good prospect of the "plains of
Moab" eastward, such as Keil thinks the import of the
name requires (Comment. ad loc.). The third of
Balaam's posts of observation was "the top of Peor,
which looketh towards Jeshimon," or the desert [of Judah]
(Numb. xxiii, 29); and as the next to the last day's
journey of the Israelites was "to the top of Pisgah,"
which looketh towards Jeshimon" (xxii, 28), and as, moreover,
Moab died on the top of Pisgah, and was buried "in a
valley in the land of Moab, over against Beth-peor" (Deut.
xxxiv, 6), Paine concludes that all these were
designations of the same or immediately adjoining
spots, thus making the ruin-crowned summit of Sâd-
ghâh the site of the sanctuary of Peor, and he adds
the character of the remains as evidence that they were
an early temple. He thinks they are not sufficiently
extensive for those of the town of Nebo (q. v.),
but the inclines to identify with the more considerable ruins
called Khâbar el-Mukheisât, a little more than a mile
south of Jebel Nebâh.

Other collateral arguments of less moment adduced
by Prof. Paine in support of his views are drawn from
the name "Ashdoth-Pisgah" (Deut. ii, 17; iv, 49; Josh.
xii, 8; xiii, 29), which he renders springs of Pisgah,
and identifies with those of Ayûn Mâsâ; and from the
Bible accounts of Moeos's death and burial. He also
adduces the statements of later writers (Josephus,
Eusebius, etc.) on these points. His attempt to trace
the name Pisgah back to the Syrian root Peor as
pointed out by some of his predecessors, he regards
as failure. His main conclusion that Pisgah is a special
name for a particular part of Mount Nebo, and that the
mountains of Abarim are likewise limited to the hills
immediately overhanging the north-east end of the
Dead Sea, can be supported as being in accordance with
the genius of the place; and we therefore incline to the
generally entertained view that the reverse is true. Dr. J.
L. Porter has still more recently travelled over this lo-
cality, and he states, in his account of his journey in
the London Athenæum, that Jebel Nebâh is a common
name for many of the eminences in this vicinity.
He is inclined to regard Sâdghâh as a relic of the name Pis-
gah. See Nebo.

PIȘTATAH. See FLAX.

PIȘTÂDI (PIȘTÂDI, etymology uncertain) was a dis-
trict of Asia Minor, which cannot be very exactly
defined. But it may be described sufficiently by saying
that it was to the north of Pamphylia, and stretched
along the range of Taurus. Northward it reached to
the Arctic Ocean. It was probably of tolerably oblong
shape, and rather as is shown on the modern maps on the
southern side of Asia Minor. Thus Antioch in Pisidia was
sometimes called a Phrygian town. In general terms it may be said that Pisidia
was bounded on the north by Phrygia, on the west
by Caria and Lydia, on the south by Pamphylia, and on
the east by Cilicia and Cappadocia. It was a
mountainous region; but high up
among the peaks of Taurus were some fertile valleys and little upland plains. The province was subdivided into minute sections, and held by tribes of wild and wakike highlanders, who were the terror of the whole surrounding country (Strabo, 2 c.; Xenophon, Anab. 1, 11; 2, 5, 18). It was probably among the deities of Pisidia that the apostle Paul experienced some of those "perils of robbers" of which he speaks in 2 Cor. xi, 26; and perhaps fear of the bandits that inhabited them had something to do with John's abrupt departure from Paul and Barnabas just as they were about to enter Pisidia (Acts xiii, 10, 14). The Pisidian tribes had rules of their own, and they maintained their independence in spite of the repeated attacks of more powerful neighbors, and of the conquests of the Greeks, and even of the Romans. The latter were content to receive from them a scanty tribute, allowing them to remain undisturbed amid their mountain fastnesses. See Smith, Dict. of Class. Geog. s. v. The scenery of Pisidia is wild and grand. The mountains are mostly limestone, and are partially clothed with forests of oak, pine, and juniper. The lower slopes are here and there planed with olives, vines, and pomegranates. Many of the rivers are artificially grand—have cliffs rising up a thousand feet and more on each side of the bed of a foaming torrent. In other places fountains gush forth, and streams crawl along amid thickets of olean- der. The passes from the sea-coast to the interior are difficult, and have always been imperative. See Land and Life in Pisidia.

Paul paid two visits to Pisidia. In company with Barnabas he entered it from Pamphylia on the south, and crossed over the mountains to Antioch, which lay near the northern border (Acts xiii, 10). Their mission was successful; but the enemies of the truth soon caused them to be expelled from the province (ver. 50). After an adventurous journey through Ly- overthom" (comp. Hab. i, 8), but at the same time quotes an etymology given in Herodich Rabbe, § 16, in which it is asserted that the river is called Pison "because it makes the flux (πηγή) to grow." Josephus explains it by λαυρέας, Scaliger by λαυρεμύρα. The theory that the Pison is the Ganges is thought to receive some confirmation from the author of the book of Ecclesiasticus, who mentions (xxiv, 25, 27) in order the Pison, the Tigris, the Euphrates, Jordan, and Gihon, and is supposed to have commenced his enumeration in the east and to have terminated it in the west. That the Pison was the Indus is an opinion current a few years before it was revived by Ewald (Gesch. d. Volker. fiber, i, 381, note 2) and adopted by Kalisch (Genesis, p. 96). Philostorgius, quoted by Huet (Ugolino, vol. vii), conjectured that it was the Hydaspe; and Willad (A. R. A., vol. vii), following the Hindú tradition with regard to the origin of mankind, discovers the Pison in the Landi-Sind, the Ganges of Isidorus, called also Niláb from the color of its waters, and known to the Hindús by the name of Nila-Gangá, or Gangá simply. Severianus (De Mundi creat. and Epiphanius, Hær., Comm, s. a. Gen.) agrees with Ammianus Marcellinus in identifying the Pison with the Ganges. The last-mentioned father seems to hold, in common with others, some singular notions with regard to the course of this river. He believed that it was also the Ganges and Indus, and that, after traversing Ethiopia and Elymais, which he considered landlocked, it fell into the ocean near Cadiz. Such is also the opinion of Epiphanius with regard to the course of the Pison, which he says is the Ganges of the Ethiopians and Indians and the Indus of the Greeks (Aen. c. 58).

Some, as Hopkinson (Ugolino, vol. vii), have found the Pison in the Naharnawa, one of the artificial canals which formerly joined the Euphrates with the Tigris. This canal is the flumen regionum of Amm. Marc. (xxiii, 6, § 20, and xxiv, 6, § 1), and the Armeleth of Pliny (N. I. vi. 90). Grotius, on the contrary, considered it to be the Gihon. Even those commentators who agree in placing the terrestrial Paradise on the Shat el-Arab, the stream formed by the junction of the Tigris and Euphrates, between Ctesiphon and Apamæa, are by no means unanimous as to which of the branches, into which this stream is again divided, the names Pison and Gihon are to be applied. Calvin (Comm. s. a. Gen.) was the first to conjecture that the Pison was the most easterly of these channels, and in this opinion he is followed by Scaliger and many others. Huet, on the other hand, conceded that he proved by arguments that Calvin was in error, and that the Pison was the westernmost of the two channels by which the united stream of the Euphrates and Tigris falls into the Persian Gulf. He was confirmed in this opinion by Bölling, (Herat. pt. ii. 1, 5, c. 6), Junius (Pres, s. a. Gen.) and Rask discovered a relic of the name Pison in the Pastigiris. The advocates of the theory that the true position of Eden is to be sought for in the mountains of Armenia have been induced, from a certain resemblance in the two names, to identify the Pison with the Phasis, which runs in the elevated plains of the foot of Mount Ararat, near the sources of the Tigris and Euphrates. Reland (De Situ parad. terr. Ugolino, vol. viii), Calmet (Dict. s. a. Link (Urvelt, i. 307), Rosenmüller (Handb. der bibl. Altert., s. a. Gen.) and Hartmann have given their suffrages in favor of this opinion. Such suggestions by Delitzsch (Genesis) endeavors to prove that the Pison was the Phasis of Xenophon (Anab. 4, 6), that is, the Aras or Araxes, which flows into the Caspian Sea. There remain yet to be noticed the theories of Lelicer (Comm. s. a. Gen.), and of the modern Barada, which takes its rise near Damascus; and that of Buttmann (A. It. Erk., p. 82), who identified it with the Besyrag or Arabatt, a river of the Mandelsohn (Comm. s. a. Gen.) mentions that some affirm the Pison to be the Golan of 2 Kings xvii, 6 and 1.
Chron. v. 26, which is supposed to be a river, and the same with the Kziel-Usen in Hyrcania. Colonel Chesney, from the results of extensive observations in Armenia, seems to infer that the river is none of the comparatively modern names of Halyos and Araxes are those which, in the book of Genesis, have the names of Pison and Gihon; and that the country within the former is the land of Havilah, while that which borders upon the latter is the still more remarkable country of Cush" (Exped. to Euphr. and Tigris, i. 267). — Smith. Fabel inclines to make it the Abarus of Phinyx, or Batam of modern geographers, which rises in Armenia and flows into the Black Sea; but Dr. Hales considers the Araxes to have a better claim; and this last speculation (for nothing better can any of the assigned positions be called) seems to derive support from the author of the apocryphal book of Ecclesiasticus, who, speaking of a wise man, says that "as he filleth all things with his wisdom," or spreads it on every side, "as Pison and Tigris" spread their waters "in the time of the new fruits," that is, when they are swollen by the melting of the winter snows, thus seeming to indicate a river rising in a cold and mountainous region. The mention of gold as the special product of the vicinity inclines to the view which regards the Pison as identical with the Phraya, or Phrygia, and the resemblance of names confirms this. See Eden.

"Fis’apha" (Heb. Pisāpāh, Pissapha, perhaps expansion; Sept. Φασφια) the second of the three sons of Jethar, of the tribe of Abser (1 Chron. viii. 38). B.C. cir. 1017.

Pistaclio. See Nut.

Pistis Sophia (i.e. the Believing Wisdom) is the name of a newly discovered Gnostic work, fully entitled "Pistis Sophia, Opus Gnosticum e codicis manuscrypta Copice-Lutine eruit G. M. Schurville, sodulst J. H. Petermann (Berl. 1851). The date is doubtful; it evidently belongs to the period when Valentinian Gnosticism had reached its full development—about the close, therefore, of the 2d century. The general dogmas of the Valentinian system are found in it, though half buried in a luxurious and monotonous vegetation. The theme is always the same—a gnostis, or hidden doctrine, which brings salvation by simple illumination. Jesus Christ returns from the heavens into which he had reascended, and appears to his disciples on the Mount of Olives, to reveal to them the sublime mysteries of the truth. They form in a knowledge of the inner and particular works of the spiritual ones, whose charge is it to transmit this hidden mystery to the pneumatic men of future generations. All these revelations revolve around the destiny of Sophia, who here symbolizes, far more clearly than among the Valentinians, the divinely holy condition of the human soul, which, as the punishment for having sought to overpass the limits of its original sphere, is tormented by the comical powers, among which we recognize the Demiurgus. He produces, by emanation, a terrible power with a lion face, which, surrounded by other similar emanations, terrifies the noble and ardent exiled Sophia, even in the dark regions of matter, flashing before her eyes a false and misleading brightness. Nevertheless she does not lose courage; she still hopes and believes. Hence she declares the name of the Believing Wisdom. Twelve times she invokes the Deliverer in strains of passionate and truly sublime supplication; these are her twelve repentances ("Nunc cujus πινοηεν λαλερ, progregator, ut dicat solutionem duodecim mevnaes πινοηενς να- φις;" Pist. Soph. p. 70). Her deliverance is accomplished by the desertion of the Valiant Sin, the apostate on the part of Jesus. As the fall, or sin, is nothing more than an obscuration produced by matter, so salvation is simply a return to the light. This division of the lamentations of Sophia and the interventions of Jesus produces a weariness of repetition; the aspirations of the soul are, however, rendered with a force all the more poetic because so largely derived from the Old Testament. In particular, all the penitential Psalms are applied to Sophia, being wrested from their natural meaning.

"O Light of the world," she exclaims, "thou whom I have seen from the beginning, listen to the cry of my repenting." (Lamen luminum, cal invincibilis inde ab initio, audi tigl turf sonc, lumen, lumina, opus nostum, bibd. p. 300). "0 Light, from my own thoughts, which are evil. I have fallen into the infernal regions. False lights have led me astray, and now I am lost in those chaotic depths. I cannot spread my wings and return to my place, for the evil powers seat for me in the abyss, and mire, and mud, and earth, and sea, faced power, hold me captive. I have cried for help, but my voice dies in the night. I have lifted up my eyes to the heights, the earth did not return to me. But I have found none but hostile powers, who rejoice in my affliction, and seek to increase it by putting out the mark of Nineveh. 0 Light of truth, in the simplicity of my heart I have followed the false brightness which I mistook for thee. My sin is wholly before thee. Leave me not to suffer longer, for I have cried to thee from the beginning. It is for thee that I am plunged into this affliction. Behold me in this place weeping, crying out again for the light which I have seen upon the heights. Hence the rage of those who keep the doors of my prison. If thou wilt come and set me free, O Light of mercy: grant my supplication. Deliver me from this dark matter, lest I be, as we were, swallowed up in it." (Liberera me e vag hujus caligend, bibd. p. 34). "O Light, cast upon me the flame of thy compassion, for I am in bitter anguish. Rapid my cry for me. I have passed and spouse that he might come and fight for me, and he comes not. Instead of light, I have received darkness and matter. I will pray that I will glorify thee, and this hymn rise with acceptance to thee at the gates of light. I let my whole body be estranged from matter; I am in the divine city. Let all souls which receive the mystery be admitted therin" (φαινον οριν ακολουθεί μεστεριομεν, bibd. p. 303). "12 times the cry rises to the Deliverer. 'I am become,' says Sophia again, 'like the demon who dwells in matter, in whom all light is extinct. I am myself become matter. My strength is turned to stone in me' (Atque mea viae cogit iunctae in me, bibd. p. 48). "I have set my love in the darkness, light, leave me not in the chase. Deliver me by thy knowledge. Enlighten me in the darkness. O. Spera me in te cogito, bibd. p. 50). "My trust is in thee, they will return to my light, because thou hast pity on me. Give me thy baptism, and wash away my sins." See Cramer, Beiträge zur Beförderung theolog. Kenntniss (1758), ii, 82 sq.; Kistlin. Das gnostische System des B. Pistis Sophia, in Zeller's Theol. Jahrb. (Tub. 1854), vol. i and ii. C. D. F. Moulin. See Gnostic.

Pistola. Synod or, in 1786, marks one of the many reformatory movements in the Roman Catholic Church which remained without any effect. Leopold of Tuscany (q.v.), acted by the same sense in which his brother Joseph II of Austria acted, tried to liberalize the affairs of the Catholic Church in his country. For this purpose he issued Jan. 25, 1786, O. Light of the world, to his bishops, containing fifty-seven articles of his reformatory plan, which he wished them to examine respectively, and carry out. The most important points for consideration were, 1. The necessity of holding annual synods in each diocese; 2. The full establishment of the episcopal power; 3. A scientific training of the clergy, and a religious education of the people. This circular-adress was prepared by the grand-duke himself, who was well versed in theological literature. He gave his bishops six months' time for consideration, but after this time he expected them to sign. The circ. was emulated in every respect those of Eleusis or of Mit-br. See Cramer, Beiträge zur Beförderung theolog. Kenntniss (1758), ii, 82 sq.; Kistlin. Das gnostische System des B. Pistis Sophia, in Zeller's Theol. Jahrb. (Tub. 1854), vol. i and ii. C. D. F. Moulin. See Gnostic.

Pistola. Synod or, in 1786, marks one of the many reformatory movements in the Roman Catholic Church which remained without any effect. Leopold of Tuscany (q.v.), acted by the same sense in which his brother Joseph II of Austria acted, tried to liberalize the affairs of the Catholic Church in his country. For this purpose he issued Jan. 25, 1786, O. Light of the world, to his bishops, containing fifty-seven articles of his reformatory plan, which he wished them to examine respectively, and carry out. The most important points for consideration were, 1. The necessity of holding annual synods in each diocese; 2. The full establishment of the episcopal power; 3. A scientific training of the clergy, and a religious education of the people. This circular-adress was prepared by the grand-duke himself, who was well versed in theological literature. He gave his bishops six months' time for consideration, but after this time he expected them to sign. The circ. was emulated in every respect those of Eleusis or of Mit-br. See Cramer, Beiträge zur Beförderung theolog. Kenntniss (1758), ii, 82 sq.; Kistlin. Das gnostische System des B. Pistis Sophia, in Zeller's Theol. Jahrb. (Tub. 1854), vol. i and ii. C. D. F. Moulin. See Gnostic.
theloulogians in the first two centuries of the Reformation, of whom we mention the following:

1. Conrad, a Brunswick theologian. Together with Paul Eitsen, of Hamburg, and Joachim Möhrin, of Bruns-
wick, he took part in the proceedings of the Harden-

2. In 1562 he was superintendent in Güstrow; in 1572 the duke Ulric of Mecklenburg disinherited him from his estates. He then went to Rostock; thence to Antwerp and Vienna; was appointed superintendent at Hildesheim, and, when expelled, returned again to Brunswick, where he died in 1588. See Herzog, Real-
Encyklop., s. v.; Theologische Universal-Lexikon, s. v.

3. John (1) of Ratisbon, at first a Roman Catholic, was a convert to Lutheranism; he assisted St. John's in Nidda, a Hungarian city, afterwards first Lutheran pastor and superintendent there, took part with Melancthon and Bucer as a representative of the Protoc ntes in the colloquy at Ratisbon in 1541, and afterwards at Worms in 1557. In 1544 he was very active in aiding the prince Henry, count of Wied, to introduce the Reformation in the archbishopric of Cologne, but the battle at Mühlberg put an end to the whole movement. Pistorius died in 1585. See Herzog, Real-Encyklop., s. v.; Theologische Universal-Lexikon, s. v.; Smith, Hist. of the Church of Christ in Germany, i. 365, 467; Wars, p. 53; Kurz, Lehrbuch der Kirchengesch. S 185, 8; Niedner, Lehrbuch der christl. Kirchengesch. p. 635.

4. John (2) also called Niddanus, from his native place, son of the former, was born Feb. 4, 1546. He studied first medicine, law, and history, and only later theology. Originally a Lutheran, he became next a zealous Calvinist, and induced the first son of the margrave Charles II of Baden, Ernest Frederick, to join him. Soon afterwards he joined the Roman Catholic Church, in which alone he could see the continuity of the Church of Christ, and induced the second son of the margrave Jacob to follow him. In behalf of his patron, he held in 1589 a colloquy at Baden with Andreae and Heerbrand, who represented Lutheranism, and Schyrus, who represented Calvinism. A second colloquy he held at Emmerndingen in 1590, a Dr. Peppas, of Strasburg. After the death of his patron, Pistorius went to Frei-
burg and Constance; became doctor of theology, canon of Constance, cathedral-provost of Breslau, and imperial councillor to the emperor Rudolph II. Pistorius died in 1598. In his Theologiae de fidei Christianae definita mensura, and in Unser von Gottes Gesandes Jakobs Markgrafen zu Baden . . . christl. erhebliche und wohlfahrene Motiven etc., he endeavored to justify his own and his patron's conversion to the Church of Rome. His polemics against Luther in his Anatomi Lutheri, seu de septem spiritibus, and on other topics, are worthy of attention. See also rejoinders. Pistorius is also the author of some medical works, and some historical works on Poland, Germany, Hungary, and Spain. In the service of the Church of Rome, Pistorius also wrote a Wegweiser für alle ver-
führten Christen, to which Dr. Menster replied in his Anti-Pistorius. See Fechtis Historia Colgiosa Em-
mendationis, cui subjicit protoculum et conclusio (Rostock, 1709); Herzog, Real-Encyklop., s. v.; Theolog.
Universal-Lexikon, s. v.; Jöcher, Gelehrten-Lexikon, s. v.; Buchan, Jurisdiction Index.

5. M. Theophilus (1), succeeded the excellent John Mathesius (q. v.) in the ministry at Joachimsthal; and his son, also.


PIT. In the A. V. this word appears with a figurative as well as with a literal meaning. It points out the facts that belong to the outward aspect of Palestine and its cities to states or regions of the spiritual world. With this power it is used to represent several Hebrew and Greek words, and the starting-point which the lit-
eral meaning presents for the spiritual is, in each case, a subject of some interest.

1. Of those בָּדַד, בַּדָּד (root בָּדַד, cognate בָּדָד, בָּדָד, a well), occurs most frequently, and means a deep hole or pit, dug in the first instance for a well, or a cistern hewn or cut in stone, a reservoir, which the Orientals are in the habit of preparing in those regions where there are few or no springs, for the purpose of preserving rain-water for travellers and cattle. These cisterns and trenches are often without water, no supply being obtainable for them except from the rain. In old decayed cisterns the water leaks out, or becomes slimy (Jer. ii. 13). Such cisterns or pits, when without water, were often used in the East apparently for three purposes: (1) for the purpose of sepulture (Jer. xxviii. 11; xxx. 4; Isa. xxxviii. 18), hence חָקַךְ כָּבֵד, "they that go down to the pit"—a phrase of frequent occurrence, employed sometimes to denote dying without hope, but commonly a simple going down to the place of the dead (see Gesen. Lex. s. v.); also, "the graves set in the sides of the pit" (Exod. xxxii. 28), the recesses cut out for purposes of burial; or they might be the natural flat-bottomed basins, abounding in all limestone formations, of which the rocks of Syria and Palestine chiefly consist. (2) A prison: "they shall be gathered as prisoners are gathered in the pit, and shall be shut up" (Isa. xxiv. 22; also Jer. xxxiv. 16; Exod. xii. 29). The phrase was used of the place of punishment in the East, and very dreadful it was as the case of Jeremiah illustrates (Jer. xxxviii. 4, 9). To be doomed to the pit was often to be left to a slow death by starvation; and to be saved from such a doom was regarded as the greatest of all deliverances. Hence it was used as a place of destruction (Zech. xix. 10). In the case of Joseph, Reuben suggested the pit as a device for saving his brother; the others hostile to Joseph adopted it as the most secret, and, they might think, the least guilty method of making away with him (Gen. xxxviii. 22-26).

As remarked above, in this word, as in the cognate בָּדַד, בָּדָד (which is likewise rendered pit in Gen. xiv. 10; Ps. lv. 23; lxix. 15; Prov. xxiii. 27), the special thought is that of a pit or well dug for water (Gesen. Theoseaur. s. v.). The process of desanonymizing which goes on in all languages seems to have conformed the former to the state of the well or cistern, dug into the rock, but not filled with water, but where the sense in both cases is figurative, and the same English word is used, we have pit (בָּדַד) connected with the "deep water," "the water-flood," "the deep" (Psa. lxix. 16), while in pit (נַחֲלָה) there is nothing but the "miry clay" (Psa. xi. 2). Its dreariest feature is that there is "no water in it" (Zech. ix. 11). So far the idea involved has been rather that of misery and despair than of death. But in the phrase "they that go down to the pit" (נַחֲלָה) it becomes even more constantly than the synonyms noticed below (שהל, שךך, שךך) the representative of the whole of the word (Ezek. xxxii. 14, 16; xxxii. 18, 24; Ps. xxviii. 1; cxliii. 7). There may have been two reasons for this transfer: 1. The wide, deep excavation became the place of burial. The "graves were set in the sides of the pit" (Ezek. xxxii. 24). To one looking into it, it was visibly the home of the dead, while the vaguer, more mysterious Sheol carried the thoughts further to an invisible home. 2. The pit, however, in this sense, was never simply equivalent to burial-place. There is always implied in it a thought of some manner of punishment. This, too, had its origin apparently in the use made of the excavations, which had either never been wells, or had lost the supply of water. The prisoner in the land of his enemies was left to perish in the pit (בָּדַד) (Zech. ix. 11). The greatest of all deliverances is that the captive exile is released from the slow death of starvation in it (שךך, Isa. li. 14). The history of Jeremiah, cast into the dungeon or pit (בָּדַד) (Jer. xxxviii. 6, 9), let down into its depths with cords, sinking into the filth at the bottom (here also there is no water), with death by hunger staring him in the face, shows how terrible an act of punishment can be such a pit. The condition of the Athenian prisoners in the stone- quarries of Syracuse (Thuc. vii. 87), the Persian punishment of the εὐκοτίας (Pser. 49.), the oublittes of medieval princes, present instances of cruelty more or less analogous. It is not strange that with these associations and with the horror clustering around, it should have involved more of the idea of a place of punishment for the naughty or unjust than did the sheol or the grave. See Well.

2. שךך, שךך, of which, as well as in the cognate שךך, שךך (rendered "pit" in Prov. xx., 14; Jer. ii. 6; xix. 20, 22), שךך, שךך ("pit," Prov. xxviii. 10), שךך, שךך, שךך ("pit," Lam. iv. 20; "destruction," Prov. xxii. 20), and שךך, שךך, שךך ("pit," Ps. xvii. 6; cxix. 55; Jer. xvii. 29), as the root שךך shows, the sinking of the pit is the primary thought (see Paezaur. s. v.). It is dug into the earth (Ps. ix. 16; cxix. 85). A pit thus made and then covered lightly over, served as a trap by which animals or men might be ensnared (Ps. xxxv. 7). It thus became a type of sorrow and converse from which a man could not extricate himself, of the great doom which was coming upon the land, of the dreariness of death (Job xxxiii. 18, 24, 28, 50). To "go down to the pit" is to die without hope. It is the penalty of evil-doers, that from which the righteous are delivered by the hand of God. See Trap.

3. שךך, שךך, in Numb. xvi. 80, 83; Job xvii. 16. Here the word is in form, which is used only of the hollow, shadowy world, the dwelling of the dead, and as such it has been treated of under HELL.

4. Other Hebrew words rendered pit in the A. V. are the following: בָּדַד, something cut out, hence a cistern in the rock (Jer. xviii. 4); and the cognate בָּדַד, בָּדַד (Isa. xxx. 14, Jer. xxiv. 3), יִזְבּ, γυμνά, something dug (only Eccles. x. 18), and פָּתָח, an excavation (2 Sam. xvii. 9, xviii. 17; Isa. xxiv. 17, 18; Jer. xxxvi. 43, 44; "hole," Jer. xxvii. 26; "snare," Sam. iii. 7). The term מַעֲקֵר, מַעֲקֵר, rendered "deep pits" (Psa. xcvii. 10), properly signifies stream, whirlpools, abysses of waters. The term מַעֲקֵר, סִימְנָה, and Jeremiah understood pits of water.

5. The Greek terms are the following: in Rev. i. 1, 2, and elsewhere, the "bottomless pit" is the translation of τὸ φωτός τῇ θανατίον (Rev. i. 18), and properly signifies stream, whirlpools, abysses of waters. In the trinity, Symmachus, and Jerome understood pits of water.

6. Pitaka or Pitakattayan (Pali pitakam, a "basket," and สะ, "above"), the sacred books of the Buddhists. The text of the Pitaka is divided into three great classes. The instructions contained in the first class, called Wącaya, were addressed to the priests; those in the second class, Sūtra, to the laity; and those in the third class, Añña, to the dewan and priest of the celestial worlds. There is a commentary on the Añña called the Aññakatho, which, until recently, was regarded as of equal authority with the text. The text, as we learn from Mr. Spence Hardy, was orally preserved until the reign of the Singhalese monarch Wattagamani, who reigned from B.C. 104 to B.C. 76, when it was committed to writing in the island of Ceylon. The commentary was written by Baddegahosa in A.D. 420. To establish the text of the Pitakas three several convocations were held. The first met B.C. 548, when the whole was reorganized, every syllable being repeated with
PITCHER

nature of pitch is noticed in Isa. xxxiv. 9. See ASPHALTEM; BITUMEN.

Pitcher in the A.V. represents the following words in the original: 1. ἄχρυδος; Sept. ῥηψις; Vulg. hydria, legeia; skin to Sanscrit kut and κάρος; rendered "barrel" (1 Kings xvii, 12; xviii, 33). 2. ἡμέλιον, ἡμελις; Sept. αἰγεθής; Vulg. crus; A.V. "bottle," only once a "pitcher" (Lam. iv, 2), where it is joined with ἁρπάζων, an earthen vessel (Gesen. Thesaur. p. 522).

3. In the N.T. ἐπάθιον, twice only (Mark xiv, 10; Luke xxii, 10). It denotes the water-jars or pitchers with one or two handles, used chiefly by women for carrying water, as in the story of Rebecca (Gen. xxiv, 15-20; but see Mark xiv, 10; Luke xxii, 10). This practice has been and is still usual both in the East and elsewhere. The vessels used for the purpose are generally carried on the head or on the shoulder. The Bedawin women commonly use skin-bottles. Such was the "bottle" carried by Hagar (Gen. xxi, 14; Harmer, Obs. iv, 246; Layard, Nineveh and Babylon, p. 578; Roberts, Sketches, p. 164; Arieux, Trav. p. 208; Burchhardt, Notes on Bed. i, 531; Thomson, Land and Book, ii, 579). The same word κατὰ is used of the pitchers employed by Gideon's 300 men (Judg. vii, 16), where the use made of them marks the material. Also the vessel (A.V. barrel) in which the meal of the Sarepitan widow was contained (1 Kings xvii, 12), and the "barrelas" of water used by Elijah at Mount Carmel (xvii, 3). It is also used figuratively of the life of man (Eccles. xii, 6). It is thus probable that earthen vessels were used by the Jews as they were by the Egyptians for containing both liquids and dry provisions (Birch, Anc. Pottery, i, 48). At the Fountain of Nahazeth may be seen men and women with pitchers which scarcely differ from those in use in Egypt and Nubia (Roberts, Sketches, p. 29, 184). The water-pot of the woman of Samaria was probably one of this kind, to be distinguished from the much larger amphore of the marriage-feast at Cana. See BOTTLE; CHURV; EWIR; FLAGON; POT.

PITCHER, Edwin Frank, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born Feb. 14, 1846, near Fairmount, Marion County, West Virginia. He was the youngest of thirteen children. Very early in life he gave evidence of religious culture, and at the age of eleven was converted, and joined the Methodists. His school life was noted for its spiritual tone. At fourteen he entered Dickinson College. At sixteen he took the prize medal in the junior contest, and graduated the first in his class. The year following his graduation he became professor in Emory Female College, Carlisle, Pa., and while in this position was licensed to preach. Impressed with the value of a higher theological training, he went to Evanston; but the climate proving unfavorable to his health, he returned to his home. In the fall of 1865 he entered the theological school at Concord, N.H., where he remained until the spring of 1867, when he graduated. Joining the New England Conference, he was sent to Amherst, Mass., which was a new field.

Egyptian Pitchers.
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for Methodism. In 1868 he was called to Morgantown, West Virginia, where his labors were very successful. In 1870 he was stationed at Lawrence, Mass., but finding his wife’s health failing, he entered the Philadelphia Conference, and in March, 1872, was stationed at Lawrence, Kansas, where he labored until 1878, when he went to Allen town, Pa., which proved to be his last appointment. In the spring of 1875, his own health failing, he sailed for Europe. Returning the middle of September, his pasto ral work occupied his time until Feb. 28, when he was taken with hemorrhage from the lungs. He died March 18, 1876. His pastorate was thorough and elevated, his style classic and chaste. His manner was gentle and unpretentious, and his presentation of truth force ful and vivid. His favorite theme was the all-power ful Name. See Zion's Herald, Aug. 10, 1876.

P'thorn (Heb. P'ikhum', פִּיתוֹם, meaning, if of Heb. derivation, mouth of Thon; but the word is probably Egyptian, meaning the city of antemmes [justice]; Sept. Πνώμα(ν), v. r. Πνώς, one of the store-cities built by the Israelites for the first oppressor, the Pharaoh which knew not Joseph) (Exod. i, 11). In the Heb. these cities are two, Pithom and Raamses; the Sept. adds On as a third. It is probable that Pithom lay in the most eastern part of Lower Egypt, like Raamses, if, as is reasonable, we suppose the latter to be the Ramessus mentioned elsewhere. We are informed that the Israelites were garrisoned in public works within or near to the land of Goshen. See RAAMSES. Herodotus mentions a town called Puthos, Πυθούζ, which seems to be the same as the Thoum or Thou of the Itinerary of Antoninus, probably the military station Thou of the Notitiae. Whether or not Puthos be the Pithom of Scripture, there can be little doubt that the name is identical. The first part is the same as in Bu-bastis and Bu-tiria, either the definite article masculine or a possessive pronoun, unless indeed, with Brugsch, we read the Egyptian word "abolo" and can thus interpret the name. See PI NESETH. The second part appears to be the name of Atum or Tum, a divinity worshipped at On, or Heliopolis, as well as Ra, both being forms of the sun [see Os.], and it is noticeable that Thoun or Thou was very near the Heliopolite nome, and perhaps more anciently within it, and that a monument at Abu-Kheishef shows that the worship of Heliopolis extended along the valley of the canal of the Red Sea. As we find Thoum and Patamus and Raamses in or near to the land of Goshen, the probability is not unreasonable that we have here a correspondence to Pithom and Raamses, and the probable connection in both cases with Heliopolis confirms the conclusion. It is remarkable that the Coptic version of Gen. xi, 28 mentions Pithom for, or instead of, the Heropolis of the Sept. Whether Patamus and Thoum be the same, and the position of one or both, have yet to be determined, before we can speak positively as to the Pithom of Exodus. Herodotus places Patamus in the Arabian nome upon the canal of the Red Sea (ii, 48). The Itinerary of Antoninus puts Thou fifty Roman miles from Heliopolis, and his statement is probably correct; but this seems too far north for Patamus, and also for Pithom, if that place were near Heliopolis, as its name and connection with Raamses seem to indicate. It was twelve miles from Vicus Judeorum, according to the Itinerary. It must therefore have been somewhere over against Wady Tumilat, or the valley of Thoum, or near the mouth of that valley, and not far from Pi-beseth or Bubastis, now called Tell Basta. Tell el-Kebir, or the Great Heap, which is a little to the south of it, may perhaps be the site of ancient Pithom. Heliopolis, which palls, stayed, and had almost become a mythical, may, after all, be the same as Pithom. Heropaolis, according to Ptolemy, lay at the extremity of Trajan's canal, i.e. its eastern extremity, where it joined or approached the more ancient canal of Pharaoh Necho, possibly at or within the mouth of this valley, and, according to Manetho, not far from the Bubastis branch of the Nile. Most writers, however, regard the ruins at Abu-Kheishef as marking the site of Heropolis. Accordingly the scholars who accompanied the French expedition place Pithom on the site of the present A-Bakah, at the entrance of the Wady Tumilat, where there was at all times an accumulation of silt. See HEGEBENBERG, Die Bücher Moses und Agypten; Du Bos Aymé, in Description de l'Egypte, xi, 387; xvi, 1, 572; Champollion, L'Egypte sous les Pharaons, i, 172; ii, 58. See GOSHEN.

Pithon (Heb. Pithon', פִּיתוֹן, perh. karphlim [Furst]: Sept. Πνώμα(ν), the first named of four sons of Micah, the grandson of Jonathan, son of king Saul (1 Chron. viii, 35; ix, 41). B.C. post 1050.

Pithon, François and Pierre, twin-brothers, were born Nov. 1, 1859. Both became famous as canoniasts. François, who died as chancellor of the Parliament at Paris in 1907, published among other works the Codex Dionysii Heliocrum (i.e. the collection of canons of Dionysius Exiguus, as augmented by Adrian). Pierre occupied some of the highest official positions, which, however, he relinquished, in order to give himself entirely to study. After the death of Bartholome w's eve, he became a convert to the Roman Catholic Church, and again came before the public to defend the correction of Henry IV, and to effect his reconciliation with Paris. He died at Lyons-sur-Seine in 1898. Pierre was canon of Paris, and spiritual of the College of Montmartre (1694), in 88 articles, to which must be added Du Puy's Preuves des Libertés de l'Eglise Gallicane, de Maistre Pierre Pithon (ibid. 1692). Both brothers published an edition of the Corpus juris canon. See Theolog. Universalis Lexicon, a. v. (B.P.)

Pitiful. See Pity.

Pitkin, Caleb, a Presbyterian minister, was born in New York, Jan. 17, 1781. He early embraced religion, became a local preacher in 1806; and in 1817 he was installed pastor of the Congregational Church at Ohio-town, Portage county, Ohio; and he remained about ten years. Previous to the close of this period measures had been taken by the preachers of the River and Portage towards the establishment of a college. Mr. Pitkin had been an active agent in this work, and forward it was the principal object of his attention. In 1826 he removed to Hudson, where the Western Reserve College was established, and remained there till his death, Feb. 5, 1864. See Wilson, Prob. Hist. Almanac, 1865, p. 169. (J. L. S.)

Pitman, Charles, D.D., a pioneer preacher of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born near Cookstown, N. J., Jan. 10, 1845. He earned the degree of A.B. from the Philadelphia University, and was licensed to preach in 1866, and became a local preacher in 1871, and the next year joined the Philadelphia Conference. At once he obtained popularity with all hearers, occupying, from time to time, the most important stations and districts in the Philadelphia Conference. In the year 1841 he was elected one of the ministers of the Church, and became a deacon of the society. His health failing in 1850, he resigned this office and retired to Trenton, passing serene and faithfully from life, Jan. 14, 1854, and leaving a name for Christian purity, consistency, ministerial ability, and usefulness which the Church delights to remember. He possessed a strong memory, a quick perception, with discriminating judgment, and a holy evangelical fervor stamped his pulpit labors. Dr. Pitman had not many equals as a public speaker. His oratory was emphatically not scholastic, but, like the great Patrick Henry's, the true eloquence of nature. Although Dr. Pitman was an ex-
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temporaneous preacher, he carefully used his pen in preparations for the pulpit. Many sermons he wrote in full, not to read or memorize them, but for the purpose of properly disciplining his thoughts and language, and for useful reference. Emphatically a preacher of Christ, the precious atonement became his favorite theme, and imputed righteousness a daily theme upon his lips while he held up a crucified Saviour. All who heard him believed to be a man of God, preaching with divine unction, and they received in faith the words of truth which he uttered. Dr. Pitman had a fine, large head, moderately high forehead, and slightly sunken eyes, his likeness resembling the celebrated Robert Hall of England. See New Jersey Memo- 

PITMAN, John Rogers, an English divine, noted as a classical scholar and general litterateur, was born about 1672, and was educated at Pembroke College, Cambridge, in 1694. He became preacher at Berkeley and Belgrave chapels, and in the Foundling and Mag- 

dalen hospitals, and perpetual curate of St. Barnabas Church, Kensington. He died in 1757. Of his publications, we mention Exercitata ex oratis Romanis Poeta (London, 1698).—Sermones et Discursos (subdivided, 1695; 2nd series, 1709).—Sermons for the Year (1695, 2 vols. 8vo; 2d series, 1728).—Sermons on the Mount (1852).—Mr. Pitman also edited the works of Dr. Lightfoot (1722–25, 18 vols. 8vo) and Bingham's Origenis Ecclesiastica (1746, 9 vols. 8vo).

Pitt, Edward, the eldest son of Robert Pitt (1717–1799), was born in London on 4 April 1759. He was educated at Eton and at Trinity College, Cambridge, and after a brief career in the law, he entered Parliament as Member for Wiltshire in 1780. He was a close associate of William Pitt the Younger, and together they formed one of the most powerful and influential coalitions in British politics. Pitt's political career began in 1780, when he was elected as a Whig MP for Wiltshire. He quickly rose through the ranks and became a key figure in the Whig Party. Pitt was a strong supporter of the American colonists in their struggle for independence, and he played a significant role in the negotiations that led to the Treaty of Paris in 1783. After the war, Pitt was appointed as Lord Chancellor of Ireland, a position he held until 1785. In 1788, he became Secretary of State for War, a post he held until 1789.

PITT, CHRISTOPHER, an English divine, noted especially as a poet, was born in 1699 at Blandford, Dorset- 

shire; was educated at Winchester and at New College, Oxford; and, after taking holy orders, obtained the family living at Pimperne, where he passed his life, be- loved and respected for his suavity of manners and gen- eral benevolence. He died in 1748. His works are of a 

secular character. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. 

PITTONI, Gianambrotta, an Italian canonist, was born at Venice in 1665. He took holy orders and was a priest, and resided in turn at Rome and Venice. He died Oct. 17, 1744. He compiled with great order a collection of the pontifical constitutions and of the decisions of the different Roman congregations (Viterbo, 1745 and ensuing years, 14 vols. 8vo), which is held in high esteem. He left also, Vita di Benedetto XII (Venice, 1780), 4 vols.—De commeniatione omnium fidelium defensorum (ibid. 1739, 8vo)—De octo octo festo- 

rum (ibid. 1746, 2 vols. 8vo); etc.

PITTO, Lodovico Biot (in Latin, Pictorius), a modern Latin poet, was born in 1454 at Ferrara. He cultivated with some success philosophy and theology, but his favorite study was Latin poetry. The only de- feat of his Latin poems is a kind of monotonous facility. We mention of his works, Candidia, a poem (Modena, 1491, 4to)—Tunulius aureum carminum lib. ii (ibid. 1492, 4to)—Christianorum opusculorum lib. iii (ibid. 1496 or 1498, 4to)—Epigrammata in Christi vitam (Mi- 

an, 1518, 4to)—In ecelestes proceres hymnorum epita- phiorumque lib. Ferrara, 1514, 4to).—Et si te laet in 

PITT, John, D.D., an English divine, noted as a biographer, was born at Alton, in Hampshire, A.D. 1560. He received his early education at Win- 

tchester College, whence, at the age of eighteen, he was elected a prebendary fellow of New College, Oxford; but in less than two years he left the kingdom as a voluntary Roman exile, and went to Douai. He went thence to Rheims, and a year afterwards to the English college at Rome, where he studied seven years, and was then ordained priest. He returned to hold the professorship of rhetoric and Greek at Rheims. Towards the end of 1590 he was appointed governor to a young nobleman, with whom he travelled into Lorraine, and afterwards went through Upper Germany and Italy. He subse- quently returned to Lorraine, where he was preferred to a canonry in Verdon. When he had passed twenty years at his new residence, Antonia, daughter of the duke of Lorraine, who had married the duke of Cleves, invited him to Cleves to be her confessor. He continued in her service twelve years, till her death, when he returned a third time to Lorraine, and was promoted to the dean- ery of Livourne, where he died in 1616. The leisure he enjoyed while confessor to the duchess of Cleves enabled him to compile a work which has given him great rec- ommendation: The Lives of the Kings, Bishops, Apostolical Men, and Writers of England (four large volumes). The first contains the lives of fifteen kings, the second of the bishops, the third of the apostolical men, and the fourth of the writers. The three first are preserved in the archives of the collegiate church of Verdun; the fourth only was published after his decease, under the title of Ioannis Pistis Angli, S. Theologian Doctoris, Livorni in Lombardeo Die, with Novissima veterum tomorum Anglicae Tomus Primus (Paris, 1619 and 1629, 4to), but the running title by which it is most frequently quoted is De illustribus Angliae Scriptoribus. In this work Pitt took much from Bale's book, De Scriptoribus Mo- 

PITY is usually defined to be the unsuitableness we feel at the unhappiness of others, prompting us to compassion- ate them with a desire for their relief. God is said to pity them that fear him, as a father pitteth his children (Ps. cxxii, 18). Pity is thus a Christian grace, to the practice of which we are exhorted by the apostle: "Love as brethren, be pitiful, be courteous" (1 Pet. iii, 8).

The phrase παράξενος λόγος, nashim rachamamoth, rendered "pitiful words" in Pits's version (Lam. iv, 10), properly refers to the tenderness and affectionate love which is the distinguishing trait of the female character; and that such women should in the "sieve and the straitness" be driven to and adopt the terrible expedient of feeding upon their own children, as in this passage they are stated to have done, is an awful picture of the literal fulness of the threatenings of the Lord in the event of the disobedience of the house of Israel (Deut. xxvi, 57). The same terrible expedient was resorted to also in the last siege of Jerusalem, as it had formerly been at the siege of Samaria, in the reign of Ahab (2 Kings vi, 28, 29).

Pitiful is a word whose derivations have by modern usage been almost limited to the sense of mean, contemptible, or insignificant. In the Bible and Prayer- 

book the old and primary meaning of full of mercy,
compassionate, or tender, is retained. The English Prayer-book gives us these examples: "... though we be tied and bound with the chain of our sins, yet let the pitifulness of thy great mercy loose us."—Occasional Piety. 6. Enthusiastically, "pitifully beholding the sorrows of our hearts," which petition in the Litany is thus altered in the American Prayer-book, "With pity beholding the sorrows of our hearts." In these, the original and better sense of the word is alone intended. In the Primer of King Edward VI there is this expression: "O pitiful Pope! and Healer both of body and soul, Christ Jesus!" And Latimer, in his sermon on the birth of Christ, remarks: "Preachers exhort us to godliness, to do good works, to be pitiful and liberal unto the poor;" that is, to be compassionate, tender-hearted, and sympathizing to them.

Pius I, pope and saint of Rome, was a native of Aquileia, and succeeded Hyginus. Pius I is supposed to have commenced his pontificate, or rather bishopric, about 152 or 158, and to have died in 157. The date of his reign, however, as given by other authorities, is from 127 to 140. He was succeeded by Anicetus, but if by Hyginus, as some think, then the latter date of reign is not the true one. At least the pope had been attributed to Pius I by Gratian, but they are generally considered apocryphal. Hermes, the author of the Shepherd, is reputed to have been the brother of this pontiff. Pius I is commemorated in the Western Church July 11. See A. C. 152, p. 59; Budge, p. 179; J. F. R., Pontif. Rom., i. 27; Jaffé, Regesta Pontificum Romanorum, p. 8 and 920; Tillemont, Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire ecclésiastique (ed. 1732, fol.), p. 180 and 268; Fontanini, Historia Literaria Aquilea, lib. ii, cap. iii, p. 70. (J. H. W.)

Pius II, pope of Rome (from 1458 to 1464), whose original name was Æneas Sylvius Piccolomini, was a great theologian, diplomatist, historian, orator, and in fact a pontiff universally accomplished. He is especially noted as the inspirer of a crusade against the Saracens. He was born at Corsignano, in Siena, Oct. 18, 1405. Early devoted to study, he soon became noted for his scholarship, and found no difficulty in securing within the Church all the honors and distinctions he might seek. In 1431 he went as secretary of cardinal Dominicus Capranica to the Council of Basle, that celebrated ecclesiastical assembly which assembled earnestly, though with little success, the reformation of the Church. Which Piccolomini wrote a history: Commentarius de Gestis Basil. Concilii, in two books—a very important work for the history of the Church of that period, which, because of its advocacy of Gallican principles, was put in the Index Librorum Prohibitorum. At that time Piccolomini was a strong advocate for the supremacy of the council, and its right to judge and depose even the pope, "who," he argued, "ought to be considered as the vicar of the Church rather than as the vicar of Christ." These tenets, however, were condemned by the Council of Florence IV, though they caused the council to assert its authority by suspending the pope from his dignity. Then began a long struggle, which terminated in an open schism, the council deposing Eugenius and electing Felix V. Piccolomini was appointed secretary of the new pope or antipope, and several by him as his successor to the emperor Frederick III, who was so pleased with the envoy that he prevailed upon him to give up his precarious situation and accept the place of imperial secretary. Frederick afterwards sent him on several missions, and loyally to the Holy Family. Piccolomini proved his gratitude to his imperial master, for he wrote several works in praise of his patron and in support of his imperial prerogative—De Origine et Autoritate Romani Imperii ad Fredericium III Imperatorem, Liber Una;—De Frederic, III, nobi...
Christian. In the year 1648 an armament intended against the Turks was directed to assemble at Ancona, and at Verona, with a number of powerful vessels. Matthias, king of Hungary, and Charles, duke of Burgundy, had promised to accompany the expedition. The Venetians also had promised the use of their fleet to forward the troops across the Adriatic into Albania. Pius II set off from Rome for Ancona, but on arriving there he found that the soldiers were in want of arms, clothes, and provisions; the foreign princes did not come; and instead of the Venetian fleet, only a few galleys made their appearance. The aged and disappointed pontiff fell sick, and was in a state of despair. He had now reached the extreme of his career, and beguiled himself as well as he could in the government of the Church. He was generally regarded, especially throughout Italy. He was succeeded by Paul II. Pius II, before his death, raised his native town, Consignano, to the rank of a bishop's see, and gave it the name of Pienza, by which it is now known. Pius assisted Ferdinand, king of Naples, in his war against the duke of Anjou, the pretender to that crown. At the same time he was obliged to make war in his own states against Sigismondo Malatesta, lord of Rimini and Pesaro, but Pius, who by the consent of the counsellors was in all of which undertakings he was successful. By a bull addressed to the universities of Paris and of Cologne, Pius condemned his own writings in defence of the Council of Basle, concluding with these words: "I believe what an old man, now say to you, and not what I wrote when I was a young man." Two of his letters are addressed to individuals; reject •'Enea Sylvius, and accept Pius II." In several of his letters to his friends also, and especially to Petro di Noceto, he expresses sorrow for his juvenile weaknesses, for he had once been too fond of the fair sex, and had even written accounts of some of his amorous adventures, and of those of other persons, which are found among his "Epistles." Some writers assert that •'Enea Sylvius had refused the priestly office until his forty-third year because of his fondness for the fair sex; and they quote his own confessions in proof. But whatever his previous life, as pontiff he was devoted to the Church, and sought the accomplishment of great things.

A vacancy having occurred in the archiepiscopate of Mentz, two candidates appeared for it—Adolph, count of Nassau, and Dietrich of Isenburg. The latter had the majority of votes, but Pius, who by the right of deciding in cases of contested elections, refused to confirm the choice of Dietrich unless he engaged not to assert the supremacy of a general council, not to covet of his own authority an imperial diet, and further, not to have the right to double the annates or first-fruits. Dietrich demurred to the first condition, and positively refused to accede to the last; and as proceedings were instituted against him in the apostolic court, he appealed to the next general council. Pius declared such appeals to be heretical, and excommunicated and deposed him, appointing Adolph of Nassau in his place. The emperor acknowledged Adolph, but Dietrich being supported by the count palatine and the elector of Bavaria, a war ensued, which, after much mischief, ended in the submission of Dietrich. Those who were opposed to him formed a party under Pius, imperial secretary, and especially his letter (Epistola 25) to the papal nuncio, John Carvalj, concerning the supremacy of the council, were inclined to think that change of station had, in him as it but too often does in men, produced a corresponding change of opinions.

As a scholar and a writer, Pius II is best known under the name of •'Enea Sylvius, the most important part of his career being passed before he was elected pope. He was one of the first historians of his age, a geographer, a scholar, a statesman, and a divine. He was also learned in all the arts, and subject to certain regulars who had lived many years in Germany; he repeatedly visited France, went to Great Britain and as far as Scotland, and to Hungary. His biographer Campanus, bishop of Arezzo, speaks at length of his peregrinations, and his diligence in informing himself of everything worth noticing in the countries which he visited. His principal works, besides those already mentioned, are: Cosmographia, not de Mundo Universo Historiurum, libri i (a second book treats especially of Europe and its contemporary history); —In Antoni Panormitii De Dictis et Factis Alphonnes Aragonum Regis, libris quatuor, Commentaria: —Epistola super Decades Pliani Blondi Friscorum, et inclinatione Imperii usque ad tempora Johannis XXIII., Pont. Max. (in 10 books) —Historia Gothic (published first at Leipsic in 1780) —A Treatise on the Education of Children, with Rules of Grammar and Rhetoric: —lastly, his numerous letters, which contain the rarest information. A collection of his works was published at Basle, •'Enea Sylvii Piccolomini Senex Opera qua extant (1551, fol.), but this edition does not include all. Domenico de Rosetti has published a catalogue of all his works and their various editions, and also of his biographers and commentators, Sede di Fereccio, et Operi de Pio II, o da lui intitolate (Trieste, 1810). Biographies of Pius II by Platina and Campanus are annexed to the Basle edition of his works, but a much more ample biography is found in the Commentaries of Pernalete, published (Frankfort, 1614). Pius Gobellinus, his secretary, but which has been written by himself or under his direction, Pii II, Pont. Max., Commentarii Hrumin Memorabilium qua Temporibus sui conspexit, libri xii., with a continuation by his intimate friend, James Ammanato, cardinal legate of the pope at Paris, who has been the private secretary of Pius and of his successor Piccolomini. See, besides these, Milman, Hist. of Latin Christianity, viii, 120—122; Hiddle, Hist. of the Papacy, ii, 377 sqq.; Bower, Hist. of the Popes (see Index); Hagenbach, Rückriickungen auf •'Enea Sylvius (Basle, 1840); Verdière, Sur •'Enea Sylve. Piccolomini (Paris, 1848); Pfister, •'Enea Sylve. Piccol. etc. (Stuttg. 1844); Helwing, De Pii II Pontifici maximi Rebus gestis et moribus commentatio (Berol. 1825); Voigt, •'Enea Sylve. Piccol. (Berlin, 1858-9); Dix, Kardinal Nicolas v. Cusa u. die Kirche seiner Zeit (Regensburg, 1847, 2 vols. 8vo).

Pius III, pope of Rome in 1503, whose original name was Francesco Tedeschini Piccolomini, was the child of pope Pius II's sister, and was born at Siena in 1439. He was made cardinal by pope Alexander VI., and succeeded him in 1503. His pontificate was of only a very short duration. Twenty-six days after his elevation he died, July 11 (q.v.), became his successor. See Panvinius, Vita Pii III. Pius IV, pope of Rome from 1560 to 1563, whose original name was Giovanni Angelo Medici or Medicini, was born at Milan, Italy, March 81, 1499. He was originally a student of law and devoted to the legal profession, but his brother won him over to the ecclesiastical ranks, and in 1549 he was made cardinal by pope Paul III. Pius IV was elected pope in April 1549 (q.v.) about the close of 1559, a very critical period in papal history, and was crowned Jan. 6, 1560. The most important act of his pontificate was, at Easter, 1561, the reassembling of the Council of Trent, which had been promulgated when Pius II was particularly interested upon checking the spread of heresy, which had taken root in several parts of Italy, besides the valleys of Piedmont, and especially in some districts of Calabria. The Spanish viceroy of Naples sent his troops, assisted by an inquisitor and a number of monks, to exterminate by fire and sword the heretics of Calabria. Emmanuel Philibert, duke of Savoy, after attacking with an armed force the Waldenses, who made a gallant resistance, agreed to allow them the exercise of their religion within their own districts, and, by a decree, which was also binding upon the Catholics and Protestants in France were more difficult to settle. Some of the French Catholic prelates, among others Monle, bishop of Valence, and the cardinal of Lorraine, recommended large concessions.
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to be made to the Protestants with the hope of reconciling them to the Church, and queen Catharine di Medici wrote to the pope to that effect. The pope referred the matter to the council, and in the meantime Catharine published the edict of pacification, in January, 1563, which allowed the Protestants liberty of conscience and the right to perform their worship in country places, but not within walled towns. The prelates sent by France to the Council of Trent, and several councilors of the Parliament of Paris who were also ordered to attend in the name of the king, spoke loudly of the necessity of an immediate reform in the Church, and seemed disposed to render the bishops more independent of the see of Rome. The cardinal of Lorraine was of opinion that the mass and other offices should be performed in the vulgar or popular language of each country; but the Italian prelates, and Lainez, general of the Jesuits, supported the maintenance of the established forms of worship, as well as of the papal authority in all its existing plentitude. The discussions grew warm, and it was only in the following year, 1563, that the two parties came to an understanding. The council terminated its sittings in the middle of that year, and the pope confirmed its decrees by a bull. This was the principal event of the life of Pius IV. True, the Tridintel Council was not the most important that has ever met, but at all events it is the most important that has met in modern times. Its importance is comprised in two great groups of events. By one, dogmatic theology, after various fluctuations, settled itself from Protestant views forever, and the doctrine of justification as then established gave rise to the entire system of Roman Catholic dogmatism as maintained to this day. By the other the hierarchy became founded anew, theoretically by the decrees respecting ordination to the priesthood, practically by the resolutions on the subject of reform. The faithful were again subjected to an intolerant Church discipline, and in urgent cases to the sword of excommunication. As the pope held the exclusive right of interpreting the Tridintel decrees, it ever remains with him to prescribe the rules of faith and manners. All the threads of the restored discipline converged together in Rome. Such progress could only have been made by means of a community of sentiment and action with the leading Roman Catholic powers. In this union with the monarchies there lies one of the most important conditions for the whole subsequent development of Romanism, and were it for nothing else Pius IV would still be an important person in the history of the Church.

He was the first pope who has ever planned and suffered or caused the claim of the hierarchy to place itself in opposition to monarchical government. After the council Pius IV relaxed all energy, neglected religion, and drank too eagerly, and took an excessive delight in the splendor of his court, in sumptuous festivities, and in costly buildings. He evidently had done his work. He died in December, 1565. His disposition was generous, and he embellished Rome; but he was guilty of the common fault of nepotism. He made his nephew, Charles Borromeo, a cardinal, who afterwards became celebrated as an archbishop of Milan; and he instituted proceedings against the nephews of the late pope, cardinals Carlo Caraffa, and his brother the duke of Palliano, who were accused of various crimes, which were said to be proved against them, and both were excommunicated. But in the succeeding pontificate of Pius V, the proceedings being revised, the two brothers Caraffa were declared to have been unjustly condemned. See Ranke, Popery, i. 384 sq.; et al.; Bower, Hist. of the Popes (see Index): Leonardi, Oratio de Iudiciis Pii IV (Padua, 1565); Pariiinius, Vita Pii IV; Servius, Ch. Hist. of France, 1563, 1569; y, Pinter, Relations of Concilium, vol. i, p. 68; Janus, Pope and Council, p. 418; Cramp, Popery, p. 264 sq.; Fisher, Reformation, p. 411; Montor, Hist. des Souverains Pontifes, iv, 185 sq.

PIUS IV, CREED OF. This document, which forms one of the authorized standards of the Church of Rome, was prepared by pope Pius IV immediately after the rising of the Council of Trent, and is understood to embody in substance the decisions of that Council. The creed bears date November, 1564, and was no sooner issued than it was immediately received throughout the Roman Church, and since that time it has continued to receive the acceptance of the laity, and is binding upon all clergymen, doctors, teachers, heads of universities, and of monastic institutions and military orders, and all reconciled converts. For this authoritative document, with the oath of promise appended, see Pius IV's Exercitationes.

Pius V, pope of Rome, succeeded Pius IV in 1566. His family name was Michele Ghislieri; he was born of low descent, Jan. 17, 1564, at Bosco, not far from Alessandria, in Piedmont, Italy. Early in life he entered the Dominican order, and devoted himself soul and body to the monkish piety which his order demanded. He sided with the strict party professing the old opinions, and especially distinguished himself by his zeal in support of the Inquisition, of which tribunal he, as pope, became one of the leading members. In 1570, when he attached himself to the French court, he rose with the ascendancy which it gained. Pope Paul IV spoke of friar Michele as an eminent servant of God, and much to be honored.
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ing to the civil magistrates the repression of this abuse, he insisted upon the bishops acting both as magistrates and judges, and armed them with episcopal courts, and provided prisons for the punishment of offenders. Thus frequent collisions were occasioned between the civil and ecclesiastical authorities, especially at Naples, where the pope was wont to visit. There also existed a spirit concerning the ecclesiastical inspectors and collectors sent by the pope to visit and demand accounts of all Church property throughout Italy. Pius proceeded on the principle asserted in the false decreals that the pope has the disposal of all the clerical benefices throughout the world. Hence he was wont to say: "If I die, let me be buried in Jerusalem, and the pope will give me to live all to death," and signified his approbation of Alva's sanguinary proceedings by sending him a consecrated hat and sword. Queen Elizabeth of England he put under ban, and Maximilian II he threatened with excommunication if he should grant toleration (religious) to the Protestants. Sure was of this, that this was a matter of simplicity, nobleness, personal strictness, devoted religiousness, and morose exclusiveness, of bitter hate and bloody persecution. See Walch, Entwurf einer vollk. Geschicht. der rom. Popst., p. 392 sq.; Catena, Pius del gloriosissimo papa Pio V; Ranke, Pupocyc, i, 299-327; Agostini di Somma, Vida di Pio Quinto; Furillet, Vie du Papa Pie V (1674); Falloux, Hist. de Saint Pie V (1844, 2 vols.); Mendemant, Life and Pontificate of Saint Pius V (Lond. 1852, 1844); Bowes, Hist. of the Popes (see Index); Sommese, Elizabethan Hist. (see Index); Collier, Eccles. Hist. (see Index); Fisher, Hist. of the Reformation, p. 302, 411.

Pius VI, pope of Rome, whose original name was Giovanni Angelo di Braschi, descended from a noble family, and was born at Cesena, Italy, Dec. 27, 1717. He made his reputation as a monsignor of his extreme Calvinism, devoted to important ecclesiastical dignities at an unusually early period. In 1744 he was made keeper of the papal exchequer, and in 1773 was honored with the cardinal's hat. In 1775, upon the death of pope Clement XIV, better known as Ganganelli, cardinal Braschi, who had then the reputation of being of a generous disposition, fond of learning and the arts, and had besides the advantages of a handsome person, a graceful demeanor, and easy and affable manners, was chosen successor to the vacant pontifical chair. In his previous office of treasurer he had managed the financial affairs of the country with prudence and disinterestedness. In the first five years of his pontificate he occupied himself largely with public improvements, and displayed the same care and independence. But in his political career pope Pius VI was rather unfortunate. Even at his elevation, feeling that he had not the qualifications of a politician, he predicted himself, to the conclavists, an unhappy termination of his reign. Conclavists in spirit, and determined upon the preservation of unity in the Church, he would frequently make concessions where stern opposition was most urgent; again, he caused the bishops to be%
influence of the see of Rome. Pius VI, not willing to leave unemployed any conciliatory offices at his command, believed that his duty lay in a visit to the emperor, and accordingly he set out for Vienna in 1785, to settle matters by personal arrangement. The step was not without some risk. For several centuries Pius had never left Italy. Monti wrote a poem on the remarkable event, entitled II Pellegro Apostolico. At Vienna the pope was received with every honor; yet Pius failed to make any impression on the emperor, and the matter in discussion was referred to a ministry unfavorable to papal claims. It was the same struggle as that of France, Gallicanism against Ultramontanism, only this time the pope was himself inclined to be the peace-maker between the contending factions in the Church. Pius VI failed utterly in his mission, and returned to Rome disappointed and defeated, to be reproached for his good intentions, with having lowered the dignity of his office, and encouraged the Gallican tendencies in the Church at large. The troubles doubled upon the outbreak of the French Revolution, and rendered the remaining years of his pontificate gloomy and calamitous. In the early period of that fearful struggle Pius VI had solemnly condemned the abrupt changes made in France concerning the discipline and the property of the clergy, though in all secular matters he had the French ambassador as his interpreter. But in January, 1789, a complication arose of a most serious nature. A young man, Hugo Basseville, an agent of the French republican party, on his way to Naples, where he was to be secretary of embassy, stopped in the Eternal City, and made a foolish demonstration in the Corso, apparently to sound the opinions of the people. He appeared in a carriage with several tricolor flags, and distributed revolutionary tracts, vociferating something about liberty and against tyrants; but a mob collected; he was dragged out of his carriage, and mortally stabbed by the populace. The military arrived too late, and though some of the murderers were arrested and tried, the French government charged the papal authorities with having been a party to the crime. The result was that the breach widened, and that finally the pope joined the league of the sovereigns against France. In 1796, when Bonaparte invaded Northern Italy, he took possession of the legations, but at the same time offered to the pope conditions of peace. These, however, it was impossible for Pius to accept, and the papal troops withdrew from the French. The defeat of the French army followed, and after the possession of Ancona and Loreto, peace was established at Campo Formio in Oct., 1797. The conditions of peace were very onerous, and added vexation to vexation against the unfortunate pope, who, old and infirm, was unequal to the difficulties which crowded upon him. Heavy contributions were imposed by the French Directory, and Ferrara, Romagna, and the Bolognese were incorporated with the newly founded Cisalpine republic; the price of peace in fine, was the revocation of the papal edicts limiting the Jesuits in the Rom., and the excommunication of the French clergy. To make bad matters worse, some disorders in Rome between the French and Italians, in the course of which the French general Duhopt was shot, gave a pretext to the French Directory for the expedition of Berthier, who arrived in Rome on February 10, and occupied the Vatican. Pius VI, forsaken by most of the cardinals, who had escaped, remained in the Vatican. On the 15th a tree of liberty was raised in the Campo Vaccino, and Rome was formally declared a republic. Berthier afterwards sent an order to the pope that he must renounce his temporal sovereignty. Pius answered that he had received it from God and by the free election of men, and could not renounce it; that he was eighty years old, and his troubles could not be of long duration, but that he was determined to do nothing derogatory to his high office. Next came the comissary-general of the French army, who, after taking an inventory of all the valuables that still remained in the papal residence, ordered Pius to prepare to set out in two days. The pope said he could not oppose force, but protested against this new act of violence. On Feb. 20 Pius VI left the Vatican. His only visitors were the detachment of cavalry, took the road to Florence. He was lodged at first in a convent near Siena, and afterwards in the Carthusian convent near Florence, where he remained till the following year, when the French, having driven out of Tuscany the grand-duke Ferdinand, and being threatened by the Austro-Russians who were advancing to the Adige, ordered the pope to be transferred to France. He was taken to Grenoble, and afterwards to Valence, on the Rhone, where he died in August of the year (1799). Just before his death the Roman republic had ceased to exist, the French being driven out of Italy by the Austro-Russians, and Rome was occupied by Austrian and Neapolitan troops. In the year 1802, after the restoration of the papal government, the remains of Pius VI were transferred to Rome by leave of the first consul Bonaparte, at the request of his successor, Pius VII, and deposited with solemn pomp in the church of St. Peter. The bulls published by Pius VI are in Bullar. Romani, contin. summer. Pontif. Clem. med. XIIII. Clem. XTV. Pii VI constitutiones, etc., quas cod. Rom. Basile. (Rom., 1802, i. vii-x); const. contin. Pii VI. Pius VI greatly enlarged the museum of the Vatican, which he made one of the richest in Europe in works of sculpture, vases, precious marbles, and other remains of antiquity; and he caused a splendid set of engravings of the objects in this museum to be published, under the title of Museo Pio Clementino. He made additions to the church of St. Peter, and embellished Rome with new palaces, fountains, and other structures. His internal administration was liberal and mild, an unusual freedom of opinion and speech prevailing throughout Italy. He removed the papal creditors thither from other parts of Italy. Many foreigners came to settle in that capital, the fine arts were encouraged by the pope and several of the cardinals, and modern Rome was reviving the brilliant period of Leo X when the struggle with the French Directory darkened the scene. See, besides the memoirs by Beccatini (Venice, 1804, 4 vols.); Tavanti (Flor. 1804, 3 vols. 4to); Gesch. des Papstes Pius VI (Vienna, 1799); Bourgoing's Memoires de P. VI (Paris, 1799); Ferrari, Vita Pii VI (Paris, 1802); Novaes, Sommi Pontifices, vol. xvi, xvi.; Artault, Histoire de Rome, 6 vols. (Par., 1791-1810, vii-viii; Wolff, Gesch. der kathol. Kirche unter Pius VI (Zurich, 1797-1802, 7 vols. 8vo). Pius VII, pope from 1800 to 1823, was successor of the preceding. He was originally called Gregorio Barnabo Chiaromonti, being also of noble descent, and was born in 1749 at Corna. He first studied in the college of Ravenna, and subsequently entered the Order of Benedictines in 1788. He was appointed lecturer on philosophy, and afterwards on theology, to the novices of his order, first at Parma and then at Rome. Pius VI appointed him bishop of Imola, and in 1785 made him a cardinal and bishop of Imola. When Bonaparte took possession of the legations, and annexed them to the Cisalpine republic, cardinal Chiaromonti in a hansom exhorted his flock to submit to the new institutions, and to be faithful to the state of which they had become a part. This conduct is said to have gained the approval of Bonaparte. When the news of the death of Pius VI, in his exile at Valence, in August, 1799, came to Italy, the concile was summoned to assemble at Venice, then under the dominion of Austria, as Rome was in the state of a republic. It assembled ac- cordingly in the Benedictine convent of St. Giorgio Maggiore, in order to elect one of their number to the papal office, a dignity apparently not very enviable in those troubled times. The deliberations of the concile lasted several months, and at last, on March 14, 1800, cardinal Chiaromonti was chosen, and crowned
For the security of the numerous members of it who were living in those very countries with which the emperor was then at war. He said that the head of the Church ought not to be a minister of conciliation, but a priest, and that the pope must take part in a war which has no religion for its object; that if some of his predecessors had not always abided by this rule, he at least should not follow their example. Napoleon, however, insisted, and an angry correspondence was carried on between the two courts for about two years on this subject of contention, the neutrality of the Papal States being all the while merely nominal, as the French troops marching from and to Naples crossed and recrossed it at their pleasure, and the French also kept a garrison at Ancona, the only port of the papal port of any importance. By degrees the French extended their posts all along the Adriatic coast, and garrisoned the various ports. Some time after a body of French troops, coming from Naples, passed through Rome, ostensibly to proceed to Leghorn; but they suddenly turned out of the main road and surprised, in the night the town of Civita Vecchia, of which they took military possession. In all these places they confiscated whatever English property they could find. The papal troops at Ancona, Civita Vecchia, and other places were ordered to place themselves under the direction of the French, and henceforward the pope was reduced to a mere negotiator. But on an intimacy from Bonaparte, who was above all things anxious that the matter should be promptly settled, the pope despatched to Paris cardinal Consalvi, who smoothed down all difficulties, and the concordat was signed at Paris, July 15, 1801, and was ratified by Pius at Rome, after some hesitation and consultation, on August 14th following. The principal stipulations of the concordat were: The pope was to retain his temporal rights, and the pope was to have juris-
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war which began soon after in Spain prevented Napol-
leon from occupying himself with the affairs of Rome,
which remained in a state of uncertainty amid frequent
clashing between the French military authorities and
the Roman curia, the territory, impoverished as it was
by the loss of its finest provinces, was obliged to pay
the French troops which garrisoned the towns that
still nominally belonged to the pope. All the
disaffected and the turbulent, trusting to French
protection, openly insulted the papal government. The
pope removed himself to his palace on the Quirinal,
with his Swiss guard at the gates, not wishing to
expose himself to violence by venturing out. On May
17, 1809, Napoleon, who was then making war against
Austria, issued a decree from Vienna, in which he re-
suscitated the guilt of his predecessors against Pope
Charles-magne, and united the remainder of the Roman
States to the French empire, leaving to the pope his
palaces and an income of two millions of francs. On June
10, 1809, the pope issued a bull of excommunication against
all the perpetrators and abettors of the invasion of Rome
and of the territories of the Holy See. The bull was
affixed to the gates of the principal churches of Rome
and in other public places. The text of the bull is
given by cardinal Paccia, in his Memorie Storiche, Ap-
pendix to pt. i, No. v. The French commander, Mollien,
being instructed by the papal legate to pacify the people of Rome,
who had shown unequivocal signs of attachment to
their sovereign, thought it expedient to remove Pius
from the capital. The Swiss guards made no resistance,
having orders to that effect from the pope; and,
protesting that he yielded to force, Pius took his
litter under his arm, accompanied the general to the
gate, where his carriage was ready, and drove off
under an escort. He was taken first to Grenoble, in Daup-
ine, from whence he was removed, by order of Na-
poleon, to Savona, in the Riviera of Genoa, where he re-
mained until 1812. While Pius was at Savona, Na-
poleon convoked a council at Paris of the bishops of his
empire; but he found that assembly less docile than he
expected, and he dissolved it without reaching any
conclusion. The great question was how to fill up the
vacant sees, when the pope refused the canonical
institution. The pope at the same time would not recognize
Napoleon's divorce from his first wife Josephine.
In short, Napoleon found that unarmed priests were more
difficult to conquer than the armies of one half of Europe
(Thibaut, Le Consulat et l'Empire, ch. lxxvii; Bottia,
Storia, pt. iii). The plan of Napoleon was to
have the pope settled at Avignon, or some other town of his
empire, as his subject and his pensionary, and to
control himself the nomination not only of the bishops, but
of the cardinals also, by which means he would have
added to his already overbearing temporal power the
incalculable support of a spiritual authority which extends
over a great part of the world. The resistance of Pius
disconnected his views. Napoleon at last imagined that
by changing Pius to Fontainebleau he might succeed in
overcoming his firmness. He therefore caused Pius
to be removed with the greatest secrecy. He was
brought to Fontainebleau in June, 1812, lodged in the
imperial palace, and treated with marked respect.
Napoleon had set out on his Russian expedition. After
his return from that disastrous campaign, in December,
1812, he went to see the pope, embraced him, and treated
him with studied attention; he also allowed several
cardinals who were at Paris to repair to Fontainebleau,
and at last, chiefly through their persuasions, he pre-
vented the pope to sign a new concordat, Jan. 25,
1813. It is not true, as some have stated, that Na-
poleon grasped at his opportunities when Pius, lifting
his hand against him and struck him. Paccia (Memorie
Storiche, pt. iii, ch. i) denies this on the authority of
Pius himself, but thinks it very probable that Napoleon
spoke to his prisoner in an authoritative and threaten-
ing tone. Napoleon hastened to publish the articles of
the concordat, and to give them the force of laws of the
empire; after which he granted access to the pope,
to all cardinals, and others who chose to repair to
Fontainebleau. Pius, who had scruples concerning some
of the articles which he had signed, laid them before the
cardinal de Bénédite, his chaplain. Several of the car-
dinals, especially the Italian Guerini, Pacci, Litta, and Di Pietro, stated that some of the ar-
ticles were contrary to the canon law and the legitimate
jurisdiction of the Roman see, and pregnant with the
most serious evils to the Church, and they urged the
necessity of a prompt correction. They quoted the ex-
ample of Paschal II, who, in similar circumstances hav-
ing ceded to the emperor Henry V the right of investi-
ture, hastened to submit his conduct to the judgment of a
council assembled in the Lateran, and the council
revoked the privilege of investiture. Upon this Pius
wrote to Napoleon, March 24, retracting his con-
cessions, but proposing a new basis for a concordat:
Napoleon, however, took no notice of the retractation,
except to exile some of the cardinals who, he thought,
had influenced it. Napoleon soon after set off for his
army in Germany, and the affair with the pope remained
in suspense. It was only after the defeat of the French
armies and their expulsion from Germany that Na-
poleon proposed to restore to the pope the Papal
States south of the Apennines, if the pope would agree to
a concordat of concordats, and, in fact, engage not to
interfere in any negotiations until he was restored to Rome.
On Jan. 22, 1814, an order came for the pope to leave Font-
ainebleau the following day. None of the cardinals
were allowed to accompany him. He set out, accompa-
nied by an escort, and was taken to Italy. On arriving
at the bridge on the river Nera, in the state of Frascati,
he met the advanced posts of the Neapolitan troops un-
der Murat, who was then making common cause with
the allied powers against Napoleon. Murat had taken
military occupation of the Roman state, but he offered
to give up the state and fetters to the pope if he
preferred stopping at Cesena, his native town, until the
political horizon was cleared up. After the abdication
of Napoleon and the peace of Paris, Pius made his en-
trance into Rome, May 24, 1814, in the midst of rejoic-
ings and acclamations. His faithful Consalvi soon after
resumed his office of secretary of state. By the articles
of the congress of Vienna the whole of the Papal
States were restored, including the legations, which were not,
however, evacuated by the Austrian troops until after
the fall of Murat, in 1815.
The second half of the life of Pius VII were spent in comparative tranquillity, though not in idleness.
He applied himself to adapt, as far as it was prac-
ticable, the civil institutions of his dominions to the
great changes which had taken place in the social state.
By a "motu proprio" of the year 1816 he confirmed the
suppression of all feudal imposts, privileges, monopolies,
and jurisdictions; he abolished every kind of torture,
including that called "corda," or "estrapade," which
was formerly a frequent mode of punishment at Rome;
he diminished the land-tax; retained the register of
hypothèques," or mortgages, instituted by the French;
laid down the basis of a new code of public adminis-
tration, and in November of the following year he published
a new code of civil procedure, in which he regulated the
costs of judicial proceedings. He maintained the com-
mercial courts established by the French, as well as the
new system of police, enforced by newly appointed car-
abiniers, instead of the old "sibiri," who were ineffective
and corrupt (Tournon, Études statistiques sur Rome, bk.
iv, ch. vi). Unfortunately, however, the old system of
secret proceedings in criminal matters was restored, as
well as the law of the inquisition, under which the State,
Pius, however, also made some important alterations in the form of proceeding of the
inquisition, abolishing torture as well as the punish-
ment of death for offences concerning religion. He did
perhaps all that he could do as a pope, certainly more
than any pope had done before him. Cardinal Consalvi
took vigorous measures to extirpate the banditti of the Campagna; and in July, 1819, he ordered the town of Somuo, a nest of incorrigible robbers, to be razed to the ground. With regard to spiritual matters, Pius concluded a new concordat with France, Naples, Bavaria, and other states. He condemned by a bull the political notions of Carbonari, as well as other secret societies. In the month of July, 1825, the aged pontiff fell a fall in his apartments and broke his thigh. This accident brought on inflammation, and he died Aug. 20. He was succeeded by Leo XII. (q. v.). Thorwaldsen was commissioned to make his monument, which has been placed in St. Peter's, Pius IX., as one of the most prominent among the long series of popes for his exemplary conduct under adversity, his Christian virtues, and his general benevolence and charity. Free from nepotism, virtuous, modest, unassuming, and personally disinterested, he was a stanch, though temperate, defender of the rights of his see; and his mild bearing and unblemished character engaged on his side the sympathies of the whole Christian world, without distinction of community or sect, during the long struggle with his gigantic and ungenerous adversary. A selection of his bulls, breve, etc., are found in Roskoyan, Monum. Cath. pro independencia pont. eccle. Quinque eccles. (1847), ii. 1 sq. The Bullicium Romanum continuat contains in vol. xi and xii (Rom. 1846) all bulls and brevils till 1806. See Cohen, Praxis histor. sur Pie VII (Var. 1828); Simon, La vie pontificale de Pie VII. (Rome, 1831); Wolf, De novissimae descriptae Populare Pie VII. (Venetia, 1824); Rasch, Geschichte des Papstes Pius VII. (Frlt. 1824); Hau-taun de Morsot, Hist. de la Vie et du Pontifical du Pape Pie VII (3d ed. Paris, 1839, 2 vols. 8vo); and Cardinal Pacca's Historia de los Pontifices (3d ed. Paris, 1839, 2 vols. 8vo); the London Messenger (third, 1829), Fugger, History of the Popes, ii, 511 sqq. etc.; Bower, History of the Popes, vol. viii; Church Journal, vol. viii; Stud. and Krit. 1867, No. 1; English Cyclopaedia, &c.

Pius VIII, pope of Rome, was born at Cingoli, in the province of Ancona, Italy, Nov. 20, 1761. His original name was Francesco Xavier Consigliani. He was the friend of Pius VII, and was by him created bishop of Montalto in 1800, and elevated to the cardinalate in 1816. He was generally regarded as the most learned canonist of the papal court. He was desired for successor of pope Leo XII. for long Pius VIII's short pontificate of one year and eight months (March 31, 1829 till Nov. 30, 1830) nothing remarkable occurred. He labored against indifferentism, Bible societies, Freemasonry, and all secret associations, and successfully labored for the establishment of a patriarchate at Constantinople, for the liberation of the persecuted Armenians. He endeavored to be especially commended for his humane efforts with Dom Pedro of Brazil to suppress the slave traffic and system. His bulls, canons, etc., are in Roskoyan, Monument. Cath. ii, 293-317. He was succeeded by pope Gregory XVI. See Artaud de Montrot, Hist. du Pape Pie VII (Par. 1843); Nodari, VitaPontifical Pii VII, VII, Leoni XII, et Pii VIII (Padua, 1840). (J. H. W.)

Pius IX, the last of the Roman pontiffs who held both temporal and spiritual rule. His original name was Giovanni Maria Mastai Ferretti. He was of noble parentage, though there are writers claiming him to be of Jewish descent, born at Sinigaglia, May 18, 1792. As a youth he was distinguished for a mild disposition and for his works of charity. While still a child he was saved from drowning by a poor contadino, who lived to see him seated on what the historian Macaulay calls "the most ancient and venerable throne of Europe." At the age of eighteen he went to Rome with the purpose of entering the body-guard of the reigning pontiff, Pius VII. An epileptic attack, however, prevented the attainment of his wishes, and he entered a religious seminary, where his gentleness and devotions proved the foundation of his future distinction.

While at Rome he lived under the protection of an uncle, an officer of the ecclesiastical establishment of the Vatican. In the troubled period which marked the closing days of Napoleon's reign, uncle and nephew removed to their estates at Sinigaglia. On a visit which pope Pius VII paid this place, Mastai was presented to his old family friend and cousin, and on his return to Rome, after his long captivity in France, the young ecclesiastic of Sinigaglia was called to the holy city. In the meantime his health had improved, and he was able to prosecute his studies uninterruptedly. By invitation of cardinal Odescalchi, he took part in a mission to his native province, and when he returned he was made deanon in 1818. He obtained a personal audience of the pontiff, and sought a dispensation which would allow him to be ordained without delay to the priesthood. The legend states that his holiness, laying his hands on the young aspirant, granted him the favors asked, together with the apostolic blessing, and thus forever cured him of his epilepsy. Secular writers less anxious to paint the miraculous manifestations in Pio Nonno's youthful days declare that he was a libertine, and that, stretched upon a bed of sickness, he repented of his sins, and, by a life of abstinence and purity, gradually recovered.

In 1819 Mastai received priest's orders, and first exercised the sacerdotal functions in the hospital of San Giovanni at Rome—an institution founded for the education of the poor. He was afterward sent to the United States, and when he returned was appointed to his ministerial duties, and became noted for his charitable works also. In 1823 a wider field opened to him. A canon of the cathedral of Santiago, in Chili, had come to Rome to request of the pope the appointment of an apostolic delegate to that country, and when monsignore Muli had been given this position, Mastai was selected to accompany him as auditor. Two years he spent in South America, and on his way home he also visited the North, and he is said to have been the only pope that ever saw America. Report will have it that he even visited a body of Freemasons in Philadelphia (see Princeton, Mass., March, 1878, p. 610). Nor need this surprise. "It is a fact," says Trollope, "which may be relied on, that—of course in the days before he became a priest, or had thought of ever becoming one—Pius IX had been a member of a lodge—or a veneduta, as the term was—of Carbonari." This was a secret society, originally of charcoal-burners (as the name signifies), who were opposed to the tyranny of the times. In the summer of 1825 Mastai was taken into the household of pope Leo XII. as domestic prelate. He became a favorite with the pontiff, and in December was made superintendent of the hospital of St. Michael, founded two centuries ago by Innocent X., and comprising at this time not only a hospital for the sick, but a retreat for the aged, a refuge for boys, a house for magdalens, a home for virtuous girls, and a school of arts and industries. When he assumed the presidency of this vast and complicated institution it was on the decline. He reorganized every department of the hospital, repaired its dilapidated revenues, extended the range of its charities, and in less than two years brought order out of the confusion—by the sacrifice of his own patrimony. He also preached much and obtained great distinction as a pulpit orator.

In 1829 Spoleto needed an archbishop. The political agitation was great throughout Italy. The approach of the disturbances which created the v hone manifest in a thousand ways. The ecclesiastics, in order to be all-powerful and sufficient for the struggle, needed more than ordinary experience. A policy of anxious, irritated, and, at the same time, irritating repression had proved a failure. Mastai Ferretti was young enough to avoid falling into this excess of zeal, and, as he had gained much political sagacity in his seminaria-religious mission across the sea, he was selected for the vacant archiepiscopal chair. He quickly perceived that he must abandon the old receipts of the
prison and the executioner, and by a wise rule maintained perfect order in the midst of general disturbance. While all Italy was in arms, the little archbishopric of Spoleto remained peaceful. When suddenly 5000 insurgents came there to seek refuge from the pursuing Austrians, Mastai dealt boldly and judiciously with them that he induced them to lay down their arms and submit to authority; and when the civil authority of the city submitted to him the lists of these insurgents, he tossed them into the fire, instead of forwarding them to Rome. Gregory XVI and his court were displeased and indignant at such proceedings. Mastai was then summoned to Rome to give an account of his conduct; but he succeeded without much difficulty in persuading Gregory that if their enemies could be put down without punishents, which left a fresh store of hatred behind, it was all the better. Mastai's enemies said that his conduct towards the persecuted liberal party was not altogether straightforward and consistent, and that he even in those early days showed a certain tendency to run with the hare at the same time that he was hunting with the hounds. The archbishop certainly succeeded finally in obtaining the public recognition of his hold on the bishopric, when on Dec. 17, 1832, he was translated to the see of Imola—a very important promotion, because it is understood that this bishopric is a stepping-stone to the cardinalate. Mastai had not only proved his political sagacity, but his religious freedom and freedom of judgment gave a most dignified position to the archbishops of the churchmen of the diocese of Spoleto, as well as later to that of Imola. Particularly he was noted for his charity and readiness to aid all good works, both public and private. The disturbed times required such ecclesiastics. It gave authority to the sees and influence to the pontificate. How well the pope appreciated Mastai is made apparent in his selection, a short time after, as apostolic nuncio to Naples. He so ably discharged his mission that he was rewarded with the cardinalate by secret conclave in 1839, though he did not receive the purple before another. He was in comparatively a young man. There were many far his seniors in the college of cardinals. Certainly no one dreamed that the bestowal of the red hat upon Mastai Ferretti was likely to bring him the tira soon.

In 1846 Gregory XVI died. When the news from Rome came to the archbishop-cardinal of Imola, he delayed to celebrate first the obsequies of the dead pope. Apparently he was in no haste to get to Rome; yet those who were close observers and less friendly said that he had an eye to the papal throne from the moment of his elevation, and that he was prudently forebore ever after to identify himself with the court of Gregory. There were two parties in the conclave. Each of these sought in this new pontiff the representative of their ideas. The one party, confined to the Jesuits and headed by Lambruschini—himself an aspirant for the vacant chair—determined to maintain the papacy of medieval times; the other party, moderately liberal, made up of better men than the Jesuits, yet also devoted to the fabric of medieval times, but with some show of concession to modern ideas, were disposed to compromise on a moderate basis, and, for the nonce, a conscientious Bianchi, the Dominican who never doffed the dress of his order for the purple robe, though he accepted its honors and encroached the Austrian policy of the late pontificate. Outside of the conclave, however, there was a small but enthusiastic faction, called "Young Italy," resolved to have a liberal pope, and they fastened upon the young cardinal who had espoused the Italian cause and had been a liberal in his past history. No one outside of the conclave imagined, when, on the 14th of June, it convened, that the party at whose simple mention the "holy" men were accustomed to cross themselves would be successful. The only hope was in the popular enthusiasm, which ran so high that there was hope the roz popoli might possibly be turned into the roz Dei. On the very first vote Lambruschini received fifteen votes and Mastai thirteen. On the afternoon of the 16th Mastai received on the fourth ballot thirty-six votes—making of the fifty-two present, more than the necessary two thirds—when the assembly rose as one man to confirm the choice by unanimous acclamation. Young Italy had conquered against all the Jesuit machinations. But it was done so soon for as Mastai—how Pius IX.—was bestowing his benediction (Urbi et orbi) from the balcony of St. Peter's, an Austrian cardinal drove into the Piazza with smoking post-horses and a "veto" from Vienna. Various incidents in the reign of Pio Nono's predecessor had given rise to the widest agitation in diplomatic circles. In 1846 there occurred the rising in the Romagna, which, when suppressed, revived in a far more effective shape in the famous pamphlet, I Casi delle Romagna, which circulated as the testament of a new political gospel throughout the peninsula. Then there came the memorable visit of the czar Nicholas to Rome, and those interviews in which the pope had dared to protest to the dread autocrat against the treatment in which he subjected the Roman Church in Russia. The interest excited in the political world was very great, for, on the one hand, Pio Nono had assumed serious proportions, while, on the other, speculation was stimulated by the mystery surrounding this interview, at which only two witnesses had been present (cardinal Acton and Mr. Boutieviess, the Russian minister), and by the proceedings of the adjutant M. Rossi, a born subject of the pope—a fugitive professor from Bologna, and a notoriously compromised liberal—awovedly to obtain from the holy see its concurrence with the principles of free education, then advocated in France, and its compliance with the desire of the French government for the reduction within moderate limits of the establishments that had been opened in France, more or less clandestinely, by the Jesuits. All these circumstances had brought about a degree of agitation which was acknowledged by all who had not some political object in view. But Gregory XVI had lived in hourly dread of revolutionary upheaval, and in constant fear of absolute neglect by the European states. He had always kept in his drawer a document empowering the cardinals, on his demise, to proceed to immediate election, if they saw danger to the free action of the conclave. Such times needed a popular priest in the pontificate. But Mastai disappointed both his friends and his enemies—the former so sorely that they were weakened beyond the possibility of recovery; the latter, by his forming an alliance with them, that it bore the peculiar stamp of a union never dreamed could be executed, even if Lambruschini himself had been in the papal chair. Pio Nono proved an impulsive, good-natured man, but ignorant and superstitious, vain and impetuous, weak and obstinate, without a mind of his own or settled policy. His reforms were, in reality, of little value. The best of them —those devoid of any political significance—projects to regulate the finances, to reform the administration of justice, to introduce railways, to ameliorate the condition of the Campagna—brought about merely a temporary improvement. True the virtues were not long-lived in their results, and, besides, were a burlesque on liberalism. Thus in March, 1847, an edict of the press was published with the intention of removing some of the restrictions under which it had labored till then; but strong hints were given as to subjects which the government would allow to be discussed, and a censorship remained established in full force. The same year witnessed the institution of the Consulta, under the presidency of Gizzi. This seemed like concession to popular demands, but the whole thing was a farce; the members were chosen by the pope, and the functions of the council of the most limited nature. Its duty was to give an opinion when called upon, leaving it to the pope to act upon the proffered advice or to do otherwise. In 1848 appeared the famous statuto creating a high council and a chamber of deputies, as the
triumph of constitutionalism. But the chambers were forbidden to propose any law on ecclesiastical or mixed affairs, and every measure had to be submitted to the pope in a secret consistory, with the absolute right of veto. When the national crusade was inaugurated in 1848, the government, in order to give the revolution a religious sanction, invited all the prelates of the diocese of Nice to take an oath on the house of Savoy—the grandfather of the present king of Italy—the pope went with the multitude. The Ultramontanes, of course, broke out against this manifest liberalization of the pontiff, but it only needed a little strategy on their part, and he was at their bidding. When his trusted adviser, count Rossellini, was assassinated at the door of the Council of State, Pius IX as rapidly retracted his steps as he had advanced, and now unreservedly gave himself over to those very Jesuits who had plotted the death of his minister, that the liberals might be charged with desperate motives. Accordingly, the pope, on the 29th of April, 1848—his ministry, who had counseled that the abandonment of the people “would most seriously compromise the temporal dominion of the holy see,” having left him—issued, in the form of an allocution addressed to the cardinals, that celebrated paper which put an end as once for ever to the ephemeral season of popularity and affection of his subjects in which he had basked. The first words of it declare the intentions of the Holy See “not to deviate from the institutions of our predecessors.” Then it goes on to state that evil-minded men and knaves had been at work, and had encouraged the Italians in their revolutionary aspirations, and had endeavored to make his conduct in this respect a means of stirring up schism in Germany. The paper finally warns all the Italians against any such designs or aspirations, enjoining them to remain docile subjects to their princes. This “allocation” fell like a bombshell in the midst of the liberal party. The dismay, the disappointment, the rage, were indescribable. Many had been led—some of the princes of Italy among the number—to compromise themselves in a way they would have been the last to think of if they had known that the pontiff was at the head of the liberal movement. This terrible announcement was made, too, when already the papal troops had passed the frontier of the States of the Church and joined the forces marching against the Austrians; so that these betrayed men were left to be treated by the Austrian soldiery as mere rebels and brigands. The king of Sardinia and the grand duke of Tuscany were equally placed in a most painful predicament by this sudden derogation of Pius IX. They acted, as is well known, differently in the difficulty. The king of Sardinia was faithful, with a spirit of resolution which he had put his hand. The great grand duke made haste to follow the lead of the pontiff, and cast in his lot with him and with the Austrians. Such vacillation could not be other than destructive. When the barbarians swept over the political allegory of Europe, the papal troops reached the Italian shores, Rome’s prince was the first to feel its severest touch. In France the citizen-king was forced to exile; in Rome the citizen-pope suffered a like fate, and with this begins from the Quirinal to Giesta terminates Pio Nono’s comedy of liberalism. The story of Pio Nono’s extraordinary career we cannot detail. Suffice it to say that Pio Nono’s exit from Rome was made with the aid of the Bavarian minister, and at Gaeta he was received with great honor by the king of Naples, who persuaded the pope to abandon his original intention of going to the Balearic Islands. He was now the joy of the reactionists all over the world who had looked so coldly upon his early efforts at reform, but gained, of course, the execrations of the liberals, whose cause he had abandoned. Rome, left without a prince, was a rajah running upon the defiantly tested against all its acts, and summoned the Catholic world to put it down. It was France which, having disgraced herself by the election of a Bonaparte as president, was condemned to finish her story of crime and humiliation by throttling the Roman republic and re- storing the temporal authority of the papacy. French troops landed at Civita Vecchia on the 25th of April, 1849, and besieged the capital, while the Austrians entered Italy from the north and the Spaniards from the south. The capital surrendered on the 1st of July; and pending the return of the pope—which did not take place until next year—the government was placed by a papal commission, a council of state, a council of finance, and provincial councils. The pope returned in April, 1850, surrounded by the bayonets of a French army, “to a capital torn and ravaged by bombardment, and drenched in the blood of his own subjects, slain for the crime of taking up and carrying on the government in which he had abdicated.” His first act was the perjury of destroying the constitution of chartered rights which he had guaranteed to his subjects. His second act was the granting of a mock amnesty, the exceptions to which were so framed as to put well-nigh the whole population under ban. The galled prisoners, which it had been his delight to empty at his first accession, filled up again as before. The Inquisition recommenced its sacred labors. Five hundred citizens were shot or de- capititated and thirty thousand proscribed. Tribunals were established which conspired and murdered without even open accusation. Speech was gagged, the press was muzzled, the Bible was prohibited. The stirring of resistance, provoked by excess of tyranny, was seized as the pretext of wanton barbarity; and the kindred crimes of broken hearts and broken lives that had encouraged the Italians in their revolutionary aspirations, and had endeavored to make his conduct in this respect a means of stirring up schism in Germany. The paper finally warns all the Italians against any such designs or aspirations, enjoining them to remain docile subjects to their princes. This “allocation” fell like a bombshell in the midst of the liberal party. The dismay, the disappointment, the rage, were indescribable. Many had been led—some of the princes of Italy among the number—to compromise themselves in a way they would have been the last to think of if they had known that the pontiff was at the head of the liberal movement. This terrible announcement was made, too, when already the papal troops had passed the frontier of the States of the Church and joined the forces marching against the Austrians; so that these betrayed men were left to be treated by the Austrian soldiery as mere rebels and brigands. The king of Sardinia and the grand duke of Tuscany were equally placed in a most painful predicament by this sudden derogation of Pius IX. They acted, as is well known, differently in the difficulty. The king of Sardinia was faithful, with a spirit of resolution which he had put his hand. The great grand duke made haste to follow the lead of the pontiff, and cast in his lot with him and with the Austrians. Such vacillation could not be other than destructive. When the barbarians swept over the political allegory of Europe, the papal troops reached the Italian shores, Rome’s prince was the first to feel its severest touch. In France the citizen-king was forced to exile; in Rome the citizen-pope suffered a like fate, and with this begins the Quirinal to Giesta terminates Pio Nono’s comedy of liberalism. The story of Pio Nono’s extraordinary career we cannot detail. Suffice it to say that Pio Nono’s exit from Rome was made with the aid of the Bavarian minister, and at Gaeta he was received with great honor by the king of Naples, who persuaded the pope to abandon his original intention of going to the Balearic Islands. He was now the joy of the reactionists all over the world who had looked so coldly upon his early efforts at reform, but gained, of course, the execrations of the liberals, whose cause he had abandoned. Rome, left without a prince, was a rajah running upon the defiantly tested against all its acts, and summoned the Catholic world to put it down. It was France which, having disgraced herself by the election of a Bonaparte as president, was condemned to finish her story of crime and humiliation by throttling the Roman republic and restoring the temporal authority of the papacy. French
Paolo-fuori-le-mura there is a memorial of one of the proudest moments of Pio Nono’s life. An expensive and elegant memorial is that placed in 1871 over the well-known bronze statue of St. Peter. Those who desire the fullest details are referred to the pages of the Civiltà Cattolica.

In 1847 he began the reform of the great religious bodies. On June 17 he appointed a commission to inquire into the laxity of discipline in religious communities, and in the issue he so modified the constitutions of several as to make the period of probation more protracted, and to raise among all the standard of discipline and intellectual training. The missions of the Church were also strengthened, being carried forward in profusio infidelium, and great hierarchies, in lands formerly heathen or Protestant, were added to the vast clergy that owned “the Latin obedience.” Thus he provided by brief of 1850 for the ecclesiastical government of England, dividing that country into one metropolitan and twelve episcopal sees; and this was followed by a pastoral letter of cardinal Wiseman, on his appointment as archbishop of Westminster, exulting in the supposed triumph of his Church in the land which had been the home of the Reformation for three centuries. Then he created in this country a vast Roman Catholic hierarchy, by elevating to the cardinalate the archbishops of New York in 1865, and prepared the way for the establishment of the hierarchy in Scotland, which was effected in 1878. Finally, in 1854, without advice of a council, he ventured the utterance of a few dogmas—the immaculate conception (q.v.) of the Virgin Mary—and the audacious promulgation, in 1864, of the bull Quanta Curà, which, with its accompanying “Syllabus” of damnable errors, was simply an attack on free governments and civilization itself, and rivalled the spirit and times of Hildesbrand, the ecclesiastical absolutism of the 11th century. The consecration of these acts in the Vatican Council of 1870 by the decree of infallibility (q.v.) was the logical completion of the Roman system and of the pontificate of Pius IX. The disturbances which have grown out of these steps are detailed in Olio Catholicum, etc. One of the foulest blots on the pages of history regarding his reign is the forcible conversion of the Jew boy Mortara, and of a piece with this is the abject condition of the Hebrews at Rome, where the walls of the Ghetto were only removed with the establishment of the Italian power. The private life of the pope was marked by great simplicity of habits.

See Balleydier, Histoire de la Révol. de Rome (Lyons, 1851, 2 vols. 8vo); Maguire, Rome, its Ruler and its Institutions (London, 1859); Saint-Alban, Pius IX (Paris, 1860); Pius IX and his Life (London, 1875, 2 vols. 8vo); Trollope, Pope Pius IX (ibid. 1877, 2 vols. 8vo); Legge, Growth of the Temporal Power of the Papacy (ibid. 1870); also, Life of Pius IX (ibid. 1875, 8vo); Hitchman, Biog. of Pius IX (ibid. 1878, 12mo); New York Tribune, Feb. 9, 1878; Christian Union, vol. xvii., No. 7; Churston Review, March, 1878.

Più Societies The stormy years of 1848 and 1849 brought great hopes and great dangers to the Roman Catholic Church of Germany, especially the hope of entire emancipation from the State, and the danger of enslavement to the despotism of a liberalist absolutist to the Church. But its representatives knew how to steer skillfully between the Scylla and Charybdis. In November, 1848, the German bishops of the Romish body in Würzburg, to the chagrin of the other concerning the best means to proceed in this critical period. Unwavering faithfulness to the papacy was the first point settled; voluntary co-operation with the “political regeneration” of the fatherland, the second; thankful acceptance of the promise of unconditional freedom of conscience (in the fundamental rights of the Frankfurt Parliament), in order to accomplish the most complete independence of the Church and absolute control of national education, from the elementary to the high schools, the third. Shortly before this, however, an organization of far-reaching significance had been effected, in all the parishes, and prominently to co-operate, viz., the Più Society, a Roman Catholic counterpart of the Protestant Church Diet (q.v.). Soon after the revolutionary struggles of March, unions were formed at several places in Germany having for their object the protection and advancement of Roman Catholic interests. At the anniversary of the building of the cathedral at Cologne, in August, 1848, the members of several of these unions met together and resolved upon a general convocation, in October, 1848, at Mayence, where the first union of this kind was formed, under the name of Pius Society. Here all the single unions were formed into a great collective union under the name of “Catholic Union of Germany;” although in practice the shorter name of Pius Society has been preferred. To direct the business of the collective union, one of the single unions was chosen to hold the conference, which was called “Vorort.” The object of the union was “the obtaining and maintenance of the freedom of the Church and control of the same over the schools; national culture in the Roman Catholic spirit and practice of Christian living.” It sought, by the help of its episcopate and to the episcopate; pacific posture towards the State and towards every existing form of government, so far as the rights of the Church were not thereby prejudiced; and defensive, not aggressive, posture towards the non-Catholic confessions. This Virginius was chosen as patroness of the union, and every member bound himself to repeat a daily Paternoster and Ave Maria to further the objects of the union.” The first general assembly, which was held at Mayence in 1848, was represented by eighty-three different societies; and a letter received from the pope (Feb., 1849), in which he gave his approbation and blessing to this union, only strengthened the movement, and gave not only authority, but also the name. A second assembly was held at Breslau, where the papal letter was received, and where the assembly openly expressed it that “a united Catholic Germany was only possible with a Catholic Christianity.” Here a new society was also organized, the Vincentian Society, for missionary work at home. The third general assembly was held at Regensburg (October, 1849). Here, by the organization of the Vincentian Society, a paper was started, Katholischer Vereinsbote für das deutsche Reich, in the interest of all societies organized in the spirit of the Più societies. Every year new societies of like tendency and spirit were organized, till in the year 1863 the number was so great that the Pius societies and branch associations, were finally amalgamated into one, as all were only serving one purpose—the advancement of ultramontanism in Germany. Yet, in spite of all these efforts, the seventh general assembly, held at Vienna (Sept., 1858), was forced to admit that “the united Catholic Germany had not succeeded in attracting the masses, for only the same faces were present. The meeting at Cologne in 1854 became discordant, because the committee refused to give the Prussian government a guarantee of abstinence from political utterances and confession of opinions. The ninth general assembly, held at Salzburg in 1857, was a living “testimonium paupertatis,” which the Roman Catholic world exhibited to the union. Little was felt here of important men, deeds, and speeches. The cathedral capitular Himbioten of Mayence, the “real apostle of the times of glory,” the other concerning the fabulous stories of the Roman Catholicism in Germany, and expressed the confident hope, in regard to the forty new Protestant churches built by the Gustavus Adolphus Union, that these would shortly disappear again. "Harlequinades also were not wanting. Prof. Kreuzer, of Cologne, e. g., comforted those present in regard to
the charge of ultramontanism with the proverb, 'There stands the ox at the mountain,' from which it follows incontestably that the oxen are the real Cismontanes, because they are not able to pass over the mountain; and as regards the papacy, it is evident that Christ himself, who called upon his Father on the cross, was a papist; indeed the best proof of the papal child is 'papa' already in the cradle; and other such comical things. As a change, it was also greatly lamented that two hundred and seven large and twelve hundred and thirty-four small journals were in the service of the Protestants of Germany, while, on the other hand, the Roman Catholics had only six large and eighty-one small ones.

The tenth general assembly was held at Cologne (September, 1858). All agreed that the results hitherto achieved were satisfactory. In general, the department of the wide field of Roman Catholic congregations in Protestant Germany was not so well attended as in the first conference after Christ, in consequence of the first secularization, when the soldiers cast lots for the garment of the Saviour, which he had worn the evening previous as a chasuble at the first celebration of the mass. Indeed, we can even go farther back than this: Mary, who made swaddling-clothes for the God Jesus, was the prophetic spirit of the union. After being despoiled with such trifles, but also bearing many important truths, especially concerning the study of history and the musical culture of the young, the meeting was closed by consecrating the pillar of Mary built at Cologne in honor of the immaculate conception. The eleventh annual conference, which was held at Freiburg in 1859, expressed the hope that soon all Germany will be brought back within the pale of the Roman Catholic Church; while the twelfth, held at Prague in 1860, lamented over the wounds which were inflicted upon the papacy in that same year. The thirteenth general meeting, held at Munich in 1861, exalted the virtues of the holy father, and declared the robbing of the pope's territory to be a robbery of God. The fourteenth, which was held at Traves in 1865, praised the encyclopaedia published in 1864 in the bull "Quanta cura" as the greatest deed of the 19th century; pronounced John Goerres (q.v.) as the greatest German, and the holy coat at Traves as the symbol of Catholic unity. In this tenor it went on: 'Half childish, half apocalyptic remained the character of the meetings, until the day at Bremen in 1872, when burning was in the language to rage, naivete to fanaticism, and the ostensible peace-policy to the ringing of the alarm-bell' (Kurtz).

The most prominent societies in connection with the original Pius societies are the Bonifacius unions for the support of the Needy Roman Catholic congregations in Protestant Germany (an imitation of the Gustavus Adolphus Union); the Charles Borromeo unions, to spread good Roman Catholic writings; the Vincentius and Elizabeth unions, for visiting the sick and taking care of the poor; the parishes (founded by Wilfrid) in 1846, for the spiritual and temporal assistance of the poor; and the unions of The Holy Childhood of Jesus, composed chiefly of children, who contribute monthly five pennies for the salvation of exposed headless children (especially in China), and daily pray an Ave Maria for them. These are the most prominent organizations in the service of the hierarchy, and are found all over the world. In the United States there is hardly a large town in which one or the other of these societies is not to be found. The tendency is the same. In 1856, some as late as 1866. His pontificate has the purpose of these organizations in the United States is to bring the state as much as possible under the influence and control of the hierarchy, and the political arena is the field of labor. Already they influence the legislatures, school-boards; yes, we may say they form a state within the state. The clergy commands a great ignorant mass, easily fanaticized, and ready to do anything in majorem Dei gloriam et honorum paupere infal- libilium. The doctrines of the Vatican are promulgated through numerous periodicals, and the utterances made at the annual gatherings of the different organizations are the expression of the most spiritual and emotional of these societies. See Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s. v. Piusvereine; Theolog. Universal-Lexikon, s. v.; Wetzer u. Wolte, Kirchen- Lexikon, s. v.; more especially Kurtz, Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte. (Mittau, 1874), ii, 332 sq. See also Ultramontanism, in its conflict with Germany. (B. P.)

See Pius. See Aphex. See Place, J. de la. See Place, A. See Amalason. See Abalason. See Fruitz. See Carmel.

Place, CONSERS, an English divine of some note, flourished in the first half of last century, very near the opening of that era. We know nothing of his personal history. He has left several valuable publications, among which we note, besides his Sermons (Lond. 1702, 4to, 1721, 8vo; 1706, 4to), Adversaria (1709).-Remarques, with Quercourt and Bolo, concerning A. P. Pamphlet, or, cloisterly Invecive, against the Christian Ministry and World, called Some Thoughts concerning Church Authority (1724, 8vo): Space is Necessary Being, etc. (1726):-Easy to the Vicar of the Invisible Subject (1720, 8vo):-Reason on Incoherent Guide (1735):-Remarks on a Treatise on the Lord's Supper, etc. (1801). See Blakeny, Hist. of the Philosophy of the 18th Century, iii, 31; Albion, Dict. of Brit. and Am. Authors, s. v.; Hook, Ecles. Biog. s. v.

Place, ENOCH, an American minister in the Free-will Baptist Church, was born in Rochester, N. H., July 18, 1786. He was converted in March, 1807, while engaged in teaching, and soon felt called of God to enter the work of the ministry. He preached his first sermon June 2, 1807, and was ordained Jan. 23, 1818. Forty-one years of his public life he passed in Strafford, N.H., laboring also much in adjoining towns. He had a thirst for knowledge, and from youth to manhood avoided himself of the means within his reach to acquire an education, though at denomination at that time was not in favor of a learned ministry. By personal effort he advanced until he became eminent among his own people and a leader in his town. His gifts and position eminently qualified him for usefulness both as a minister and citizen. He was called to fill high positions in his denomination, such as moderator of General Conference, trustee of printing establishment, member of mission boards, etc. As a preacher, he was earnest and warm. At times he would have such a sense of the sinner's condition and obligation to God that he would speak as one having authority. Occasionally he would rise to such a height in feeling and eloquence as to be almost overwhelming and irresistible. His personal appearance was commanding, his voice sonorous and rich. He was also eloquent and mighty in prayer. Mr. Place, with many other Free-will Baptists, early espoused the antislavery cause. Abundant in labors and rich in faith. Father Place, as he came to be called, died March 23, 1863. See Barrett, Mem. of Eminent Preachers, p. 86 sq.

Place (Placeus), Josué de la, a celebrated French Protestant divine, was born in Bretagne about the close of the 16th century: some put the date at 1556, some as late as 1566. His denomination is not perfectly known. The purpose of these organizations in the United States is to bring the state as much as possible under the influence and control of the hierarchy, and the political arena is the field of labor. Already they influence the legislatures, school-boards; yes, we may say they form a state within the state. The clergy commands a great ignorant mass, easily fanaticized, and ready to do anything in majorem Dei gloriam et honorum paupere infal-libilium. The doctrines of the Vatican are promulgated through numerous periodicals, and the utterances made at the annual gatherings of the different organizations are the expression of the most spiritual and emotional of these societies. See Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s. v. Piusvereine; Theolog. Universal-Lexikon, s. v.; Wetzer u. Wolte, Kirchen-Lexikon, s. v.; more especially Kurtz, Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte. (Mittau, 1874), ii, 332 sq. See also Ultramontanism, in its conflict with Germany. (B. P.)
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until 1632, when he was called, with Amyraldus and Capellus, to a professorship of theology at Saumur. He died in 1655. An excellent teacher and a pious Christian, he yet offended greatly, and provoked much strife and controversy by his tendency to Armenian theology in his views on the doctrine of Imputation (q. v.). The theory of original sin, as consisting only in native corruption, was condemned by the French symod of 1645, though Placeus himself was not named. Strictly speaking, his theory was only a modification of Jean Camerons (q. v.), who had succeeded Gomaras (q. v.) at Saumur in 1618. Cameron himself taught, after Piscator, the imputation of Christs passive obedience alone; and advocated the theory of the hypothetic universalism of divine grace, which was more fully developed by Amyrast. "The peculiarity of Amyraldism," says Schweizer, "is in the combination of a real particularism with a merely ideal universalism." Placeus accepted the statement of the symon of 1645, by distinguishing between immediate and mediate imputation, and advocated the mediate, instead of the immediate imputation of Adams sin to his posterity. He was opposed by Anton Garissol (q. v.), professor in Montauban, and defended by Charles Drelicourt (q. v.), pastor at Charenton. His defence, Disputationes academicae, sub praefatio J. Placeri, de imputatione primi pecordi Adami, de argumentis quibus efficier, Christi prius fuisse, quousque in b U. V., was published at Montauban, 1649, and in an enlarged form the year of his death (1655), and since. His works (Opera) were published in collected form at Franco in 1659, and again in 1702. See Schweizer, Centraledomgen, ii, 234 sq., 319; Haag, Hist. des Dogmes; Ebrard, Dogmatik, vol. i, § 43; Müller, On Sin (see Index); Theological Essays from Princeton Review (N. Y., 1846), p. 156 sq.; Cunningham, Reformers, p. 379 sq. Devereux, Theology, ii, 447; Brul and For. Ec. Rev., July, 1860, p. 582; New-Englanders, July, 1868. (J. H. W.)

Placebo, an office in the Church of Rome, so called from its first word, has for its purpose the prayer for souls. It is the antithon (q. v.) at vespers in the office of the dead, as the dirge is at matins. See Procter, Book of Common Prayer; Elliott, Delegation of Romanism.

Placenta, Council of (Concilium Placentinum). Several important ecclesiastical privileges were granted there. The first of importance was convened March 1, 1095, and concluded March 5, by Pope Urban II. Two hundred bishops attended, with nearly 4000 other ecclesiastics and 30,000 laitymen. So innumerable were the claims of persons who flock to it that no church could be found in those parts capable of containing them, therefore the pope was compelled to hold the first and third sessions of this assembly in the open air. The emperor Praxedes in person made complaint against her husband the emperor Henry, who divorced her and treated her infamously. Ambassadors from the emperor of Constantinople were present, who demanded help against the infidels, with the approbation of the pope. Fifteen canons were published, by which the heresy of Berenger was again condemned, and the truth of the real presence of the Lord Jesus of Christ in the holy Eucharist clearly set forth. The sect of the New Nicolausans (who favored incontinence in the clergy) was also condemned. The orders conferred by Guibert, the antipope, and others who had been excommunicated, were declared null. The Ember fasts were also fixed. After this Urban went to France, and to the autumn of the same year held the celebrated Council of Clermont. See Labbé, Conciliorum, x, 500.

Another important council was held after Easter, 1182, by Innocent II, assisted by several bishops of Lombardy. It was forbidden to receive to penitence those who refused to renounce fornication, hatred, and every mortal sin. In this council the antipope Anacletus was excommunicated. See Labbé, Conciliis, x, 988.

Place, Bereghed. See Mazor.

Place (plac erium region, litera parcella seu ex- equator) is the sanction by a reigning prince to the promulgation and execution of an ecclesiastical ordinance. The place is necessitated as soon as ecclesiastical ordinances transgress the purely religious boundaries, and come in conflict with those of the state. As soon as the mutual boundaries had acquired a relative independence, which drew a line of demarcation between both the State and Church, the right of the place was established, and the first traces of it we find in the quarrels of Philip Le Bel of France with Boniface VIII (q. v.), and Louis of Bavaria with John XXII (q. v.). In the 15th century we find this right of assertment fully established in different countries. Thus Louis XI, in 1495, appointed a commission at Amiens to examine all persons coming from Rome whether they had any papal briefs upon them "et nones voire et visiter, pour savoir s'elles sont aucunement contraires ou prejudiciables a nous et a la dite eglise Gallicane. Et que nous trouviers aucunes qui y fussent contraires ou prejudiciables, prenez les et retenez par devers vous, et les porteurs arrezzes et constitues prisonniers, si vous voyez en dire ou en faire et en executer les mentions dictes lettres nous adversisses, ou les nous envoyz a toute diligence, pour y donner la provision necessaire" (comp. Preuves, Les Libertés de l'Eglise Gallicane, ch. x). Martin V (q. v.), in a letter to the archbishops of Portugal, complains, anno 1497, of Portugal: "Hicurur enim nobis, quod statuto regio mandatum est, ne quis audeat sine ipsius regis licentia sub pena mortis et perditionis bonorum in dicta regia litteras apostolicas publicare." When John II, king of Portugal, instigated by Innocent VIII, repealed the Placeo Regiae, in 1513, the pope declared himself resolute, and declared that without the consent of the states such a repeal was void (Augustini Manuelis, Hist. Joan. II). Philip the Good, duke of Burgundy, decreed, Jan. 8, 1447: "Dat nimis et brevissime, oft exsequere eenehe goetheyckle monitien, inhabitien oft anderhebend, op eenige onderszetens des Landits van Brabant, wyt wat seaside dat het zy, by eerst home by onde Officier ende Weothouderen, ende geoe hem klaerlyck te kennen de seeke waeorom, ende verkrykte orlof ende consider. Den gne die dat dede, sal daer een verbarete hebben alle inne gederen, ende te dieien een syn lyf euen wegh te S. Peter ende S. Paula te Roomeen te doen." By 1594 the place was already regarded as a customary right. Doctrine, usage, and legislature, however, developed more fully the cases in which the place should be used, and thus in matters of conscience, according to a royal declaration of March 8, 1772, reissued Feb. 28, 1810, no place was required. In Austria the necessity of the place was emphasized as early as the 16th century. In addition to former ordinances, the decree of Leopold II, dated March 17th, 1778, declared that all bulls, briefs, and constitutions must have the sanction of the reigning prince before they can be promulgated and accepted. This ordinance also refers to all previous papal edicts, without exception, in such a manner that whenever use is made of an ancient bull the sanction is required, and even such bulls as were pronounced shall only be valid as long as new decrees of the state do not affect their validity." According to another decree, dated April 2 and 7, 1784, the place was also required for all instructions, orders, etc., given to preachers and priests, as to what churches should be visited, the duties of priests, and the distribution of the earnings known to them. The Austrian decree of 1791 was also adopted Jan. 30, 1880, for the province of the Upper Rhine. In Bavaria the same principles, which were still adhered to in the edict dated May 26, 1816, were already the same as in the edict dated April 8, 1770, that all ecclesiastical edicts are subject to the place, with the
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exception of summons issued by the ecclesiastical authorities, provided they only refer to the lower clergy, and are the natural issues of ordinances already sanctioned. These claims of the state had always been the subject of protest on the part of the Roman See. The bell "in com" domini" (q. v.) excommunicates all those with whom it resonates without the sanction of the government, appealing to privileges, liberties, and usages, Innocent X., in 1651, protested against it most decidedly: "Quod equidem audiri sine horrore animo non potest." "Never has such a privilege been granted either by a pope or a council, which must needs destroy the papal power. None, however, dare to refer to the privilege of a worldly prince, because it would be nothing else but a foolhardy arrogance to bind and lose the souls, which right the Lord Jesus Christ has granted to none else than to his vicar" (Rosa- vanov, Novum, 1.223). The work Augustinus without the sanction of the government, appealing to privileges, liberties, and usages, Innocent X., in 1651, protested against it most decidedly: "Quod equidem audiri sine horrore animo non potest." "Never has such a privilege been granted either by a pope or a council, which must needs destroy the papal power. None, however, dare to refer to the privilege of a worldly prince, because it would be nothing else but a foolhardy arrogance to bind and lose the souls, which right the Lord Jesus Christ has granted to none else than to his vicar." (Rosa- vanov, Novum, 1.223).

PLACEDUS. See PLACE, JOSÉ DE LA.

Placidus, St., a Christian martyr of the 6th century, was of pious parentage, and was born probably in 515. When only seven years old he was instructed by his father, the Roman patrician Tertullus, to the care of St. Benedict of Nursia. Placidus, thus religiously trained, grew up in the service of the Church, and in 541 became abbot of a newly founded monastery at Messina. In 546 he was killed, with his companions, by pirates. He is commemorated in the Church of Rome July 11. See Wetzeler u. Weite, Kirchen-Lexikon, vol. xii, 3.v.; Alzog: Kirchengesch. ii, 22.

PLAGUE is used in the A. V. as the rendering of five Hebrew words: 1. Deber, "pestilence," which properly means destruction, death (Exod. xiv, 14), and is hence applied to pestilence (as Lev. xxvi, 25; Deut. xxvii, 19; 2 Sam. xxiv, 18; 1 Kings viii, 87), and to a murmur among beasts (as Exod. iii, 9). The Sept. mostly has Σίσαρυς. 2. Maggoph, "pestilence," from the root תֵּ-poq, to "smite; hence a plague as actively considered, a pestilence sent from God (Exod. ix, 14; comp. Num. xiv, 87; xvii, 18; xxxv, 16, etc.). It is also used of slaughter in battle (1 Sam. iv, 17; 2 Sam. xvii, 9). 3. Mekkal, "pestilence," from the root תֵּ-poq, to "smite; properly the act of smiting; hence a bone, a stroke, and so it should be rendered, rather than the root (Lev. xxvi, 21; Num. xi, 33; Deut. xxviii, 59, 61; xxxix, 22; 1 Sam. iv, 8; Jer. xix, 8; xlix, 17; 1, 13). 4. Ne'ga, "pestilence," from תֵּ-poq, to "smite; hence the meaning is like that of the foregoing. But it is often used to mean a spot, mark, cut, upon the skin, from the common effects of a blow. This is its meaning throughout the 13th and 14th chapters of Leviticus, where it is rendered plague in the A. V. 5. Ne'geph, "pestilence," from תֵּ-poq, to "strike, as above; hence a plague, as a divine judgment (Exod. xii, 18, and often). See PLAGUES OF EGYPT. To these should be added the following Greek words, which are usually translated "plague" in the A. V.: μουρίς, properly a scourge or whip (Mark iii, 16; Acts xx, 20; 2 Tim. i, 22), a stroke, a wound, whether of natural or artificial infliction (Rev. iv, 8; xvii, 6; vii, 1, 6, 8; xvii, 9, 21; xviii, 4, 8; xxii, 19; xxi, 18). It is evident that not one of these words can be considered as designating its signification the plague. Whether the disease be mentioned must be judged from the sense of passages, not from the sense of words. The discrimination has already been pretty fully considered under the word PESTILENCE (q. v.).

In the following treatment of the term we use it in its strict medical application. In noticing the places in the Bible which might be supposed to refer to the plague, we must bear in mind that, unless some of its distinctive characteristics are mentioned, it is not safe to infer that this disease is intended. In the narrative of the Ten Plagues, none corresponding to the modern plague. The plague of boils has indeed some resemblance, and it might be urged that as in other cases known scourges were sent (their miraculous nature being shown by their opportune occurrence and their intense character), so in this case a disease of the country, if indeed the plague anciently prevailed in Egypt, might have been employed. Yet the ordinary plague would rather exceed in severity this affliction than the contrary, which seems fatal to this supposition. Those pestilences which were sent as special judgments, and were either supernaturally rapid
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in their effects, or in addition directed against particular culprits, are beyond the reach of human inquiry. But we also read of pestilences which, although sent as judgments, have the characteristics of modern epidemics, not being rapid beyond nature, nor directed against individuals. The remarkable healings in the Leviticus and Deuteronomy, pestilence is spoken of as one of the enduring judgments that were gradually to destroy the disobedient. This passage in Leviticus evidently refers to pestilence in besieged cities: "And I will bring a sword upon you, that shall avenge the quarrel of [my] covenant: and when ye are gathered together in your cities, I will send the pestilence among you; and ye shall be delivered into the hand of the enemy" (xxvi, 25). Famine in a besieged city would occasion pestilence. A special disease may be indicated in the parallel portion of Deuteronomy (xxviii, 21): "The Lord shall make the pestilence cleave unto thee, until he [or 'it'] have consumed thee from off the land whither thou goest to possess it." The word rendered 'pestilence' may, however, have a general signification, and comprise calamities mentioned afterwards, for there follows an enumeration of several other diseases and similar scourges (xxviii, 21, 22). The first disease here mentioned has been supposed to be the plague (Bunsen, Bibleleerk), It is to be remembered that "the botch of Egypt" is afterward spoken of (ver. 27), by which it is probable that ordinary boils are intended, which are especially severe in Egypt in the present day, and that later still "all the diseases of Egypt" are mentioned (ver. 69). It therefore seems unlikely that so grave a disease as the plague, if then known, should not be spoken of in either of these two passages. In neither place does it seem certain that the plague is specified, though in the one, if it were to be in the land, it would fasten upon the population of besieged cities, and in the other, if then known, it would probably be alluded to as a terrishing in his enumeration of notices in the prophets present the same difficulty; for they do not seem to afford sufficiently positive evidence that the plague was known in those times. With the prophets, as in the Pentateuch, we must suppose that the diseases threatened or prophesied as judgments must have been known, or at least called by the names used for those that were known. Two passages might seem to be explicit. In Amos we read, "I have sent among you the pestilence after the manner of Egypt: your young men have I slain with the sword, and have taken your horses out of your bowels, and have caused the voice of your cry to come up into your nostrils" (iv, 10). Here the reference is perhaps to the death of the first-born, for the same phrase, "after the manner of Egypt," is used by Isaiah (x, 24, 26), with a reference to the Exodus, and perhaps to the oppression preceding it; and an allusion to past history seems probable, as a comparison with the overthrow of the cities of the plain immediately follows (Amos iv, 11). The prophet Zechariah also speaks of a plague with which the Egyptians, if refusing to serve God, should be smitten (xiv; 18); but the name and the description which appears to apply to this scourge seem to show that it cannot be the plague (ver. 12). Heze- kiah's disease has been thought to have been the plague, and its fatal nature, as well as the mention of a boil, makes this not improbable. On the other hand, there is no mention of a pestilence among his people at the time, unless we regard the sudden destruction of Sennacherib's army (2 Kings xx, 1-11). Severe epidemics are the common accompaniments of dense crowding in cities and of famine; and we accordingly often find them mentioned in connection (Lev. xxv, 25; Jer. xxv, 8; Mic. vii, 4). But there is no better argument for believing that "pestilence" in these instances means the glandular plague, than the fact of its being at present a prevalent epidemic of the East. It is also remarkable that the Mosaic law, which contains such strict rules for the seclusion of lepers, should have allowed a disease to pass unnoticed, which is above all others the most deadly, and at the same time the most easily checked by sanitary regulations of the same kind. Michaelis endeavors to explain why the law contained no ordinances about the plague by arguing that, on account of the sudden appearance and brief duration of the disease, no permanent enactments could have been efficient in moderating its ravages, but only such preventive measures as varied according to the ever-varying circumstances of the origin and course of its visitations (Moae. Reck, iv, 250). The destruction of Sennacherib's army (2 Kings xix, 35) has also been ascribed to the plague. But—not to insist on the circumstance that this awfully sudden annihilation of 185,000 men is not ascribed to any disease, but to the agency of an angel (since such passages as 2 Sam. xxiv, 15, 16, weaken this objection, and even Josephus understood the cause to be a pestilence, Ant., x, 1, 5)—it is impossible that such a mortality could have been produced, in one night, by a disease which spread itself by contagion, like the Oriental plague; and the same remark applies, though in a less degree, to the three days' pestilence in the reign of David (2 Sam. xxiv, 18). There does not seem, therefore, to be any distinct notice of the plague in the Bible, and it is most probable that this can be accounted for by supposing either that no pestilence of antiquity in the East was as marked in character as the plague, or that the disease then frequently broke out there as an epidemic in crowded cities, instead of following a regular course. See Disease. The disease now called the plague, which has ravaged Egypt and neighboring countries in modern times, is supposed to have prevailed there in former ages. Hetho, the Egyptian historian, speaks of "a very great plague" in the reign of Semenpesis, the seventh king of the first dynasty, B.C. cir. 2275. The difficulty of determining the character of the pestilences of ancient and mediæval times, even when carefully described, has not led us not to conclude that every such mention refers to the plague, especially as the cholera has, since its modern appearance, been almost as severe a scourge to Egypt as the more famous disease, which, indeed, as an epidemic seems there to have been succeeded by it. Moreover, if we admit, as we must, that there have been ancient pestilences very nearly resembling the modern plague, we must still hesitate to pronounce any recorded pestilence to be of this class unless it be described with some distinguishing particulars. The plague in recent times has been known only by its name, and the kingdom of Persia. It has been asserted that Egypt is its cradle, but this does not seem to be corroborated by the later history of the disease. It is there both sporadic and epidemic; in the first form it has appeared almost annually, in the second at rarer intervals. As an epidemic it takes the character of a pestilence, sometimes of the greatest severity. Our subsequent remarks apply to it in this form. It is a much-vexed question whether it is ever endemic: that such is the case is favored by its rareness since sanitary measures have been enforced. Respecting the cause of the plague nothing is known. There cannot be the slightest doubt that it is propagated by absolute contact with, or a very near approach to, the bodies or clothes of persons infected; but we are entirely at a loss to know how it is generated aseparately. Extremes of temperature have a decided effect in putting a stop to it; but Dr. Brenchley has found that in the year 1761 the plague at Aleppo was mild, in 1762 it was severer, and in 1768 it was very fatal; and yet there was no appreciable difference in the respective seasons of these years. In Egypt, the plague comes on in six or seven months after the rains (see Matti, Trs. p. 199; Prosp. Alp., Rev. Alg., ii, 19). In Europe the plague disappeared during the winter. This was remarked in all the epidemics except that from 1668 to 1669, called the Great
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PLAGUE, on account of its long duration: but even in this instance it abated considerably during the winter. It was a common superstition that the plague abated on St. John's day. The plague when most severe usually appears first on the northern coast of Egypt, having perciuosly broken out in Turkey or North Africa west of the Mediterranean, and in the following year with riging risque of the skin, going much farther. Thus Mr. Lane has observed that the great plague of 1835 "was certainly introduced from Turkey" (Modern Egyptians, 5th ed., p. 3, note 1). It was first noticed at Alexandria, ascended to Cairo, and farther in the southern parts of Egypt, a few cases having occurred at Thebes and it afterwards spread over the whole of Egypt, though its ravages were not great in the southern parts" (ibid.). The mortality is often enormous, and Mr. Lane remarks of the plague just mentioned: "It destroyed not less than eighty thousand persons in Cairo, that is, one third of the population, and far more, I believe, than two hundred thousand in all Egypt" (ibid.). When this pestilence visited Egypt, in the summer of 1843, the deaths were not numerous, although, owing to the government's posting a sentry at each street in which it was suspected, the disease, to enforce quarantine, there was much concealment, and the number was not accurately known (Mrs. Poole, Englishwoman in Egypt, ii, 32-35). Although since then Egypt has been free from this scourge, Benghazî (Hespe- rides), in the pastoral of Tripoli, was almost depopulated in 1847-51. The most fatal, and at the same time the most general epidemic, was that which ravaged Asia, Africa, and the whole of Europe in the 14th century. It was called by the northern European nations "the Black Death," and by the Italians "la Mortigella Grande"—the great mortality. According to Dr. Hecker, not less than twenty-million millions perished by it in the short space of three years, from 1347 to 1350. Since the commencement of this century Europe has been free from the plague, with the exception of two or three instances. It occurred at Noja, in the kingdom of Naples, in 1813 and 1816; at the Lazzaretto of Venice in 1818; in Grei- fenberg, in Silesia, in 1819. It has not been seen in Great Britain since the great epidemic of 1665, which is stated to have carried off eight thousand in one week. Quarantine was first performed in one of the islands near Venice in 1495. Persons who had been cured of plague in the Lazzaretto on one of the adjoining islands were sent there, and all those with whom they had had intercourse, where they were detained forty days. This period was probably fixed upon account of some medicine supposed to be used by the Jewish chronicles of the last day of avert diseases, and that which separated them from chronic. Forty days constituted the philosophical month of alchemists. Theological, and even legal derivations have also been given. The forty days were divided into seven weeks, each of which was called a week or week, and was also called the "Saxon term" (Sächsische Frist), which also lasts forty days. Bills of health were probably first established in 1507, by a council of health established at Venice during a fatal plague. They were given in the case of those persons who had not been exposed to the disease, as now generally used until 1665. It is to these great measures that Europe is indebted for its present immunity from this terrible scourge; and it cannot be doubted that but for the colossal indifference of the Orientals (which proceeds from their fatalism, love of gain, and ignorance), the same measures would be adopted in the East with the same success (Hecker's Hist. of the Epidem- icon of the Middle Ages; Dr. Brown, art. Plague, in Cyclop. of Prac. Med.). See Pestilence.

The glandular plague, like the small-pox, is an erup- tive and systemic disease. The symptoms first appear in the glands, especially the regional, and in the disease with which we are acquainted. The eruption consists of buboes, carbuncles, and pustules. Buboes are inflamed and swollen glands; and the glands so affected are generally those of the groin, axilla, neck, and the paraolivary. More frequently there are two, three, or even four such tumors. They sometimes subsist of themselves; or, what is more common the case, they suppurate: and as this process seldom commences before the disease has taken a favorable turn, it is regarded as the cause, but more correctly as a sign, of approaching recovery. A carbuncle is an inflamma- tion of a gland or glandular system, often in the neighborhood of the skin, giving rise to pus-tules or vesicles upon it. It resembles a common boil, but differs from it in this important respect. The car- buncle becomes gangrenous throughout its whole exten- so, that when the eschar separates a large deep ulcer is left. Under the term pesteichum are included evanescence spots of various colors, often varying from pale blue to a deep purple, which give a marbled appearance to the skin. When such livid streaks occur in the face, they disfigure the countenance so much that a patient can hardly be recognised by his friends. The disease varies so considerably in its symptoms and course that it is impossible to give one description that will suit even the majority of cases. Sometimes the eruption does not appear at all, and even the general symptoms are not of such violence as to lead an ignorant person to suspect danger. The patient is suddenly attacked with a loss of strength, accentuated perspiration, weight in the head, oppression at the heart, and extreme dejection of spirits. Such cases sometimes terminate fatally within twenty-four hours, and occasionally on the second or third day. Generally, however, the disease is more prolonged, and which is soon followed by fever, giddiness, pain in the head, occasionally also by vomiting. Buboes and car- buncles in most cases make their appearance on the first day; and successive eruptions of them are not unusually observed during the course of the disease. There is a peculiar and characteristic muttering of the eye, which has been described by Dr. Russell as a muddiness and lustre strangely blended together. The fever remits every morning, and increases during the day and night. The vomiting then increases; the tumors become pain- ful; and the patient wanders, and is inclined to stupor. On the morning of the third day, in favorable cases, a sweat breaks out, which produces great relief, and sometimes even proves critical. The exacerbation on the fourth day is more severe than on the preceding ones, and continues intense until it is terminated by the sweat on the morning of the fifth day, which leaves the pa- tient weak, but in every respect relieved. After this the exacerbations become slighter and slighter; and the bu- boes, advancing favorably to suppuration, little or no fever remains after the beginning of the second week. In other cases, again, symptoms of the most alarming nature are met with, sometimes low and fluttering, external heat moderately feverish, or occasionally intense in irregular flushings. There is pain at the heart, burning pain at the pit of the stom- ach, and incessant restlessness. When to these symp- toms are joined faltering of the tongue or loss of speech, and the surface of the body becomes covered over with clammy sweats, death is inevitable, although it may still be at some distance. When the patient has been much weakened by the vomiting, diarrhoea, or hemorrhage, the third day proves fatal; but more com- monly the disease terminates on the second or third day, and sometimes later; but whether they advance towards suppuration or not, they seem to have no effect in hastening or retarding the termination of the disease. Lastly, in some cases, the eruption of bu-
boes and carbuncles constitute the principal symptoms of the disease; and patients are so little indisposed that they are able to go about the streets, or attend to their usual avocations, if not prevented by the inflammation of inguinal tumors. The disease has never been successfully treated, except in isolated cases, and when the epidemic has seemed to have worn itself out. Deplorably and stimulants have been tried, as with cholera, and stimulants with far better results.

See Lüdecke, Brachæid. des türk. Reichs, p. 63 sq.; Ohlert, Voyage, vol. i, p. 18; Bocconi, Ratiens nach Orient, p. 558 sq.; Descrit. de l'Egype, xiii, 81 sq.; Bullard de Mern, La Peste Orient. (Paris, 1889); L'Aubert, De la Peste, ou Typphus (Ibid. 1840); Russell, Nat. Hist. of Aleppo; Colt-Bey, De la Peste en Egypte (1840), and Aperçu général sur l'Egype, ii, 549-550. See Medicine.

Plagues of Egypt (for the use of the Hebrew word, see Plague), the term usually applied to the series of divine visitations of wrath with which Jehovah punished the Egyptians, and especially their king, for their refusal to let Israel go. In considering the history of the Ten Plagues we have to notice the place where they occurred and the occasion on which they were sent, and to examine the narrative of each judgment, with a view to ascertain what it was and in what manner the Egyptians were punished by it, as well as to see if we can trace any general connection between the several judgments; and we shall thus be prepared to estimate their providential character, as well as to determine how far they were miraculous events, and how far natural or simulated. In this discussion we make use of the natural information which that derived from modern investigations. See Egypt; Moses.

1. The History of the Occurrences. - 1. The Place.

Although it is distinctly stated that the plagues prevailed in all Egypt, save, in the case of some, the Israelitish territory, the land of Goshen, yet the descriptions seem principally to apply to that part of Egypt which lay nearest to Goshen, and more especially to "the field of Zoan," or the tract about that city, since it seems almost certain that Pharaoh dwelt in the Delta, and that territory is especially indicated in Ex. lxxviii, 48. That the capital at this time was not more distant is evident from the time in which a message could be sent from Pharaoh to Moses on the occasion of the Exodus. The descriptions of the first and second plagues seem to refer to a land and to plains in streams and lakes, and so rather to the Lower than to the Upper Egypt. We must therefore look especially to Lower Egypt for our illustrations, while bearing in mind the evident prevalence of the plagues throughout the land.

2. The Occasion. - When that Pharaoh who seems to have been the first oppressor was dead, God sent Moses to deliver Israel, commanding him to gather the elders of his people together, and to tell them his commission. It is added, "And they shall hearken to thy voice: and thou shalt come, thou and the elders of Israel, unto the king of Egypt, and ye shall say unto him, The Lord, that great God of the Hebrews hath met with us: and now let us go, we beseech thee, three days' journey into the wilderness, that we may sacrifice to the Lord our God. And I am sure that the king of Egypt will not let you go, no, not by a mighty hand. And I will stretch out my hand and smite Egypt with all my wonders which I will do in the midst thereof: and after that he will let you go" (Exod. iii, 18-20). From what follows, that the Israelites should bow jewels and raiment, and "let not your garments be rent" (v. 22), it seems evident that they were to leave as if only for the purpose of sacrificing; but it will be seen that if they did so, Pharaoh, by his armed pursuit and overtaking them when they had encamped at the close of the third day's journey, released Moses from his engagement.

When Moses went to Pharaoh, Aaron went with him, because Moses, not judging himself to be eloquent, was difflent of speaking to Pharaoh. "And Moses said before the Lord, Behold, I am [am] of uncircumcised lips, and how shall Pharaoh hearken unto me? And the Lord said unto Moses, See, I have made thee a god to Pharaoh: and Aaron thy brother shall be the prophet." (Exod. iv, 10-16). Moses seems herefore to understand that even when Moses speaks it is rather by Aaron than himself. It is perhaps worthy of note that in the tradition of the Exodus which Manetoth gives, the calamities preceding the event are said to have been caused by the king's consulting an Egyptian prophet; for this suggests a course which Pharaoh is likely to have adopted, rendering it probable that the magicians were sent for as the priests of the gods of the country, so that Moses was exalted by contrast with these vain objects of worship.

It has been asked, What period of time was occupied in the infliction of these successive plagues? In answer to this, some contend for a year; but they have no better reason for this than that it enables them to compare the plagues with certain natural phenomena occurring at fixed seasons of the year in Egypt. This has been done with considerable ingenuity, though not without some rather violent straining in particular cases; but without some better reason than this we should not feel justified in accepting a hypothesis which involves the general statements of the narrative. Each plague, according to the historian, lasted only for a short time; and unless we suppose an interval of several weeks between each, a few months or even weeks would afford sufficient time for the happening of the whole. We may now examine the narrative of each plague.

3. The Plagues themselves. - We here notice first a preliminary phenomenon of the same general character with the "plagues." When Moses and Aaron came before Pharaoh a miracle was required of them. Then Aaron's rod became a "serpent" (A.V.), or rather "a serpent (779). Its being changed into an animal reverenced by all the Egyptians, or by some of them, would have been an especial warning to Pharaoh. The Egyptian magicians called by the king produced what seemed to be the same wonder, yet Aaron's rod swallowed up the others (vii, 3-12). This passage, taken alone, would appear to indicate that the magicians succeeded in working wonders, but if it is compared with those others relating their opposition on the occasions of the second and third plagues, the general tone of the narrative seems more reasonable. In this case the expression "they also did in like manner with their enchantments" (ver. 11) is used, and it is repeated in the cases of their seeming success on the occasions of the first and third plagues (ver. 22) and the second (vii, 7), as well as when they failed on the occasion of the third plague (ver. 18). A comparison with other passages strengthens us in the inference that the magicians succeeded merely by juggling. Yet, even if they were able to produce any real effects by magic, a broad distinction should be drawn between the general and powerful miracles wrought by the hand of Moses and Aaron and their partial and weak imitations. See Magic.

(1.) The "Plague" of Blood. - When Pharaoh had refused to let the Israelites go, Moses was sent again, and, on the second refusal, was commanded to smite upon the waters of the river, and to turn them all into blood. The miracle was to be wrought when Pharaoh went forth in the morning to the river. Its general character is very remarkable, for not only was the water in the river, Nisibim, but all the water, even that in vessels, throughout the land of Egypt. The fish died, and the river stank. The Egyptians could not drink of it, and digged around it for water. This plague appears to have lasted seven days, for the account of it ends, "And seven days were fulfilled, after that Pharaoh smote the river. Then the river returned into its channel" (vii, 22). The nature of the plague immediately fol-
low, as if the other had then ceased. Some difficulty has been occasioned by the mention that the Egyptians dug for water, but it is not stated that they so gained what they sought, although it may be conjured that only the water that was seen was smitten, in order that the nation should not be able to quench their thirst. It appears that the water, when filtered through the soil of the banks, regained its salubrity. This plague was doubly humiliating to the religion of the country, as the Nile was held sacred, as well as some kinds of its fish, not to speak of the crocodiles, which probably were destroyed. It may have been a marked reproof for the cruel edict that the Israelitish children should be drowned, and could scarcely have failed to strike guilty consciences as such, though Pharaoh does not seem to have been alarmed by it. He saw what was probably an imitation brought by the magicians, who accompanied him, as if he were engaged in some sacred rites, perhaps connected with the worship of the Nile. Events having some resemblance to this are mentioned by ancient writers; the most remarkable is related by Manetho, according to whom it was said that, in the reign of Nephrecheres, seventh king of the second dynasty, the Nile flowed mixed with honey for eleven days. Some of the historical notices of the earliest dynasties seem to be of very doubtful authenticity, and Manetho seems to treat this one as a fable, or perhaps as a tradition. Nephrecheres, it must be remarked, reigned a hundred years before the Exodus. Those who have endeavored to explain this plague by natural causes have referred to the changes of color to which the Nile is subject, the appearance of the Red sea, and the so-called rain and dew of the Middle Ages; the last two occasions by small fungi of very rapid growth. But such theories do not explain why the wonder happened at a time of year when the Nile is most clear, nor why it killed the fish and made the water unfit to be drunk. These are the silly weighty points, rather than the change into blood, which is the main point into the semblance of blood. The employment of natural means in effecting a miracle is equally seen in the passage of the Red sea; but the divine power is proved by the intensifying or extending that means, and the opportune occurrence of the result, and its fitness for a great moral purpose. See Nile.

(2.) The “Plague” of Frogs.—When seven days had passed after the smiting of the river, Pharaoh was threatened with another judgment; and, on his refusing to let the Israelites go, the second plague was sent. The river and all the open waters were covered with countless frogs, which not only covered the land, but filled the houses, even in their driest parts and vessels, for the ovens and kneading-troughs were spotted. The magicians again had a seeming success in their opposition; yet Pharaoh, whose very palaces were filled by the reptiles, entreated Moses to pray that they might be removed, promising to let the Israelites go; but, on the removal of the plague, again hardened his heart (Exod. vi, 1-15). This must have been an especially trying one to the Egyptians, as frogs were included among the sacred animals, probably not among those which were revered throughout Egypt, like the cat, but in the second class of local objects of worship, like the crocodile. The frog was sacred to the goddess Heket, who is represented with the head of this reptile. In hieroglyphics the frog signifies “very many,” “millions,” doubtless from its abundance. In the present day frogs abound in Egypt, and in the summer and autumn their loud and incessant croaking in all the waters of the country gives some idea of this place. They are useful for fishing; nor is there any record, excepting the Biblical one, of their having been injurious to the inhabitants. It must be added that the supposed cases of the same kind elsewhere, quoted from ancient authors, are of very doubtful authenticity. The species of reptile which was made the instrument of this infliction was probably

the small frog of Egypt called by the natives dòbó, the Rana Moschi of Sextus (Reisen, ii, 245, 256 sq.). See Frogs.

(3.) The “Plague” of Lice.—The account of the third plague is not preceded by the mention of any warning to Pharaoh. We read that Aaron was commanded to stretch out his rod and smite the dust of the earth; a name, as the A. V. reads the word, “lice” in man and beast. The magicians again attempted opposition; but, failing, confessed that the wonder was of God (v. 16-19). There is much difficulty as to the animals meant by the term dòbó. The Masoretic punctuation in ver. 18, 14 is as dòbó, which would probably make it a collective noun with dòbò formatives; but the pointing of dòbò (ver. 19) and the more decided plural form dòbò also occur (ver. 18, 14; Ps. cv, 31), of which we once find the singular dòbò in Isaiah (li, 6). It is therefore reasonable to conjecture that the first form should be punctuated dòbò, as the defective writing of dòbò; and it should also be observed that the Samaritan has dòbò. The Sept. has avóripea, and the Vulg. scirphea, mosquitoes, mentioned by Herodotus (ii, 95) and Philo (De Vita Moses, i, 20, p. 97, ed. Mang.) as troublesome in Egypt. Josephus, however, makes the dòbò lice (Ant. ii, 14, 8), with which Bochart agrees (Herod. ii, 572 sq.). The exact form is doubtful, and perhaps the word is Egyptian. The narrative does not enable us to know whether it was the more probable of the two renderings, except, indeed, that if it be meant that exactly the same kind of animal attacked man and beast, mosquitoes would be the more likely translation. In this case the plague does not seem to be expressly directed against the pests of the Egyptians; if, however, it were of lice, it would have been most distressing to their priests, who were very cleanly, apparently, like the Moslems, a religious duty. In the present day both mosquitoes and lice are abundant in Egypt: the latter may be avoided, but there is no escape from the former, which are so distressing an annoyance that an increase of them would render life almost insupportable to beasts as well as men. It is therefore probable that some species of gnat or mosquito is meant. See Lice.

(4.) The “Plague” of Flies.—In the case of the fourth plague, as in that of the first, Moses was commanded to meet Pharaoh in the morning as he came forth to the water, and to threaten him with a judgment if he still refused to give the Israelites leave to go and worship. He was to be punished by dòbò, arbó, which the A. V. renders “swarms of flies,” “a swarm of flies,” or, in the margin, “an abomination”; in these passages, the creatures were to cover the people, and fill both the houses and the ground. Here, for the first time, we read that the land of Goshen, where the Israelites dwelt, was to be exempt from the plague. So terrible was it that Pharaoh granted permission for the Israelites to sacrifice in the land, which Moses refused to do, as the Egyptians would stone his people for sacrificing their “abomination.” Then Pharaoh gave them leave to sacrifice in the wilderness, provided they did not go far: but on the plague being removed broke his agreement (viii, 20-23). The proper meaning of dòbò is a question of extreme difficulty. The explanation of Josephus (Ant. ii, 14, 3), and almost all the Hebrew commentators, is that it means “a mixture,” and here designates a mixture of wild animals, in accordance with the derivation from the root dòbò, “he mixed.” Similarly, Jerome renders it omne genus mammalium, and Aquila οἰκίη ψεύδων. The Sept., however, and Philo (De Vita Moses, i, 28; ii, 10, 11, ed. Mang.) suppose it to be a dog-fly, κυνώγας. The second of these explanations seems to be a compromise between the first and the third. It is almost certain, from two passages (Exod. viii, 29, 81; Hebrew, 25, 27), that a single creature is intended. If so, what reason is there in favor of the
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Sept. rendering? Oedmann (Verm. Sammelungen, ii, 150, ap. Gesen. Theolur. s. v.) proposes the blatta orientalis, a kind of beetle, instead of a dog-fly; but Gesenius objects that this creature devours things rather than stings men, whereas it is evident that the animal of this plague attacked or at least annoyed men, besides apparently injuring the land, where we read, "He sent the ʾāḇānīāh, which devoured them," must have been a creature of devouring habits, as is observed by Kalisch (Comment. on Exod. p. 188), who supports the theory that a beetle is intended. The Egyptian language might be hoped to give us a clue to the rendering of the Sept. and Philo. In hieroglyphics a fly is ʿaf, and a bee šehō, or šeb, šk and šk being interchangeable in different dialects; and in Coptic these two words are confounded in ʿafš, ʿafš, ʿahf, meaning ʿumān, ʿāpās, scarabaeus. We can therefore only judge from the description of the plague; and here Gesenius seems to have too hastily decided against the rendering "beetle," since the beetle sometimes attacks men. Yet modern experience does not bear out the idea that any kind of beetle is injurious to man in Egypt; but there is a kind of gadfly found in that country which sometimes stings men, though usually attacking beasts. The difficulty, however, in the way of the supposition that a stinging insect is meant is that all such flies are, like this one, plagues to beasts rather than men; and if we conjecture that a fly is intended, perhaps it is more reasonable to infer that it was the common fly, which in the present day is probably the most troublesome insect in Egypt. That this was a more severe plague than those preceding it appears from its effect on Pharaoh, rather than from the mention of the exception of the Israelites, for it can scarcely be supposed that the earlier plagues affected them. As we do not know what creature is here intended, we cannot tell where to look for any reference in this case in the Egyptian religion. Those who suppose it to have been a beetle might draw attention to the great reverence in which that insect was held among the sacred animals, and the consequent distress that the Egyptians would have felt at destroying it, even if they did so unintentionally. As already noticed, no insect is now so troublesome in Egypt as the common fly, and this is not the case with any kind of beetle, which fact, from our general conclusions, will be seen to favor the evidence for the former. In the hot season the flies not only attack the food and drink, but they torment the people by settling on their faces, and especially round their eyes, thus promoting ophthalmia. See FLY.

(5.) The "Plague of the Murrain of Beasts."—Pharaoh was next warned that, if he did not let the people go, he should see on the day following "a very grievous murrain," upon the horses, asses, camels, oxen, and sheep of Egypt, whereas those of the children of Israel should not die. This came to pass, and we read that "all the cattle of Egypt died: but of the cattle of the children of Israel died not one." Yet Pharaoh still continued obstinate (Exod. i. 17). It is to be observed that the expression "all the cattle" cannot be understood to be universal, but only general, for the narrative of the plague of hail shows that there were still at a later time some cattle left, and that the want of universal terms in Hebrew explains this seeming difficulty. The mention of camels is important, since it appears to favor our opinion that the Pharaoh of the Exodus was a foreigner, camels apparently not having been kept by the Egyptians of the time of the Pharaohs. This plague would have been a heavy punishment to the Egyptians, since it would have been upon their sacred animals of two of the kinds specified, the oxen and the sheep; but it would have been most felt in the destruction of the greatest part of their useful beasts. In modern times murrain is not an infrequent visitation in Egypt, and is supposed to be produced by the plague of sand flies, which are said to be the plague. The most severe murrain occurred in that country in 1842, which lasted nine months, during the latter half of that year and the spring of the following one, and was succeeded by the plague, as had been anticipated (Mrs. Poole, Englishwoman in Egypt, ii, 32; 1, 53, 114). "A very grievous murrain," forcibly reminding us of that which visited this same land in the days of Moses, is reported during the last three months"—the letter is dated Oct. 18, 1842—"and the already distressed peasants feel the calamity severely, or rather (I should say) the few who possess cattle. Among the rich men of the country the loss has been enormous. During our voyage up the Nile," in the July preceding, "we observed several dead cows and buffaloes lying in the river, as I mentioned in a former letter; and some friends who followed us, two months after, saw many on the banks; indeed up to this time great numbers of cattle are dying in every part of the country" (ibid. i, 114, 115). The similarity of the calamity in character is remarkably in contrast with its difference in duration: the miraculous murrain seems to have been as sudden and nearly as brief as the destruction of the first-born (though far less terrible), and to have therefore produced, on ceasing, less effect than other plagues upon Pharaoh, nothing remaining to be removed. See MURRAIN.

(6.) The "Plague of Boils."—The next judgment appears to have been preceded by no warning, except, indeed, the threatened destruction of the first-born. Yet, in Egypt, Pharaoh might no doubt have repented at the last moment. We read that Moses and Aaron were to take ashes of the furnace, and Moses was to "sprinkle it toward the heavens in the sight of Pharaoh." It was to become "small dust" throughout Egypt, and "be a boil breaking forth with blains upon man and upon beast." This accordingly came to pass. The magicians now once more seem to have attempted opposition, for it is related that they "could not stand before Moses because of the boil; for the boil was upon the magicians, and upon all the Egyptians." Pharaoh again became new, and the magicians were no longer able to withstand the murrain. Pharaoh still refused to let the Israelites go (Exod. xii. 8-12). This plague may be supposed to have been either an infliction of boils, or a pestilence like the plague of modern times, which is an extremely severe kind of typhus fever, accompanied by swellings. See PLAGUE. The former is, however, the more likely explanation, since, if the plague had been of the latter nature, it probably would have been less severe than the ordinary pestilence of Egypt has been in this 19th century, whereas with other plagues which can be illustrated, they torment the people by settling on their faces, and especially round their eyes, thus promoting ophthalmia. See FLY. The former is, however, the more likely explanation, since, if the plague had been of the latter nature, it probably would have been less severe than the ordinary pestilence of Egypt has been in this 19th century, whereas with other plagues which can be illustrated, they torment the people by settling on their faces, and especially round their eyes, thus promoting ophthalmia. See FLY.
tending to produce a permanent state of foul and wasting disease. One species of it which seized upon the legs and knees, and was regarded as incurable, was peculiar to Egypt, and was hence called "the botch of Egypt" (Deut. xxviii, 27, 35). In the case before us, this eruption had a tendency to break out into larger swellings (γήφυτος, from unused γήφω, to boil up, to swell), and became probably the disease called elephantiasis, a disease said to be peculiar to Egypt, or the black leprosy, a disease which also was known under the name of melamidia (Jahn, Arch. l. c. 181 sq.). It was something evidentially more severe and deadly than the endemic Nile-fever, or eruption which visits Egypt periodically about the time of the overflowing of the Nile, and with which some writers would identify it.

(7.) The "Plague" of Hail.—The account of the seventh plague is preceded by a warning, which Moses was commanded to deliver to Pharaoh, respecting the terrible nature of the plagues that were to ensue if he remained obstinate. First of all of the hail it is said, God has sent it here to us all the time I will cause it to rain a very grievous hail, such as hath not been in Egypt since the foundation thereof even until now. He was then told to collect his cattle and men into shelter, for everything hailed upon should die. Accordingly, such of Pharaoh's servants as "feared the Lord," and "stood before the people," did so. But the rest of the land, which was not called by Pharaoh, acknowledged his wickedness and that of his people, and the righteousness of God, and promised if the plague were withdrawn to let the Israelites go. Then Moses went forth from the city, and spread out his hands, and the plague ceased, when Pharaoh, supported by his servants, again broke his promise (Exod. ix, 34-35). The character of this and the following plagues must be carefully examined, as the warning seems to indicate an important turning-point. The ruin caused by the hail was evidently far greater than that effected by any of the earlier plagues; it destroyed men, which those others seem not to have done, and not only men, but beasts and the produce of the earth. In this case Moses, while addressing Pharaoh, openly warns his servants how to save something from the calamity. Pharaoh for the first time acknowledges his wickedness. We may imagine that in this event they were gathered together in great numbers, and that at this time he dwelt in a city. Hail is now extremely rare, but not unknown, in Egypt, and it is interesting that the narrative seems to imply that it sometimes falls there. Thunder-storms occur but, though very loud and accompanied by rain and wind, they rarely do serious injury. Those long residents in Egypt do not remember to have heard while there of a person struck by lightning, nor of any ruin excepting that of decayed buildings washed down by rains. On this account, this plague was specially terrible.

(8.) The "Plague" of Locusts.—Pharaoh was now threatened with a plague of locusts, to begin the next day, by which everything the hail had left was to be devoured. This was to exceed any like visitations that had happened in the time of the king's ancestors. At last Pharaoh's own servants, who had before supported him, remonstrated, for we read, "And Pharaoh's servants said unto him, How long shall this man be a snare unto us? let the men go, that they may serve the Lord their God: knowest thou not that Egypt is destitute?" They suggested a compromise with Moses, proposing that the men should be allowed to go with him to offer sacrifice to Jehovah in the wilderness, while retaining the females they made sure of the men's returning to their servitude. Then Pharaoh sent for Moses and Aaron, and offered to let the people go, but refused when they required that all should go, even with their flocks and herds. "And Moses stretched forth his rod over the land of Egypt, and the Lord brought an east wind upon the land all that day, and all [that] night; and when it was morning the east wind brought the locusts. And the locusts went up over all the land of Egypt, and rested in the borders of Egypt: very grievous were they; before them there were no such locusts as they, neither after them shall be such. For they covered the face of the whole earth, so that the land was darkened; and they did eat every herb of the land, and all that was grown in the trees which the hail had left: and there remained not any green thing in the trees, or in the herbs of the field, through all the land of Egypt." Then Pharaoh hastily sent for Moses and Aaron, and confessed his sin against God and the Israelites, and begged them to forgive him; "Now, therefore, forgive, I pray thee, my sin only this once, and entreat the Lord your God that he may take away from me this death only." Moses accordingly prayed. "And the Lord turned a mighty strong west wind, which took away the locusts, and cast them into the Red Sea; and the wind blew upon the sea, and the sea was dried up unto the very great part of it. And Egypt was overcometh from before the children of Israel. And the children of Israel went about the wilderness to the Red Sea, and the children of Israel came forth into the wilderness of Zin unto Kadesh. And there was no water for the congregation to drink: so they gathered together against Moses and against Aaron, saying, Give us water, that we may drink. And Moses and Aaron said unto them, Why thus? gather you water from the rock, and give us drink." The plague being removed, Pharaoh again would not let the people go (Ex. i, 20). This plague has not the unusual nature of the one that preceded it, but it even exceeds it in severity, and so occupies its place in the gradation of the more terrible judgments that form the later part of the series. It was then that the words from the book of Deuteronomy were fulfilled, which were spoken by Moses and stood by those who have been in Egypt in a part of the country where a flight of locusts has alighted. In this case the plague was greater than an ordinary visitation, since it extended over a far wider space, rather than that it was more intense because it was more extensive. They imagine any more complete destruction than that always caused by a swarm of locusts. So well did the people of Egypt know what these creatures effected, that when their coming was threatened Pharaoh's servants at once remonstrated. In the present day locusts suddenly appear in the cultivated land, coming from the desert in a column of great length. They fly rapidly across the country, darkening the air with their compact ranks, which are undisturbed by the constant attacks of kites, crows, and vultures, and making a strange whizzing sound like that of fire, or many distant wheels. Where they alight they devour every green thing, even stripping the trees of their leaves. Rewards are offered for their destruction, but no labor can seriously reduce their numbers. Soon they continue their course, and disappear gradually in a short time, leaving the place where they have been as empty of vegetation as if no vegetation had existed. The devastation of the effects of a flight of locusts is from Mr. Lane's manuscript notes. He writes of Nubia: "Locusts not infrequently commit dreadful havoc in this country. In my second voyage up the Nile, when before the village of Bistar, a little above Khartum, many locusts pitched upon the boat. They were beautifully variegated, yellow and blue. In the following night a south-westerly wind brought other locusts in immense swarms. Next morning the air was darkened by them, as by a heavy fall of snow; and the surface of the ground was thickly scattered over by those which had fallen and were unable to rise again. The ships were anchored upon, and within the boat, and alighted upon our persons. They were different from those of the preceding day, being of a bright yellow color, with two marks on the backs which made them dreadful. In four hours a field of young durrah [millers] was cropped to the ground. In another field of durrah more advanced only the tops were left. Nowhere was there space on the ground to set the foot without treading on many. A field of cotton-plants was quite stripped. Even the branches along the banks were made bare, and palm-trees were stripped of the fruit and leaves. Last night, we heard the crackling of the locusts (water-wheels), and the sighing of women driving the cows which turned them: to-day not one skylark was in motion, and the women were hurrying a little to avoid fainting, vainly attempting to frighten away the locusts. On the preceding day I saw, among the most beautiful kind of these creatures with a solution of thyme: on the next day some of the other locusts ate them almost entirely, pellucid and as if they were in a museum by reason that they had nearly finished their meal. On the third day they were less numerous, and gradually disappeared. Locusts are
eaten by most of the Bedawin of Arabia, and by some of the Nabataeans. We ate a few, dressed in the most approved manner, baked, and fried them in butter. They had a flavor somewhat like that of the honeycomb and the mead tree, and they were preserved for them as a common article of provision by parboiling them in salt and water, and then drying them in the sun.

The parallel passages in the prophecy of Joel form a remarkable commentary on the description of the plague in Exodus, and a few must be here quoted, for they describe with wonderful exactness and vigor the devastations of a swarm of locusts: "Blow ye the trumpet in Zion, and sound an alarm in my holy mountain: let all the inhabitants of the land tremble: for the day of the Lord is coming as destruction from the Almighty; a day of darkness and of gloominess, of the shadow of death upon the mountains: a great people and a strong; there hath not been ever the like, neither shall be any more after it, (even) to the years of many generations. A fire devoureth before them, and behind them a flame burneth: the land is as the garden of Eden before them, and behind them a desolate wilderness; yea, and nothing shall escape them. The appearance of them is as the appearance of horses; and as horsesmen, so shall they run. Like the noise of chariots, and as the noise of horses, is the noise of their wheels: a quick rush of med upon mountains, and they leap, like the noise of a flame of fire that devoureth the stubble, as a strong people set in battle array. . . . They shall run like mighty men; they shall climb the wall like men of war; and they shall march every one on his ways, and shall break the rest in pieces." The earth trembles before them; the heavens shall totter: "the sun and the moon shall be dark, and the stars shall withdraw their shining." It is a day which will be remembered with fear for years to come.

(9.) The "Plague of Darkness." After the plague of locusts we read at once of a fresh judgment: "And the Lord said unto Moses, Stretch out thine hand toward heaven, that there may be darkness over the land of Egypt, that [one] may feel darkness. And Moses stretched forth his hand toward heaven; and there was a thick darkness in all the land of Egypt three days: they saw not one another, neither rose any from his place for three days: but all the children of Israel had light in their dwellings." Pharaoh then gave the Israelites leave to go if only they left their cattle; but when Moses required that they should take these also, he again refused (Exod. xii. 21-29). The expression we have here has "not been its season." "Darkness" is caused by a cloud in the atmosphere. It is a term of Coptic, not of Hebrew, origin, and the cloud is thinly transparent, and in its southern limit it can be seen in the sky. The Israelites were thus protected from the destructive power of the plague as it spread over the land. They were not in the midst of darkness, but they were in the shadow of God's protection.

Pharaoh then gave Israel the permission to go if only they left their cattle; but when Moses required that they should take these also, he refused (Exod. xii. 21-29). The expression we have here has "not been its season." "Darkness" is caused by a cloud in the atmosphere. It is a term of Coptic, not of Hebrew, origin, and the cloud is thinly transparent, and in its southern limit it can be seen in the sky. The Israelites were thus protected from the destructive power of the plague as it spread over the land. They were not in the midst of darkness, but they were in the shadow of God's protection.

(10.) The Death of the First-born. Before the tenth plague Moses went to warn Pharaoh: "And Moses said, 'Thus saith the Lord, About midnight shall all the first-born in Egypt die, both the first-born of man and beast; and there shall be a great cry throughout all the land of Egypt, such as there was none like it, nor shall be like it any more." Pharaoh was then told that the first-born of the Israelites would die. The word "first-born" is used in the sense of "the eldest" or "the oldest," and it is applied to both human and animal beings. The word "first-born" is used in the sense of "the eldest" or "the oldest," and it is applied to both human and animal beings. The word "first-born" is applied to both human and animal beings. The word "first-born" is applied to both human and animal beings. The word "first-born" is applied to both human and animal beings. The word "first-born" is applied to both human and animal beings. The word "first-born" is applied to both human and animal beings. The word "first-born" is applied to both human and animal beings. The word "first-born" is applied to both human and animal beings.
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puts it wholly beyond comparison with any natural pseu-
dience, even the severest recorded in history, whether of
the peculiar Egyptian plague, or other like epidemics.
The Bible affords a parallel in the smiting of Semnach-
eter's army, and still more closely in some of the pun-
ishing acts of God upon Egypt, but in each being some-
what like the great smiting of Egypt. It is well known
that many ancient Egyptian customs are yet observed.
Among these one of the most prominent is the wailing
for the dead by the women of the household, as well as
those hired to mourn. It was thus in the great cholera
of 1848 at Cairo. This pestilence, as we all know, fre-
quently follows the course of rivers. Thus, on that oc-
casion, it ascended the Nile, and showed itself in great
strength at Buliâk, the port of Cairo, distant from the
city about a mile and a half to the westward. For some
days it did not traverse this space. Every evening at
sunset it is the custom to go up to the terrace on the
roof of the house. There, in that calm, still time, might
be heard each night the wail of the women of Buliâk
for their dead borne along in a great wave of sound a
distance of two miles, the lamentation of a city stricken
with pestilence. So, when the first-born were smitten,
"there was a great cry in Egypt." See Exod. 12

The history of the ten plagues strictly ends with the
defeat of the first-born. The pursuing of the passa-
gers of the Red Sea through the waters of the Red Sea
PASSAGE or. Here it is only necessary to notice that
with the event last mentioned the recital of the won-
ders wrought in Egypt concludes, and the history of
Israel as a separate people begins. See Exod. 12

1. Miraculous Nature of the Infestions.—In the
shore account we have constantly kept in view the argu-
ment that the whole of the phenomena were not
miraculous, and, while fully admitting all the illustra-
tion that the physical history of Egypt has afforded us,
both in our own observation and the observation of
others, we have found no reason for the naturalistic
view in a single instance, while in many instances the
illustrations from known phenomena have been so dif-
ferent as to bring out the miraculous element in the
narrative with the greatest force, and in every case that
element has been necessary, unless the narrative be de-
prived of its rights as historical evidence. Yet more,
we have found that the theological and metaphysic ex-
planation have been forced by their bias into a distor-
tion and exaggeration of natural phenomena in their
endeavor to find in them an explanation of the wonders
recorded in the Bible. As miraculous the historian ob-
viously intends us to regard them, and this is clearly
borne of the "wonders" (םָרֶכְכָּרֶכְפָּקֵק) which
God wrought in the land of Ham (Psa. 105, 27), as his
miracles (םָרֶכְכָּרֶכְפָּקֵק) in Egypt (erv. 7), as his signs
and prodigies (םָרֶכְכָּרֶכְפָּקֵק) which he sent into the
midst of Egypt (xviii. 9), etc. It is only under this
aspect that we can accept the narrative as historical.
It is true that many of them appear to have been of
the same kind with phenomena natural to the country;
but this cannot be said of all of them; and in the case of
those of which it can be said, the presence of the super-
natural is seen not only in the unparalleled degree to
which the infliction reached, but still more in the com-
plete command which was exercised by Moses as the
agent of Jehovah over the coming and going of the
veneration. The exemption of the Egyptians, whether from
the general calamity is also clearly assigned to the mirac-
ulous. The only alternative, therefore, allowed to us is
to reject the whole narrative as mythic, or to accept it
as miraculous. The attempts made by Eichhorn and
the older rationalists to give natural explanations of
these plagues, only exhibit the deplorable expedients
to which an unsound hypothesis may compel able men
to resort. They were evidently nearly all miraculous
in time of occurrence and degree rather than essentially,
in accordance with the theory that God generally em-
lows natural means in producing miraculous effects.
They seem to have been sent as a series of warnings,
and the way in which each was something like the previ-
ous one may be an analogy to which we see an analogy in
the warnings which the providential government of the world often puts before
the sinner. The first plague corrupted the sweet water
of the Nile and slew the fish. The second filled the
land with frogs which were as thick as the whole country.
The third covered man and beast with vermin or other
annoying insects. The fourth was of the same kind,
and probably a yet severer judgment. With the fifth
plague, the murrain of beasts, a loss of property began.
The sixth, the plague of boils, was worse than the ear-
lier plagues that had afflected man and beast. The sev-
enth plague, that of hail, exceeded those that went be-
fore it, since it destroyed everything in the field, man
and beast and herb. The eighth plague was evidently
still more grievous, since the devastation by locusts
must have been far more than that by the hail,
and since at that time no greater calamity of the
kind could have happened than the destruction of all
remaining vegetable food. The ninth plague we do
not sufficiently understand to be sure that it exceeded
this in actual injury, but it is clear from the text that
it must have caused great terror. The last plague is
the only one that was general in the destruction of
human life, for the effects of the hail cannot have been
comparable to those it produced, and it completes the
climax, unless indeed it be held that the passage of
the Red Sea, the first point of the ten wonders, was a
wonder, rather than a separate miracle. In this case its
magnitude, as publicly destroying the king and his
whole army, might even surpass that of the tenth
plague.

2. Their Historical Character.—These events, though
supernatural, all find a foundation in the natural phe-
nomena of Egypt, and stand in close connection with
ordinary occurrences. Hence the rationalist Bohlen
says that "Moses, in order to avoid the suspicion of
self-deception, was at least obliged to express himself
in the mildest manner possible; and his miserable
knoblauchers, who were so well acquainted with Egypt, if
he wished to make the commonly observed natural phe-
nomena avail as miracles." To this remark Hengsten-
berg replies (Egypt and the Books of Moses, in English,
Edinb. 1851):

"But it is perfectly clear that these occurrences, as they
are related, notwithstanding their foundation in nature,
always maintained their character as miracles, and con-
sequently are sufficient to prove what is pretended to
prove, and to accomplish what they did accomplish.
Indeed, the unanswerable force in which the common ob-
naturalist of nature here manifest themselves, and
especially their rapid succession, while at other times only a single
one exhibits itself with unusual intensity—If we at
the same time consider these events in connection with
the changing cause of them, and also take into account
the exemption of the land of Goshen—bring us to the limits
of the miraculous; for the transition to the miraculous is
reached through the ordinary in its highest gradua-
tion. But we are brought into the sphere of the mirac-
ulous itself, by the circumstance that these things are
introduced and performed by Moses, that Moses, with his
request, and a part of them at a time fixed upon by Pha-
rus himself (Exod. viii. 8 sq.). Hence the connection with
natural phenomena can be made to avail against the Per-
tateuch only when, going beyond the present narrative,
we limit what it can be explained by the ordinary oc-

currences of Egypt, and establish the presumption that
the remainder belongs to fiction. But this assumption
wants all foundation. It is a purely speculative
unnatural, in the Scriptures, no violent opposition to the
natural, but rather unites in a friendly alliance with it.
This follows from the fact that the natural events also stand to God. The endeavor to isolate the mira-
clusus can only produce a naked naked. In a particular
reason also for uniting the supernatural as closely as
possible with the natural. The object to which all
of these occurrences were directed, as the 8th and
v. 90, was to show that Jehovah is Lord in the midst
of the land. Well-grounded proof of this could not have
been produced by bringing suddenly upon Egypt's eo
cession of strange terrors. From these it would only have taken Jehovah had received a momentary and external power over Egypt. On the contrary, if their annual return were placed under the control of the plagues, it would be appropriately shown that he was God in the midst of the land, and the doom of the false gods had been placed in his hands. He would go forth and they would be entirely driven out of the jurisdiction which was considered as belonging to them.

Some objectors have attempted to throw discredit upon the Mosaic narrative by remarking that no traces of any allusion to these plagues of the Egyptians are discoverable upon the monuments of that country. To this the reply is easy. The monuments in question were reared under the superintendence of the heathen priesthood, and miracles such as these were too humbling to the pride, and too destructive of their influence with the people, to render it likely that they would allow them to be recorded in any manner. Victories, triumphs, religious processions, and whatever was calculated to exalt the gods and kings in the minds of the people, were the only subjects permitted to be sculptured upon the walls of the temples; and the usages or domestic life furnish the subjects of the paintings of the tombs. In the examination we have made it will have been seen that the Biblical narrative has been illustrated by reference to the phenomena of Egypt and the manner of destroying the Pharaoh's enemies, and that, throughout, its accuracy in minute particulars has been remarkably shown, to a degree that is sufficient of itself to prove its historical truth. This in a narrative of wonders is of no small importance. See Moses.

3. The Egyptian Counterfeits.—Of the deeds performed by Moses some were imitated by the magicians of the Pharaoh. To account for this, various hypotheses have been resorted to. It has been supposed that they were enabled to do this by diabolic aid. But this assumes the position that men can enter into agreement or compact with evil spirits so as to receive their aid—a position which has never been proved, and consequently cannot be legitimately assumed to explain an actual phenomenon. This hypothesis assumes also that evil spirits can work miracles, a position no less gratuitous and improbable. It has been maintained that the magicians were instruments in the hands of God to do what they did; that they were instruments in his hand, as was the witch who raised Samuel, and were therefore as much surprised at their own success as she was; and that God thus employed them probably to show in the manner of the great master that the power at work was his and that it was just as he gave the power or withheld it that the miracle was performed. For this hypothesis there is much to be said. At the same time it is open to objection for—(1) While Moses distinctly asserts that it was by divine power that he and Aaron wrought, he nowhere says that in the most distant way, that it was by this that the magicians succeeded in their attempts; and (2) It is expressly said, on the contrary, that what they did they did by means of their enchantments.

The word here used (σαμαίας) means a secret art—hence magical arts, enchantments; and may be properly used to designate the covert tricks or juggl ing artifices by which practitioners of legendarium im posed upon others. This leads us to the second hypothesis which is that the achievements of the magicians were merely clever tricks by which they imposed upon the people, and tended to confirm the Pharaoh in his obduracy. This hypothesis has in its favor the fact that the term by which the Egyptians of the language generally have always, down to our own day, possessed an unparalleled and almost incredible dexterity in artificial magic (see Lane, Modern Egyptians, p. 352 sq.). It is to be borne in mind, also, that in the cases before us these magicians were directed to prepare themselves, and to go through those introductory processes by means of which jugglers mainly succeed in deceiving the beholders; and, moreover, it is important to keep in view that they performed before witnesses who were interested in believing in their success. Above all, in the three feats in which they succeeded, there was really nothing but what the judges of the present day could easily do. The jugglers of India will, for a few pence, do tricks with serpents far more wonderful than making them rigid so as to resemble staves; and any juggler could make water in a basin or a tank resemble blood, or, when he was already sweating, could cover some place that had been cleared for the purpose with these reptiles, as if he had suddenly produced them. The performances of these magicians are really below par as compared with those which may be witnessed in the room of any travelling conjurer among ourselves. Let it be noted, also, that had the Pharaoh seen how readily as well as required to perform the miracle on the instant, as in the case of the plague of lice, for their attempts to imitate which no time was allowed; and as a consequence of this it is emphatically said, "they could not." When to all this it is added that they were impotent not only to remove the infliction, but even to exempt themselves from it, there seems abundant reason for concluding that these magicians attained to nothing beyond the performance of a few successful tricks (Scott, Congregational Lecture, p. 210—226; Wardlaw, On Miracles, p. 521 sq.). See Jannes and Jambres.

4. The Design of these Injunctions.—This is a most important inquiry. That their ultimate object was the effecting of the liberation of the Israelites from their cruel bondage and on the surface of the narrative that with this there may have been, and probably were, other ends contemplated. We may suppose—1. That God designed to produce an effect on the mind of Moses himself, tending to educate and discipline him for the great work on which he was about to enter—the conduct and rule of the people during their passage through the wilderness. For such a task great fortitude and implicit confidence in the power and majesty of Jehovah were required; and as Moses, timid at first, and ready to retire on the first rebuff, gradually acquired courage and determination as the manifestations of God's power in the chastisements inflicted on the Pharaoh and his land proceeded, it is very probable that the series of injunctions of which he was the instrument were designed to confirm him in faith, obedience, and confidence, and so fit him for his great work. 2. We may suppose that a salutary effect was intended to be produced on the minds of the Israelites, the mass of whom had, under their long protracted debauch, sunk low in religious and intellectual life. The marvellous manner in which God interposed for their deliverance, and the manner and the power by which it was brought forth, could not but arouse them to thought, and elevate and quicken their religious emotions. 3. It appears that a salutary religious effect was produced on many of the Egyptians themselves, as is evidenced by the multitude who united themselves to the Israelites when they made their escape; and also on the surrounding nations, as is attested by Jethro, the father-in-law of Moses (Exod. xviii, 10, 11). We may presume, therefore, that this also was part of the design of these injunctions, especially as we find God expressly declaring to Moses that these judgments were intended to make the Egyptians know that he was God (vii, 5).

4. The Design of these Injunctions.—This is a most important inquiry. That their ultimate object was the effecting of the liberation of the Israelites from their cruel bondage and on the surface of the narrative that with this there may have been, and probably were, other ends contemplated. We may suppose—1. That God designed to produce an effect on the mind of Moses himself, tending to educate and discipline him for the great work on which he was about to enter—the conduct and rule of the people during their passage through the wilderness. For such a task great fortitude and implicit confidence in the power and majesty of Jehovah were required; and as Moses, timid at first, and ready to retire on the first rebuff, gradually acquired courage and determination as the manifestations of God's power in the chastisements inflicted on the Pharaoh and his land proceeded, it is very probable that the series of injunctions of which he was the instrument were designed to confirm him in faith, obedience, and confidence, and so fit him for his great work. 2. We may suppose that a salutary effect was intended to be produced on the minds of the Israelites, the mass of whom had, under their long protracted debauch, sunk low in religious and intellectual life. The marvellous manner in which God interposed for their deliverance, and the manner and the power by which it was brought forth, could not but arouse them to thought, and elevate and quicken their religious emotions. 3. It appears that a salutary religious effect was produced on many of the Egyptians themselves, as is evidenced by the multitude who united themselves to the Israelites when they made their escape; and also on the surrounding nations, as is attested by Jethro, the father-in-law of Moses (Exod. xviii, 10, 11). We may presume, therefore, that this also was part of the design of these injunctions, especially as we find God expressly declaring to Moses that these judgments were intended to make the Egyptians know that he was God (vii, 5).

4. But these ends were included in the great end of demonstrating the vanity of those idols in which the Egyptians trusted. "Against all the gods of Egypt," said the Lord to Moses, "I will make you to be hated generally: I am Jehovah" (xii, 12). On these ideals God would pour contempt; and in connection with this it is noticeable that nearly every miracle performed by Moses had relation to some object of idolatrous worship peculiar to Egypt, as among the Egyptians was the serpent by which the serpent into which the rod of Moses had been turned was directed against the serpent-worship of Egypt; the turning of the water into blood was an assault on their sacred river the Nile; the plague of the
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frogs, the gnats, the flies or scarrabai, all tended to bring objects of idolatrous worship among the Egyptians into contempt; the murrain on the cattle was directed against their Apis-worship; the plague of boils, brought on by the casting of ashes from the altar into the air, a rite which they followed to arrest evil, showed how God could make use of a rite supposed to be so good for good to turn to evil; the hail and storm plague was directed against their worship of the elements, or of deities supposed to preside over them; the plague of lice showed that this great scourge which they were wont to trace to the wrath of their deities was entirely in the power of Jehovah; the plague of darkness poured contempt on their worship of the sun-god; and the death of the first-born wound up this terrible series by showing that in the hand of Jehovah alone was the life of all his creatures. A mighty and memorable lesson was thus read out before both Egyptians and Israelites, which could not but have its effect in weakening among the former the attachment of many to their idols, and confirming the latter in their reverence for Jehovah as the only true God. 5. The gradual increase in severity and frequency of the plagues are perhaps the best key to their meaning as to the king of Egypt himself. They seem to have been sent as warnings to the oppressor, to afford him a means of seeing God's will and an opportunity of repenting before Egypt was ruined. It is true that the hardening of Pharaoh's heart is a mystery which St. Paul leaves unexplained, answering the objector, "Nay but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God?" (Rom. ix. 20). Yet the apostle is arguing that we have no right to question God's righteousness for not having mercy on all, and speaks of his long-suffering towards the wicked. The lesson that Pharaoh's career teaches us seems to be that there are men whom the most signal judgments do not affect so as to cause any lasting repentance. In this respect the after-history of the Jewish people is a commentary upon that of their oppressor. The "hardening" of Pharaoh's heart was evidently nothing more than that permissive act of providence by which a long-delayed punishment encourages to the persistence in sin (Eccles. viii. 11; Rom. ii. 5). God's design in so often releasing him (Exod. xii. 17) from the earlier stages of the afflictions was that the final blow might come with full effect, both to Pharaoh and the world at large. See JUDICIAL BLINDNESS.

See Stachhouse, Hist. of the Bible; Bryant, Observations on the Plagues inflicted on the Egyptians (Lond. 1794); Eichhorn, De Egypti anno mirabilis, in the Comment. Soc. Reg. Scient. Gottingen, Recension, iv. 45; Schwarz, De plagis Pharoritis (Wittemb. 1724); Bonindeg, De plagis Egypt. (Aboe, 1809-10); Hengstenberg, Egypt and the Books of Moses; Millington, Signs and Wonders (Lond. 1874); British Quarterly Review, July, 1874, p. 153 sq.; and the various commentaries, ad loc.

Plaifere (or Playfere), John, D.D., an English divine of some note, flourished near the close of the 16th and the opening of the 17th century. He was educated at St. John's College, Cambridge, and was for some time fellow of his alma mater. About 1580 he was made Master of the Grammar School at Cambridge. He died in 1608. He was an Arminian in theology, and his writings circulated extensively and had great renown. Thomas Baker, the antiquary, says that if Plaifer's sermons had never been printed, his name would yet have been honored in history, so decidedly marked was his influence on his time. Among his works we mention Apello Evangelicum for the True Doctrine of Divine Predestination, etc. (Lond. 1652, 12mo); republished in Cambridge Tracts (1803, 8vo). See Catermole, Literature of the Ch. of England I. 334; Churchmen Remembrancer, vol. i.

Plains. I. This term, either in the sing. or plur. des dury in the A. V. for no less than seven distinct Hebrew words, each of which had its own independent and individual meaning, and could not be—at least is not—interchanged with any other. We frequently find two, three, and even more equivalents for the same Hebrew term; and, besides, some of the words are manifestly mistranslated, and some of them are proper names. See TOPOGRAPHIC.

1. ᾿αβέλ, like the Arabic abala, signifies moisture and the erudere produced by it, as in a meadow, to which last term it chiefly corresponds. Hence it came to be applied to a low green plain. It occurs frequently as a proper name in Scripture; chiefly, however, in composition, as ᾿αβέλ-βασσανάκαθ (2 Kings xi. 20; 1 Kings iv. 20, 25; Judg. xii. 5, 6); ᾿αβέλ-μεθόλα (Judg. vii. 22, 23, 24, 25 ; 2 Chron. xvii. 7, 8); ᾿αβέλ-πορεία (Judg. xv. 2; 2 Chron. xvi. 4); ᾿αβέλ-σχίριτ (Numb. xxxix. 49); also alone, as in 2 Sam. xx. 14, 18. In 1 Sam. vi. 18 the A. V. reads "unto the great stone of Abel;" but the Hebrew is בֵּית אֵבָל, "unto Abel the great." Several MSS. read בֵּית אֵבָל, "stone" (the Sept. has Αἴσων, and this is probably the true reading (De Rossi, Var. Lect. ad loc.). Judg. ix. 38 is the only passage in which it is rendered "plain," and he smote them from Aroer, even till thou come to Minniath . . . and unto the plain of the Philistines ("πλαγιά τῆς φιλιστίμης", Sept.); Ezek. i. ἐρείπια, v. e. Ἠσία ὁμοιόμενα; Αβέλ quod est coalescens. There can scarcely be a doubt that this is a proper name, and it should be rendered ᾿αβέλ-κεραμίμ. Eusebius and Jerome mention it as a village of the Ammonites still existing in their day, situated six miles from Philadelphia, in the midst of vineyards (Onomast. a. v. Abelaviniarum). See ABEL.

2. ἐλέμ. This word is derived from the root ἔλεος, to be strong; and hence it is used in Scripture to signify a strong tree, and most probably the oak, which grows to a great size in central and southern Palestine (Genesis, Theaur. p. 42, 50, 51). In the A. V. it is rendered "plain" (Gen. xii. 6; xiii. 18, etc.), or "plains" (xviii. 1; Deut. xii. 9), but in one place the margin has "oak" (Judg. ix. 6). It is difficult to account for this rendering. Probably it was adopted from the Vulgate, which translates corollia in four places, valis in two, and quercus in three. The Sept. has ἄργους, except in Judg. ix. 3, where it has δέλαννω; and ver. 57, ἡμερο-

plagioris. The Hebrew word always means a sacred tree. Under "the oak of Moreh," at Mamre, Abraham pitched his tent, and wor-

shipped God (Stanley. S. and P. p. 508). See OAK.

3. בַּקִּדָה, is from the root בַּקָּד, to clear awnder, and signifies literally a cleft, or place formed by dividing mountains, then a valley between mountains. It is equivalent to the Arabic bukhah. It is generally used in the Bible to denote a low widely extended plain as: the "plain of Shinar" (Gen. xi. 2; Sept. πεδινός; campus); the "valley of Jericho" (Deut. xxxiv. 3); the "valley of Megiddo" (2 Chron. xxxiv. 27; Zech. xii. 11); the "valley of Lebanon" (Josh. xvi. 17, called in Amos i. 5 "the plain of Aven"), which is now called el-Bakka; the "plain of Ono" (Neh. vi. 2), which appears to have been a portion of southern Sharon, where the town of Ono was situated. This word is rendered "plain" in the following passages: Gen. xi. 2; Neh. vi. 2; Isa. xi. 4; Ezek. iii. 22, 25; Amos i. 5; where it is translated "valley." It is generally rendered בקיע in the Sept. and campus in the Vulgate. בַּקָּד, the Chaldean form of בַּקִּדָה, found only in Dan. iii. Nebuchadnezzar set up the "golden image in the plain of Dura." See VALLEY.

4. בַּקָּד, kikkèr, seems to be equivalent to בַּקִּד, from the root בַּק, to move in a circle; בַּק therefore signifies a circuit, or "the region round about any place" (allied to which are צִּקָּד, cursus, and circle; Gesenius, Thesaur. p. 717). Hence, with the article בַּקִּד, kikkèr, it was applied topographically to "the region of
the Jordan," especially the southern part of it, in which the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah once stood. It is so used seven times in Genesis (xiii, 10, 11, 12; xiv, 17, 25, 28, 29); also in 2 Sam. xviii, 23; 1 Kings vii, 46; 2 Chron. iv, 17; and apparently in Neh. iii, 22; xii, 26. Relics of that name must have been derived from the windings of the river (Ptolema. p. 274; comp. Stanley, S. and J.' p. 278). Though uniformly rendered plain in the A. V., and περιφορός or περιπεριας in the Sept., it appears to have all the definiteness of a proper name. It must be confessed that it is not easy to trace any connection between a "circular form" and the nature or aspect of the Jordan valley, and it is difficult not to suspect that κεκορισ is an archaic term which existed before the advent of the Hebrews, and was afterwards adapted into their language. See JORDAN.

The word is also very frequently used in Scripture to signify "a piece of money," generally "a talent" in the A. V. (Exod. xxx, 39; 1 Chron. xxi, 2, etc.) also "a cake" or "loaf of bread" (1 Sam. x, 3; Prov. vi, 26). Their circular form doubtless suggested the name.

5. מִשְׁרוֹ, mishšôr, with the article "הָמִשְׁרוֹ."
This word comes from the root בָּשַׂר, to be straight or even, hence "level" or "plain" or low country; thus in Ps. xxxii, 12, "My foot standeth in an even place," that is, "in a plain" also, figuratively, "rectitude or justice," as in Ps. lxvii, 4, "Thou shalt judge the people righteous-ly (with justice)." With the article it has a topographical signification, and has usually the definiteness of a proper name. The A. V. it is uniformly rendered "plain." It occurs in the Bible in the following passages: Deut. iii, 10; iv, 43; Josh. xiii, 9, 16, 17, 21; xx, 8, 1 Kings xx, 23, 25; 2 Chron. xxxvi, 10; Jer. lxviii, 8, 21.

In each of these, with one exception, it is used for the district in the neighborhood of Heshbon and Dibon—the Bezek of the modern Arabs, their most noted pasture-ground; a district which, from the scanty descriptions we possess of it, seems to resemble the "Downs" of England in the regularity of its undulations, the excellence of its turf, and its fitness for the growth of flocks. There is no difficulty in recognizing the same district in the statement of 2 Chron. xxxvi, 10. It is evident from several circumstances that Uzziah had been a great conqueror on the east of Jordan, as well as on the shore of the Mediterranean (see Ewald's remarks, Geschicht. iii, 508, note), and he kept his cattle on both sides of the Hinnom on one hand, and Ammonites on the other. Thus in all the passages quoted above the word mishšôr seems to be restricted to one special district, and to belong to it as exclusively as shephelah did to the low land of Philistia, or arabah to the desert of the Jordan valley. It is therefore puzzling to find it used in one passage (1 Kings xx, 23, 25) apparently with the more general sense of low land, or rather flat land, in which chariots might be maneuvered—as opposed to uneven mountainous ground. There is some reason to believe that the scene of the battle in question was on the east side of the Sea of Gennesaret, in the plain of Jaulan; but this is no explanation of the difficulty, because we are not warranted in extending the mishšôr farther than the mountains which bounded it on the north, and where the districts begin which bore, like it, their own distinctive names of Gilgal, Bashan, Argob, Golan, Hauran, etc. Perhaps the most feasible explanation is that the word was used by the Syrians of Damascus without any knowledge of its strict signification, in the same manner indeed as it was employed in the later Syro-Chaldee dialect, in which messura is the favorite term to express several natural features which in the older and stricter language were denominated each by its own special name. See Mission.

6. פּוּדַע, פּוּדַע. The root פּוּדַע, to be dry. In poetry it is applied to any dry pasture-land, like Midbar; but with the article it means the valley of the Jordan, and has the force of a proper name. In the A. V. it is commonly rendered "plain" (Deut. i, 17, etc.); but in Deut. xii, 80, "cham- paign;" in Ezek. xliii, 8, "desert;" and in Josh. xv, 6; xvi, 18, "Arabah" (Gesen. Thesaur. p. 1066; Stanley, S. and P. p. 481). The Sept. usually has Ἀπόστολος, but sometimes Ἠφαίστεια. See ARABAN.

7. פּוּדַע, po'da', shephelah, a plain, from the root פּוּדַע, to be dry, or "plain." In the A. V. it is rendered "plain" in Jer. xvii, 26; 1 Chron. xxvii, 28; 2 Chron. ix, 27; but elsewhere "vale" or "valley." It has all the definiteness of a proper name, being the specific designation of the maritime plain of Philistia. To the Hebrews this, and this only, was the Shephelah. Shephelah has some claims of its own to notice. It was the name of the most tenacious of these old Hittite terms. It appears in the Greek text and in the A. V. of the book of Maccabees (1 Macc. xxii, 38), and is preserved on each of its other occurrences, even in such corrupt dialects as the Samaritan version of the Penta- teuch, and the Targums of Pseudo-Jonathan and of rabbis Joseph. And although it would appear to be no longer known in its original seat, it has transferred itself to other countries, and appears in Spanish as Sierra, and on the east coast of Africa as Sufala. See SHEPHALEH.

The word, however, is more generally used for the smaller valleys of the country—the "valley of Jerseel." Perhaps Esdraelon may anciently have been considered as consisting of two portions: the valley of Jerseel, the eastern and smaller; the plain of Megiddo, the western and more extensive of the two. See ESDERAELON.

II. The following are the principal plains of Palestine alluded to in the Bible, proceeding from north to south:

1. The great plain or valley of Cæle-Syria, the "holy land" of the Greeks, which separates two ranges of Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon, is the most remarkable of them all. It is called in the Bible the Bika'ath Aven (Amos i, 5), and also probably the Bika'ath Lebanon (Josh. xi, 17; xii, 7), and Bika'ath Mizpeh (xii, 8), and is still known throughout Syria by its old name, as Ḳub'ān, or Ar'el-Ḳub'ān. "A long valley, though broad," says Dr. Pusey (Comment, on Amos i, 5), "if seen from a height looks like a cleft;" and this is eminently the case with the "valley of Lebanon" when approached by the ordinary roads from north or south. It is of great extent, more than sixteen miles by about five in average breadth, and the two great ranges shut it in on either hand, Lebanon especially, with a very well-like appearance. See POLEMAIS.

2. The plain (called פּוּדַע in the Bible) of Jerseel or Esdraelon, which runs from the bay of Ptolemais to the Jordan, dividing the mountains of Galilee from those of Ephraim. It is well watered and grassy. See JERSEEL.

3. The flat along the Mediterranean from Carmel to the brook of Egypt (whose northern part near Joppa is called שֹׁרֶם, "the southern part Shephelah, פּוּדַע, the plain of the tribe of Judah stood in connection with the latter (1 Macc. iii, 24, 40; xiii, 18). See SHORON.

4. The meadow of Jordan, or the plain on both sides of that river, from the Sea of Gennesaret to the Dead Sea, usually called simply The Plain (פּוּדַע). In the neighborhood of Jericho this valley widens into a greater expanse which is called פּוּדַע יְרֵיחוֹ, The Plains of Jericho (Josh. iv, 13; v, 10; 2 Kings xxv, 5; Jer. xxxix, 5), as the Dead Sea is called the Sea of the Plain (Deut. iii, 17; iv, 49). See JORDAN.

5. The elevated plain (פּוּדַע הַיַּרֶם) in the tribe of Reu- ben, in which lay Bezer and Medeba (Josh. xiii, 16; xx, 8; Deut. iv, 43). It belongs to the large but rather dry (Burckhardt, ii, 626) plateau of modern Beleta (Ritter, ii, 388). See MEBEDA.

6. For the "plains of Jericho," see JERSEEL.
Planck the subjective, pragmatic method reaches its height. History is only the dreary theatre of human interests and passions; but it is truly amazing that, with his indifference to Church doctrine, he could bestow so much toilsome study and learned industry on such 'perfectly indifferently antiquated' as the theological contents of the 16th and 17th centuries. Of course his work, with all its great and enduring merits, and the relative truth and necessity of its conclusions, did not fail to have a bad effect, in completely sundering the doctrinal consciousness of its age from the basis of the older Church orthodoxy, and in justifying this rupture as a pretended advance. In his other large work, the History of the Church Government, Planck likewise starts from that rationalistic conception of the Church, which dates from Locke, viz., that this divine establishment was originally a mere voluntary association, which formed its laws and institutions in accordance with the changing wants of the times, and under the influence of fortuitous, external circumstances; and that, in this way, it gradually assumed an aspect altogether different from what its founder and first members intended or foresaw. In this way he accounts for the gigantic hierarchy of the Middle Ages, which he looks upon in a simply political light, with all the calamities of a phenomenon of a very recent spectator: while the older Protestant orthodoxy had held it in pious abhorrence, as the broken bulwark of the veritable Antichrist" (Schauf, Hist. of the Apostolic Church, p. 73). A complete list of all his writings is given in Plutser, Göttingen Nachrichten, vii, 121; iii, 283 sq; iv, 270. See Lütcke, Gottlieb Jacob Planck, ein biographischer Versuch (Götting, 1888, 8vo); Ilgen, Zeitshchr. für histor. Theol. 1848, iv, 75-88; Rheinwald, Repert. of. theolog. Literatur, 1833, xxv, 105 sq; Hollensteiner, Geschichte der Zeit, 1837, iii, 281 sq; Dorner, Hist. of Protestant Theology, i, 383; Kahnis, Hist. of German Protestantism, p. 176: Hurst's Hagenbuch, Church Hist. of the 18th and 19th Centuries; Alzog, Kirchengeschichte, ii, 286, 731. (J. H. W.)

Planck, Heinrich Ludwig, another German Protestant divine, son of the preceding, was born at Göttingen July 19, 1785, and educated at the university of that place, where his father was then a professor. In 1809 young Planck appeared as author of a work entitled Versuch einer neuen synoptischen Zusammenstellung der drei ersten Evangelien, nach Grundsätzen der höhern Kritik (Götting, 1805, 8vo). In 1810 he was appointed extraordinary professor of theology at Göttingen; and his introductory preliminary dissertation De rerum inter se collationibus et analogia orationis Graecae Novi Testamenti Commentatio (Göttingen, 1810, 4to), added greatly to his reputation. The value of this essay can scarcely be overrated, and its influence has been equal to its worth. It has wrought an entire change of opinion respecting the N.-T. Greek, and upon the views which it enforced all subsequent investigations have been based. An English translation is published in the second volume of the Edinburgh Biblical Cabinet. It was Planck's intention, as stated in this essay, to exhibit his views in a more perfected form, in a work to be entitled Logica Philologica in Novum Testamentum; but from this he was diverted by an engagement into which he entered upon the strong recommendation of Gesenius, namely, to prepare a lexicon of the N. T. similar to that which the latter had published of the O. T. Unhappily the enthusiasm awakened by his early promise were unfulfilled. His health was undermined by frequent attacks of epilepsy, and it was with difficulty that he could go through the duties of his office as ordinary professor of theology, to which he was appointed in 1826. Other works of his are, New Revelation and Inspiration (1817), and a Short Scheme of the Philosophical Doctrine of Religion (1821). He died Sept. 23, 1831. See Lütcke's biography of Gottlieb Jacob Planck.

Planck, the subject of this article, a priest of the Catholic Church, was born at Drenoutr, Flanders, in 1532. Having imbibed the principles of the Calvinistic faith in the schools of Germany and England, he embraced the evangelical ministry in 1557, and discharged its duties in Brabant and Flanders, in the midst of the persecutions of the Spanish government. After the taking of Brussels (1585), where he was pastor, he fled to Holland, and was soon attached to the Church of Amsterdam. Being a zealous defender of orthodoxy, he displayed great anxiety against the Lutherans and Arminians. He was in 1609 a member of the Synod of Dort, and was then one of the revisers of the version of the Old Testament. He is entitled to the gratitude of the Dutch people for the services which he rendered them by his geographical and nautical acquirements. He counselled the first expeditions sent by the Dutch to both Indies, and traced even the itineraries of those expeditions. He is much spoken of in Jeannin's narrative, where he is called "a great cosmographer." He died May 25, 1622, at Amsterdam. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xi, 465.

Planck, Gottlieb Jacob, a noted Protestant divine, was born at Nüttlingen, in the kingdom of Wurttemberg, Nov. 15, 1751. He was educated at the university of Tubingen, and in 1784 was made an ordinary professor of theology in the University of Göttingen. In this capacity he exerted a remarkable influence throughout Germany, as he wielded a powerful pen, and wrote many essays upon the history of the Church and its doctrines. He is a leading name in the school of "pragmatic" historiography. His principal work is his Geschichte des protestantischen Systems in seinem Ursprung, seiner Veränderung, u. seiner Fortbildung (Leips., 1784-1800, 6 vols. 8vo), which was continued in a work published after a long interval under the title of Geschichte des protestantischen Lehrbegriffs, 1781-1788, Concordiaformel bis zur Mitte des 18ten Jahrhunderts (Götting, 1811). Another great work of his is Geiz der der Ideal--Kirch. Gesellschaftsverfassung (Hann, 1803-9, 5 vols. 8vo). Planck, though widely read and followed, does not deserve the great renown he has secured. He exhibited too much indifference to doctrine to be trusted implicitly in his judgments, and yet no one could withhold from him the tribute for application. But, like a too excessive cicerone, Planck, in these works, requires great judgment in the reader. He everywhere displays a sort of preconcerted design, ambition, hatred, and other passions, as having been the motive forces in the process of doctrinal history. Thus the progressive and independent development of dogma is resolved into psychological dispositions and tendencies, while, at the same time, the author's own doctrinal indifference is unconsciously transferred to the agents of the dogmatising process, by the axiomatic assumption that doctrine alone would have been incapable of exciting so much interest or contention. In his eyes doctrine is an antiquated matter, which is properly destined to oblivion. In this method, the view being restricted to efficient causes, and the inherent activity of final causes but slight of, even the efficient causes are not comprehended in their entirety. Planck died in 1833. "With
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PLANE-tree (Exodus xxiv, 14). See CHESTNUT.

Planet. See MAZEROTH.

Planet-worship is a prominent constructive feature in all mystic systems of antiquity. Thus the primal gods of all objects like Osiris (q.v.) may be contemplated under two aspects, differing somewhat from each other, but incapable of any rigorous or formal separation. That worship seems to be in some localities directly solar. Fortunes of Osiris have been interwoven or identified with those of the great orb of the day. His votaries have an eye exclusively to periodic motions of the sun and the vicissitudes of the seasons; not so much in reference to the increase or the decrease of his luminescent functions as to seeming changes in his fructifying, fertilizing power. In winter he appears to the imagination of the worshipper as languishing and dying; and all nature, ceasing to put forth her buds and blossoms, is believed to suffer with him; while at other seasons of the year the majesty of this great king of heaven is reasserted in the vivifying of creation and the gladakening of the human heart. There is an annual resurrection of all nature, for the sun-god is himself returning from the underworld—the region of the dead. Or, if we study the same representation in its more telluric aspect, what is there depicted as a mourning for Osiris is no longer emblematic merely of protracted darkness, but it imports more frequently the loss of vital forces in the vegetable kingdom as the consequence of the withdrawal of the solstitial heat. The earth herself becomes the primal sufferer; and the cause of all her passionate and despairing lamentations is the influence that dries up the fountains of her own vitality. Now, whichever be adjudged the primitive form or the correct interpretation of this old Osiran myth, we must remember that, historically speaking, the substance of the myth itself is not by any means confined to the valley of the Nile. It recurred nearly all countries bordering on the Mediterranean. It can often be directly traced to Asia, and as often to the agency of those Phenician colonists who, scattered thickly in the islands to the west of Syria, were importing to far distant havens not their amber only, but their civilization and religious knowledge. In the mother country of Phcenicia, the Osiran worship had its ancient counterpart in the mysteries of Adonis and the annual "weeping for Tammuz" (Ezek. viii, 14). There, again, the fate of the divinity was rigorously identified with periodic change in the aspect of external nature. The idea of an Adonis in the prime of life was the most vivid image which the Syrian mind could fashion of all fertilizing and benignant powers. At length, however, the divinity sinks down oppressed and overwhelmed; his heart is pierced by some mysterious arrow: he dies, and in the sacred month, "the month of Tammuz," when the scorching blasts of summer are well-nigh exhausted, a large crowd of Syrian maidens and matrons flock together from all quarters; they bewail the loss of Tammuz; but their vehement ejaculations are all intermixed by a series of impassioned and diabolic orgies; symptoms of returning life in nature are to them a signal for festivity as frantic as their former grief. Vitality is coming back to earth; and in its advent they perceive another "finding" of their lost Adonis, eliponc A-mmūl. Nor is this the only instance of some close affinity between the old mythographers of Egypt and Phenicia. Mingling with the other progeny of Phtra, or the Egyptian Vulcan, stand the great Cabirian brothers, whose repute and worship were extensively diffused in various provinces of the West. Not only is Cabeiri itself immediately explainable, if we resort to the Semitic languages; for there it means the "Great" or "Mighty Ones," and thus is pointing in the same direction as the ancient dwarf-gods, which were also sacred images of Cabeiri, and were venerated with a kindred fervor by the rude Phenician pilot and the polished priest of Memphis. The

Calceiri seem to have been eight in number, or, excluding Esamun (literally the eighth), that one of the fraternity who was regarded as the chief or aggregate expression for the whole, we limit them to seven; which strongly indicates, in the opinion of some writers, an original institution of seven additional divinities: the "seven happy ones" being worthy of peculiar homage are the sun, the moon, and the five planets; while the planets, when regarded singly, have been made to bear the correlative title of the "five heavenly chiefs." The Greek had similarly his seven Sēi μυαλον, and the Persian his seven ministers of the highest; examples which appear to be suggestive of the early spread of planet-worship, if they do not absolutely prove that astronomical principles had entered largely into the construction of all mystic systems, that of Egypt not excepted. See Hardwicke, Christ and Other Masters, ii, 264-267; Uhlemann, Argyt, Alterthümer, ii, 162 sq.; Movers, Die Religion und die Gott beken der Phönizier (Bonn, 1841), p. 12 sq.; Lucian, De Deis Syr., vi sq.; Bunsen, Egyptian Places, i, 144; Journal of Asiatic Society, 1864, p. 58 sq.

Plutn. See CHASUBLE.

Plain (γλυκύλα, ἐλα, Ezek. xii, 25, a tree [i.e. beam], as elsewhere usually rendered; ἡ εκόλογος, a valley [or side]).

1. Kings vi, 15, as elsewhere generally rendered: 22, 06 (probably the same as γλυκύλα, ἐλα, a threshold, or "thick beam," of Kings vii, 6; "thick plank," Ezek. xii, 25). "thick plank," Ezek. xii, 26.

Plant. Under this general term we classify and explain the several plants mentioned in Scripture, as edible, flowering, or medicinal, in order.

1. Edible Plants.—Among these, with which we number also aromas and spices, may be noticed:

1. Amiir, Gr. ἀμύς, which means rather αὐλί, an aromatic herb mentioned by Christ (Matt. xxiii, 23). See Anise.

2. Barley, the frequent rendering of the Hebrew se'ak, סֶאָכ, and of the Greek ἑπαρ, as in Rev. vi, 6; John vi, 15. See BALEY.

3. Born, Heb. pēl, pēl, as in 2 Sam. xxvii, 28; Ezek. iv, 9. See Barley

4. Caper-berry, Heb. ḥabjōm, ḥabjōm, ḥabjōm, desor (Ezek. xii, 5). See CAPEP-PLANT.

5. Cinnamon is the rendering of the Hebrew ḭwznm, ḏḥwzn, (Exod. xxx, 23), and of the Greek κυματισμός (Rev. xviii, 13). See CINNAMON.

6. Coriander represents the Hebrew gad, גַּד, in most ancient versions, as the Sept. and Vulg., in Exod. xvi, 31; Num. xi, 7; but the Chaldee and Samaritan vary. See Coriander.

7. Cucumber translates the Hebrew ḥisākā, ḥisākā (Num. xi, 5); and wild cucumbers appear to be meant in 2 Kings iv, 59 by ḥisākā, ḥisākā, where our version has Cucumber. See CucumbE.

8. Cummin stands for the Hebrew ḵmnm, ḵmnm (Isa. xxviii, 25, 27); and in the New Test. for the Greek ἐχήμ, which is simply an adoption of the Hebrew. See Cummin.

9. Dorro's dung our version gives for chapeh yɔmim, דִּנְיָב יָם, which is probably some kind of vegetable food, perhaps kili, though the rendering given is the literal translation (2 Kings vii, 23). See Dorro's Dung.

10. Fitches is given by the A. V. in Isa. xxviii, 25, 26, 27 for the Hebrew kitōlak, kitōlak, kitōlak, which, according to the Sept., Vulg., and rabbinis, is a kind of tallow flower, as black cummin. In Ezek. iv, 9 the word κημμωθ, κημμωθ, is rendered fitches, but it seems to mean properly spejl. See Fitches; ILIN.
32. Wheat in general is the Heb. chittith, אכית, of which the plural in Chaldee is chinin', אכיתנ', as Ezra vi, 9; vii, 22; and in the New Test. is ορός, a general name for grain, which is also rendered "corn" (Mark iv, 28; Acts vii, 12).

11. Garlic is the Hebrew בנים, בנים (Num. xi, 5). See GARLIC.
12. Gourd. See CUCUMBER; GOURD.
13. Grape is the rendering of several Hebrew words; some of them distinguishing particular kinds or qualities: (a) הבשימ, בושים (Isa. v, 2, 4), wild grapes, l. e. bad grapes. Aquila has σκαρπίαν, Symm. σκαρίλις. (b) בַּקָּרָה, בַּקָּרָה (Isa. xviii, 5; Jer. xxxii, 24, 50; Ezek. xxii, 3), sour or unripe grapes; Sept. בַּקָּרָה. (c) חָרַשׁ, חִרְשָׁה, sour grapes, kernels (Num. vi, 4), and of the Greek ἄγραφος, ἄγραφον, bunch of grapes (Matt. vii, 16; Luke vii, 44; Rev. xiv, 18). See GRAPE.
14. Leek (in Num. xi, 5) renders אֵשֶׁר, chaitir', which elsewhere is translated gras, l. e. green. See LEAK.
15. Lasul renders Heb. אֲדוֹת, אָדוֹת (Gen. xxv, 84; 2 Sam. xvii, 28; xxiii, 11; Ezek. iv, 9). See LENTIL.
16. Mallow is for the Heb. mallāch, מַלָּך, properly a parsnip (Job xxx, 4). See MALLOW.
17. Mandrake is the Heb. dodān, דדָן, love-apples (Gen. xxx, 14; Cant. vii, 15). See MANDRAKE.
18. Manna, Heb. מָנָה, מָנָה, a sweet resin distilling from the leaves of tamarisk trees, of several species, especially the tamaric Galliæa macrophylla, from punctures made by an insect, the cocoon macropus. See MANK.
19. Melon is found in Num. xi, 5 as the rendering of the Hebrew abattitim, אבּתיתים. See MELON.
20. Millot (in Ezek. iv, 9) represents the Hebrew dochă, dochă; it is the kolchus dochani (Linn.). See MILLOT.
21. Mist (in Matt. xxiii, 28; Luke x, 42) is the Greek σιβάρυς, i. e. sweet-scented, the mentha viridis of Linn. See MINT.
22. Mustard (in Matt. xiii, 31; xv, 20; Mark iv, 3; Luke xii, 19; xv, 6) is the Greek σιβάρυς; the simplicis orientalis. See MUSTARD.
23. Olive universally is given in the A. V. where the Hebrew סַביִיק, סַבִּיק, is used. In 1 Kings vi, 23 the word olive-tree renders the Heb. אֵשֶׁר-סַבִּיק, אֵשֶׁר סַבִּיק, lit. the tree of fairness. The same expression is rendered oil-tree (Isa. iv, 19) and pine (Neh. viii, 15). See OLIVE.
24. Onion is in Heb. בֵּטֶל, בֵּטֶל, as Num. xi, 5. See ONION.
25. Parched-corn is the Heb. כֵּל, כֵּל, or כָּלָה, it is wheat or barley roasted in the ear and then rubbed out; perhaps occasionally some kind of pulse (1 Sam. xv, 17). See PARCHED-CORN.
26. Pistacia-nuts, in Heb. בוטמין, בוטמין (Gen. xxiii, 11), a kind of nut of olibanum, and taking this name from betr, בטר, the belly, in allusion to their form. See NUT.
27. Pomegranate renders the Heb. רָמבָד, רָמבָד, in many passages. See POMOGRANATE.
28. Purslane is the Heb. challah-math, חלחמל, according to the Syriac. Our version has egg (Job vi, 6), "white of an egg," which is certainly wrong. See GENSEN. Speculum, v. s., and PERSILIAN.
29. Raisins, bunches of (1 Sam. xxvii, 18; xxx, 12; 2 Sam. xvi, 1; 1 Chron. xii, 40), translates the Heb. יַאֲשֵׁר, יַאֲשֵׁר. See RAISINS.
30. Sesame (in Exod. ix, 22; Isa. xxvii, 25) translates the Heb. שָׁמֵש, שָׁמֵש, which means a smooth grain, qrb. See No. 10, above, and RYE.
31. Vine, Heb. סֵיַר, סֵיַר, or sorakh, סֵרָכָה, is a peculiar kind of grape - vine. Thus, choice vine (Gen. xlii, 11); choicest vine (Isa. v, 2); noble vine (Jer. ii, 25). See VINE.
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Plantier, Claude Henri, one of the most prominent members of the French episcopate, was born of humble parentage at Ceyzeries, in France, in 1813. In 1837 he was made a priest, and soon afterwards he was appointed professor of Hebrew at the theological seminary. In 1838 he was made bishop of Nismes, and died May 25, 1875. He was one of the fiercest opponents of Louis Napoleon. See Literarische Haupteigesehr, 1875, p. 292. (B. P.)

Plantin, Christophe, a celebrated printer, was born in 1534 at Mont-Louis, in the French province of Touraine, of poor parents. He went to Paris in his youth, and worked there some time in a bookbinder's shop; but afterwards went to Caen, in Normandy, where he learned the art of printing. After working in several of the printing-offices of France, and especially at Lyons, he returned to Paris; but the religious disturbances which commenced about that time induced him to remove to Flanders, and he is known to have been a master-printer at Antwerp in 1555. Besides his printing establishment at Antwerp, he had one at Paris and another at Leyden. The beauty as well as the correctness of the works which issued from his press extended his reputation beyond Italy, and he soon acquired a considerable fortune. He employed as correctors of the press several men distinguished for their learning, and Plantin's house was resorted to by learned men from all countries. He died July 1, 1589. The work which has given most celebrity to Plantin's printing establishment at Antwerp is the edition which he printed of the great Polyglot Bible, which had previously been printed at Alcalá, in Spain, under the direction of Cardinal Ximenes. Plantin was engaged to perform the work by Philip II of Spain, who sent Arius Montanus to superintend it, and he was engaged for several years (1568-1572) in this occupation. See Arius Montanus. Guillaume Lebo was sent for from Paris to engrave the punches and superintend the casting of the type. The work, in addition to the contents of the Alcalá Polyglot, gave a Chaldaic paraphrase and a Syriac version of the New Testament in Hebrew and Syriac characters. The proofs of the Antwerp Polyglot were all revised by Raphelengius, and the work was published in eight large folio volumes (1568-1572). Plantin was not so learned as the Aldine of Venice or the Estiennes of Paris, but his Latin preface to several of the works which he printed seems sufficiently to establish that he had acquired a considerable scholarship.

Plantsch, Martin, D.D., a German theologian, was born in 1460 at Dormstetten, in Württemberg. He studied at the newly founded university at Tübingen, where in 1483 he was made master, in 1484 professor of philosophy, and in 1494 doctor and professor of theology, at the same time preaching in the church of St. George. In 1523 he was present at the Zurich colloquium, and died July 18, 1538. In connection with Dr. Hartseerer, he founded the famous academy of St. George and St. Martin at Tübingen. He was also the author of Tractatus de fuga malice, which he wrote in 1566, on the occasion of the burning of a certain witch at Tübingen. See Jöcher, Gelehrten-Lex. s. v. (B. P.)

Plautes Maximus, a Byzantine monk noted as a literary character, flourished in the 14th century. He was born himself in or near Athens; and his works, at Nicomedia. The time of his birth is unknown, and almost the only circumstance of his life which is beyond doubt is that in the year 1327 he was sent on an embassy to Venice by the emperor Andronicus the elder. At this time he must have been of a mature age. That he was not yet alive in 1340 is evident from a letter still extant, in which he wrote to the emperor Johnnes Palaeologus, who ascended the throne in that year. D'Orville places his death in 1355, for which, however, he adduces no testimony. Gerhard Rüßmann prolongs his life to the year 1370, and others place it still later. Towards the close of his life Planudes, it is said, was imprisoned on account of his partiality for the doctrines of the Church of Rome; and when afterwards compelled to write against that Church, to have done so in such a manner and with such feeble arguments that cardinal Desselar declared that he pitied the heart of Planudes more in what he had written on that occasion. His works, of which several exist only in MS. form, are not of sufficient importance to be enumerated here. They consist of orations and homilies; translations from Latin into Greek; and several works of a philosophical character, as Cicerio, Cesar, Ovid, etc.; also of Boethius' De Consolatione; St. Augustine, De Trinitate and De Cicerate Dei; a collection of E coy's Fabulas; commentaries on the Rhetoric of Hermogenes, and other Greek writings. See Fabricius, Bibliotheca Graeca, xi, 392 sq.; Hoffmann, Lexicon Bibliogr. Sacrum. Graec. s. v.

Plassmann, Heinrich Ernst, D.D., a German Roman Catholic divine, was born in 1817 at Paderborn, where he also afterwards labored as professor of theology. He then went to Rome, where he was appointed rector of the German National Church. He was also honored with the title of "Magister Scriptorum Theologicorum" by the Dominican college St. Thomas de Ures. He died at Tivoli, Italy, July 23, 1865. He wrote Die Schule des heil. Thomas (Soest, 1857), a great but unfinished work. See Literarischer Handwörterbuch für das katholische Deutschland, 1867, p. 27; Zuchhold, Bibliotheca Theologica, ii, 1000. (B. P.)

Plaster, Mason's (""), mixt, so called from its effervescence, lime; Sept. xenia: Dan. v. 5; "chalk," Isa. xvi, 9; also "calk," from its being, lime. Deut. xxvii, 4, 2; "lime," Isa. xxvi, 12; Amos i, 1; a verb, T42, "take, to smear," Lev. xiv, 42, 43; elsewhere "clab," etc.) The mode of making plaster-cement has been described elsewhere. See Mortar. Plaster is mentioned on three occasions in Scripture:

1. Where, when a house was infected with "leprosy" (Lev. xiv, 42, 48), the priest was ordered to take away the portion of infected wall and replaster it (Michaelis, Loci of Moses, § 211, iii, 397-398, ed. Smith). See House; Leprosy.

2. The words of the law were ordered to be engraved on Mount Ebal on stones which had been previously coated with plaster (Deut. xxvii, 2, 4; Josh. vii, 32), the pillars being covered with plaster, and the law written on the stones (Deut. xxvii, 3; Josh. v, 23 sq.). Michaelis, however (vol. i, bk. iii), supposes that the words were cut in stone and plaster afterwards put upon it, when that the plaster should fall off the words might still be legible. Of this, however, no evidence appears. The process here mentioned was probably of a similar kind to that adopted in Egypt for receiving bas-reliefs. The wall was first made smooth, and its interstices, if necessary, filled up with plaster. When the figures had been drawn, and the stone adjacent cut away so as to leave them in relief, a coat of lime whitewash was laid on, and followed by one of varnish after the painting of the figures was complete. In the case of the natural rock the process was nearly the same. The ground was covered with a thick layer of fine plaster, consisting of lime and gypsum, carefully smoothed and polished. Upon this coat of plaster, a thin one was laid, and on it the colors were painted, and set by means of glue or wax. The whitewash appears in most instances to have been made of shell-limestone not much burned, which of itself is tenacious enough without glue or other binding material (Long, quoting from Belzoni, Ep. Add., ii, 49, 50). At Behistun, in Persia, the face of the inscribed rock-tablet was covered with a varnish to preserve it from weather; but it seems likely that in the case of the Ebal tablets the inscription was cut while
the plaster was still moist (Layard, Ninereh, ii, 188; Vaux, Nin. and Persep. p. 172). See Strong, p. 69. The plaster's affords a covering of cement on which the fatal letters were traced by the mystic hand "on the plaster of the wall" of Belshazzar's palace at Babylon (Dan. v. 5). We here obtain an incidental confirmation of the Biblical narrative. For while at Ninereh the walls are paved with alabaster slabs, at Babylon, where no such material is found, the builders were content to cover their tiles or bricks with enamel or stucco, finely trimmed plaster, fit for receiving ornamental designs (Layard, Nin. and Bab. p. 692; Diod. ii. 9). See Buick.

Plaster, Medicinal (772, march, to rub, hence to moist with a healing salve or similar substance, Lea, xxxviii, 31). See Medicine.

Plastic Nature, an absurd doctrine, which some have thus described: "It is an incorporeal created substance, ended with a vegetative life, but not with sensation or notion; penetrating the whole created universe, being co-extensive with it; and, under God, moving matter, so as to produce the phenomena which cannot be solved by mechanical laws: active for ends unknown to us, and not being expressly conscious of its actions, and yet having an obscure idea of the action to be entered upon." To this it has been answered that, as the idea itself is most obscure, and, indeed, inconsistent, so the foundation of it is evidently weak. It is intended by this to avoid the inconvenience of subjecting God to the same trouble of the changes in the universe, and the meanness of others. But it appears that, even upon this hypothesis, he would still be the author of them: besides, to omnipotence nothing is troublesome, nor those things men, when considered as part of a system, which alone might appear to be so. See Doddridge, Lectures, lect. 87; Cudworth, Intellectual System, p. 149, 172; More, Immortality of the Soul, lib. iii. c. 12; Ray, Wisdom of God, p. 51, 52; Lord Monboddo, Ancient Metaphysics; Young, Essay on the Powers and Mechanism of Nature; Cooke, Theism; Tulloch, English Prov. Thed. ii, 269, 273, 397.

Plat (πλάτων), Achilleus, 2 Kings ix, 26, a piece, or portion of ground, as elsewhere rendered.

Plato (πλάτων), Isacch, 1 Kings vii, 86, a board (or "table"); as elsewhere rendered: Πάθος, a thin leaft, Exod. xxxvi, 3; Numb. xvi, 38; Ἰππία, a hermitic plate of metal, Exod. xxvii, 56; xxxii, 30; Lev. viii, 9; Πάθος, wire, an axle, 1 Kings vii, 80).

Platel, Jacques, a French theologian, was born at Besee, a village of Artois, in the year 1608. He joined the Jesuits, and taught philosophy and theology at Douai. He was regarded as a man of some learning, and his writings were received favorably. He died Jan. 7, 1661, at Douai. His works are, Synopsis casuus theologii (Douai, 1654, fol.; 4th ed. 1706)—Auctoritas contra physico praedeterminismum (ibid. 1663—1673, 2 vols. 12mo).

Platina, Battista Bartolommo de' Sacchi, a very learned Italian, is noted as the author of a History of the Popes. He was born in 1421 at Piadena, a village between Cremona and Mantua. He first embraced a military life, which he followed for a time, but afterwards devoted himself to the study of theology. He went to Rome under Calixtus III, who was made pope in 1455; where, getting himself introduced to cardinal Besarian, he obtained some small benefits of pope Pius II, who succeeded Calixtus in 1468, and afterwards was appointed apostolic legate. When Paul II succeeded Pius in 1464, Platina was deposed, and placed in an unfavorable turn. In the first place, Paul was much indisposed towards him, on account of his connections with his predecessor Pius; but this might possibly have been borne if Paul, in the next place, had not removed all the abbreviators from their employments by abolishing their places, notwithstanding they had purchased them with great sums of money. Upon the Pope's complaining to the people, and most humbly besought him to order their cause to be judged by the auditors of the Rota. The pope was offended at the liberty, and gave him a very haughty repulse: "Is it thus," said he, looking at him sternly—"is it thus that you surround me, if you knew not that all laws are centred in our breast? Such is our decree: they shall all go hence, whithersoever you please: I am pope, and have a right to ratify or cancel the acts of others at pleasure." These unheeded men, thus incurring the enmity of the princes, used their utmost endeavors for some days to obtain audience of the pope, but were repulsed with contempt. Upon this Platina wrote to him in the following terms: "If you had a right to dispense us, without permitting our cause to be heard, of the employments we had lawfully purchased, we, on the other side, ought to be permitted to complain of the injustice we suffer, and the ignominy with which we are branded. As you have repulsed us so contumeliously, we will go to all the courts of princes, and entreat them to call a council, whose principal business shall be to obtain from us, and cause why you have divested us of all our lawful possessions." Nothing can better illustrate the temper and character of Platina than this letter, which was, however, considered as an act of rebellion, and caused him to be imprisoned, and to endure great hardships. At the end of four years he had his wish and his orders not to leave Rome, and continued in quiet for some time; but afterwards, being suspected of a plot, he was again imprisoned, and, with many others, put to the rack. The plot being found imaginary, the charge was turned to heresy, which also came to nothing, and Platina was set at liberty some time after. The pope then flattered him with a prospect of preferment, and thus kept him in Rome; but, dying of apoplexy, left him to shift for himself as he could. This whole conflict is related by Platina himself in his Lives of the Popes, under the pontificate of Paul II. Sixtus IV succeeded Paul in 1467, and appointed Platina keeper of the Vatican Library, which was established by this pope. Platina here found himself in his own element, and lived very happily in that station till 1468, when he was snatched away by the plague. He bequeathed to Pomponius Lestus the house which he built on the Mons Quarinalis, with the laurel grove, out of which the poetical crowns were taken. He was the author of several works, the most considerable of which is De Vicis ac Gestis Romani Principis Pius II, or history of the popes from St. Peter to Sixtus IV, to whom he added it. The Protestants have approved it, and ranked the author among the witnesses to truth. Some Roman Catholic writers charge him with want of sincerity and care; yet Fanvinius did not scruple to publish this history, with notes of his own, and added to it the Lives of the popes from Sixtus IV to Pius IV. It was first printed at Venice in 1479 (fol.), and reprinted once or twice before 1500, since which time all the editions of it are said to have been castrated. His Lives of the Popes is written with elegance of style, and displays powers of research and discrimination which were then rare. He writes with freedom of the popes. Some passages are omitted in later editions. In the edition of 1574, the passage in the life of St. Anacletus, "Uxorum habitus in Bithynia," is for the first time changed into "Uxorum non hahens." Platina wrote also a History of the popes in Latin, which was first published by Lambeius, with notes, at Vienna (1675, 4to).

of his own imaginative excursions, and anticipating the fantastic reveries of the Neo-Platonic Thaumaturgus.

Plato was born a full Athenian citizen, of Athenian parents, but, apparently, not within the limits of Attica. His birthplace seems to have been the island of Aegina, where his father owned a cleruchy, or colonial estate. It is uncertain in regard to the year of his birth, but it fell within the first half of the Decennial War, or earlier portion of the Peloponnesian War. Grote assigns his nativity to May, B.C. 427, just before the surrender of Plataea; Clinton to May, B.C. 429, four or five months after the battle of Pericles; another, Diogenes Laertius to B.C. 428, the year in which Anaxagoras died. Taking Grote's date for convenience, as this is no place for the investigation of such chronological problems, the philosopher's birth was synchronous with the first exhibitions of the comic Aristophanes, whom, throughout life he so greatly admired, and whose works he kept habitually under his pillow. Both the parents of Plato were of noble blood; a circumstance which affected equally his political inclinations and his speculative views. His father was Aristocles, the son of Aristocles, and traced his descent from Croesus and the god Poseidon. His mother's name was Perictione. She was descended from a collateral branch of the family of Solon the Lawgiver; was nearly related to Critias, the chief of the Thirty Tyrants, and was the sister of Charmides, who was at the same time one of the ten governors and the ten ephors of the State. Her influence was increased, rather than diminished, during the long and ardent struggle between rising Christianity and expiring Paganism—both combating receiving his impulse, claiming his alliance, and submitting to his philosophical ascendency. Though the oblivion of the Greek language and the dogmatic character of mediæval speculation turned intellectual activity into widely divergent channels, yet the revival of letters was attended by the resurrection of Plato; and the Medicean Academy of Florence, under the direction of Marsilius Ficinus (q. v.), renewed the prominence of his name and of his philosophy. Since that period, the beginning of the 16th century, Plato has enjoyed an augmented authority in the domain of metaphysical inquiry; has animated successive schools of brilliant reputation and of extensive rule; and has been the late progenitor of the transcendentally great system which has given to modern Germany its marvellous predominance in transcendentally metaphysical speculations.  

1. Life and Times.—The notices of Plato's life which have come to us are few and uncertain, and for the most part unhistorical. Legend early fastened upon his name, and incrusted it over with myths as striking and as unreal as any employed by himself for the embellishment of his tenets. He transformed the rugged honesty of his teacher, Socrates: he was himself transfigured by the wild fancy of his own followers, and was translated in equal degree with Bully Bottom, though in dissimilar mode. But, if little is known of the real circumstances and incidents of the life of the philosopher, there is abundant information in regard to the tribulations and misfortunes which he lived. The ancient authorities for the life of Plato which have been transmitted to us are few, late, and untrustworthy. His biography by his pupil, companion, and successor, Xenocrates, was early lost. Of the numerous writers contemporary with him, or living in the next centuries, who treated his life, preferably or incidentally, a very few have had trustworthy materials at command, but they have commingled, or rather intermixed, them with the legendary growth which sprang up after Plato's death—a growth which should not be entirely neglected, as it exhibits the manner in which Plato was regarded by his admiring disciples, arising out

Soon after his birth he was carried to Mount Hymettus by his father and mother, that they might perform on his account the due sacrifices to the enchorial deities—Pan, the Nymphs, and the Nomian Apollo. As the infant lay sleeping on the flowers, the bees settled upon his lips, and filled his mouth with honey and the honeycomb, that Homer's verse might be accomplished, see Olympiodorus:  

According to Greek usage, the child was called Aristocles, after his paternal grandfather. The name of Plato was imposed on him by Ariston of Argos, his instructor in gymnastics, on account of the breadth of his shoulders or of his forehead, or in consequence of the compass and fluency of his speech. He excelled in athletic sports as to gain the reputation of having contended in the Isthmian and other games. He began his education at an early age by studying grammar under Dionysius, and continued it by prosecuting the study of philosophy; and may have had trustworthy materials at command, but they have commingled, or rather intermixed, them with the legendary growth which sprang up after Plato's death—a growth which should not be entirely neglected, as it exhibits the manner in which Plato was regarded by his admiring disciples, arising out
apprehension, eager, diligent, grave, and modest. His first ambition, as with most young men of lively genius, seems to have been for literary renown. He wrote lyrics, did not relax his dramatic compositions, and is said to have composed a tetralogy for competition in the Dionysiac festival. In the estimation of antiquity he was universally accomplished, and his writings attest a wide range of acquirement. After he entered into intimate relations with Socrates, he burned up his juvenile verses; but throughout his career he was attended by the poetic afflatus. The acquaintance with Socrates seems to have begun about his twentieth year (B.C. 407), and was probably incited by the same causes which induced other wealthy, elegant, and ambitious Athenians to frequent him; for it cannot be dismissed out of the question—desire of skill in debate, and dexterity in public harangues. Plato, or the author of the Seventh Epistle attributed to Plato, acknowledges that in youth "he was animated, like other young men, to devote himself, as soon as he was his own master, to the affairs of the commonwealth." Other attractions arose, and the association with Socrates became closer and closer with the passing years, till his venerable master was removed from him by the fatal cup of hemlock, after eight years of service.

The twelfth year of Plato, according to Grote's chronology, coincides with the return of Alcibiades to Athens, the commission of Lysander as commander of the Peloponnesian fleet, and the appointment of Cyrus as satrap of Asia. Two years later came the decisive battle of the Lamian sea, which set a seal upon the fall of Athens. The siege—the starvation—the surrender—the devastating and the humiliation of Athens. These disasters were wild imaginations, springing from the acknowledgment of Plato's service in the field, which an active, healthy youth could not have avoided, in such days of agony, without incurring the degradation of 

Plato might have been present at Corinth, but Delium was fought when he was only three years old; Tanagra, when he was only one, or, if the principal action of that name be regarded, thirty years before. In the state of affairs which existed in the thirty years before his marriage, there is no reason to look Plato's military service, but the scenes of that service are wholly conjectural. His intimate connection with Chabrias, in whose defence he once spoke, perhaps arose from old camaraderie.

The subjugation of Athens and the usurpation of the Thirty opened to Plato the public career which appeared barred against him during the reckless rule of the Deucalion. Critias, the leader of the Thirty, a man of splendid and various talent, of high culture, of daring energy, and of unassuming ambition, was a cousin; Charmides, one of the Ten at Plataeum, who fell in the battle with Thrasybulus, was an uncle. The gates of the political stadium were thrown wide open to him, and the prospect of rapid advancement invited his eager activity. Accepting the Seventh Epistle as genuine, we have his own declaration that he sought and obtained the opportunity afforded. His relatives, his friends, his party, so long excluded from office, were at length in power; and he entered as an aspirant along with those to whom he was united by blood, by traditional associations, by hereditary interest, and by personal propinquities. He was a born aristocrat. These things should be remembered in the appreciation of Plato's political reverses, in the estimation of his censures of Pericles and the democracy, and even in the interpretation of his sarcasms on the rhetoricians and sophists. He was himself its victim and its martyr. His loss of liberty even more than he hated a tyrant. His political prospects were, however, soon overlaid. The recent democracy had, doubtless, been lawless, savage, oppressive, and indiscriminate; but its kinsmen, Critias, Charmides, and their colleagues, were more lawless, sanguinary, rapacious, and brutal. It is safe to reject the blind partisan vilification of Grotius and of Mazzini. Whether under the rule of the mob or under the rule of the few, the internal condition of Athens had become desperate. Our histories of Greece, with all their details of license and exaction, reveal but little of the consuming fever by which Athens and her sister states were slowly perished. What outraged Plato more than anything else was the indigence and treacherous injustice shown towards his master, Socrates, himself affiliated with the dominant party. Socrates was ordered to arrest an innocent man, and to conduct him to condemnation, in order to make him implicated in the crimes of the chief. We are reminded of the nefarious counsels given by the historian and administrator Guicciarini for the repression of the prostrate and humiliated Florence. Socrates refused, and his life was endangered. At the same time his generous nature was stopped, and his instructions in the streets and highways prohibited. Plato gave up the delusive visions of reform which he subsequently ascribed to his youth, and withdrew himself from political concerns. Critias was killed in the Thirty party driven to flight, the revolution overthrown, and a complete subversion of the recent policy was effected. Plato again sought an entrance into public life. He was dragged in this direction by a strong desire, as he confesses. His inclinations were decided political. He complains of the censure of his friends, who attended to the disturbances, but admits that such moderation was shown by the restored democracy. Still the party adverse to him acquired full ascendency, and he found himself excluded from influence. His final repulse from the Athenian politics was due to his malicious indictment of Socrates, and his death under sentence of the criminal court. The peril and the condemnation of his teacher drew Plato closer to him. He attended and advised the sage in his trial. He offered to pay the fine that might be imposed upon him; and, if parted by sickness from his last serene hours, he fondly treasured up his memory and his aims, and consecrated his own life to the illustration of his virtues, and the perpetuation of the fame of his great guide and friend. Anxious and occupied with other cares as were the years of Plato's intercourse with Socrates, many of the learned German scholars who have occupied themselves with the Platonic writings have concluded that several of them were composed and published before or soon after the death of his illustrious instructor. It seems more reasonable to refer them all, or nearly all, to a much later period.

The tragic fate of Socrates dispersed the Socratic fraternity and drove Plato from Athens. He naturally feared to be involved in like odium and like danger with Socrates. It must be remembered that the real cause of enmity was mainly political—that Socrates and Plato were not merely adversaries of democratic ascendency, but had been identified with the tyranny of the Thirty. The looseness, too, and unregulated passion of Athenian procedures, civil and criminal, must also be borne in mind. Justice in the ancient law was no assured protection before an Attic dicastery. This, doubtless, intensified Plato's hereditary opposition to the rule of the majority, and would increase his distrust after the judicial murder of Socrates. He might recall the remark made by Alcibiades at the time of his flight from Sicily, that he would not trust his life to the vote of his own mother, lest she should blunder and deposit a black pebble for a white one. Plato accordingly retired from Athens, and found refuge in the house of Euclid at Megara, a fellow-pupil, and the reputed father of the Megarian school. He lived to the age of eighty. How long he continued at Megara, and how far he imbibed the doctrines of Euclid, cannot be ascertained, though Megarian tendencies may readily be
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recognised in his own teachings. After leaving Megara, Plato entered upon a round of distant voyages; but their extent, their order, and whether continuous or interspersed with visits to his native city, must remain undetermined. In the course of his travels he visited Cyrene, where he studied geometry under Theodorus; and then, having vowed to dedicate to Egypt, where he admired the ancient monuments, and held intercourse with the priests. Some reports alleged that he extended his journeys to Palestine, Syria, Babylonia, and even to Persia. When he was about forty years of age he visited Tarentum—where he became acquainted with the Pythagoreans, Archytas, Timaeus, Echecrates, etc.—and Syracuse, where his intimacy with Dion was formed. He is said to have been admitted at this time to the society of the elder Dionysius, and to have offended the tyrant, who sent him away in charge of Pollis, the Spartan, to be disposed of as a prisoner of war. The commission was executed, and Plato was sold as a slave in Egypt, but soon ransomed by Aniceriua, who refused reimbursement. The story is questionable in all its parts.

Immediately after this supposed adventure Plato returned to Athens, and revived in a novel and more systematic form the career of Socrates, opening a school of philosophy in the grove of the hero Academus, which adjoined a small estate of his own, either inherited or purchased, in the south of Athens, on the road to Eleusis. Here he remained for nearly forty years, in the exercise of his didactic vocation, with the exception of two absences in Sicily, each of considerable length. To this interval between the death of Socrates and the establishment of the Academy has been attributed the composition of many of the Platonic Dialogues. This has been done by German critics, who have been enabled by keen intuition to discover what was in the mind of Plato, though wholly unrevealed by himself. The object of their production in these years is not easily discernible, but their production would scarcely be afforded during the fatigues of his long journeys; nor is it likely that one so averse to the literary promulgation of his views would engage in such labors while occupied in storing his mind with multifarious knowledge, in examining the dogmas of other philosophers, and in maturing his own views. In the absence of all positive information, a decision is as absurd as it would be impossible. But the conclusion of Grote is most plausible—that the Chartist Platonism are all subsequent to Plato's entrance upon his career as a teacher. The Academy under his rule and instruction of its founder is unknown. That it was thoroughly successful is evident from the high and wide reputation of its teacher, from the distinguished names of its pupils, from the duration of their academical course, and from the flourishing condition of his death. Among the more notable of the earlier academicians were Aristotle, who attended the instructions of the great teacher for twenty years; Speusippus, the nephew of Plato, and his immediate successor; Xenocrates, who succeeded Speusippus in the direction of the school; Eudorus of Cnidus, the illustrious astronomer; the orators Demosthenes, Hyperides, and Lycurgus; the Syracusan Dion, and his comrade and murderer, Callippus. May we add "Timon of Athens" to the list, on the strength of the statement of Olympiodorus, that "with Plato alone did the misanthrope associate." Men and strong-minded women are said to have flocked to his lectures, as he denounced the pugent and mortifying irony of Socrates, abstained from disputations in the markets and workshops, and refrained from hunting up young men to persecute them with logomachies. He did not, like others, set his seal in the pursuit of Platonic companions; Demosthenes, Hyperides, and Lycurgus; the Syracusan Dion, and his comrade and murderer, Callippus. May we add "Timon of Athens" to the list, on the strength of the statement of Olympiodorus, that "with Plato alone did the misanthrope associate." Men and strong-minded women are said to have flocked to his lectures, as he denounced the pugent and mortifying irony of Socrates, abstained from disputations in the markets and workshops, and refrained from hunting up young men to persecute them with logomachies. He did not, like others, set his seal in the pursuit of Platonic companions; Demosthenes, Hyperides, and Lycurgus; the Syracusan Dion, and his comrade and murderer, Callippus. May we add "Timon of Athens" to the list, on the strength of the statement of Olympiodorus, that "with Plato alone did the misanthrope associate." Men and strong-minded women are said to have flocked to his lectures, as he denounced the pugent and mortifying irony of Socrates, abstained from disputations in the markets and workshops, and refrained from hunting up young men to persecute them with logomachies. He did not, like others, set his seal in the pursuit of Platonic companions; Demosthenes, Hyperides, and Lycurgus; the Syracusan Dion, and his comrade and murderer, Callippus. May we add "Timon of Athens" to the list, on the strength of the statement of Olympiodorus, that "with Plato alone did the misanthrope associate." Men and strong-minded women are said to have flocked to his lectures, as he denounced the pugent and mortifying irony of Socrates, abstained from disputations in the markets and workshops, and refrained from hunting up young men to persecute them with logomachies. He did not, like others, set his seal in the pursuit of Platonic companions; Demosthenes, Hyperides, and Lycurgus; the Syracusan Dion, and his comrade and murderer, Callippus. May we add "Timon of Athens" to the list, on the strength of the statement of Olympiodorus, that "with Plato alone did the misanthrope associate." Men and strong-minded women are said to have flocked to his lectures, as he denounced the pugent and mortifying irony of Socrates, abstained from disputations in the markets and workshops, and refrained from hunting up young men to persecute them with logomachies. He did not, like others, set his seal in the pursuit of Platonic companions; Demosthenes, Hyperides, and Lycurgus; the Syracusan Dion, and his comrade and murderer, Callippus. May we add "Timon of Athens" to the list, on the strength of the statement of Olympiodorus, that "with Plato alone did the misanthrope associate." Men and strong-minded women are said to have flocked to his lectures, as he denounced the pugent and mortifying irony of Socrates, abstained from disputations in the markets and workshops, and refrained from hunting up young men to persecute them with logomachies. He did not, like others, set his seal in the pursuit of Platonic companions; Demosthenes, Hyperides, and Lycurgus; the Syracusan Dion, and his comrade and murderer, Callippus. May we add "Timon of Athens" to the list, on the strength of the statement of Olympiodorus, that "with Plato alone did the misanthrope associate." Men and strong-minded women are said to have flocked to his lectures, as he denounced the pugent and mortifying irony of Socrates, abstained from disputations in the markets and workshops, and refrained from hunting up young men to persecute them with logomachies. He did not, like others, set his seal in the pursuit of Platonic companions; Demosthenes, Hyperides, and Lycurgus; the Syracusan Dion, and his comrade and murderer, Callippus. May we add "Timon of Athens" to the list, on the strength of the statement of Olympiodorus, that "with Plato alone did the misanthrope associate." Men and strong-minded women are said to have flocked to his lectures, as he denounced the pugent and mortifying irony of Socrates, abstained from disputations in the markets and workshops, and refrained from hunting up young men to persecute them with logomachies. He did not, like others, set his seal in the pursuit of Platonic companions; Demosthenes, Hyperides, and Lycurgus; the Syracusan Dion, and his comrade and murderer, Callippus. May we add "Timon of Athens" to the list, on the strength of the statement of Olympiodorus, that "with Plato alone did the misanthrope associate." Men and strong-minded women are said to have flocked to his lectures, as he denounced the pugent and mortifying irony of Socrates, abstained from disputations in the markets and workshops, and refrained from hunting up young men to persecute them with logomachies. He did not, like others, set his seal in the pursuit of Platonic companions; Demosthenes, Hyperides, and Lycurgus; the Syracusan Dion, and his comrade and murderer, Callippus. May we add "Timon of Athens" to the list, on the strength of the statement of Olympiodorus, that "with Plato alone did the misanthrope associate." Men and strong-minded women are said to have flocked to his lectures, as he denounced the pugent and mortifying irony of Socrates, abstained from disputations in the markets and workshops, and refrained from hunting up young men to persecute them with logomachies. He did not, like others, set his seal in the pursuit of Platonic companions; Demosthenes, Hyperides, and Lycurgus; the Syracusan Dion, and his comrade and murderer, Callippus. May we add "Timon of Athens" to the list, on the strength of the statement of Olympiodorus, that "with Plato alone did the misanthrope associate." Men and strong-minded women are said to have flocked to his lectures, as he denounced the pugent and mortifying irony of Socrates, abstained from disputations in the markets and workshops, and refrained from hunting up young men to persecute them with logomachies. He did not, like others, set his seal in the pursuit of Platonic companions; Demosthenes, Hyperides, and Lycurgus; the Syracusan Dion, and his comrade and murderer, Callippus. May we add "Timon of Athens" to the list, on the strength of the statement of Olympiodorus, that "with Plato alone did the misanthrope associate." Men and strong-minded women are said to have flocked to his lectures, as he denounced the pugent and mortifying irony of Socrates, abstained from disputations in the markets and workshops, and refrained from hunting up young men to persecute them with logomachies. He did not, like others, set his seal in the pursuit of Platonic companions; Demosthenes, Hyperides, and Lycurgus; the Syracusan Dion, and his comrade and murderer, Callippus. May we add "Timon of Athens" to the list, on the strength of the statement of Olympiodorus, that "with Plato alone did the misanthrope associate." Men and strong-minded women are said to have flocked to his lectures, as he denounced the pugent and mortifying irony of Socrates, abstained from disputations in the markets and workshops, and refrained from hunting up young men to persecute them with logomachies. He did not, like others, set his seal in the pursuit of Platonic companions; Demosthenes, Hyperides, and Lycurgus; the Syracusan Dion, and his comrade and murderer, Callippus. May we add "Timon of Athens" to the list, on the strength of the statement of Olympiodorus, that "with Plato alone did the misanthrope associate." Men and strong-minded women are said to have flocked to his lectures, as he denounced the pugent and mortifying irony of Socrates, abstained from disputations in the markets and workshops, and refrained from hunting up young men to persecute them with logomachies. He did not, like others, set his seal in the pursuit of Platonic companions; Demosthenes, Hyperides, and Lycurgus; the Syracusan Dion, and his comrade and murderer, Callippus. May we add "Timon of Athens" to the list, on the strength of the statement of Olympiodorus, that "with Plato alone did the misanthrope associate." Men and strong-minded women are said to have flocked to his lectures, as he denounced the pugent and mortifying irony of Socrates, abstained from disputations in the markets and workshops, and refrained from hunting up young men to persecute them with logomachies. He did not, like others, set his seal in the pursuit of Platonic companions; Demosthenes, Hyperides, and Lycurgus; the Syra...
though unrecognized; the total decay of the constitution was mistaken for an accidental, transitory, and curable disease. It was a time, in some respects, like that which saw the birth and growth of the trouble in the case of society was universally experienced; when theories of all kinds—new constitutions on novel principles; socialistic, communistic, and other dreams—were in vogue, and sometimes put into practice, with only an aggravation of misery. This unhappy condition of society explains not merely Plato's failures in Sicily, but his disgust at Athenian politics, and the visionary, extravagant, and often immoral devices of his own political speculations.

The remainder of Plato's life, after his final return from Sicily, was devoted to his school. It was passed in the most profound reflection and in the most intimate intercourse with the most distinguished men of the time. He held intimate intercourse with the most distinguished personages of the period; that he was brought into close connection with Socrates and the Socratic family, with the Heracleitans, Megarics, Pythagoreans, and other schools; that his education was large and liberal; his studies, observation, and travels varied and extensive; his talents versatile and lofty; that he united the genius of the poet, the aptitudes of the rhetorician, the skill of the dialectician, the reason of the philosopher, with the diligence of a scholar, the training of a man of the world, and the propensities of a statesman. He was thus full-armed, and prepared to convert to his own use all former knowledge and speculation. How he employed his gifts and the materials at his command will be manifested by the consideration of his literary and philosophical works.

II. Writings.—The literary remains which pass under the name of Plato are among the most extensive monuments of the classic age of Athens, notwithstanding the childishness with which he regarded writing as a mode of instruction, and the repeatedly expressed preference for oral teaching. His writings have been traced to a number of different hands, and the names of the authors who have written under his name are not known. The body of works ascribed to Plato has been estimated at about fifteen thousand pages. The chief of these works are the dialogues of Plato, which are divided into two classes: the works of the philosophical school, consisting of the dialogues of Plato's school, and the works of the literary school, consisting of the dialogues of Plato's literary school. The former class includes the works of the philosophical school, consisting of the dialogues of Plato's school, and the works of the literary school, consisting of the dialogues of Plato's literary school. The latter class includes the works of the literary school, consisting of the dialogues of Plato's literary school.
to later years. Some critics have supposed that the order or approximate dates could be settled by the relation of the works to Socrates in the Phaedrus, Thrasylus, and Phaedo. This is very arbitrary and fantastical, and leaves no guidance but bold conjecture. Some critics assume that certain pieces appeared during the lifetime of Socrates, others immediately after his death, others again during the period of Plato's foreign wanderings, and a large portion of the remainder in an indicated succession after the institution of the Academy. Some philological commentators decide that the Phaedrus and such other Dialogues as may suit their fancy were the first fruits of his literary fecundity, in consequence of the joyous juvenility of his own nature, the unconscious audacity of imagination, and the poetic richness of expression. But the latest productions of Edmund Burke were the richest, the most ornate, fervid, and poetical.

It is impossible to discover the chronological order of the Platonic treatises. The wide diversity of opinion on the subject, the ingenious arguments employed by discordant scholars to confirm their own theories and to refute those of others, attest this impossibility. There is as much diversity of view in regard to the sequence of the Platonic Dialogues as in regard to the dramas of Sophocles. The historical uncertainty of all conclusions is assured by the similar characteristics of both authors. The productions of each were subject to continued revision and alteration; the first draft rarely, if ever, represented the ultimate form. Additions, suppression, re-ordering of fragments, or allusion, were introduced by both into their works, which were not published in permanent form, or thrown into circulation until after the death of their authors. Hence it is an utterly delusive procedure in either case to undertake to decide the date of production by tone, by style, by doctrine, or by historical statement or allusion. The writings of Plato are not bounded by the accidents of time. They bear the impress of his hand, his heart, his soul, not at particular moments of his life, but are the flower and sum of his whole intellectual existence. Except in a few instances, which do not affect the totality of his instructions, there is no ascertainable before and after, but all stand upon the same chronological plane. The attempt to determine the order in which the several works of Plato was produced derives its chief interest from the aid thence expected in tracing the evolution of the Platonic system of thought, and the relation of each treatise to the rest. The inquiry is tempting, but, even if capable of satisfactory solution, would be more fruitless in the case of Plato than of any other philosopher. There is so little in Plato of a dogmatic character as to render each treatise, tentative, and stand as a more or less accurate and complete model of what might be in the process of development and expansion, but only the settlement of the sequence of published doubts.

The question of the connection of the Platonic writings early engaged attention. It seems to have been raised in the years immediately following Plato's death. The great critic Aristophanes of Byzantium, librarian of the Museum at Alexandria, put forth an arrangement of the more notable tractsates of Plato in a system of trilogies, the members of each trilogy being determined by community of subject or correspondence of form and treatment. The Platonic exposition is, for the most part, so thoroughly dramatic that it might naturally suggest an arrangement analogous to that observed in theatrical compositions. But the adaptation of the mould to the Platonic contents is altogether arbitrary, and proved to be inadequate in the hands of its inventors. The Lysis and Epinomis were divorced from the Republic; the Crito and Phaedo were placed in a different class from the Euthyphron and the Apology. Only fifteen of the treatises were adopted; the best were overlooked, and some were placed in single files. Grots thinks the arrangement may have been earlier than Aristophanes. The imperfections of the scheme are manifold, and provoked other distributions. By some critics his works were arranged in three classes: 1. The Direct, or dramatic; 2. The Indirect, or speculative; 3. The accidental. The first is awkward, insufficient, and indistinct. Only two, or at most three of the works of Plato are really narrative. All the rest are dialogues, and therefore dramatic; but these are composed of dialogues blended in varying proportions with narrative. Under the reign of the first emperors of Rome the Platonic remains were distributed by Thrasylus, to whom were due two distinct schemes. Imitating the example of Aristophanes, and guided by the same dramatic analogy, he disposed the whole recognised works of Plato in nine tetralogies, or groups of treatises, in which a real community of subject and an orderly development are manifest, was formed of the Euthyphron, Apology, Crito, and Phaedo—which still lead the procesion of the Corpus Platonicum in nearly all editions of Plato's works. But the tetralogies of Thrasylus had no more chronological truth, and rarely more logical coherence, than the trilogies of the Alexandrian school. They do not seem to have satisfied himself, for he proposed another and totally diverse classification of the Platonic memorials, founded upon their form and aim rather than on their subject-matter. Thrasylus distinguished the Platonic treatments into: I. Inquisitory; II. Expository. The Inquisitory productions were divided into, A. Gymnastic; B. Agnostic. The Gymnastic were subdivided into, I. Obstetrical; II. Peirastic. The Expository were from Time Ancient, C. Confirmatory, or Monstratory; and 2. Refutatory. The Expository treatises were separated into, C. Theoretical, and D. Practical. Each of these contained two classes: the Theoretical—1. Physical; 2. Logical; and the Practical—1. Ethical, and 2. Political. The two schemes are exhibited by Grote in tabular form (Plato, vol. i, ch. iv, p. 161, 162).

The ancients thus renounced the effort to reduce into a connected series the writings of Plato, either by the evidence of the order of their production, or by hypothetical indications of their logical and philosophical interdependence. Such disappointment did not cool the ardor or repress the audacity of the German philologists. Schleiermacher bluntly assumed that the various productions of I. constiuted preconceived and well-ordered parts of a systematic doctrine, contemplate in its integrity from the beginning of his career. Starting from this point, he undertook to detect by internal signs the periods of production, the relation of the parts to each other, the purpose of each treatise, and the constitution of the whole philosophy. Whatever did not accord with the system was rejected as an error, and rejected as a fraudulent pretense. Schleiermacher's views raised up a host of opponents, but a host of imitators of his procedure also. It is not appropriate to examine here the theory of Schleiermacher, or the theories of his antagonists; or to point out what has been admitted and what rejected by each of the acute disputants. The theses of Schleiermacher, Ast, Socher, C. K. Hermann, Stallbaum, Steinhardt, Stüemihl, Munk, and Ueberweg are carefully stated, weighed, and judged in Grote's laborious and tedious work. The discussion is noticed here because it involves the decision of two very important points in the appreciation of the doctrine of Plato: Was there any unity of design in the literary productions of this philosopher? Is there any unity of execution, any methodical scheme of philosophy in them? In other words, did Plato contemplate from the commencement of his career the elaboration of that scheme which may be deduced from his works? Does each separate work bear, from the intention of its author, a definite relation, and render a definite service to any complete doctrine? Are the works of Plato a system? Or, as, in the main, occasional and fragmentary presentations of disconnected parts of philosophical inquiry? These questions probe the whole significance
PLATO's career and of the Platonic doctrine, and we
assent substantially to the conclusions of Grote. The 
tide of a preconceived plan had been rejected by Ast,
Socher, Hermann, Stallbaum, and others, before it was 
impugned by Grote. A system of philosophy is always 
a production of slow and gradual growth, requiring not 
merely a long time and a great deal of labour, but also 
favorable circumstances, so that it is rarely com-
pleted by its originator, except in method and broken 
outline. The philosophy of Comte is one of the few in-
stances of complete organization by the author himself;
the philosophy of Leibnitz an instance of the much 
commoner result of only fragmentary indication. The 
assumption of Schleiermacher is at variance with nearly 
all experience. Certain fundamental views in regard 
to principle or method, usually to both, for they are al-
most indissolubly connected, present themselves to the 
quick apprehension and creative imagination of the 
young philosopher. These long struggle to shape them-
selves into definite form. They are at first vague, though 
luminous; active, though indeterminate; indistinct in 
outline, though of penetrating radiance. As separate 
questions are discussed, and the difficulty is impelled 
upon the contemplative mind by the guidance of the new 
light: and each successive 
discussion renders this new force more distinct, 
more prominent, and more controlling. With the proc-
es of such expansion, new modifications and new ap-
lications are introduced, and it is only when an oppor-
tunity is given to review the chain of progression, for 
revising the plan of philosophy, that a philosopher 
is enabled to present his doctrine in harmonious integ-
ity. Was this opportunity afforded to Plato, outside 
of the sphere of his acosmatic expostions? It may 
well be doubted, if not roundly denied. In his pub-
lished works we find fragmentary revelations only, ac-
companied by incongruities and positive inconsistences, 
which would surely have been absent from speculations 
complete in the mind of the philosopher, and not merely 
in various stages of development. 
If there was no unity of purpose in the several pro-
ductions, if they were never contemplated in their con-
ception as parts of a general and concordant system, 
there could scarcely be any definite unity in their ex-
ecution. The whole is composed of all its parts. The 
meditated whole may, indeed, be discerned "by the 
mind's eye" where several of the parts have been lost 
or never supplied, as any circle may be completed from 
a single arc, or from the broken segments of the same 
circumference. But that this may be done it is essen-
tial that all the members or preserved shall have the 
same curvature, shall have the same radius, the same 
radial revolution rounding the same centre. This 
cannot be said, and cannot be supposed without violent 
premises, of the Platonics treatises. All that we 
know, and all that we can positively discern, is ad-
verse to such an hypothesis. The whole of Plato is sin-
gularly various; its variety is one of the most salient 
indications of the wealth, freedom, and activity of his 
genius. The structure of the several dialogues is so in-
genious diversified as to render them incapable of clas-
sification, like the plays of Shakespeare, each a distinct species in itself. Plato's way of procedure is as elastic as his style. The 
Socratic method of disputation may be usually retained, 
but its spirit is curiously changed in different applica-
tions, and its prominence is varied. The points of view, 
the central stations, are constantly shifted in passing 
from one dialogue to another; and, as a necessary result, 
the aspects presented are changed—the tendencies are 
dissimilar and the doctrines are uncoalescing. But 
more than this: very few of the treatises of Plato are 
constructive or systematic. Nearly all of them are 
simply negative or inquisitorial. The latter do not 
seek to maintain any dependence on the former. They 
are separated by the whole diameter of the intellectual 
spere. It is only in a few of his works—presumably 
the late and still crude products of his old age, the sec-
ond fruitage that never ripens—that Plato enunciates 
principles which are neither inductions nor deductions, 
and propounds dogmas which are rather germs of un-
developed speculation than the partial representation 
of the conclusions of a system already completed and 
formulated. However greatly he may have travelled 
and sublimated his character from his first appearance as 
philosophical protagonist, his procedure was in the main 
and throughout honestly and earnestly Socratic, and his aim 
was Socratic also. His object was not the establish-
ment of a doctrine, but the stimulation of candid inves-
tigation, in order to free his hearers from the stagnation 
of thought and the obsession of vulgar or treacherous 
errors. He was not a 
doctrine, but an inquirer; or, 
rather, he taught the need and practice of investigation, 
not a body of conclusions. Undoubtedly there is an 
intellectual unity, vague, unformed, and in great meas-
ure unconscious, in the constitution of every man, there 
is a mental identity, through innumerable and often 
wide changes of opinion, in the entire career of every 
thinker, and this unity and this identity, intuitively 
recognised by the pupil or student, will suggest purpose 
where no purpose was previously impelled, and guided 
by the light of an imaginary system which never revealed itself 
to its parent. To this cause may be largely assigned the 
strange and divergent developments of the Platonics 
philosophy in the several schools which sheltered their 
reveries under the prestige of his great name. It would 
lead us too far for one purpose to enter into this ques-
tion of the origin of dogmas, nor is there any place in the 
view of the author. For us they exist as distinct imaginary con-
versations, composed by the same author at unknown 
times and under unknown specialties of circumstance" 
(PLATO, vol. i, ch. vi, p. 279).

The mode in which these questions may be decided 
regulates the interpretation to be given to the Platonic 
philosophy, both in the original conception of its author 
and in its subsequent developments. It explains the 
origin, the cause, and the filiation of the later divergen-
cies, and their wide separation from each other. It 
determines our appreciation of the nature and extent 
of Plato's services to his own and future times, fixes his 
position in the history of philosophy, and ushers in the 
same radiance of the human intellect. It affects our estimate of 
his relation to his disciples, to his country, and to his 
times; and, indeed, penetrates and colors every part of 
the criticism which may be hazarded on his personal 
and speculative career.

III. Relations to his Times.—For the just and ade-
quate conception of Plato it is indispensable to ascertain 
his actual position in the Hellenic world, and his atti-
dueto Attic thought, the thought both of the 
general public and of the cultivated intelligences in that 
period of mental activity which follows the death of Pericles. To do this it is necessary to consider the 
remarkable mission of Socrates; for, however Plato may 
have transmitted and glorified his master, he unques-
tionably continued his labors in a higher sphere, and 
both spoke in his name and possessed the power of 
public results. The extreme democracy of Athens, which 
was only the fullest and most pronounced exhibition of 
the general Hellenic tendency, threw all power—politi-
cal, social, and, we may almost say, religious—into the 
hands of the multitude. The populace became more 
constructive, more wilful, arrogant, and reckless after the 
generation produced by the Peloponnesian War and the plague. But the intractable Demus, described in burning linea-
ments by Ariosto, is always under the guidance or 
at the mercy of demagogues, flatterers, and time-serving
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The sense of power produced in the mass in the feeling of right, for with mere numbers "might is right;" and the execrable maxim, "Stet pro ratione voluntas," is the motto of an ochlocracy even more than it is of an autocrat. The mob cannot be led by considerations of abstract morality; it may be wheedled by promises, swelling phrases, by dramatic appeals to its whims, passions, and immediate interests. At Athens it had lost all reverence for the cardinal principles of right; it had been greatly corrupted by the incidents and consequences of the war; it was habitually misguided for some time by its passionate leaders; generousness, mercy, justice, prudence, were all discredited; and everything was sacrificed to momentary caprice, to insane suspicion, and to blind fury (Plato, De Rep. viii., x.-xiii.; Xenoph. De Rep. Ath. Oratores Attici, passim). In these respects the Athenians were merely the highest exemplification of the contemporaneous spirit of the Greeks. The leaders, who debauched the people, could hope to gain or to retain their ascendancy only by encouraging the debauched sentiments by which they thrived. Under these circumstances professed teachers visited the houses and the galleys, under-taking to communicate for the corrodery arts by which the populace might be swayed, and office, power, honor, and emolument acquired. By the union of these bad influences truth lost all respect; virtue all authority; the sense of right was destroyed; every ancient rule of practical politics was deprived of its sanction; every venerable principle was brought into contempt; morality was supplanted by passion or apparent expediency; nothing stable was suffered to remain; words became jugglers' tools, reason was degraded to chicanery, casuistry, and sonorous plausibility; and specious rhetoric or ambiguous commonplaces took the place of wisdom. No hope could be entertained for the renewed health of society, for the welfare of the community, for the restoration of order in the state, till this vicious circle of delusions had been broken and suppressed. But the delusions, and the pernicious practices which attended them, were fortified by the conceit of knowledge and of practical sagacity; and this conceit could not be overcome without exposing the ignorance which it concealed, and compelling the vain tribe of blind leaders of the blind to confess their ignorance with shame and remorse. The most effective mode of reaching this result might well seem to be the examination of the nature, import, and ambiguities of words, habitually and loosely used without reference to their special significance or insignificance, the investigation of the shadowy, casuistic, and sonorous plausibility; and the detection of the conditions under which valid conclusions might be drawn. Lessons of this character could not be effectually communicated to persons confident in their own knowledge and perspicacity, and contemptuous all who were of a different communion, otherwise than by proposing a series of interrogations growing not out of each other, but out of the argumentation, and thus leading the respondents into a labyrinth of perplexities, absurdities, inconsistencies, and impotent confusion. No escape would then be left from the recognition of previous ignorance and error. The better nature would be stimulated to further inquiry, and to persistent efforts to attain a knowledge of momentous truths, or, at least, to abstain from the preconization of manifest uncertainties, unmeaning verbiage, or interested misrepresentations, as unquestionable truth. Now this procedure was the Socratic elénchus, and it was most effectually carried on by the Socratic form of reasoning, most fallacious form of reasoning, but most piercing in unveiling the hollow pretensions of arrogant sophistry. It was a keen "examination of conscience," intended to lay bare the habitual sins of ignorance, false knowledge, and fraudulent conceit. It was not designed to teach anything but the knowledge of self, and the accompanying knowledge of ignorance disguised as wisdom. This was the true Noēse toipum, and the ground on which the Delphic Oracle pronounced Socrates the wisest of men—because he professed to know nothing. It was a contrivance for sweeping away error, as the true blasts of the Socratic oracles, by discrediting its various appeals to its whims, passions, and immediate interests. At Athens it had lost all reverence for the cardinal principles of right; it had been greatly corrupted by the incidents and consequences of the war; it was habitually misguided for some time by its passionate leaders; generousness, mercy, justice, prudence, were all discredited; and everything was sacrificed to momentary caprice, to insane suspicion, and to blind fury (Plato, De Rep. viii., x.-xiii.; Xenoph. De Rep. Ath. Oratones Attici, passim). In these respects the Athenians were merely the highest exemplification of the contemporaneous spirit of the Greeks. The leaders, who debauched the people, could hope to gain or to retain their ascendancy only by encouraging the debauched sentiments by which they thrived. Under these circumstances professed teachers visited the houses and the galleys, under-taking to communicate for the corrodery arts by which the populace might be swayed, and office, power, honor, and emolument acquired. By the union of these bad influences truth lost all respect; virtue all authority; the sense of right was destroyed; every ancient rule of practical politics was deprived of its sanction; every venerable principle was brought into contempt; morality was supplanted by passion or apparent expediency; nothing stable was suffered to remain; words became jugglers' tools, reason was degraded to chicanery, casuistry, and sonorous plausibility; and specious rhetoric or ambiguous commonplaces took the place of wisdom. No hope could be entertained for the renewed health of society, for the welfare of the community, for the restoration of order in the state, till this vicious circle of delusions had been broken and suppressed. But the delusions, and the pernicious practices which attended them, were fortified by the conceit of knowledge and of practical sagacity; and this conceit could not be overcome without exposing the ignorance which it concealed, and compelling the vain tribe of blind leaders of the blind to confess their ignorance with shame and remorse. The most effective mode of reaching this result might well seem to be the examination of the nature, import, and ambiguities of words, habitually and loosely used without reference to their special significance or insignificance, the investigation of the shadowy, casuistic, and sonorous plausibility; and the detection of the conditions under which valid conclusions might be drawn. Lessons of this character could not be effectually communicated to persons confident in their own knowledge and perspicacity, and contemptuous all who were of a different communion, otherwise than by proposing a series of interrogations growing not out of each other, but out of the argumentation, and thus leading the respondents into a labyrinth of perplexities, absurdities, inconsistencies, and impotent confusion. No escape would then be left from the recognition of previous ignorance and error. The better nature would be stimulated to further inquiry, and to persistent efforts to attain a knowledge of momentous truths, or, at least, to abstain from the preconization of manifest uncertainties, unmeaning verbiage, or interested misrepresentations, as unquestionable truth. Now this procedure was the Socratic elénchus, and it was most effectually carried on by the Socratic form of reasoning, most fallacious form of reasoning, but most piercing in unveiling the hollow pretensions of arrogant sophistry. It was a keen "examination of conscience," intended to lay bare the habitual sins of ignorance, false knowledge, and fraudulent conceit. It was not designed to teach
Socrates the principal speaker, illustrating the Socratic method under the mask of Socrates, and putting nearly everything of weight, moment, or originality into his mouth. He never appears in *propria persona*. There is nothing to connect him before the Athenian dicatars, with any of the retinue of his admirers. It is to an intense and intricate desire of a constant avoidance of definite doctrine, a frequent censure of written instruction, a continual reference to the ob- stetrical procedure, and a deliberate renunciation of all responsibility. Everything is thus adverse to systema- tic unity of any kind in the *Corpus Platonicum*. The dramatic form of nearly all the Platonic writings has just been mentioned as one of the instrumentalties by which the philosopher subdued his personality, and withdrew himself from the malice of his fellow-citizens; but it constitutes one of the distinguishing excellences of his composition. Whatever construction may be put upon Plato's philosophical career, whatever value may be assigned to his speculations, whatever censure of his doctrines may be hazarded, his varied literary merits and graces have always won the most enthusiastic admira- tion. In a beautiful epigram on his great comrade, Plato contemporary attributed to him, Plato says that the Graces found in the soul of Aristophanes a temple which should never decay. The comedies of Aristophanes were Pla- to's constant companions. He caught from them many delightful turns which were solely refused to a more thoughtful mind, and he offered in his own Protagonist an equally im- perishable temple for the habitation of the Graces. Plato probably owes much more of his immortality to the beauties of his compositions than he does to his philosophic splendor and profundity; and perhaps it was chiefly through the fascination of his manner that his doctrines secured the attention necessary for their ap- praisal and acceptance. The literary attractions of the Platonic writings furnish their first and most easily recognized claim to permanent renown, and can scarcely be a mere accidental circumstance. Plato's earliest efforts were in the direction of poetry. He is believed to have produced attempts of high pre- tention in the popular forms of poetic art. No literary ap- prehensiveness equals poetical composition. When he first associated himself with Socrates he was full of dreams of political distinction, and he may have expected to derive from the intercourse the same aids for a political career which were derived by other illustrious pupils of the school. When he renounced the temptations of a political career, he converted to philosophic purposes all the enthusiasm and all the ardor of his youth. He abandoned his former line of ap- parent expression which he had acquired by his pre- vious discipline. The result was a style unrivaled for variety, fertility, vivacity, ease, flexibility, and almost every form of literary excellence. The great difficulty of expression—to say simple things simply, and ordi- nary things with propriety (difficulté est communis di- cre) —was never surmounted by any writer with such facility as by Plato. None has approached him in the natural facility with which he changes the mood of ex- pression with the changed mood of feeling, or with the requirements of the object of his treatise. He treats "from more grave to gay, from lively to severe," with inimitable self-possession; rising without effort to the highest sub- limities of imagination, descending without a fall to the playfulness of unchecked humor, and poising himself in the middle air without hazard and without uneasy flut- tering of his pinions.

The exuberance of the Greek vocabulary can be esti- mated only by comparing Aristophanes with Plato— not that they exhaust its wealth, but that they have an equal mastery of its treasures than any other writ- ers of the tongue. In this comparison Plato will not appear inferior to Aristophanes in the extent of his pos- session, in the happiness of their employment, or in the force of their combinations. Words, are, however, only the currency of thought and feeling. The pre- eminent merit of Plato is equally manifest in the plas- ticity of his phraseology; the appropriate turns of ex- pression—the homesickness at times, at times the rare magnificence of his diction; the close adaptation of the utterance to the sentiment, so as to furnish a perfect cast of whatever is intended to be conveyed, no matter how convoluted and intricate the phrase may be. A constant balance must be added the balance and harmony of all the instrumenta-

1. The dictionary is named *Protagoras*. ly of communication, and—that which most de- lighted an Athenian—the rhythm and melody which are almost imperceptible to moderns as "the music of the spheres" to those who know not "divine phileo-

2. The dictionary is named *Plato*. phy." These remarkable excellences are only aids for the fuller exhibition of higher characteristics of art. The drama was the favorite recreation of the Athenian peo-

3. The dictionary is named *Aristophanes*. ple; their whole life was dramatic; their time was spent in the open air, "hearing or telling some new thing"; their political discussions were dramatic; their forensic controversies were thoroughly theatrical; their social gatherings and their street colloquies were all dramatic—and the dialogue was in consequence the natural representation of their daily existence, as well as the customary procedure of Socrates. The Dia-

4. The dictionary is named *Plato*. logues of Plato, at once artful and artistic, seemed wholly devoid of art, from their correspondence with the familiar usages of the people; and thus they won regard and ready acceptance, which might have been denied to a more studiously refined and imaginative form. Then, too, the dialogue enabled the au-

5. The dictionary is named *Plato*. thor to turn and twist a question into every imaginable attitude and shape, and Plato revelled in the perform-

6. The dictionary is named *Plato*. ance of such legendain. It furnished an opportunity of bringing a thesis or a doubt on every possible side; and, more effective are the Dialogues of Plato, at once artful and artistic, seemed wholly devoid of art, from their correspondence with the familiar usages of the people; and thus they won regard and ready acceptance, which might have been denied to a more studiously refined and imaginative form. Then, too, the dialogue enabled the au-

7. The dictionary is named *Plato*. thor to turn and twist a question into every imaginable attitude and shape, and Plato revelled in the perform-

8. The dictionary is named *Plato*. }
practical interest and significance. The total neglect
into which the great schoolmen have fallen, when con-
trasted with the unfading fame of Plato, may prove
how much of his genius in every age has been due to
his literary skill and the marvellous subtlety and per-
fection of his dialogue.

If we frankly and admiringly confess the variety and
splendor of the Platonic style, we must not close our
eyes to its occasional defects. The copiousness of his
expression, and the joy of indulging his genius encour-
aged loquacity and a needless languor of move-
ment. The richness of his imagination, lavished upon
reveries, also led to turgidity and inappropriate gor-
geousness of rhetoric. These defects were noticed by
the ancient critics, and can sometimes be overlooked
by the sober modern student (Dionys. Halicarn. De
There is the brilliancy, but there is also the extrava-
gance of the Melitonic outbursts of fancy, and, as the
language far outstrips the thought, it becomes obscure,
like a cloud before the sun, whose darkness is deepened
by the fringe of radiance on its borders.

It is not merely from this cause that Plato frequently
lapses into obscurities and awkwardnesses. He is some-
times more concerned about his expression than about his
thought, and his works reflect his magnificence to him-
self, and in mysteries not clear to his own mind. There
was constant demand for the services of a Delian diver.
The subjects which he handled were not only deep, but
unfathomable by him; not only dark, but undefined.
Theoverlaying approaches by which he was balked was reflected
by the insubstantiality of his utterances. There was also
a misleading star by which he was often led astray,
and tempted into pathless intricacies. The imagination
of Plato was the commanding faculty of his intellect,
and he followed its beams too far. He was a poet by
congenital propensity. Aristotle has said that the phi-
losopher is a devotee of fable (φαλάνθρες ὁ φιλόσοφος
φαλάνθρες, Metaph. i, ii, p. 982). Plato furnished the
example and confirmed the dictum. He insisted upon
the employment of philosophical fiction as the best
means of popular education; and proposed to substitute
it for the great poets—Homer, Pindar, and the Traged-
ians—whom he condemned and excluded from his com-
monwealth. He was constantly indulging his poetic
appetites, inverting fables for the illustration of his
positions, and converting his fables into philosophical
verses. Plato filled them with luxurious pictures of
more than fantastic dreams—"tenuis sine corpore vi-
tas"? This tendency, which grew with years, eventu-
ated in mysticism; and mysticism is at best a lumin-
ous cloud, unsubstantial, impalpable, inappraisable,
how can it be shown to be true and without reciprocal
V. Philosophy.—From what has already been ob-
served, it will be evident that we could not ascribe to
Plato a definite, distinct, coherent, and complete body
of doctrine. But philosophy, in its original application,
and peculiarly in the Socratic school, imparted the
love and pursuit of truth and wisdom, without assuming
their actual attainment. In the philosophy of every
sect, the method of inquiry and the gerrn of fundamen-
tal principles constitute its distinctive characteristics
and excellences, and determine its superior develop-
ments, whether wrought out by the founder of the school
or by his successors. Thus, though we may
deny to Plato the full creation of a philosophic system,
we must admit that he laid the corner-stone and some
of the foundations of a system; that he opened out new
paths of inquiry and broadened old ones, that he stimu-
lated investigation by characteristic modes, and com-
municated a potent impulse in a particular direction;
and that he furnished new and pregnant germs of
thought to be cherished into ample growth and produc-
tion by those who should come after him. These germs
are as yet without life, as yet without reciprocal
connection; but they may be discovered, harmonized,
and combined. Though their meaning may appear di-
verse to different minds, their combinations be variously
established, and their developments be strangely diver-
gent, yet a general accordance in the constitution of all
the expositions of his system and his doctrine attests the presence of a distinctive and fruitful though
undisclosed body of thought in the original founder of
the sect. It is this body of thought, indicated, but un-
equally and imperfectly revealed, in the Platonic
manifestations—manifested from them, and co-narrated by a succession of sects, that constitutes that first
in the authentic texts—which constitutes the philosophy
of Plato. Partly in consequence of the length of this no-
tice, partly in consequence of the impossibility of refer-
ing the connected scheme in its connected form to
Plato, it will be presented in a brief outline under the
head of PLATONIC PHILOSOPHY.

VI. Services and Influence.—A few remarks may be
added here on the character and tendency of the Pla-
tonic teachings, as no appropriate place will be found
for them in the present examination of Platonic
doctrine. The aim of Plato was to bring his pupils to
a knowledge of their intellectual sins, and to a confes-
sion of ignorance and guilt in their pretensions and
practices, in order that a foundation for truth might be
discovered, and the rules of correct action and upright
conduct must be found. The whole enterprise of the
object was to confute intellectual chicanery, to dispel
delusion, and to lead men to an eager desire for justice,
righteousness, and wisdom. For his greater pupil, Aris-
totle, was reserved the task of building on the ground
which he had prepared in form and ruin and poisonous
weeds. But the vast and magnificent structures of the
Stagirite are the best proof of the valuable service
which Plato rendered. The domination of sophistry
was ended by the career of Socrates and the institution
of Plato's Academy. In various modes, earnest men
addressed themselves to the search for truth, and ceased
to wander after "sounding brass and tinkling cymbals.
Healthy thought, eager purpose, and honest resolution
were reawakened throughout the realm of Hellenic in-
tellect; and, though devious paths were pursued, and
dissimilar resting-places accepted as the goal, all prose-
cuted their investigations with a single eye to truth,
and not as the means of fraudulently gaining personal
advantage. As the Knights of the Round Table sepa-
rated in the quest of the Holy Grail, which only one
achieved, the philosophers of Greece, after Socrates
passed away, travelled and lost in Platonic groves. The
philosophers, however, on the Platonic trail, pursued the
same end, though Aristotle alone accomplished the task
which all contemplated. The pursuit of the summum
bonum, or supreme good, became after Plato the special
object of all philosophy (Cicero, De Fis. Bon. et Mal.).
Divergence was found in the backs of the inquiry, but
the forms of good which were contemplated, but
with all the schools virtue and happiness, which was its
promised fruit, were the aim. The utter rotenessness of
the communities of Greece, the irreparable disintegra-
tion of Hellenic society, prevented the new spirit from
influsing health into the diseased political fabric;
but the unexamined integrity of Lycurgus, and the exalted
morality of Demosthenes in his Orations, both alleged
pupils of Plato, may be taken as evidence of the whole
some reaction produced. To the lofty and pure senti-
ments of Plato, even more than to the beauty of his
style, may be applied the observation of Quintilian:
"Ut mihi non hominis ingenio sed quodam Delphico
videatur oracula instructus" (Or. Inst. x, i, 81).

The philosophy and the habitual sentiments of Greece
were purified and elevated by the teachings of Plato,
and the world never wholly lost the vantage-ground
which had thus been gained. There is indeed nothing
more remarkable in the history of Greek intellect than
the purity of sentiment, the spirituality of aspiration,
the adoration of virtue and holiness and justice and
right, the fervent and unbroken re-rose, irrespective of consequences, and the intuitive apprehen-

sion of the highest precepts of morality, which shine
through all the writings of Plato. They are blended, occasionally, it is true, with coarse views contracted from the habitual practice of the pagan world around. Some of these views are too disgusting to be commended on any count, and Plato, in the actual or spiritualized, is like the Pythagorean averse to all but the purest of human feelings. When he advocates the community of goods and the community of women, and the paternal abnegation of children, in the governing class of his ideal commonwealth, we see how far the fantasy betrayed him into pernicious error (De Rep. v.). There was no greater service rendered to the human soul than the confutation of these dangers and immoral extravagances. But when we contemplate the positions of Plato in regard to the perfections of God, to the nature of virtue and holiness; when we consider his declaration that man should assimilate himself to the Deity, that God is the source of good, but not of evil, that the regeneration of the spiritual nature is not to be attained by argumentative reasoning, and cannot be taught as a science or an art; when we regard his assertion of the immortality of the soul, his belief in future retribution, his assertion that the highest truth must be revealed, his delineation of the Son of God (τοῦ Θεοῦ γιγνομένου)—it is impossible to overlook his vast superiority over all former schemes of morality, and his near approximation to the doctrines of Christianity—some of which he announced, and some of which he deprecated, as unnecessary. We know no more terrible and sublime passage than the passage in which he depicts the dead presenting themselves for judgment in the other world, scoured and bloated and branded with the indelible marks of their earthly sins (ψυχήν διὰ σαμμαρισμοῦ καὶ αἰχματούσην ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐπὶ τὴν ψυχήν, κ. τ. λ. Gorg. c. 112). Yet this is but one of many analogous passages. This approximation to revealed truth is among the most insoluble problems bequeathed to us by antiquity. It has been derived of much of his theological and ethical doctrine from the Hebrew prophets, either circuitously or by direct acquisition during his supposed travels in Palestine. But his tenets are not to be found in those prophets in such a form as to be apprehended by a Gentile; nor can they be detected in them except through the illumination of the later revelation. It has been alleged that the spiritual interpretation of these utterances, which gives them their startling significance, is unwar- rantedly deduced from the Neo-Platonists, who were possibly the first to realize it. But the tenets of the Greek Master are hesitating and only problematical—dreams thrown out as possibilities, the vague longings of the ecstatic fancy—but the mystery remains; how could such dreams and longings arise in the midst of paganism, and of Athe- nian degradation and corruption? We offer no solution of the enigma, which awaits its Odysseus. We only note the existence of the riddle. There are marvels in the life of men and of nations which no plummet in man's bands can fathom, but which justify the conviction that, as the spirit of God brooded over the face of the deep, and brought order and beauty and life out of chaos, so it incessantly broods over the dark confusion of earthly change, regenerating all issues, and preparing the world, in the midst of manifold disorder, for the higher and purer phases of being for which it is designed, and towards which it is blindly striving. We are not of the number of those who accept without inquiry the tenets of Plato, or approve the whole tendency of his teachings. We are of another school. We recognize, however, that his aims are always noble, and that an invigorating morality breathes through nearly all his works. We are the recipients of many glorious visions of supernal beauty, which beam upon us like the unattainable stars disclosed through rifts in the clouds which envelop the earth. But the philosophy of Plato is essentially mystical, and consequently unsubstantial; and, though mysticism may in- }
with occasional Annotations on the Nine Dialogues translated by Sydenham, and copious Notes by the latter Translator, etc. (Lond. 1804, 5 vols. 8vo). At the very time of Roger's complaint a new and respectable version was on the eve of appearance: The Works of Plato, a New and Literal Version, chiefly from the Text of Stallbaum, by Henry Cary and others (Bohn, Lond. 1848, 6 vols. sm. 8vo). A third and admirable version, recently produced, satisfies the desires and removes the grounds of censure expressed by Rogers: Jowett, The Dialogues of Plato, translated into English, with Analyses and Introductions (republished N.Y. 1874, 4 vols. 8vo). A new and revised edition of the work has recently appeared.

The other aids deserving of notice in this connection are, Day, Summary and Analysis of the Dialogues of Plato (1870, 8vo); Grote, Plato and the other Companions of Sokrates (2d ed. 1867, 8 vols. 8vo); Lewes, Biographical Hist. of Philosophy; Rogers, Essays, "Plato and Socrates" (in the Edinburgh Rev. April, 1848, art. 1); Zeller, Plato and the Older Academy, translated by Allyn and Goodwin (Lond. 1874, 8vo). It may be added that indispensable assistance is still rendered by Cicero's Questions Academicae, etc., by Ludworth's Intellectual System of the Universe, and by Brucker's elaborate exposition of the Platonic tenets in his well-known Historiae Criticae Philosophiae. (G. F. H.)

**PLATON**

Antique Bust of Plato.

Platon, a celebrated Russian prelate of modern times, whose family name was Reffechin, was born June 29, 1737. He was the son of a village priest near Moscow, in the university of which capital he received his education, and, besides studying the classical tongues, made considerable proficiency in the sciences. His talents soon caused him to be noticed, and, while a student in theology, he was appointed, in 1757, teacher of poetry at the Moscow academy, and in the following year began to publish in the seminary of the St. Sergius Lawra, and convert. He shortly afterwards entered the Church, became successively hieromonach, prefect of the seminary, and, in 1762, rector and professor of theology. That same year was marked by an event in his life which greatly contributed to his advancement, for on the visit of Catharine II to the St. Sergius Lawra, after her coronation, he addressed the empress in an eloquent discourse, and on another occasion preached before her. So favorable was the impression he made, that he was forthwith appointed court preacher and preceptor in matters of religion to the grand- duke (afterwards the emperor Paul), for whose instruction he drew up his Orthodox Faith, or Outlines of Christian Theology, which is esteemed one of his best and most useful productions, and has been reproduced in English by Pinkerton (Lond. 1814), by Coray (1857), and by Potissaco (1868). During the four years of his residence at St. Petersburg, Platon frequently preached before the court, and also delivered orations on many of the discourses and orations which are among his printed works. After being created member of the synod at Moscow, by an imperial order, he was made archbishop of Twer in 1770. His attention to the duties of his new office was assiduous and exemplary; for he not only set about improving the course of study pursued in the various seminaries throughout his diocese, but established a number of minor schools for religious instruction, and drew up two separate treatises, one for the use of the teachers, and the other for their pupils. He was also intrusted with the task of urging the princess of Wurtemberg, Maria Feodorowna, the grand-duke's consort, in the tenets and doctrines of the Greek-Russian Church. At the beginning of 1775 he received the empress at Twer, and proceeded with her and the grand-duke to Moscow. He was advanced to the powerful position to retain the archimandritship of the Sergius Lawra. With the exception of some intervals occasioned by his being summoned to St. Petersburg, where he preached before the court, it was in that convent that he chiefly resided, until he was erected another in his vicinity at his own expense, in 1785, called the Bethania. Two years afterwards he was made metropolitan of the Russian Church, in which capacity he crowned the emperor Alexander, at Moscow, in 1801, delivering on that occasion a discourse that was translated into several modern languages, besides Latin and Greek. He died in 1818, the bishop of Bethania, Nov. 11–23, 1812. His works, printed at different times, amount in all to twenty volumes, containing, besides various other pieces, 555 sermons, discourses, and orations, many of which are considered masterpieces in style and eloquence. A selection from them, consisting of the finest passages and thoughts, was published in two volumes in 1805—English Cyclop. a. v. See Mouravieff, Hist. of the Church of Russia (Okt. 1842); Otto, Hist. of Russian Literature, p. 327–380; Hagenbach, Hist. of Christian Doctrines, ii, 452, 468; Schlegel, Kiewer Sprach, des 18ten Jahrh. i, 70–80.

Platonic Philosophy, or the philosophy of Plato. The term is loosely and ambiguously applied. It is sometimes used to signify the collection of fragmentary views scattered through the writings of Plato; sometimes it is employed to denote the systematic co-ordination and development of those views by the later academicians; and, most frequently, it is extended to embrace the whole chain of opinion which may be deduced from, or which claims filiation with, the teachings of Plato. These diverse applications of the name are rarely discriminated in ordinary use, and its specific import is left vague and undetermined. This indistinctness cannot be wholly avoided, for it rises out of the disconnected utterances and unsystematic presentations of Plato himself, together with the concurrence of his successors in their efforts to elucidate and systematize his doctrines. In attempting an outline of the Platonic philosophy, the effort will be made to adhere as closely as practicable to the authentic texts in the writings accredited to Plato, and to borrow as little as may be from the speculative inferences of the later authors.

Numerous devices have been employed for the exhibition of the Platonic doctrine, and none of them are entirely satisfactory. It is necessary for a synoptical exposition that some thread should be discovered or invented for the support and connection of its several members, and that some definite commencement should be assumed to which the thread may be attached. The fixed point of departure has been variously chosen; and the tenets of Plato have been strung variously, and with various degrees of skill, on the thread adopted. The Germans, with their inner light and their diverging assumptions, have been peculiarly ingenious, and often peculiarly unhappy, in the performance of their task. They abound in luminous views and in acute suggestions, but they generate such an intricate labyrinth of cross-threads that they dazzle, bewilder, and blind as much as they illuminate. To these they add their arbitrary opinions on Plato, as regards both the import and the coherence of his doctrines. They assert design where no design can be safely asserted. They imagine dependence where all is disconnected; and pretend to explain where systems are not the results of inquiry, feeling the difficulty and the hazard of the task, have been content, like the translators and many
of the editors of Plato, to give an abstract or analysis of the several pieces, with an appreciation of their contents. This leaves the doctrines in their original segregation, and affords little aid in bringing them into one harmonious picture. This process has been, in the main, followed by Grote, whose extensive work appears revised, rearranged, and organized within a compact scheme, which could not have been contemplated by Plato. In avoiding Scylus on the one hand, and Charybdis on the other, we are thrown back upon the original record, with such assistance as may be derived from illustrative works, and especially from the historians of ancient philosophy. Among these expositors, the one who may still render the best service is Brucker. He is in many respects antiquated; he has morbid antipathies and scornful condescensions; he is very mechanical, and even wooden in his arrangements; but he is honest, earnest, industrious, and practical. The very method of his procedure is serviceable, when we seek a summary but connected view of the doctrines which Plato taught, or was supposed in ancient times to have taught.

The leading object of Plato's life and philosophical activity was to teach the Greeks the correct use of reason, and to induce them to apply it, with a constant observance of the requisite conditions, to the practical concerns of private and public life. The human mind, like its constitution and from the defects of its instrument of communication, is ever exposed to the hazard of plausible delusions, and to the peril of accepting fallacies for irrefragable truth. These pernicious consequences were the daily diet of the Athenian people. Hence arose errors in morals, disregard of virtue, indifference to wrong-doing, unremitting license of individual passion or caprice, disintegration of society, corruption, and anarchy. How were welfare, virtue, and happiness to be attained in this mass of disorder? What were justice, right, truth? How were they to be detected, appreciated, and appropriated? On truth everything else reposed; but other Greeks besides the Cretans were habitual liars (Graciu mendax). What is truth? The interrogation of Pilate was the fundamental question propounded by Plato to himself and to his age; and, in propounding it, he trod in the steps of Socrates, as a whole series of questions about the essence of being, and they must agree with each other. How are they to be reached and reconciled? If the instruments of knowledge are broken, warped, or otherwise disordered, there can be no true knowledge, and no valid apprehension of the character and relation of the facts with which we have to do. The purpose of Plato was, in some respects, similar to the purpose of Bacon. Bacon proposed to rectify the processes of reasoning in the investigation of nature, for the attainment of scientific knowledge, and for the practical benefits thence to be derived. Plato, in a more general manner, for the intellectual and moral improvement of men, of societies, and of states. Coleridge has enlarged upon the correspondences of Plato and Bacon, and has exaggerated them. It was a fine and just instinct which suggested the parallelism. With Plato, as with Bacon, the first step was the exposure and expulsion of confused ignorance and presumptuous error; the refutation of the vast brood of sophisms which swarmed around every principle of speculation and conduct; the determination of the character, extent, and value of imperfect knowledge, in order to secure the legitimate use of reasoning, and for the avoidance of its abuse. Only after this had been done would it be possible to arrive at trustworthy knowledge or safe opinion in regard to the universe of which we are members, and in regard to the relations in which we stand to it and to its parts. The truth of being, as a subject of knowledge, thus demanded and presupposed the truth of knowledge, not in its rounded fulness, but in its formulary of procedure. In the ultimate and unattainable result, the truth of knowledge would accord and be superficially coextensive with the truth of being, as the province of the art of discerning corresponds with the object reflected. Not until such a recognition of the truth of being was gained as the competency of the weak, fallible, finite mind of man might permit, could the conduct of men find safe and authoritative regulation, and the truth of action, or right in all moral contingencies, be discovered. To reason accurately in order to know the essential character of the facts on which action should depend, and by which it must be controlled, and to use right reason and correct knowledge of facts for the determination of right action, may be said to be an abstract statement of the Platonic scheme, which thus embraces the whole duty of man. The intricate casuistry of Plato, and the breathless flights of his daring and playful fancy, withdrew attention from his solens, earnest, direct, everyday aim. The method of his procedure is serviceable, when we seek a summary but connected view of the doctrines which Plato taught, or was supposed in ancient times to have taught.

In strict accordance with this interpretation of Plato's latent meaning, his philosophy is distributed under three heads: I. Dialectical Philosophy; II. Theoretical, Contemplative, or Physical; III. Practical (Cicero, Acad. Quest. i, § 19). The second and third divisions are subdivided. This distribution is not distinctly proposed in Plato's works, but it is implied in them. It is accredited by Sextus Empiricus to Xenocrates, Plato's second successor in the Academy. The terms employed are earlier than Plato, as are the inquiries also. It must not be forgotten that though Plato was in the main Socratean, he was also a votary of other doctrines - Eclectic, if not Synergetistic, and, in his later writings, largely Pythagorean.

I. Dialectical Philosophy. The term "Dialectic" includes in Plato much more than it does in Aristotle (Sophist, p. 253; De Rep. vii, 582-583; Aristotle, Topica, i. 1. Sophist, Elech. xxxii; Metaph. ii. i; iii. 2; Eth. i. 2). It is not confined to the art of probable argumentation, nor to the discovery of truth by argumentation, the characteristics of correct and incorrect reasoning, the conduct of the understanding, and so much of psychology as is concerned with the operations of the mind in the acquisition, estimation, and communication of knowledge. This wide range may be illustrated by Lord Bacon's inclusion under the title of the "Artes Interscientifiae, Judicandae, Retinendae, et Tradendae" (De Augm. Sci. v, 6).

There is a fundamental enigma which demands solution at the commencement of all inquiry, and which has been designated the problem in a startling manner in more general manner, for the intellectual and moral improvement of men, of societies, and of states. Coleridge has enlarged upon the correspondences of Plato and Bacon, and has exaggerated them. It was a fine and just instinct which suggested the parallelism. With Plato, as with Bacon, the first step was the exposure and expulsion of confused ignorance and presumptuous error; the refutation of the vast brood of sophisms which swarmed around every principle of speculation and conduct; the determination of the character, extent, and value of imperfect knowledge, in order to secure the legitimate use of reasoning, and for the avoidance of its abuse. Only after this had been done would it be possible to arrive at trustworthy knowledge or safe opinion in regard to the universe of which we are members, and in regard to the relations in which we
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"nai intellectus ipse." The mind is its own place. It is lord of itself, and of all the world beside. Sense is an affection of the mind through the intervention of the corporeal sensibilities. Permanent impressions made by the senses are retained by the faculty of memory. The mind receives with its sensitive experiences constitutes opinion—true opinion when they agree, false opinion when they are discordant (Phileb., p. 84; Theaet., p. 186). The knowledge of things in time is uncertain, and amounts only to opinion. The human mind may be conceived to be a tablet of wax, ready to receive and to retain any impression. This is, however, merely an illustration (Xyloph. Iren.). Thought is the commingling of the mind with itself. Speech is the sensible utterance of thought. Words are not knowledge, but only the means and vehicle of knowledge (Theatet., p. 191, 292).

Intelligence, or real knowledge, is the action of the mind in the contemplation of the prime Intelligibles, or incorporeal types of being. It is twofold; the first is the perception of the soul, which beheld its appropriate Intelligible, before descending into the body; the second or real knowledge is that which the mind receives while enveloped in its carnal integument. The latter, or mundane knowledge, is the restored but broken recollection of what had been known in a pre-existent state, and must be distinguished from the acquisitions of knowledge which are associated with things intelligible, as the other is with things sensible (Timaeus, p. 30; Phaedon, p. 74-76; comp. Wordsworth, Ode on Intimations of Immortality, etc.). This doctrine of reminiscence is a peculiarly Platonic fancy, and fascinated the later Platonists to such an extent that Symeias declined a bishopric in the Christian Church rather than renounce the dream. It is implicated, as cause or consequence, with the doctrine of the Platonic ideal, as both are with the dialectic process by which Socrates and Plato strove to dissipate error and to evolve truth from the minds of men. The manifesto of the mind is the Socratic mockery; Socrates professed, and which Plato represented him as professing, necessitated the assumption that truth was present potentially in the mind, and that it only required to be drawn from its latent state by adroit handling. It could not be latent, nor could it be brought forth, unless it lay there like a chrysalis, and descended from an anterior condition of being. It was in a super-terrestrial and antemundane existence that souls had acquired

"Aetherum sensum, atque arat simplicis ignem."

but before their demission, or return to earth, they had been steeped in oblivion,

"Silicet immemores suprema ut convexa revendant."

The acquisition of genuine knowledge was thus the restoration of the obliterated memories of supernal realities. Absurd and extravagant as this tenet appears in its Platonic form, it was a dreamy and ineffectual effort to give definite expression to the mysterious process of thought. The doctrine was modified and transformed by St. Augustine, who conceived it to derive it of its wildness and irrationality. He conceived the human mind to be constituted in perfect harmony with the universe. The acquisition of knowledge was the evolution of this harmony, and it was accompanied with instinctive conceptions of the pre-adaptation. Many of the strange revivals of Plato may be similarly reduced to a priori probability.

The supernal realities which are the objects of the pure and of the purified intelligence are the first Intelligibles, presented to the contemplation of unembodied and undetected spirits. These prime intelligibles are Ideas—eternal images, immaterial archetypes (sine corpore formis) — patterns or conceptions forever present to the Divine Mind, furnishing the models, and, indeed, the essence, of all the temporal creation. The term Ideas was older than Plato; but its application to heavenly types, its metaphysical employment, and its substitution for the Pythagorean Numbers, were almost certainly Platonic inventions (Parmenid, p. 193; De Rep., vi, 509). It has justly been remarked by Ueberweg, as it had often been remarked before Ueberweg, that the Platonic philosophy centres in the theory of ideas. All Platonists and Neo-Platonists all converge towards this point. But the Ideas of Plato are not merely his central doctrine; they are usually conceived to be his distinctive doctrine. As such, they were assailed and refuted by Aristotle (Metaph. i. vii, viii), who, nevertheless, substituted a more rationalistic concept of things intelligible. As such, they were received and expanded by the New Platonists. As such, they have given life and name to all associated schemes of philosophy, included under the broad name of Idealism. As such, they furnished the battle-ground for the long, impassioned, and bitter controversy of the Realists and Nominalists. See Realism and Nominalism.

According to Plato, following the Eleatic school and Heraclitus, all sensible or concrete existence is prizable, feeling, and imperfect; but all this imperfection involves the essence of the perfect. The soul, when it beheld the immortal (Aristot. Metaph. i. vi; Alex. Aphrod. Asclep. et Anon. Urb. Schol. ad loc.). If some things are good, there must be an absolute goodness, in which all things good participate, and which they feebly reflect. This absolute is the incorruption of the beautiful. If actions are just, beneficent, or holy, there must be an eternal justice, beneficence, and holiness, whence they derive their character (Philebus, p. 243-250; Hipp. Maj. p. 294, 295; Conow., p. 210-219; Phaedo, p. 100-112). The passing things of sense acquire their essential character from the indwelling of these immutable existences, however these may be warped and deformed by being reduced to temporal conditions. As it is with abstract qualities, so it is with individual things. A dog, a horse, a man, a woman, sit and stand, eat and drink, walk and run, breathe and sleep, are the expressions of the essential nature of those animals—carnality, opinion, humanity. Each differs from other members of its class, or is individualized, by union with matter, and consequent deflection from the perfect conception of the breed. Each, therefore, is an inadequate and, consequently, untrue representation of the true and perfect being of its kind, and approaches such perfection just in proportion as it approximates to the true, perfect, and eternal image. These intelligible and untenable perfection is the idea, present from the beginning, or before all beginning, in the contemplation of the Divinity, after which all things are made that were made. They are not merely the models of created things, but their essence. In the progress towards truth, all phenomenal being, all concrete existence, all temporal presentation, all earthly images, all sensible apprehensions, must be left behind, and, by an ascending process, the purified intelligence must pierce the veil and phantasmal appearances of time, and look upon the absolute, everlasting, unchanging, and divine ideas of things. These being, therefore, is an inadequate and, derived from sense is phenomenal, evanescent, and delusive. The doctrine of ideas will reappear, for, as Brückner notes, neither the metaphysics and theology of Plato, nor his physical and ethical philosophy, can preserve any consistency without them. Ideas form the first order of intelligibles and are apprehended by the pure reason with the aid of the scientific understanding (νοησις μετα λογιου περαιτερων). The second order consists of species which are united with matter and cannot be separated from it—the ininseparable sensible species of the schoolmen. These are apprehended by the understanding with the concurrence of the intuitive faculty. Things sensible are, in like manner, primary and secondary, and are apprehended only conjunctly through irrational perception (παθι μετα αιθησιν των λογιων εορθων). Intelligibles belong to the intelligible and eternal universe (υπο νοησιος, αυ ουκε
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Sensibles are the shadows of the intelligible, and appertain to the visible, phenomenal, and shifting world (τὸ φάντασμα, τὸ αἰσθήσις, τὸ ὑποκάτωτα δυνάμει τῆς γνώμης). Knowledge attaches only to the former: from the latter nothing better than opinion can spring (Timæus, p. 281; De Rep., vi. 25, p. 598).

Knowledge is the truth and falsehood: in matters concerned with action, it judges of right and wrong. The moral or practical judgment proceeds from an ingenuous sense of beauty and goodness, and decides, in particular instances, by comparison with the example of excellence. Truth, beauty, and goodness are thus nearly identified, and are exhibited as different aspects of the same perfect idea. Beauty is conformity to the idea, and the idea is perfectly good and true.

In dialectical procedure, the first thing to be determined is the essential nature of the object under consideration. The essence is established by definition, division, and resolution. The accidents are separated by induction and ratiocination, or deduction from first principles. In detecting the essence we reduce the manifold into the single and the simple, and trace the one in the many. The Platonic scheme is presented in the Republic (vii). It is noticeable that hypotheses are admitted by Plato among the processes for discovering truth. The abstract theory thus sanctions the large use of imagination which prevails over its whole system. We have therefore to determine the form, and to compare the dialectics of Plato with the severe logic of Aristotle, and with the elaborate devices proposed in the second book of Bacon's Organon. Words are no criteria of the character of things. They are loosely imposed, in consonance with popular impressions, and do not agree with realities. Yet words and language are of grave importance, and require to be used with propriety and precision, to avoid indistinctness and ambiguity, and consequent delusion or deception. The art of effective speech springs from a just knowledge of the intellectual powers and emotions, of the disposition of men, and of the different forms of expression. The perfect orator is one who has these endowments, knows the arts of persuasion, and can apply them to his purposes (Phædrus, p. 258). The value which Plato attached to the sciences of composition is attested by the skill and beauty of his own compositions. He has also strongly declared it (Ibid., p. 258). Hence, when we find him ridiculing and denouncing rhetoric in the Gorgias, and comparing it to unhomely cookery, we must assume the opposition to be real. The Gorgias was an attack, and designed only for the refutation of the Sophists and sophistical teachers of rhetoric (Inst. Or., ii. 15). The dialectics of Plato thus embraced every thing connected with the discovery, determination, and communication of truth, in its subjective aspect. But it will be remembered there was, in addition to the truth of knowing, the truth of being also; and this forms the second part of the Platonic philosophy.

II. Theoretical, Contemplative, or Physical Philosophy.—This grand division of Platonic speculation is developed under three heads: Physics, Proper, and Mathematics, which is a sort of appendix to the other two. It will be observed that the term Physics is employed in a very wide and unrestricted sense, to include not merely nature, but everything extrinsic to the intellectual operations and the ethical conduct of man. It is contradistinguished from dialectics by the recasting the constitution of things, while the latter is confined to their mental apprehension and exposition. It is contrasted with ethics, as it is concerned with essential being, while the latter deals only with what is. The division is made in the Phædo (ii, p. 108; comp. De Rep., ii. 19, p. 881). It is further to be observed that the Platonic doctrines are rarely conveyed in explicit propositions, but must be gathered from fragmentary statements, from incidental expressions, from poetical fancies, and from the general tenor of discussion. In the Phædo, Plato explains the utter abnegation of physical inquiries by Socrates. In the opening of the Timæus, he announces the impossibility of giving anything more than a plausible account (ἰδέας λόγος) of things becoming, and not permanent (vid. Aristotle. sp. Stob. ixxx, 7). Recognizing, then, the difficulties and difficulties of the order due to the character of the procedure and the presumed complexion of the subject, we continue to note the peculiarities of the Platonic philosophy.

I. Theology.—"In the beginning the world was without form." The universe is everywhere filled with the order by the Supreme and Intelligent Cause, who framed the creation in accordance with the perfect and eternal patterns ever present to the divine mind. It is the best of all generated existences, the best of all possible worlds, because it was fashioned by the Highest Goodness and Wisdom working after the absolutely perfect models, or ideas (Timæus, p. 285). It was not made, however, out of nothing, but out of eternally existing matter. Being formed out of matter, it is not free from grave blemishes and defects, which are due to the innumerableness of the infinite, and the difficulty of perceiving matter. God and formless matter are thus the two concurrent but antagonistic causes of the universe. By matter is understood something very different from the palpable substance or body which is habitually contemplated under the name of matter: something totally different also from anything that we can conceive of. It is that remnant or substratum of body which subsists after every cognizable property of body has been removed (Timæus, p. 51; comp. Porph. Sentent. xx; Plotin. Ennead. ii. 4; Berkeley, Sirs, § 817). By ascribing to God the creation of the Cosmos out of unformed matter, Plato avoids the heresy of pantheism. Still he indulges in fantasies which readily lead to it. From the nature of matter as co-eternal with the Divine Intelligence, and from its reductiveness in yielding to the creative energy, originate the necessary existence and form of all created things (Theaet. p. 176). The antagonism of matter suggested the presence of subtle aptitudes and occult qualities. We are thus brought within the range of hypotheses similar to those which underlie the recent theories of Darwin, Spencer, and Huxley.

Matter was the relatively passive ingredient in the process of creation. The active power was the Supreme Intelligence, or Highest Good, whom it is almost impossible to apprehend, and impossible to define (Timæus, p. 29). He is the efficient cause and sustainer of all the things that exist, but is not in any way a sort of author or deifier of the things that exist, and of the existing existences: the founder and ultimate fabricator of everything. His inscrutable reason, self-existent, eternally the same, without beginning, without end, having no affinity with things of sense, and apprehensible only by the pure intellect. He is all-wise, all-seeing, all-foreseeing, all-mighty, except so far as restricted by the intractability of matter. He has absolute freedom of will, is supremely good, and, being good, is void of envy and malevolence. Hence everything made by him is good, so far as he permits. He framed the world in all possible excellence after the eternal image in his own mind. This uncreated and unbeginning idea of the universe (λόγος or λογισμός τοῦ θεοῦ) has been regarded as a third co-eternal principle. This exemplar included the patterns or ideas of all created things thus forming the possible universe being fashioned according to its corresponding type in the intelligible universe, or world of ideas. The doctrine seems to have been deduced from Pythagoras, but was applied by Plato in his own manner only after the revolution made in the Pædo (ii, p. 108; comp. De Rep., ii. 19, p. 881). It is further to be observed that the Platonic doctrines are rarely conveyed in explicit propositions, but must be gathered from fragmentary statements, from incidental expressions, from poetical fancies, and from the imperfect things of earth were thus the obscure, fleeting images of the perfect forms of the divine contemplation. It is un-
certain whether Plato attributed to these ideas a substantive existence of their own, separate from and independent of the divine mind, or supposed them to be simply the different, changeless thoughts of the Godhead. Yet, though God is distinctly and habitually acknowledged as the father and creator of all things, all things were not directly framed and regulated by the Supreme Divinity. For the government of the sensible universe he created a subordinate deity, and placed it in the material creation (Timæus, p. 34). This guiding spirit, or Demiurgus, was a mixture of the ideal and of the material, of the one and of the many, that, being intermediate, it might communicate with both. This was the Animus Mundus, which assumed such promiscuous powers as to involve the physiological and the physical speculations of the Stoics. It maintained the regular operations of the laws of temporal change, and by its plastic energy moulded into appropriate forms all the multitudinous manifestations of transitory being (τὸ γιγαντιονος) (Cratylus, p. 53).

The soul of the universe was not the sole created divinity. Divine spirits were apportioned to the earth, sun, moon, and stars, to govern their developments and to preside over their motions (De Legg. p. 899). Hosts of inferior deities also existed for similar purposes. Thus, with a fine and half-suppressed irony, provision was made for the national gods, and for the 30,000 unnamed divinities attested by Herodot. To these deities, each in his due place in the vast hierarchy, was ascribed the duty of forming men, animals of love to the plants, etc., and of watching over them. In the subordinate ranks of the celestial army were a countless multitude of sprites, who were cousin-german to the sylphs, gnomes, fairies, and other tribes of "little people," and to whom immortality was denied.

The second branch of contemplative philosophy is occupied with the consideration of the order of nature as the product of the acts of creation. Nothing exists or arises without cause. Hence proceeded the Aristotelian maxim vere creare est creare per causas; for the cause affords the ratio essendi, or explanation of the existence of the object investigated. As the universe, or orderly Cosmos, had a producing cause, it was created in time. It was generated or brought into being, and was therefore subject to sensible perception. It was consequently corporeal, visible, and tangible. It could be said to be the same as the body through the presence of fire, or tangible without the presence of earth. An intermediate bond is needed to link two things together, and the fairest of bonds is a mean proportion. Thus, as fire is to air, so is air to water; and as air is to water, so is water to earth. Here are the four elements according to the Pythagorean tetractys or the Pythagoreans. They were held together in their several combinations by the attraction of love. The whole theory is largely Pythagorean, and blends itself with the Pythagorean imaginations about the secret virtues of numbers. The universe is an animated whole, composed of perfect parts, and exempt from the infirmities of age and of disease (Timæus, p. 35). A spherical figure and orbicular motion are given to it and its chief components because a circle is the most perfect of figures, is least liable to injury and obstruction, returns upon itself, and thus promises the greatest duration to the vast living organism in which all things temporal are contained. As the universe had a spherical form and a circular motion conferred upon it, each of the elements had its own appropriate figure. Earth was cubical, fire pyramidal, air octahedral, and water icosidodecahedral, or twenty-sided. These were combined in apt proportions, and all things were ordered "by measure, by number, and by weight."

The details of the cosmogony must be omitted. It may be added that the earth and the seven moving lights, or heavenly spheres, were impregnated with concentric spheres, at harmonic intervals, around a mighty spindle resting on the knees of Necessity; and that their revolutions propagated along the great axis "the music of the spheres" to the earth, which was the fixed and middle orb (De Rep., p. 608). The earth was occupied by animals and human beings created by the subordinate demiurg, to whom was also intrusted the creation of man. But man, as the noblest of animals, was not left wholly to his own devices. Immortal souls, numerous as the stars, were supplied by the Supreme Intelligence, to be provided with terrestrial bodies. These souls were neither emanations nor inspirations, but true creations. They were to guide and govern the material vessels in which they should be confused, as the superior spirits guided and governed the worlds which they controlled. The matter with which they were united exposed them to contamination, to failure, and to a fate which the Platonic mythology, "within the union" results moral evil, or disobedience to the laws of ideal perfection, which are in conformity with the purposes of God. In their earthly condition, human souls were subjected to the general laws of the universe, but were endowed with an undefined freedom of will through their heavenly constitution. Happiness resulted from obedience to the impulses of the better nature, and to the order and economy of the intelligible world.

It was placed in a vacuum, and proved too tedious, to enter into the physiology propounded by Plato; and nothing could be gained from the presentation of his views but the exhibition of Platonic fantasy. We pass to the third part, or appendix, which was intended to serve as once a discipline and as an instrument.

3. Mathematics.—The importance attached by Plato to mathematical science is familiar to every student, and is illustrated by the inscription supposed to have been placed over the entrance to the Academy:—

Model géomètres eut to.

The commendations bestowed by him on this branch of learning (De Rep. vii, p. 822) may be compared with the similar eulogies of Roger Bacon (Opus Majus, pt. iv) in an age of somewhat analogous speculative development, and of Francis Bacon (De Aug. Sci. iii, vi; Essays, 1). They may also be contrasted with the views presented in the diatribe of Sir William Hamilton.

Under the head of mathematics were included, in accordance with the Pythagorean practice, and with the general conception of antiquity, arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, etc. The whole except the producing cause was created in time.

III. Practical Philosophy.—Plato's practical philosophy was in many respects consonant with his physics, or theory of nature. It would not be correct to say that it was founded upon it, for this would be inconsistent with the position that there was no orderly, confused proceeding according to the principle of the Pythagorean doctrine in the mind of its author. There is close correspondence in parts between Plato's physical and practical philosophy, but in others much separation and independence. The agreement must therefore be ascribed to the consciousness of the beholder, of the same kind, in different directions, rather than to an intentional coherence between successive applications of doctrine. The practical philosophy of Plato falls under two heads, Ethics and Politics.

1. Ethics.—Moral questions occupy the largest part of the Platonic writings; but they are treated in the Socratic manner, by question and answer, and are thus proposed in diffuse and disconnected fragments. Plato's aims, his leading tenets, and his modes of explication are derived from Socrates; but his discussions, so far as may be conjectured, are conducted in a much broader spirit and loftier strain. He includes also within the domain of ethics much that would now be referred to theology.

As in the physics everything is traced back to the First Intelligence, the Divine Creator, so in the ethics everything is referable to the divine and beneficent character of God. The good is the summit of all conceivable things. God is absolute goodness. The
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approve good of man (nouson man) is the knowledge and imitation of God, and approximation thereby to the divine nature. "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father is perfect." Everything is good and beautiful so far as it corresponds to the likeness of the divine original, and possesses the characteristics of the pure archetypal ideas of moral perfection. "Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights, in whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning." Ordinary human beings, in popular usage, such as health, strength, high birth, riches, renown, honors, are good only in conjunction with virtue; otherwise they are evil (Protag. p. 351—353). The honorable (the right) alone is good (Alestas, i. 116). This is continually and strenuously asserted in opposition to the old practical and current sentiment among the contemptuous Greeks. Virtue is lovely in itself, and to be loved irrespective of its rewards. Being of heavenly origin, the best reproduction of the divine ideas, and approximating to the divine nature, it is itself divine. Being divine, it is not an art that can be taught, but must be divinely communicated (Euthydem. p. 282). Goodness can be acquired only by the influx and inwardness of the Good.

The object of all knowledge, and it should be the object of all effort, is the assimilation to the highest good— that is, to God. This assimilation consists in the habit and practice of wisdom, fortitude, temperance, justice, and holiness (Theaetet. p. 176; De Legg. iv, 716). The final stage of this approximation is eudaimonia, usually translated happiness, but which implies good dispositions, and a conscience clear, innocent, and void of offence towards God and towards man (Gorg. p. 470; Symposium, p. 188). The Critias breaks off unfinished just at the opening of a full discussion of the conditions of a happy life. The word is also used for the future beatitude which is in himself, his temple, his sanctum, his sanctuary. To his correspond, as nearly as a pagan dream can agree with revelation, to the Scripture rule "to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with God."

As has been observed, the body was regarded as a prison, because composed of malignant matter. Hence humanity was miserable by congenial constitution. The progress towards virtue and holiness was to be achieved by the subjugation of material antagonisms, by the renunciation of worldly aims and temptations, and by the purification of mind and heart from sensual appetites and desires. When rulers had become philosophers and philosophers had become rulers, their wisdom and justice, their taste, their party proclivities, all unfitted him for success in actual politics; and from every effort to engage in them he retired discomfited and disappointed. The more congenial domain of speculation was still open to him. He might organize a state, regulate its citizens, and determine their duties, in the vague realm of fancy, with none to make him afraid of either failure or obstruction. He might look forward to the ultimate adoption of his projects or his principles in some happier time, when philosophers had become rulers, or when rulers had become philosophers. And from generation to generation, instructed by his lessons, might give reality to his dreams (De Legg. v, 739). In abstract modes, and in unrecongnised forms, his visions have been partially accomplished.

The Republic and the Laws differ greatly in tone and doxas, as well as in execution, but they are intimately connected. They are diverse and consecutive presentations of the same general design. The Republic is the ideal state, the Laws the concrete state. The Republic is the dream of a Utopian constitution, the Laws the proposal of a Utopian state. As the poet is an inspired reveler, it would be hazardous to say. Plato may have simply designed, in a blind, heathen, tentative way, to prescribe the "purification of the flesh," and the "overcoming of the world," and "the righteousness which is of God."

The morality of Plato was much higher in aim and sentiment than it was possible to be in its expression, yet in many single precepts it uses nearly the language of revealed truth. It habitually insists upon the charms of virtue and "the beauty of holiness;" and in the definition of the several virtues, which he represents as indissolubly connected (Charon, p. 161). As at times as united in one, he maintains an uncompromising elevation of view. His illustrations, indeed, are often taken with the prevalent vices of his age and country. Thus, in treating of the passions, he is led by his rich and familiar fancy into hypothetical explanations, which have been very easily misunderstood, and which are rel

Pulpative in their original proposition. We refer to his comments on friendship and love. Friendship, or attraction, is ascribed even to the particles of matter; and the like proclivities are bestowed upon primordial souls. Plato is indeed a believer in the doctrine of like attraction. Souls of similar nature are drawn towards each other by the instinct of resemblance resulting from predetermination. The attraction proceeding from conformity in their pure state exercises its due influence only between spirits retaining in some measure their primordial purity. Hence true friendship can exist only between the good (Lydia, p. 214).

Love is a species of friendship, or friendship in its highest intensity. It is of three orders: sensual, animal, or bestial; honorable, having regard to psychical virtues; and mixed, which unites the characteristics of both (Sympos. p. 201). Love, in its two forms of heavenly and earthy, "half beast, half deity," appears in Plato in many ambiguous and Protean shapes, rising from the coarsest pagan sensualism to the purest aspirations for the beautiful and the good. But the dialogue in which its nature is chiefly discussed is so tantalizing, shifting, and bewildering—it is woven with threads of such changing and returning hues—that it furnishes treacherous foundation for any dogmatic conclusions.

2. Political Philosophy.—The two most extensive and elaborate of Plato's treatises are devoted to political questions. Of these, the Republic is the most complete and characteristic triumph of his genius. The Laws is in a rough and unfinished state, and has often been excluded from his works. In narrating the life of Plato, his predilections for political life, his early and unsuccessful intervention in Athenian affairs, his political expiditions to Sicily, and his consultation in matters of state by princes and states, were duly commemorated. The contemplative habits of his mind, his eager fancy, his pitch of tone, his temperament, and his speculative tastes, his party proclivities, all unfitted him for success in actual politics; and from every effort to engage in them he retired discomfited and disappointed. The more congenial domain of speculation was still open to him. He might organize a state, regulate its citizens, and determine their duties, in the vague realm of fancy, with none to make him afraid of either failure or obstruction. He might look forward to the ultimate adoption of his projects or his principles in some happier time, when philosophers had become rulers, or when rulers had become philosophers. From generation to generation, instructed by his lessons, might give reality to his dreams (De Legg. v, 739). In abstract modes, and in unrecongnised forms, his visions have been partially accomplished.
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perception, is, Of Politics, or concerning the Just. The second epigraph may have been formally the addition of Thrasyllos, but it is sanctioned by the text itself (De Rep. ii, p. 686; comp. iv, p. 424). Many critics of great name and others of the ancients have held it to be a theoretical constitution of the state. Others, of not inferior reputation, among the moderns, have considered it as simply an investigation into the nature of justice, illustrated by the state, because the state exhibits the characteristics of justice in a complete form and on a larger scale than the individual could do. Stalhheim, in his Prolegomena, arrayed the arguments adduced in favor of either opinion, and concludes that Plato's design was to portray the image of a perfect and happy life, by prescribing the offices of man in his public and private relations (p. xviii, xix).

We are not disposed to deny this conclusion, which substantially reconciles the previous contradictions; but we think there is something more than this. The ideal, the absolute, the perfect, was always present to the mind of Plato: the whole tenor of his philosophy precluded him from resting in the actual. But his personal and philosophical career urged him also to regard with most earnestness the amelioration of the moral and political condition of his countrymen, and the improvement of their political through the rectification of their moral and religious life. In Greece, the state was everything, the individual being merely a fragment or constituent atom of the state. The life of the citizen was absorbed in the state; the life of the state was reflected in the life of the citizen—was, indeed, imposed on him. According to Greek ideas, the just man could not develop his virtues except in a just state; and the just state could not subsist except through just citizens—just either by native constitution or by compulsion, or by both. Education and discipline would be demanded to produce just rulers and just subjects. The investigation of the nature of justice would accordingly require, in the determination of the form and conditions of a justly organized community (Jowett, Plato, iv, 5); the delineation of the just state would be blended with that of the just man—and the conclusions resulting from the whole inquiry would furnish an earthly image of the Greek City of God (γῆς γας ἀδημοῦ ἀείων ἀτρή τοῖς, De Rep. ix, p. 592). In Pindar, G education both in Plato's doctrine, it would have been left much more formal, and unsatisfactory without the fancies and dreams and political precepts contained in the Stateman, Republic, and Laws. The former furnishes the frame of the complete design for whose construction all the rest was intended.

According to Plato's notion, justice or righteousness is the object and essence of healthy political organizations, and are inquiry into its nature, and the best mode of its realization in the state. Of course he cannot free himself from Hellenic preoccupations. Of course his reactionary tendencies and his oligarchical proclivities produced a constant recoil from the democratic license of his Athenian contemporaries. He was seduced, in the reign of the imitation of Spartan institutions. Even in his wildest vagaries there appears a disposition to employ supposed traditionary practices. He insists upon the strict subordination of ranks; he even petrifies his classes of citizens into castes. He does not rigorously conjoin every one to his class, but accords advancement to those of eminent ability—la carriere ouverte aux talents. He restricts the government to the few (εὐαρχομαντος); the masses he crowds almost into serfs—"beggars of wood and drawer of water," etc. There are two great classes of freemen, the guardians of the state and the craftsmen. The guardians are themselves divided into two orders, the rulers and the auxiliaries. The rulers are selected, by successive examinations till their thirtieth year, from the body of guardians, who are selected at the age of twenty. The training and the selection have some agreement with the Chinese practices, with English competitive examinations, and still more with the regulation of the Ottoman Janizaries. There is also a considerable degree of correspondence between the Platonic organization and a modern constitutively held to be a theoretical constitution of the state. The body of the guardians or auxiliaries is employed as the military forces to repress internal disorders and to repel external danger. The rulers are the supervisors of the community, and are to govern it with a view to the greatest happiness of all (De Rep. iv, p. 24). The auxiliaries are certainly to be the warriors. There is no reason to suppose that the guardians are not to be the warriors also, as to cherish and protect the whole commonwealth. "None of them should have any property beyond what is absolutely necessary; neither should they have a private house, with bars and bolts, closed against any one who has a mind to enter; their provisions should be only such as are required by trained warriors, who are men of temperance and courage; their agreement is to receive from the citizens a fixed rate of pay, enough to meet the expenses of the year and no more, and they will have common meals and live together, like soldiers in a camp. . . . They alone of all the citizens may not touch or handle silver or gold, or be under the same roof with them, or wear them, or drink from them. And this will be their salvation and the salvation of the state" (Rep., Jowett's translation, ii, 242). There is here a clear allusion to the utilization of the Peiraeus, the organization with the theoretical devices of Plato. There is also an anticipation of the standing armies of modern states.

With the details of the education of the superlative class, and with the appreciation of different branches of instruction, we cannot occupy ourselves further than to mention that it is in this connection he censures the poets, and excludes Homer and the Tragedians from the ideal state as blasphemers against the gods. We pass over the criticism of the various forms of government, and the importance of the last of them. The constitution is general, and for the estimation of Plato's doctrine and its relation to Hellenic systems. We cannot, however, omit all notice of the measures by which he endeavors to maintain the unselshful devotion of the dominant order. He leaves the laboring masses almost entirely out of sight. They are to be protected in their persons, rights, and industry; and they are to be guided in the proper course. Further than this there is little concern for them. They work in their way for the state, as their superiors live and work also for the state, which is everything. There can be no real opposition except in the interruption of Adimantas that "the citizens were made miserable," if the temporal comfort of the citizen, and not the theoretical elevation of that hypothetical unit, the state, is taken into consideration.

To this national spirit, to the Republic into its nature, and the best mode of its realization in the state. Of course he cannot free himself from Hellenic preoccupations. Of course his reactionary tendencies and his oligarchical proclivities produced a constant recoil from the democratic license of his Athenian contemporaries. He was seduced, in the reign of the imitation of Spartan institutions. Even in his wildest vagaries there appears a disposition to employ supposed traditionary practices. He insists upon the strict subordination of ranks; he even petrifies his classes of citizens into castes. He does not rigorously conjoin every one to his class, but accords advancement to those of eminent ability—la carriere ouverte aux talents. He restricts the government to the few (εὐαρχομαντος); the masses he crowds almost into serfs—"beggars of wood and drawer of water," etc. There are two great classes of freemen, the guardians of the state and the craftsmen. The guardians are themselves divided into two orders, the rulers and the auxiliaries. The rulers are selected, by successive examinations till their thirtieth year, from the body of guardians, who are selected at the age of twenty. The training and the selection have some agreement with the Chinese practices, with English competitive examinations, and still more with the regulation of the Ottoman Janizaries. There is also a considerable degree of correspondence between the Platonic organization and a modern constitutively held to be a theoretical constitution of the state. The body of the guardians or auxiliaries is employed as the military forces to repress internal disorders and to repel external danger. The rulers are the supervisors of the community, and are to govern it with a view to the greatest happiness of all (De Rep. iv, p. 24). The auxiliaries are certainly to be the warriors. There is no reason to suppose that the guardians are not to be the warriors also, as to cherish and protect the whole commonwealth. "None of them should have any property beyond what is absolutely necessary; neither should they have a private house, with bars and bolts, closed against any one who has a mind to enter; their provisions should be only such as are required by trained warriors, who are men of temperance and courage; their agreement is to receive from the citizens a fixed rate of pay, enough to meet the expenses of the year and no more, and they will have common meals and live together, like soldiers in a camp. . . . They alone of all the citizens may not touch or handle silver or gold, or be under the same roof with them, or wear them, or drink from them. And this will be their salvation and the salvation of the state" (Rep., Jowett's translation, ii, 242). There is here a clear allusion to the utilization of the Peiraeus, the organization with the theoretical devices of Plato. There is also an anticipation of the standing armies of modern states.

With the details of the education of the superlative class, and with the appreciation of different branches of instruction, we cannot occupy ourselves further than to mention that it is in this connection he censures the poets, and excludes Homer and the Tragedians from the ideal state as blasphemers against the gods. We pass over the criticism of the various forms of government, and the importance of the last of them. The constitution is general, and for the estimation of Plato's doctrine and its relation to Hellenic systems. We cannot, however, omit all notice of the measures by which he endeavors to maintain the unselshful devotion of the dominant order. He leaves the laboring masses almost entirely out of sight. They are to be protected in their persons, rights, and industry; and they are to be guided in the proper course. Further than this there is little concern for them. They work in their way for the state, as their superiors live and work also for the state, which is everything. There can be no real opposition except in the interruption of Adimantas that "the citizens were made miserable," if the temporal comfort of the citizen, and not the theoretical elevation of that hypothetical unit, the state, is taken into consideration.
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PLATO

agyption, the varied experience, the general immor-
ality, and the painful disquietude of the Greeks in the 4th centur
before Christ may account for much, but it will not interpret all. We
leave the enigma as one of the mysterious problems presented by the carer of
humanity. There is surely no more marvellous approxi-
mation to revealed truth than in the exposition of the
Supreme Good, and of its child or offspring, which is
described (De Rep. vi. p. 506) in terms that recall the
delineation of wisdom in the Book of Wisdom.

"Venerem virtutis Del, quam unam omnem est claritas Del sincerae; et ideo nihil inquisitionem in eam
lucrum.
"
"Venerem est enim lucis eternae, et speculum sine
mala Del majestatissimae et imago bonitatis illius.
"Et enim haec speculum soli et super omnem dispo-
sitionem stellarum, Iact comparata inventione prior.
"
Do not such sublime anticipations consort well with the
conclusion of the Republic, which increases our wonder,
but at the same time justifies our reverential compar-
tion.

"And thus, Glancon, the tale has been saved and
does not perish, and may be our salvation if we are obedient
to the word spoken: and we shall pass safely over the
water of Forgetfulness, and our soul will not be destroyed.
Therefore my counsel is that we hold fast to the heav-
ens, and to the gods above, and to the gods below,
considering that the soul is immortal, and able to endure
evry sort of good and every sort of evil. Thus shall we live
to see one day the gods and to the gods, both while remain-
ing here and when, like conquerors in the games who go
round to gather gifts, we receive our reward. And it shall
be shown to us, amid the din of this world, the simile of
an age of a thousand years which we have been reciting."

We have now at some length, yet all too briefly,
reviewed the philosophy attributed to Plato and deduc-
tible from his writings. We have omitted nearly ev-
everything in the way of detail, and have attempted the
survey from an elevated vantage-ground, where only
the broad lines are apparent, and where the asperities
and discords of the landscape disappear. It may now be
manifested, I think, how and why the ancients always
exercised such fascination on pure natures, and has so
largely and so enduringly stimulated the speculation
and ennobled the thought of the world.

Literature.—See the observations made and the works
specified under the article PLATO. Comp. also Talloch,
Introd. to Theol. in England, vol. i and ii (London 1872, 8vo);
Lecky, Hist. of Rationalism, and his European Morals;
Kneusn, Penesia Humanae, p. 45 sq.; Stephen, Hist.
of Eng. Thought in the 18th Century (London 1878, 2
vols 8vo); Ackerman, The Christian Element in Plato and
Plato, which is always introduced; the same, and
when exercised such fascination on pure natures, and has so
largely and so enduringly stimulated the speculation
and ennobled the thought of the world.

Plato, Ne. See NEOPLATONISM.

Platt, Adams W., a Presbyterian minister, was born in
Weston, Conn., Oct. 28, 1790. After receiving an
ordinary education, he commenced the study of med-
icine, when his brother, who was studying for the min-
istery, died, and Platt assumed his thoughts in that
direction. He graduated with the second honor of his
class at Union College, Schenectady, N. Y., in 1817,
and at Princeton Theological Seminary in 1820; was
licensed the same year, and entered upon his duties as
a minister in the churches of Hamilton and In-
diana. In January, 1824, he accepted a call, and was
ordained as pastor of the Presbyterian Church of Rut-
land, N. Y.; in July,

Payette, N. Y., until 1836, when he became pastor of
the Presbyterian Church in Hector, N. Y., where he
continued to labor till, in 1848, his health becoming
quite impaired, he ceased his pastoral labors. In 1856
he removed to Clinton, Iowa, and assisted in the organ-
ization of the Church there, and supplied the pulpit for
one year. He died May 2, 1859. Mr. Platt was a
humble, laborious, and self-denying minister — a man
of marked prudence of character. See Wilson, Pref.
Hist. Almanac, 1860, p. 121. (J. L. S.)

Platte-Montagne, NICOLAS DE, a French painter
and engraver, son of a celebrated Belgian portrait-paint-
er, was born at Paris about 1631. He was a pupil of
Philippe de Champagne, Charles le Brun, and of his un-

Jean Morin. He painted the Martyr which was
presented in 1666 to the church of Notre Dame at Paris;
a St. Benoist, a St. Scholastica (1676), and a ceiling for
the church of the Mercers, for which the society of the
Rue Cassette; and The Holy Ghost alighting upon the
Apostles, for the church of Saint-Sulpice (1676). He
also worked for the Tuileries in 1688 and 1684. He
exhibited two paintings at the salon of 1676: five
historical paintings and three portraits at the salon of
1699—the first that took place to one of the portraits.
He engraved from 1651 to 1694, in a fashion but little
differing from that of Morin, seventeen different subjects,
and eleven portraits after Porbus, Janet, Philippe de
Champagne, B. de Champagne, and after his own paint-
ings. He was registered as a member of the Academy
of St. Luke on November 21, 1779; appointed supplementary professor July 1,
1679, and regular professor Dec. 20, 1681. He signed
his works Montagne, Montaigne, De Platte-Montaigne,
N. D. P. Montaigne, N. de la Platte-Montagne, N. van
Platten Borz, vinci De Platte-Montagne, and N. de
Platte-Montagne. He died Dec. 25, 1796. — Hoefer,

Platter (πραματική, properly a sēde-dish, consisting of
dainties set on as a condiment, or sauce). Our Lord,
In reviving the Pharisees, said, "Woe unto you, scribes and
Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye make clean the outside of
the cup and of the platter, but within they are full
of extortion and excess" (Matt. xxiii. 25). "Howbeit
in vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the
commandments of men. For laying aside the com-
mandment of God, ye hold the tradition of men, as the
washing of pots and cups; and many other such like
things do ye. And ye will not be subject to the law of
God, but according to your own commandment, that ye may keep your
own tradition" (Mark vii. 7—9). The Talmud contains
tangles directions on the use of these utensils, which
Jews are strictly required to observe. See DISH.

Play (παιδική, Exod. xxxii. 6). This word, in
addition to the sense of joking or sporting (Gen. xix.,
14), may also be understood of amusements, accom-
pounded with music and singing, in which sense it may be
understood in Judges xvi. 25. Though we have no
particular mention in the Old Testament of such
matters, we may reasonably suppose that some of the games
practiced by the ancient Egyptians were likewise known
to the Hebrews; these appear, from the monuments, to
have been mock combats, races, gymnastic exercises,
singing, dancing, and games of chance (Wilkinson, Anc.
Egyptians, i, 189 sq.). In the declining period of Jewish
history the athletic games of the Greeks were intro-
duced, and there were gymnasia, or schools of exercise
in Jerusalem, where they practiced wrestling, racing,
quots., etc. (1 Macc. v. 16; 2 Macc. iv. 13—15). For the

Ancient Egyptians playing at draughts and mora (guessing numbers).
Grecian games of strength and skill so often alluded to by Paul, see Games. Comp. Sport.

Playfair, James, D.D., a Scotch divine of some note, was born about 1740, and was educated at the University of St. Andrew's. He then became minister of Liff and Benvie livings, which he held until his son succeeded him in the care of the ministry, to soon exchange, however, these fields of labor for the scientific work in which he became so greatly celebrated. Dr. James Playfair was also principal of the United College of St. Salvador and St. Leonard, in the University of St. Andrew's. He died in 1819. He published A System of Chronology, and other works. See London Gentleman's Magazine, 1819, pt. ii, p. 179.

Playfair, John, an eminent scientist, was born, in 1749, at Dundee; was educated at St. Andrew's; resigned a living, and became mathematical professor at Edinburgh, where he died July 20, 1819. Playfair was celebrated as a geologist, and a strenuous defender of the Huttonian system. Among his works are, Elements of Geometry: — Outlines of Philosophy: — Illustrations of the Huttonian Theory: — And A System of Geography.

Plays, Religious. See Mysteries.

Pleasure is the delight which arises in the mind from the contemplation or enjoyment of something agreeable, and is synonymous in expression with happiness (q.v.).

Pledge (usually some form of ἐνδήμος, χαθήδος, to bind as by a chattel mortgage; occasionally forms of θέματος, χαθήδος, to exchange, and βάρδος, arbus, to give security; Talmud, עט, עטב, in a legal sense, an assurance given as security by a debtor to his creditor, which is alluded to in the Mosaic books in several instances. Thus—

The creditor was not permitted to go to the house of his debtor to take his pledge, but must receive it before the door (Deut. xxxiv, 10 sq.). The reason of this requirement and its merciful object are obvious.

2. The articles which were forbidden to be taken in pledge were, (a) the raiment or outer garment (Exod. xxii, 21); (b) the bed (Deut. xxi, 17); (c) the handmill (q.v.; xxxiv, 6). Comp. Mishna, Baba Met. ix, 13). But notwithstanding these merciful provisions of the law, hard-hearted creditors were found among the Israelites who oppressed their debtors beyond all reasonable bounds. (Deut. xxiii, 18; Ezek. xvii, 12; xxxiii, 15; Habakk. ii, 6; comp. Job xxxii, 6; xxxiv, 3). See Delitzsch, ad loc., and especially Michaelis, Moa. Recht, iii, 61 sq. The custom of giving pledges prevailed extensively in the ages succeeding the exile, from the fact that by the decisions of the scribes all Jews were prohibited from making any payments on the Sabbath; hence he who would make a purchase on that day left some pledge with the seller (see Mishna, Shab, xxxii, 1), as his outer garment, to be redeemed by payment the next day. The taking of pledges is still further restricted by the Talmud (Baba Met. ix, 13). A pledging of land, mortgaging, appears first in the Talmud (Mishna, Shabbath, x, 6). However, the legal transfer of land under the Mosaic economy was properly but a pledging; for it could at any time be redeemed, and in the year of Jubilee it returned without repayment to the original owner. Pawning of personal property for debt, however, was a very ancient custom (Gen. xxxvii, 17 sq.). Personal guarantees of faith, pledges, or hostages, are mentioned (2 Kings xiv, 14, יִבְרֵי מִשְׁפַּט 25). The general abhorrence of the unscrupulous and of his taking pledges, among the Arabs of the present day, is also abhorred by travelers. Mohammed entirely forbids all lending on interest, and the Mosaic precepts (comp. Exod. xxii, 25-27) are generally so understood in the East. Yet nothing is more common than exorbitant usury, and the taking of pledges (Thomson, Land and Book, i, 499 sq.). See Loan.

Pledge is something given in hand as a security for the fulfilment of a contract or the performance of a promise. When a man of veracity pledges his word, his affirmation becomes an assurance that he will do what he has promised. But as the word of every man is not equally valid in matters of importance, it becomes necessary that a valuable article of some kind should be deposited as a bond for fulfilment on his part, in the 16th century. The Episcopal Church Catechism a sacrament is defined as "an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace given unto us; ordained by Christ himself, as a means whereby we receive the same, and a pledge to assure us thereof," in which the pledge is the token that we receive the Grace.

Pleismund, a noted prelate of the early English Church, flourished near the close of the 9th century. He was the friend and fellow-student of Alfred, and was in 890 elevated to the archbishopric of Canterbury. We know next to nothing about his personal history, but we are aware of the influence which he exerted on ecclesiastical affairs through Alfred. See Churton, Early English Church, p. 210, 221; Wright, Biog. Brit. (see Index).

Pleides is the rendering in the A. V. of יִסְדָּד, קַנָּד, in Job ix, 9; xxxviii, 81; but in Amos v, 8 our A. V. has "the seven stars," although the Geneva version translates the word "Pleisades" as in the other cases. In Job the Sept. has Πλευτος, the order of the Hebrew words having been altered (see Ostro), while in Amos there is no trace of the original, and it is difficult to imagine what the translators had before them. The Vulgate in each passage has a different rendering: Iuxylit in Job ix, 9; Pleisades in Job xxxviii, 81; and Arcturus in Amos v, 8. Of the other versions, the Pesos-Syriac and Chaldee merely adopt the Hebrew word; Aquila in Job xxxviii, Symmachus in Job xxxviii and Amos, and Theodotion in Amos, give "Pleisades," while with remarkable inconstancy Aquila in Amos has "Arcturus." The Jewish commentators are no less at variance. Rabbi David Kimchi in his lexicon says: "Rabbi Jonah wrote that it was a collection of stars called in Arabic Al-Thurayyd. And the wise rabbi Abraham Aben-Ezra, of blessed memory, wrote that the ancients said Kindah was a star, and they are at the end of the constellation Aries, and those which are seen are six. And he wrote that what was right in his eyes was that it was a single star, and that a great one, which is called the left eye of Taurus; and Keel the heart of the lion, the heart of the table-pew." On Job xxxviii, 31, Kimchi continues: "Our rabbins of blessed memory have said (Beraachoth, lviii, 2) Kindah hath great cold and bindeth up the fruits, and Keel hath great heat and ripeneth the fruits: therefore He said, 'or hosen the bands of Keel,' for it openeth the fruits and bringeth them forth." In addition to the evidence of rabbi Jonah, who identifies the Hebrew Kindah with the Arabic el-Thurayyay, we have the testimony of rabbi Isaac Israel, quoted by Hylde in his notes on the Tables of Ulugh Beig (p. 25-33, ed. 1665), to the same effect. That el-Thurayyay and the Pleiades are the same is proved by the words of Aben-Ragel (quoted by Hylde, p. 33): "Al-Tharayay is the mansion of the moon, in the sign Taurus, and it is called the celestial hen with her chickens." With this Hylde compares the Fr. Paullinorum, and Eng. Hen and Chickens, which are old names for the same stars; and Niebuhr (Descr. de l'Arabe, p. 101) gives as the result of his inquiry of the Jew at San'a, "Kis'ed, Pleiades, qu'on appelle aussi en Allemande la poule qui glousse." The Fr. Ancien, a b. l. (ed. 1665), gives the same name to the seven stars at the end of the constellation Aries the Pleiades, which are indeed in the left shoulder of the Bull,
but so near the Ram's tail that their position might be properly defined with reference to it. With the statement that "those which are seen are six" may be compared the words of Didymus on Homer, τέσσαρες δὲ Πεδίου οὐκ ἔστο, πάντα υδάτω ὦ ἰδέα ὑποδέχοι πάντα "οὐ πάντα "οὐ πάντα Φανέρων." (Orph. Cat. ivii, 170, i."

"Quae septem dixit, sex tamen esse solet.""

The opinion of Aben-Ezra himself has frequently been misrepresented. He held that Kimah was a single large star, Aldebaran, the brightest of the Hyades, while Keil [A.V. "Orion"] was Antares, the heart of Scorpio. When these rise in the east," he continues, "the effect produced is recorded by poets. He describes them as opposite each other, and the difference of their right ascension between Aldebaran and Antares is as nearly as possible twelve hours. The belief of Aben-Ezra had probably the same origin as the rendering of the Vulgate Hyades. One other point is deserving of notice. The rabbi, as quoted by Kimchi, attribute to Kimah great cold and the property of checking vegetation, while Keil works the contrary effects. But the words of Rabbi Isaac Israel on Job xxxviii, 31 (quoted by Hyde, p. 72), are just the reverse. He says, "The stars have opposite effects. The ripening of the fruits is the operation of Kimah. And some of them retard and delay the fruits from ripening, and this is the operation of Keil. The interpretation is, 'Wilt thou bind the fruits which the constellation Kimah ripeneth and openeth; and wilt thou open the fruits which the constellation Keil contracteth and bindeth up?' On the whole, though it is impossible to arrive at any certain conclusion, it appears that our translators were perfectly justified in rendering Kimah by "Pleiades." The seven stars" in Amos clearly denoted the same cluster in the language of the 15th century, for Cottgrave in his French Dictionary gives "Pleiaides, f, one of the seven stars." Hyde maintained that the Pleiades were again mentioned in Scripture by the name Succoth Benoth. The discussion of this question must be reserved to the article on that name."

The etymology of Kimah is referred to the Arabic كمك, "a heap," as being a heap or cluster of stars. The full Arabic name given by Genesius is "the knot of the Pleiades;" and, in accordance with this, most modern commentators render Job xxxviii, 31, "Is it thou that bredest the knot of the Pleiades," or loosenest the bands of Orion?" Simon (Lex. Heb.) quotes the Grenland name for this cluster of stars, "Kilkutetar, i.e. seilla colligatiss," as an instance of the existence of the same idea in a widely different language. The rendering "seven influences" of the A. V. in a relic of the lingering belief in the power which the stars exert over human destiny. The marginal note on the word "Pleiades" in the Geneva Version is, "Which stars arise when the sun is in Taurus, which is the spring tyne, and bring flowers," thus agreeing with the explanation of Rabbi Israel quoted above.

The word is used as the name of the cluster of stars in the neck of the constellation Taurus, of which seven are the principal. Six or seven may be usually seen if the eye is directed towards it; but if the eye be turned carelessly aside while the attention is fixed on the group, many more may be seen. Telescopes show a number of large stars there crowded together into a small space. The name Pleiades is probably derived from the Greek word Pleion, i.e. full, so that it merely denotes a condensed assembly of stars. The Romans called the Pleiades Herculis, because they arose in the spring, in the first part of May, and set early in November. See Hyde on Ulugh Beigh's Table, p. 32; Niebuhr, Arch. p. 114; Ideles, Uebrung und Bedeutung der Sterne, p. 146. See Astronomy; Constellations.

Plenary Inspiration. See Deists; Inspiration.

Pleroma (πλήρωμα, fullness) is the Gnostic term for that fullness of pure and radiant light and perfection in which the Divine Being was supposed to dwell, and whom they named Bythus. See Gnosticism.

Pleasing, Friedrich Victor - Leibniz, a German philosopher, was born at Bellenau, near Magdeburg, Dec. 28, 1752. He was the son of John Frederick Pleissinger, who was counselor of the consistory at Werningerode, and wrote an Enquir sur l'Origine du Peupl (Leips. 1757-1756, 2 vols. 8vo), and a Histoire des Tombeaux (Werningerode, 1786, 8vo); he died in 1735. Young Plessing attended the theological courses at different universities, and finally devoted himself to philosophy at Kisingen, under Kant's direction. From 1788 he was a professor at that science at Magdeburg. He died Feb. 8, 1800. He left, Von der Notwendigkeit des Uebels und der Schmerzen bei flihenden Geschichte (Dessau, 1788, 8vo); — Osniris und Socrates (Berlin, 1789, 8vo); — Historiche Untersuchungen über die Theologie und Philosophie der ältesten und neuesten Zeit, 4 vols. (Elbing, 1788, 8vo); — Memnonium, oder Versuch zur Unrichtung des Geschichtsbuches des Alterthums (Leips. 1787, 2 vols. 8vo); — Versuche zur Aufflärung der Philosophie des ältesten Alterthums (ibid. 1787-1790, 5 vols. 8vo).—Hofner, Nouv. Dicq. Générale, xi, 465.

Plessis, Joseph Octave, a somewhat noted Roman Catholic prelate, was born at Montreal, Canada, March 8, 1772, of very humble parentage. He decided to give himself to the service of the Church, and after completing his theological studies was ordained priest, March 11, 1796; was employed as professor of humanity at the College of St. Raphael, also as secretary to the bishop of Quebec, and curate of the capital; Sept. 6, 1797, he was made coadjutor to bishop Denault; April 26, 1800, he was appointed bishop of Caratue, in Palestine, with the succession to the see at Quebec, of which he became incumbent Jan. 17, 1806. He founded the college at Nicolet, as well as primary schools at Quebec. He was called by the crown to the legislative council in 1818, and proved himself a loyal and patriotic senator. In 1786 he pronounced an oration at Quebec on the occasion of the naval battle of Abukir. He died at Quebec Dec. 4, 1825. See Ferland, Biog. Notice of J. O. Plessis (Queb. 1864, 8vo).

Plessis-Mornay, See Duplessis.

Pletho or Gemistus, Georgius, a distinguished philosopher, theologian, publicist, historian, geographer, and scholar of the 15th century, is one of the most prominent of the Greeks who contributed to the revival of Greek studies in Western Europe, and the restorer of the Platonist philosophy.

Life.—The dates of the birth and death of Pletho have not been ascertained. He is supposed to have died before the capture of Constantinople by the Turks, and not many years after the Council of Florence. He is vaguely reported to have been nearly a hundred years of age at the period of his demise. If this were true, he must have first seen the light about the middle of the 14th century. His birthplace was probably Constantinople, but much of his life was spent in Peloponnesus, and was passed in official employment. He received the name of Pletho, and perhaps of Gemistus from the extent, multiplicity, and fulness of his erudition, which he displayed in numerous works on a great variety of subjects. "He was admired," says a writer near his time, "by not Greece alone, but by nearly the whole world, for his various and manifold knowledge of things divine and human, so that, by the universal consent of both Greeks and Latin, he approached most closely to Plato, the prince of philosophers, and to Aristotle." Yet this great name is one which posterity has willingly let die. He wrote on philosophy, theology, history, geog-
raphy, oratory, music, etc. He composed orations, occasional essays, polemical tracts, letters, etc., and made collections, in the fashion of declining centuries, from Diodorus, Appian, and Plutarch; from Xenophon and Dionysius of Halicarnassus, from Aristotle and Thucydides. He was engaged in numerous controversies, with George Gennadius, who became patriarch of Constantinople after the Ottoman conquest; with Theodorus of Gaza, and with George of Trebizond. The number of his works might encourage the belief that a century of years had been ascribed to their author; but this longevity is discredited by the incidents of his life. If he died, almost a centurian, in 1452, as some reporters allege, he must have been about seventy when he held the first public employment recorded as held by him; and he must have been reposing on ninety when last commissed as an imperial officer in the Peloponnesus. The years of macrobriania are so readily exaggerated by themselves, and by their more juvenile contemporaries, that no great weight need be attached to the allegation that he was born in 1855. His name of Pletho has been stated to have been bestowed on him in consequence of his learning; but it may have been as designed as an approximate reproduction of the name of Plato, to whose memory and speculations he devoted himself with unrestrained enthusiasm. The surname may also have been assumed by himself, for it fitted his frequent occasions of sarcasm and ridicule to the numerous adversaries whom he provoked. He occupied a high place at court, in the close of the reign of the emperor Manuel II Palaeologus (Brucker says Michael, but the last emperor of that name died almost a century and a half before, Dr. Plate, in Smith’s Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Mythol., etc., gives 1426 as the date of this official function, but Manuel died in 1425). Gemistus “the Philosopher,” as he was already called, was one of the notables at the conference in Constantinople which resulted in the union of the Greek Church (Michael Attalites, Hist. Polit. c. iv). He attended the emperor John V, as a senator and deputy of the Greek Church, to the Council of Florence in 1439 (Ducat, Hist. Byzant. c. xxxi). Among his companions were Bessarion, his pupil; Indore of Russia; George the Scholarius, his future antagonist; and Argypnopolus. Pletho distinguished himself by the active part which he took in the conferences, and by his violent opposition to the union of the churches. He yielded ultimately, however, and was one of the signatories of the council. This compromise of religious opinion embittered the feelings of his countrymen to him. He did not accompany the emperor on his return to Constantinople. During his stay in Florence he formed an intimacy with Cosmo di Micii, who instituted the Platonic Academy at Florence, of which Ficinus became the first director. He certainly succeeded in rendering Platonism the rage in Italy, supported as he was by the countenance of his illustrious disciple, Cardinal Darserian, and by the favor of the Medicinian house. Most of his labors henceforth were devoted to the illustration and dissemination of the Platonic doctrine. This endeavor, and the success which attended it, provoked the hostility of the Aristotelians, whose opinions had been for centuries in almost unhonoured possession of the dominant philosophy, and involved him in virulent controversy with their leaders. Nor was the hostility mitigated by the suspicion that Pletho desired to supplant not merely Peripateticism, but Christianity also, by his revived Platonism. He was charged and decried, both by the rationalized with being not less dangerous to the faith than Mohammed himself. The suspicion
affected into the perilous systems of the Alexandrians and Averroists. The institution of the Florentine Academy was one of the most potent agencies in the emancipation of modern thought; and its establishment may fairly be credited to the labors and to the impulse of Pletos. While a truly distinctive and philosophic career is his political project for the reformation and amelioration of the Peloponnesus. Though some of its outlines were derived from antiquity, and the route was in some sort indicated by Plato and Plotinus, yet it possessed originality of its own, and was immediately induced by an active desire of ministering to present needs, and of supplying practical remedies, even if they were impracticable, to the actual miseries of the society around him.

The plan proposed by Pletos was a sweeping agrarianism, resembling in some respects the system of Lycurgus and that of Cleomenes II in the same region of Laconia; resembling in others the socialism of Plato, but resembling still more the extreme projects of land-reform which have recently been proposed in England, Ireland, France, and other countries. The evils which he proposed to redress by a complete alteration of the fabric of society were the insecurity of person and property; the squallor occasioned by ravages and multitudinous taxes, ill-imposed and unfairly levied; the uncertain and defective administration of justice; and the varied and degraded currency in circulation. In Plato, he proposed to divide the people into three classes, but the classes were different from those of Plato: they were to be the agriculturists, the capitalists, and the guardians. The farmers or agriculturists were intended to include the greater part of the industrial body; the capitalists were to embrace the owners of all the appliances for the assistance of labor, and apparently the lessors of the land; the guardians, or defenders, comprehended all who were engaged in the protection of the society and its members, or in the maintenance of right and order; viz., princes, magistrates, lawyers, and soldiers—priests also, probably. There was to be no private property in land; it was to belong exclusively to the state, and to be leased out, from time to time, to landloards or capitalists. A right of temporary occupancy was all that was admitted. Of the produce of the soil, one third was to be paid to the government for the maintenance of the guardians, and for public burdens; one third went to the landlords or capitalists; and one third was to be the remuneration of the actual cultivators. Pletos, like the French Économistes, thought that the state should own all the produce of the land, and that all impositions should be charged upon it. The guardians, whether princes or soldiers or magistrates, were a class entirely apart from the rest of the community. They paid no taxes, but protected the people from external violence and internal disorder, and were supported by the government from the proceeds of the public third. The soldiers were quartered on the farmers to consume the government thrids, as far as required for their support: "fruges consumere nati." No money-taxes were imposed: the funds required for the public service were derived exclusively from the export and sale of the surplus which remained out of the government's share of the produce. Such is a brief abstract of Pletos' plethoric state. The plan was never completed; the book was burned; its author died; and the Turks conquered the Morea before the experiment could be tried.


Pletos, Joseph, doctor of theology, imperial chaplain, and abbot of the monastery of the Holy Virgin of Fargrany, Hungarian imperial canon, imperial councillor, dean-emeritus of the metropolitan chapter of St. Stephen, at Vienna; director of the theological studies in the Austrian empire, referent of the same, assistant of the imperial commission of studies, director and president of the theological faculty; and, in 1855, ex-curator magnificus of the University of Vienna, member of the high schools of Vienna, Pesth, and Padua, etc., was born at Vienna Jan. 3, 1788; attended the lessons of the gymnasium of St. Anna; studied philosophy and theology at the University of Vienna; received orders Aug. 20, 1815, and was appointed adjunct at the university, prefect of the studies, and librarian in the episcopal seminary. During the years 1814 and 1815 he taught dogmatics at the High School of Vienna. In 1816 he was appointed chaplain of the court, and first director of the studies at the institute for the institute for the regular priests, then recently founded by Francis I. In 1823 he was called upon to teach dogmatics at the University of Vienna, and Feb. 15, 1827, he became canon of the metropolitan chapter of St. Stephen. He received successively the functions and dignities mentioned above, and discharged his duties with that activity, with that activity, commendable prudence, with disinterestedness and conscientiousness, for the good of the State and the Church. A fit of apoplexy put an end to his restless activity, in 1841. Pletos was a worthy, unblemished priest, a learned theologian, a zealous protector of true science, and at the same time a father to the poor, a comforter of the afflicted, a helper in need, and to his friends a true and upright friend. Besides several works of edification and some sermons, which he published in the years 1817-1832, he wrote a number of essays in Frint's theological journal, and in his own, which he edited from 1829 to 1840, under the title of Neue theologische Zeitschrift (Vienna), in twelve annual volumes; the thirteenth, commenced by Pletos, was completed by his friend, Prof. Seebach.

Plicata, the "folded" chamble worn on Good Friday and by the deacon or by a priest, seated or by a priest, folded on the shoulder, when acting as a deacon, and in the days of Tertullian, been mentioned with peculiar interest by Christian writers on account of the testimony which he bore concerning the Christians of his day in Bithynia. They form the subject of a rather long letter (x, 97) to Tertullian, written about four years after the death of St. Paul, and followed by a short answer from Trajan. With all his advantages of education, Pliny was superstitious and credulous. Though a kindhearted man even to slaves (viii, 16, 19), he was intolerant and cruel to the Christians, according to his own account, he put to death the Cursus of Bithynia who would not abjure their religion, though he considered it only an innocent superstition. The materials for Pliny's life may be collected from his Epistles, from which a brief notice has been drawn up by Cellarius, and one more elaborately by Masson; there is also a
very complete Life of Pliny, with abundant references to his letters, prefixed to E. Thierfeld's German translation of the "Epistles and Panegyric" (Munich, 1829). But the reader is referred to the Epistles themselves for these details. A young, able, and vigorous, but one must say not altogether judicious, study of Pliny by Bayle was already in print in 1734, and the same writer on Pliny by Joseph M. Deplin, both in the year 1758. The editorship of Pliny's "Letters" was in the hands of M. Deplin, and his editing is now considered one of the most important documents remaining of early Christian history, and we therefore transcribe here some portion of it. After mentioning the difficulty of the question and the plexity in which it is conducted, he goes on to say:

"Observe that no one, if at first concealed, but Christian, and afterwards denied it, or said that he had been Christian, but had left them three years ago, some longer, and one or more afterwards. They all wrenched your tombs and the statues of the gods; these also reviled Christ. They affirmed that the whole of their faith or error lay in their belief that they were wrount either on a stated day before it was light, and sing among themselves alternately a hymn to Christ, as to God, and blind themselves by an oath, not to the commission of any wickedness, but not to be guilty of theft, or robbery, or adultery, never to fail in their faith, or deny a place in their company when called upon to return it. When these things were performed, it was their custom to separate, and then to come together again to a meal, which they ate in common without any disorder; but this they had forborne even since the ascension of my master. According to your commands, I prohibit assemblies. After receiving this account, I judged it the more necessary to examine, and that by torture, two maid-servants, who were called mistresses; but I have discovered nothing besides a bad and excessive superstition. Suspending, therefore, all judicial proceedings, I have recourse to you for advice, for it has appeared to me matter highly deserving consideration, especially upon account of the great number of persons who are in danger of suffering, for many of all ages and every rank, of both sexes likewise, are accused, and are brought before you. Now has the censure of this superstition seized cities only, but the lesser towns also, and the open country; nowhere else, however, to me that it may be brought to a conclusion, and corrected. It is certain that the temples which were almost forsaken begin to be more frequented, and the sacred objects after a long interruption are, revived. Victims likewise are everywhere bought, whereas a time there were few purchasers. Whence I think it fit to imagine what numbers of men may be reclaimed if pardon were granted to those who repent.

So few and uncertain are the records left to guide our inquiries through the obscure period which immediately followed the conclusion of the labors of the apostles, that the above testimony to the numbers and virtues of our forefathers in faith becomes indeed invaluable. See Milman, Hist. of Christianity, Liddon, Divinity of Christ; Mosheim, Commentary on Christian History; Schaff, Hist. of the Christian Church, 1, 164 sq.; Smith, Diet. of Rel. and Eur; Bihlgren, Gesch. d. römischen Literatur; Hagenbach, Kirchengesch. der ersten drei Jahrh. ch. viii.; Alzog, Kirchengesch. i, 112, 186; Ridd, Christian Antiquities, p. 176 sq.; Bender, Der jüngere Plinius (Tub. 1878); Cudworth, Intellectual Universe; Jowett, Trad. of the S. a. P. (1888); Church, Pliny's Letters (Lond. 1878).

Plisson, Marie-Prudence, a French female mathematician, celebrated in her time by her eccentricities, was born at Chartres Nov. 27, 1727. Her father was a magistrate. Her taste for learned pursuits kept her aloof from the world, and induced her to prefer single-blessedness and her isolation. Her qualities of mind soon engaged her in disputes with which her sex evidently ought to have nothing to do. She first made herself known by several pieces in prose and in verse, published by the newspapers of the time. In 1764 the question was agitated whether a child born ten months and ten days after the dissolution of the matrimonial tie was legitimate. Mlle. Plisson boldly intervened in this momentous debate, and attacked with no little vivacity the opinion of Lebais, Bertin, Antoine Petit, etc.: many were the epigrams darted at the female philosopher. There was a time when she took to observe with passion the apparent contradiction in the cases, comparing notes with all the naturalists who had written anything about it. She undertook to write the physiology of this interesting animal. "What animal," she says, in one of her pamphlets, "is more common, more at hand to be examined by educated people, than the cat?" Her library was remarkable in every respect. She died Dec. 17, 1788. Mlle. Plisson left, Ode sur la Vie champêtrce (1750):—Projet pour soulager les Pouvoirs de la Cam- pouye (Chartres, 1758):—Recherches sur la Dureté de la Grossece (Amsterdam, 1765):—La Promenarde de Pro- vincers, Nouv. Ed. (1770):—Voyages d'Ombrie dans l'île de Béarn et dans la Plaine de Mercure (Paris, 1788, 12mo):—and Maximes morales d'un Philosophe Chrétien (Paris, 1788, 16mo).—Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Générale, x, 486.

Pluo van Amstel, Cornelius, a celebrated Dutch amateur engraver and designer, was born at Amsterdam in 1728. He is chiefly distinguished for his imitations of the works of old masters, and is considered one of the best collectors known, amounting to five thousand drawings by celebrated Italian, German, French, Flemish, and Dutch masters, from Giotto to his own time. Born of a good and wealthy family, he had many opportunities of improving his taste and advancing his pursuits. Being acquainted with all the principal collectors of Amsterdam, he commenced making his own valuable collection at a very early age. He had likewise a very valuable collection of prints and etchings, especially of the works of Lucas van Leyden, Albert Durér, Goltzius, Cornelius and Jan Visscher, K. Bercham, and especially Rembrandt. Pluo van Amstel's own works consist chiefly of imitations of drawings of old masters, in chalk, washed and colored; the colored imitations were accomplished by printing with several plates. In 1766 he published a collection of forty-six such imitations in various styles, after drawings by A. Vanderwende, Rembrandt, Ostade, Gerard Dow, Backhuysen, Metzu, Berchem, A. Bloemaert, Wouvermann, Miers, Terburg, and others. There are altogether upwards of one hundred imitations of drawings by Pluo van Amstel, and as many as forty-six of his etchings, representing the various stages of progress, but very few impressions were taken of any. They are enumerated and described by Weigel in the Kunst-Katalog, and in Nagel's Künstler-Lexikon. A collection of one hundred of Van Amstel's and some additional similar imitations, with a portrait of Van Amstel, was published by C. Jost (London, 1821, royal folio); but only one hundred copies were printed, and at the enormous price of forty guineas per copy. Pluo van Amstel died at Amsterdam Dec. 20, 1778, and on March 3, 1800, his valuable collection, with the exception of the etchings of Rembrandt, was sold at auction, and realized the large sum of 109,469 florins. See Van Eynden en Vander Willigen, Geschichte der Vaterlandsche Schildkunst seder de Hof der XVIII Eeuw. 1816-1842.

Plotinus, the most prominent and celebrated of the Neo-Platonic philosophers, the most elaborate and authoritative system of the school of Antioch, and the most transcendental of the ancient transcendentalists, and was mainly instrumental in transforming into the Pantheism of Lamblichus and Proclus the doctrine deduced through many successive from Plato.

Life.—The outlines of the career of Plotinus have already been given. He is here to be described, with a brief notice of his opinions, under Neo-PLATONISM.
The esteem in which the sage of Lyceopolis was held by his contemporaries is shown by the application to him of the current proverb, "The productions of Egypt are few but they are great." His philosophical temperament is further illustrated by his dying words, addressed to Eustochius: "I am striving to reunite what is divine in me to the pure divinity which reigns throughout the universe." When he expired, a dragon rushed from under his bed, and escaped under the bed of his pupil, not yet entirely drunk. "What has become of him?" and was informed, in a string of loose hexameters, that he dwelt with Minos, Rhadamantus, Abarcas, Pythagoras, and other blessed spirits, in the contemplation of the Deity, to whom he had been conjoined in ecstatic union four times during life. After the biographical notice already given, it only remains to give a somewhat fuller account of his writings, and a more extended and connected exposition of his views.

The Proclus.—The philosophy of the Neo-Platonic school of Alexandria, founded by Ammonius Saccas, was an exclusive cult, designed to be a secret and privileged possession for the training and elevation of an elect body of theorists and enthusiasts. The seal of reverence having been broken by Herennius, his fellow-disciple, Plotinus deemed that there was no longer either obligation or expediency in endeavoring to preserve the secrets of the new speculation, and accordingly promulgated it by oral lectures at Rome, continued for twenty-five years, and by treatises written at various times during this long course of instruction. His exposition was, however, so curt, intricate, and obscure; so full of inapprehensible subtleties and impenetrable distinctions, that he was under the necessity of urging the aid of his pupils to interpret and develop his doctrine. He thus employed his veteran disciple, Amelius, to combat the repugnances and to remove the doubts of the neophyte Porphyry. All the earlier writers who have occasion to mention Plotinus speak of his brief, terse, thought-oppressed, oracular style; and the few among the moderns who have had the misfortune to get a glimpse of the whole of his talismanic compositions must have often re-echoed the ancient censures. The sublimation of the recondite thought is rendered more evident by the dryness of the phraseology and the riggledness of words. The density of the compressed and indiscriminate utterance is made evident through the abounding profusion of the words which the whole of his manifold and variously coloured text, and theletters he wrote under the inspiration of the neophyte Porphyry, he has collected fifty-four essays of various dimensions, which, in imitation of the Platonic Trilogies and Tetralogies, he arranged in six series of nine each, to which he gave the name of Enneads; being guided in their composition and disposition by the agreement or affinity of their topics, and in their succession by the ascending progress from human observation and experience, through the constituent principles of abstract nature, to ontology and theology. This is not the line of systematic exposition, nor is it, in its execution, the exact manner of thought and expression. The whole appears vague and confused; incomplete and often incoherent in its members; undeveloped and fragmentary in the exposition of the several parts. There are a few sufficiently thorough discussions: On Beauty (Enn. i, vi); On Nature and the One (Enn. iii, viii); On the Problems of Existence (Enn. iv, i–iii); and On Unity and Multiformity (Enn. vi, iv–v); to which may be added On the Essential Good (Enn. vii and ix). That there was a definite system in the mind of Plotinus may be readily admitted, for there is a general congruity of thought pervading the whole collection, and his characteristic principles were entertained from the first. This system might possibly be reproduced in its substantial integrity by a liberal employment of conjecture and logical evolution. Such a system may have been preserved by the anecdotes and traditions of his scholars, the cavils of opponents, the apparent urgency of particular questions, as in the papers Against the Gnostics (Enn. ii, ix). Yet even what was written in this disconnected manner was composed at various times, and in various degrees of completion. None of the books can be regarded as a just, rounded, and complete essay. They
are, for the most part, a collection of remarks upon discontinuous points, associated with a common subject of inquiry, thus resembling the Pausias, like those of Plato, which, however, for a longer imperfect form of enunciation with French thinkers. This, however, does not exhaust the impediments to any coherent and satisfactory ordination of the productions of Plotinus. There is no reason to suppose that all his written remains were in a condition to be made available. There is reason to believe that other materials besides those employed by Porphyry, either in his form of synoptical abridgments or of formal tracts, were in the hands of other disciples. In view of all the difficulties of his position, as far as they can now be reckoned, one may consider the tolerance of opinion among scholars and critics that the procedure of Porphyry was judicious, and that no better plan of arrangement could have been adopted than the aggregate of the fragmentary materials in accordance with the loose bond of coherence supplied by similarity of subject, although this plan utterly disregards the chronological order of their production, and shuffles confusedly together the writings of very distinct periods. Less inconvenience would result from this disorder, if there were any consistency in the development of his speculation; but in his earlier career Plotinus was much influenced by the tenets of Numenius; in his mature life he acquired greater independence of thought, but inclined most closely to the teachings and tendencies of Plato; and in his later years he was interested in Platonist philosophy. What could be done to correct or compensate for the confusion of the text was supplied by the Sentences of Porphyry, which gave an abstract of the doctrine, but these have come down to us only in a sadly mangled form.

In the arrangement of Porphyry [see Neo-Platonicism] the logical order is disturbed, and in a great measure inverted. The last two Enneads are the most characteristic, and in some respects the most important for the estimation of the philosophy of Plotinus. The first Ennead is noted by Porphyry as pre-eminent in ethical (being occupied with ἀρετή), or ὑστερίτις). The recension of Porphyry was not the only promulgation of the lectures of Plotinus. Three other publications have been specified, and other copies of special parts of his philosophy may have been circulated. As soon as he commenced reducing his views to writing, demands for copies were made upon him by his followers, and these exemplars would naturally be multiplied and disseminated to some extent. With the death of the master, some of his productions were sent in his lifetime from Rome to Syria, to the rhetorician Longinus. These loose and flying sheets would soon be lost after the more complete body of his doctrine became accessible. This, however, is acknowledged to have existed in two forms—that issued with authority by Porphyry, and another presentation by Eustochius, a pupil who attended the death-bed of his teacher. These two versions are alone recognised by Creuzer, the accepted authority for all matters connected with the text and interpretation of Plotinus. These recensions did not agree either in the distribution of the matter or in all the details of doctrine. The Eustochian edition was still in existence in the Byzantine period, but has since perished, and has left the Porphyrian text as the sole representative of Plotinus. This exemplar is, however, believed by Creuzer to have received additions and alterations from the concurrent copy of the Eustochian rolls.

We would remark, before proceeding to the consideration of the peculiar philosophy of Plotinus, that neither he, nor the sect of which he was the exponent, contemplated in a distinct type of speculation. The Neo-Platonists were the continuators of the Platonic Academy—drifted far, it may be, from the ancient shores. Their distinctive purpose was to conciliate Aristotle with Plato, and to harmonise with both the teachings of Pythagoras, and the asceticism which had flowed to Alexandria from Oriental sources. The course of the philosophy of which he was the exponent, and modified doctrine would thus be not equally expounded over all parts of any complete system, but concentrated on the subjects of conciliation, the exposition of those leading principles which furnished the means of reconciliation, and their development in accordance with the scheme of agreement. Aspasius, Alexander, and Adrastus were read in the school and commented upon by Plotinus to the last, in company with Severus, Nemoimus, and other Platonists or Neo-Platonists. Thus is given a further explanation of both the incompleteness and the difficulties of the text, and also of the inevitable difficulty of affording a clear, compact, and methodical exposition of that doctrine.

Philosophy.—The definition of metaphysics by the schoolmen as the branch of knowledge treating of abstract being and its modifications (De Ers, ordinateur et Entium affectibus) is more applicable to the dawning revivies of Plotinus than to any other scheme of speculation. For, whether we regard the term as having been originally invented by Theophrastus to designate incoherent or obscure conceptions, or as a term of abuse, or beyond physics and transcending them, it is almost exclusively in this dim and unbounded region that the reflections and imaginations of Plotinus disport themselves. With the ordinary topics of English-speaking philosophy he scarcely concerns himself. He rises from the earth, and looks beyond the sphere of intellect. What could be done to correct or compensate for the confusion of the text was supplied by the Sentences of Porphyry, which gave an abstract of the doctrine, but these have come down to us only in a sadly mangled form.
cannot, however, be conceived as unity, if the Supreme Mind be excluded, nor can it be thought of as One. Mind cannot form itself the idea of the absolute One, without the original One and the Good; that is, without the author and father of Mind itself, and of all things; that is the God, the Mind of the present exposition. It is due to a logical necessity rather than to a theological presumption that Plotinus asserts being to be posterior to the One, for he attaches being inseparably to the three hypostases of divinity which constitutes his three principles. It is an attempt to derive the entire universe, the Pythagorean doctrine of numbers, and the Platonic thesis of the One and the Many (Euns. vi, vii, 9). The Unum is Ene and summum Ene essential and primordial Being. There is no separation or division between them, but only a theoretical and shadowy antecedence from these intelligences, and so on, and their corresponding qualities, which means essentially the same thing as the One and the Good, the Divine Intelligence, Universal Reason, and the One. The universe is One, not in the vulgar sense of unity, but in the One, the absolute, eternal, unsubstantial One (Euns. vi, i, 3). This is the Absolute Good, and is wholly ineffable, being dimly apprehensible only by the purest and highest efforts of the most depurated intuition (Euns. ii, i, vi, viii, 3; iv, 3, 4; vi, i, 6; ixi, 6). The One and the Good (which are one) is before and above being, and before and above mind, the intelligible (Euns. vi, v, 1; vi, vii, 1; iv, 3, 4; vi, i, 3). That the One is above the Noetic is a fundamental dogma, which, like the soul of the universe, is deduced from Plato. This One and Good is the Father of all things, the universal God, existing in all, moving through all, and embracing all (in Patera, Inquil. Euns. vi, vii, 1; vi, i, 1).

This doctrine unquestionably presents the appearance of Pantheism, and anticipates it, especially when taken in connection with the Scala Intellectibilia in Unum, or progress towards the incommunicable union with the Universal Good. In Proclus it occurs as being distinguishable from Pantheism (Eun. iv, 2, i; ii, 2, 4, 6, 7, 9; Inquil. S. I., vii, i, 3). In Plotinus it is different. He carefully preserves the distinction between the One and the Many, between the Supreme Good and all its immediate and derivative productions. He does not ascribe personality to the Divine One, not by metaphor; but he avoids attributing to the Divine Being either the evolution or the absorption of the universe, and he accords to man personality, free will, and responsibility (Euns. iii, iv, 5-7). He distinguishes between the agents in producing all things, and the whole which is produced (Euns. iii, vii, viii, 9, 5). But there is confusion in his utterances, if not contradiction: though he may be credited with a more earnest anxiety to escape pantetheistic extravagances than can be acceded to his Christian admirer, translator, and paraphrast, Marsilius Ficinus (q.v.). According to Plato, genuine knowledge is intuitive: according to Plotinus, it is immediate—the union of the knowing and the known; and the knowledge of the Godhead is only by direct communion (Eun. vi, vii, 4, 47; iii, i, 3, 5). The soul which is the lower of the two, contemplates the One in the realm of the intelligible, first to the sensible heavens, where they assume corporeal vesture, and thence proceed by successive declensions to lower and lower corporations (Euns. iv, iii, 15). Yet the soul in its separable state retains its immortal essence and divine character (Eun. v, vii, 48; Inquil. iv, 6; ix, 9).

The second principle of Plotinus is Mind—the intelligence per se—the Universal Reason (Noetos). The One or the Good projects a perfect effulgence of itself, without loss of integrity or diminution of total power (Eun. vi, vi, i). The desire ever provokes an incursion in the opposing to itself, to its parent, to the similitude of its exemplar; and this reflection or bending back is itself the Divine Mind, Intelligence, Universal Reason, whence all reason and thought are engendered (Eun. vi, iv, vii, 4). From Mind issues Soul—the spiritual spirit—the soul of the universe, which dwells in the universal reason, as the universal soul dwells in the One (Euns. vi, i, 7). The soul is partly to the Divine Mind whence it proceeds, and imperfectly copies the ideas presented there. It turns partly towards the sensible universe, which it fashioned from the ideas of the One. All souls are not contained in the universal mind—a doctrine espoused by Arnaudin, which amounts to Pantheism. There is a genuine plurality and hierarchy of souls, derived from the soul of the universe, by many separation or division, but by separate and independent production (Euns. iv, ii, 2; iv, iv, 6, 11; Inquil. viii, 9. The One, the Soul—constitute the trinity of Plotinus. These three are one in essence, though distinct in function and in origin, and are all divine. From them, by the inaugurating potency of the first, by the presentations and concurrence of the second, and by the permanent creative energy of the third, all the order and beauty and variety and harmony of the universe are produced.

But the universe is twofold: the intelligible, archetypal and eternal (Eun. vi, vii, 5; iv, 6). And that which is the image and adumbration of the archetype, the Sensible, facilitous and transitory (Eun. vi, vii, 5; vi, 8; comp. v, 6; vi, 9). In the intelligible universe, all incorporeal ideas are incorporeal. It is the ideal world. In the sensible universe, souls are incorporated in bodies, and distributed through them (Euns. iii, iv, i). The term souls is used by Plotinus with much greater latitude than would now be sanctioned, and is extended to irrational animals and plants, and even to the blind motions, chemicals or physical, of organic and inorganic matter, which is referred to by the One through the One, which is the lower of the two, and so on. The realm of the intelligible, first to the sensible heavens, where they assume corporeal vesture, and thence proceed by successive declensions to lower and lower corporations (Euns. iv, iii, 15). Yet the soul in its separable state retains its immortal essence and divine character (Eun. v, vii, 48; Inquil. iv, 6; ix, 9).

This may afford slight pollution for any indistinctness VIII. 10.
PLATO

The descending scale of existence to the last and most rudimentary exhibitions of form. There is a dull, inert antagonism, a sullen insubordination in matter, which resists the process of this perfection; not a decided negation of the beautiful, but a passive negligence which generates physical evil, as moral evil is produced by defect of essential goodness, and by deflection and aberrancy from the good.

All derivative being turns to the superior being whence it proceeds, and to the inferior being which proceeds from it, by a constant and loving libation that directs its attention both to the exemplar above and to the product of imitation below. Hence results the best and the worst part of the One, the Good, and the true or real, from whence they have descended.

The perfection of the good, and every nature undepraved, desires, is this assimilation to the divine. In aesthetics and in the works of art, this gives us the interpretation of beauty and of the beautiful; in life and conduct it explains and prescribes virtue and holiness and sanctification.

The essence of the doctrine of Platonism is contained and charmingly displayed in his theory of beauty (Eum. i, vi), and might be reproduced in its chief lines from it. A sagacious and just instinct has often led to the publication of this beautiful and magnificent vision of the One and the Good.

Descending further, the beauty of form in the One and the Good is imitated throughout every grade in the
perfect, beneficent plan of the good, accordant with the absolute excellence of the Divine Being (ὅ ἐστι διὸ ἐξ ἀληθείας ἀληθείας ἀληθείας, Ἐπιμ. vi, vii, 88). As the whole energies of the soul are directed towards the good for which it was constituted (Ἑκ. i, vii, 1; Προτ. Ἰστ. Θεολ. § cxix), its eager appetites are inexcusable love of the beautiful. All these things, indeed, is the essence of beauty becomes both purified and intensified as the intelligent and sympathetic soul ascends nearer to the thought of the divine mind, and to the vision of the excellencies and glories of the Divine (Ἑκ. vi, vi, 6). Thence all ideas proceed: thither all forms aspire; and the power of beauty is the bloom of the universal beauty, which creates all beauty, generating it, and making it more beautiful from the redundance of the beauty in the Divine, which is the beginning and the end of all beauty" (Ἑκ. vi, vii, 82). The whole nature of beauty, therefore, consists in the immediate and loving apprehension of the goodness and wisdom and excellence of the Creator, as imperfectly shown in the incomplete perfections of parts of the creation. Whence is this faculty of recognition derived? It comes from the preserving of all that is beautiful and good and the divine, it is elevated, elevated, and it is enriched by the influx of the beautiful—by the epiphany in the splendor of the splendid and loveliness of God. As the eye sees the sun by the light which proceeds from it, so the soul recognizes goodness by the goodness which God gives and bestows upon us. As the things which are communicated from the source of all beauty—the beautiful in itself (φῶς ἀπὸ φῶς ψυχής, ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀλήθειας, Π. Θεολ. ii, vi, 6, et Μαρα. Φιλοπ. ad loc. τ. v, 7). Thus all things are suspended from the Divine, and are filled with divinity (Phil. Ἰστ. Θεολ. § cxix, cxliv). This explanation may appear vague and visionary; but the philosophy of Plotinus can find no other mode of expression for its transcendent reveries. It is, however, no more indistinct than the language of more profound intellects in regard to the like subjects. It accords with the declarations of Avicenna and Avrevos, of Duns Scotus and S. Thomas Aquinas, of Leibnitz and of Corderige (Socot. In Sentent. ii, xi, i, tom. vi, p. i, ii, p. 229-4; S. Thom. Aquin. Summ. Theol. i, lxxxix; i, lxxxix; iv, lxxxiv; leibn. Phain. Philos. ad Pr. Ex. § 42; Corderige, Aidos to Reflection, p. 242, 264, note).

Beauty thus connects itself immediately with the search after the first or supreme Good (Ἑκ. ii, ix, 8); and it is in the supreme Good that the beautiful and the beautiful is appreciated. "Since all things progress, and all things are in some sort full of delight, all creatures of this sensible world lead the wise and contemplative mind to the Eternal God: they are the shadows, the echoes, and the picture; the traces, the images, and the visions of that effect." (S. Bonaventure, Itin. Minitis ad Deum, c. viii; comp. Eccl. Benton, Prop. Opus Tertium, c. ix, p. 266, note.)

"Ipsa vocat nostrum animos ad sidera mundus" (Marcellus Astronom. iv, 919).

Ugliness is defect of the beautiful, and its inadequate realization. It corresponds to physical and moral evil, and it indicates a falling away (πτωχότερα τῆς ψυχῆς) from the goodness which was designed in the creation (Ἑκ. i, vi, vi, 9; vii, 14). The perfection of every nature is this re-establishment of itself. In the expressions of Plotinus regard to human souls and man’s duties there are frequent echoes of the contemporaneous Christianity which he opposed—exquisite utterances of religious fervor, in which Plotanism seems to lose itself in the beauties of the new religion (Ἑκ. vi, ix; i, ii, 2, 5, 4; Ἐπιμ. i, iv, 6, comp. l. Theop. ii, 18, 18; Rom. viii, 11, 16). For it is "God which worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure" (Phil. ii, 13). All things frame their height to the lowest turn by native constitution to the most excellent nature whence they are derived, and the love within their souls seek union with their original Above. This universal conversion, permeating all things, binds the soul to the beauty of the Divine, which is the Creator and the desire of all. In the lover of all righteousness, in man spiritualized and filled with the desire of holiness, it becomes ecstatic elevation and intimate communion with the Spirit of the Divine. We worship the God which is separated from God. We breathe the One, whose breath is our life, and we are preserved. This support is not given at one moment, and withdrawn at another, but is ever present for our guidance. Nay, more, we incline to the Good, and to the happiness above. There the soul is at rest and beyond ill, ascending to the true country, to the place which is pure of all evils. For the soul filled with God produces beauty and righteousness and virtue. God is its beginning and its end—its beginning, because it descends from him; its end, because he is the God of which has been raised heavenly Love, and every soul is love. The soul, in its pure nature, is possessed with the love of God, and longs for union with him, as a virgin nurses the love of the beautiful for the beautiful. Thus the life of the soul is good and quietly happy, which is the things of earth—a life uncharmed by things below—the flight of the single and solitary soul to the only One (Ἑκ. vi, ix, 11).

For such sublimities of enthusiasm no language will suffice but the rapt Greek of Plotinus or the fervid Latin of Marcellus Flaccus, and even these faint and fall beneath the divine burden of the thought.

Literature.—See the references under the art. NEO-PLATONISM, and add: Plotini Platonicorum Cophyri, Opera qua cœstant omnia. Per cerelberim illum Marcellum Ficium, Florent. Ex antiquissimis Codicibus Latinis translata et eruditesin Commentaria illustrata, etc., Basileae, Imprimis Ludovici Regis (1616, fol); Plotini Opera Omnia (ed. Kreuzer, Oxon. 1835, 3 vols. 8vo); Plotini Enneades (ed. Creuzer and Moser, Par. 1855, 1 vol. 8vo); Porphyrii, Plotina Vita; Taylor, Thomas, "The Platonist," Select Works of Plotinus (London, 1817, 8vo); Cousin, Œuvres de Plotin (Paris); Steinhardt, apud Pauly, Real-Encyclopedia, vi, ii; Kirchner, Die Philosophie des Plotins (Halle, 1854); Valentinum, Plotin et seine Werke; Richer, New-platonische Studien (Halle, 1864-7); Neander, Ch. Thomas; Baur, Die Wissenschaft, ii, 207 sq.; Nourison, Pensées Humaines, p. 134 sq.; Lecky, Rationalism, i, 240; Westminster Rev. 1868, Oct. p. 246. (G. F. H.)

Flouquet, Gottfried, a German philosopher, was born Aug. 28, 1716, at Stuttgart. He came from a Protestant family of French origin; his father was an innkeeper. While he was studying at Tübingen, he was so strongly impressed by Wolf's writings that, without giving up theology altogether, he gave special attention to the study of philosophy and mathematics. This twofold tendency strikingly appears in the theses which he defended in 1740 (Diss. qua Cl. Varigoni demonstratio geometrica possibilitas transubstantiationis enevarvatur, and in which he endeavored to reconcile Wolf's doctrines with the teachings of the Christian faith. After discharging the duties of a minister and tutor, he was appointed in 1746 deacon at Freudenstadt. His memoir on the monads (Prima monadologia capacita [Berlin, 1748, 4to]) opened to him in 1749 the Academy of Sciences of Berlin, which invited him to reside there. He went to Würtemberg, by whose protection he obtained, in 1750, the professorship of logic and metaphysics at Tübingen. He taught political economy at the same university, and was, in 1778, called to Stuttgart to teach this branch at the military school. His faculties having given way
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in consequence of a stroke of apoplexy, in 1796 he was compelled to abandon teaching. Ploucquet was an honest and open character, and he was gifted by nature with a clear and methodical mind. "A champion of spiritualism," says Mr. Haag, "he combated, with a degree of penetration equalled only by his erudition, the materialistic doctrines professed by the philosophers of the 18th century, and feared not even to enter into contest with Kant. Then, ascending the stream of the centuries, he submitted to strict analysis the systems of ancient philosophy, which he tried to build anew in historical essays, worthy even now of our attention." Ploucquet died at Stuttgart Sept. 13, 1796. He left a number of works, mostly published at Tübingen, and written with great purity, but rather exaggerated concision. The following are the most important: De materiaismo (1750, 4to); --Principia de animato et phénomene (Frankfort, 1758, 8vo); --De Pyrrhoni epocha (1758, 4to); --Fundamenta philosophiae speculative (7th ed. 1759, 8vo); it is an exposition of Leibnitz's system: --De dogmatibus Thales et Anaxagora (1763, 4to); --Methodus calculationi in topocis (1783, 8vo). In this work he represents the syllogisms by geometrical figures and mathematical formulas; these methods, hinted at by Leibnitz, engaged him in discussions with Lambert and others: --ProblHEMA DE Natura hominis ante et post mortem (1786, 4to); --Institutiones philosophiae theoricae (1772, 1782, 8vo); --Elementa philosophiae contemporaneae, sive de scientia rationis et sensus (Stuttgart, 1773, 4to); --Commentationes philosophiae selectiores (Utrecht, 1781, 4to); --Varia questions metaphysico (1782, 4to). --Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xl, 494.

Plough (charash, בָּשָׁר, to plough, whence macherekh, בָּשָׁר; and macharashet, בָּשָׁר, 1 Sam. xiii, 20; two instruments used in agriculture. One of these is perhaps the ploughshare, the other the coulter. See also E.A.S.). Egypt, from the earliest times, has laid claim to the honor of the invention of this important implement, and as it was undoubtedly one of the first countries brought under culture by the hand of man after the flood, the claim may be well founded. Agriculture was also early practiced among the Hebrews, and, from their agreement in so many other matters, it is likely that the implements of the two nations were very nearly the same. The ancient Egyptian plough was entirely of wood, and of very simple form, like that point was shod with a metal snect either of bronze or iron. It was drawn by two oxen, and the ploughman guided and drove them with a long goad, without the assistance of reins, which are used by the modern Egyptians. He was sometimes accompanied by another man, who drove the animals, while he managed the two handles of the plough; and sometimes the whip was substituted for the more usual goad. The mode of yoking the beasts was exceedingly simple. Across the extremity of the pole a wooden yoke or cross-bar, about fifty-five inches or five feet in length, was fastened by a strap, lashed backwards and forwards over a prominence projecting from the centre of the yoke, which corresponded to a similar peg or knob at the end of the pole; and occasionally, in addition to these, was a ring passing over them, as in some Greek chariots. At either end of the yoke was a flat or slightly concave projection, of semicircular form, which rested on a pad placed upon the withers of the animal; and through a hole on either side of it passed a thong for suspending the shoulder-pieces, which formed the collar. These were two wooden bars, forked at about half their length, padded so as to protect the shoulder from friction, and connected at the lower end by a strong broad band passing under the throat. See Yoke. Sometimes the draught, instead of being from the shoulder, was from the head, the yoke being tied to the base of the horns; and in religious ceremonies oxen frequently drew the bier, or the sacred shrine, by a rope fastened to the upper part of the horns, without either yoke or pole (Wilkinson, Ant. Egypt., ii, 14 sqq.). According to modern travellers the plough now used in Palestine differs in some respects from the ancient implement above described. It is lightly built, with the least possible skill or expense, consisting of two poles, which cross each other near the ground. That nearest the oxen is fastened to the yoke, while the other serves, the one end as the handle, the other as the ploughshare. It is drawn by oxen, camels, cows, or heifers (Hackett, Script. Illust., p. 158 sq.; Thomson, Land and Book, i, 267 sq.). In Asia Minor substantially the same custom and implements prevail (Van Leenep, Bible Lands, p. 75 sq.). See Agriculture.

Ancient Egyptian Plough.

still used in Egypt. It consisted of a share, two handles, and the pole or beam, last which was inserted into the lower end of the still, or the base of the handles, and was strengthened by a rope connecting it with the heel. It had no coulter, nor were wheels applied to any Egyptian plough; but it is probable that the

Ploughing in Palestine.

Plough of Asia Minor.

a is the pole to which the cross-beam with yoke, b, is attached; c, the share; d, the handles; e represents three oxen harnessed to share; and f is a goad with a wrappet at the other end, probably for cleansing the share.

Ploughman (עָבָר, עִבָּר, Isa. Ixxvi. 5, which signifies not only a ploughman, but a husbandman in general). Among the Hebrews, the rich and the noble, it is true, in the cultivation of the soil did not always put themselves on a level with their servants; but none, however rich or noble or prophetically favored, disdain'd to put their hand to the plough, or otherwise to join occasionally
PLoughMAN'S COMPLAINT

in the labors of agriculture (1 Sam. xi, 7; 1 Kings xix, 19; comp. 2 Chron. xxvii, 10). See AGRICULTURE.

Ploughman's Complaint, THE, a remarkable anonymous work, published in England in the year 1552, which severely condemned the practices of popery, especially auricular confession, the celibacy and sedentary life of the clergy, the church's supposed wealth, the carelessness and negligence of the popes, etc. It was one among many means which opened the eyes of the people to the iniquity of the system, and prepared the way for the glorious Reformation.

Plough-Monday, the first Monday after Twelfthday; so called from a diversion called fool-plough, which was kept in the provinces of England on this day, which was transferred to this day. Old ploughs are preserved in the belfries of Bassingbourne and Barrington. Ploughsmen were one penny paid for every plough harnessed between Easter and Pentecost in 676, and in 960 payable on the fifteenth night after Easter.

Ploughshare (Ps. 66, Isa. i, 4). The ploughshare is a piece of iron, broad but not large, which tills the end of the shaft. So much does it resemble the short sword used by the ancient warriors that it may with very little trouble be converted into that deadly weapon, and when the work of destruction is over, re-adopted to plough the land. In 2 Kings xi, 2, it is mentioned for the first time in use on Ash-Wednesday, but afterwards transferred to this day. Old ploughs are preserved in the belfries of Bassingbourne and Barrington. Ploughsmen were one penny paid for every plough harnessed between Easter and Pentecost in 676, and in 960 payable on the fifteenth night after Easter.
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PLURALITIES

Pluralities is a term used in canon law for the possession by one person of two or more ecclesiastical offices, whether of dignity or emolument. This practice, it is held by Non-Episcopalian, was generally forbidden in the Church of England, and they quote for their authority the instructions of the apostle Paul (Titus i, 5). Others contend even that, instead of a plurality of churches to one pastor, we ought to have a plurality of pastors to one church (Acts xiv, 23). Episcopalians contend there is no impropriety in a presbytery holding more than one ecclesiastical benefice. A bishop could not hold two dioceses; a presbytery, however, might officiate in more than one parochial church, but not in two dioceses. In the Church of England pluralities originated in the poverty of many of the livings. Originally a clergyman might hold two or more livings if under the nominal value of £8. The distance between them was fixed by the canon law as not to be greater than thirty miles, but custom now tolerates forty-five. Two thousand parishes, it is said, want in this way a resident pastor. By those who thus evade the Canon, it is held that the prohibition is not absolute, and admits of possible exception, the natural ground of the prohibition being the impossibility, in ordinary cases, of the same individual adequately discharging the duties of more than one office, and that therefore, in cases in which this impossibility will not occur, the union of two or more offices in the hands of one person might, speaking absolutely, be permitted without infringing the divine law. Hence canonists distinguish between "compatible" and "incompatible" benefices or dignities. Two benefices may be incompatible in three ways: 1, If each requires residence (ratiores resideniæ); 2, if the duties of both fall to be discharged at one and the same time (ratiores servitutum); 3, if the revenue of either fully suffices for the becoming maintenance of the incumbent (ratiores sustentationum). In other cases, benefices or dignities are considered compatible, and with that due dispensation may be held by the same person. The rules by which dispensations from the law of residence are to be regulated, as well as the penalties for its violation, whether on the part of the patron or on that of the recipient, have formed the subject of frequent legislation, as in the third and the fourth councils of the Lateran, in the decreets of Innocent III and many other popes, and especially in those of the Council of Trent. In general, it may be said that the canon law regards as incompatible, 1, each having the cure of souls; 2, two "dignities," 3, a "dignity" and a cure of souls; 4, a cure of souls and a simple benefice requiring residence. In other cases than these, the pope is held to have the power of dispensing. There is no department of discipline, however, in which the tendency to relaxation has been more persistent, and in which the magnitude and strength of the abuses of the Church was the prevalence of pluralism of incompatible benefices, even of bishoprics; and although a constant effort was made to prevent this abuse, the evasions of the law were not only frequent, but even screened from punishment. By 13 and 14 Victoria, c. 98, it is provided that no incumbent of a benefice shall take and hold together with it another benefice, unless the churches are within three miles of one another by the nearest road, and the annual value of one of them does not exceed £100. Nor can two benefices be held together if the population of one exceeds 3000, and that of the other exceeds 500. The word benefice, in this sense, includes any perpetual curacy, endowed public chapel, parochial chapel, or district chapelery. But a dispensation or license can be obtained from the bishop to allow two benefices to be held together; and if the archbishop refuse his license, the party may appeal to the Privy Council. A special provision is also contained in the statute whereby the head ruler of any college or hall in the universities of Oxford and Cambridge, or warden of Durham University, is prohibited from taking more than one benefice, or any other benefice. If any spiritual person holding a benefice shall accept another benefice contrary to the statute, the first benefice shall ipso facto become void. At the same time provision is made by statutes for uniting benefices where the aggregate population does not exceed 1000, and the aggregate yearly value does not exceed £500. In Ireland, no faculty or dispensation can be granted to any spiritual person to hold two or more benefices. In Scotland, before the Reformation, pluralities were also common. Abbeys and priories were likewise often centres of benefices. See Congregation (Theology). Of twenty abbots that sat in the Parliament which decreed the Reformation, fourteen were commissaries. Thus speaks the Second Book of Discipline: "Meikle less is it lawfull that any person amang these men sould have fives, six, ten, or twenty kirks, or maes, all having the charge of sanles: and brusk the patrimonie thairof, either be admission of the prince or of the kirk, in this licht of the evangell; for it is but mocketage to crave reformation where sic lyke bes place." The question of pluralities in the Church of Scotland was raised in 1779, renewed in 1818, and the General Assembly decided to set them in 1814 by an act which, however, was repealed in 1816. In 1817 it was enacted that no professor could hold a parish unless it was near the seat of the university. The question was again raised keenly debated in 1824—to wit, the holding of a chair in a university and of a parochial charge at the same time. The university commission soon after disapproved of the practice, but not the General Assembly of that period. The tenure of many benefices by one person was finally abolished in the Church of England by 1 and 2 Victoria, c. 105. In the Roman Catholic Church this practice has been forbidden from a very early period in its history, as by the councils of Chalcedon (A.D. 451) and that of Nice (A.D. 787), and is still prohibited both by the Roman Catholic canon law and by statute law in the Established Church of England. But the prohibition is more hibernal, and so is the exercise of the law, which is often extended to the established churches pluralism, in one form or another, is not uncommon. See Hammond, Canons of the Church, p. 105 sq.

Plüschke, Johann G., an eminent German Oriental scholar, was born Aug. 20, 1780, at Kohnatock, near Schwetinditz, in Silesia. He studied theology and philosophy, and for a number of years held the professorship of philology at Leipsic. In 1818 he was called as doctor and professor ordinarius of theology to Amsterdam, to take the presidency of the Lutheran seminary at Amsterdam, and died between 1857 and 1840. Plüschke wrote, De radicibus lingae Hebraicae natura, comm. critico cum explicatione lectionum (Leips. 1817); De radicibus lingae Medioevales a Cypiano Bugado editi peculiaris inde ejusdemque usu critico in emendanda textu Psalmier Graeci sept. interpretatum (Bonn, 1835);—Lecciones Alexandrianae et Hebraicae, rice de emendanda textu Veteris Testamenti Graeci LXX Interpretationet inde Hebraico (ibid, 1837);—De emendando Pentateucho Graeco LXX Interpretationet inde Hebraico addito cod. Holmenseorum recensione et texte Graeci demum castigati specimen (ibid, 1837). See Fürst, Bibl. Jud. iii, 107; Steinmacher, Bibl. Acta, ii, 111; Winer, Handb. der Gesch. L. p. 67, 121, 711; Thierme, De Pentateuch verseió Alex- andrae, p. 23; Zuchold, Bibl. Theologicae, ii, 1001 sq. (B. P.)

Plutarcho, an eminent Greek philosopher, noted also as a biographical and miscellaneous writer, deserves a place here for the moral tendency of all his writings, and the vast influence he has exerted in modern as well as ancient times. The works which are principal which is principally gleaned from his own and others' writings, places him in a high rank as measured by the ethics of society in his time, and sets forth the moral of certain portions of that society itself during the first century of our era, and among so-called heathens, in a land that was almost as civilized as our own, the oft as he wrote might have been written by the most ardent dis-

LIFE—Plutarch, later lived from the reign of Claudius to the time of Hadrian, was born at Chersones, a small city of Boetia in Greece, which had also been the birthplace of Pindar. Plutarch's family was ancient in Chersones: his grandfather, Lamprias, was a man eminent for his learning and as a philosopher, and is often mentioned by Plutarch in his writings, as also is his own father. The time of Plutarch's birth is not known. He was early initiated in study, to which he was naturally inclined, and was placed under Ammonius, an Egyptian, who, having taught philosophy with reputation at Alexandria, thence travelled into Greece, and settled at Athens. Under his instruction, he made great advances in knowledge; and like a thorough philosopher, more apt to regard things than words, he pursued this knowledge to the neglect of languages. The Latin language, at that time, was not only the language of Rome, but the language of all the world; yet he is conversant with it until the decline of life; and though he is supposed to have resided in Rome at different times, yet he never seems to have acquired a competent skill in it at all. He is reputed to have visited Egypt, which was at that time, as formerly it had been, famous for learning; and probably the mysteriousness of their doctrine might tempt him, as it had tempted Pythagoras and others, to go and converse with the priesthood of that country. On his return to Greece he visited the various academies and schools of the philosophers, and was in the company of some of the most celebrated savants, and the most prominent of every city in which he had visited in his travels. He took a particular journey to Sparta, to search the archives of that famous commonwealth, to understand thoroughly the model of their ancient government, the history of their legislators, their kings, and their ephors; and digested all their memorable deeds and sayings. He also visited the Lyceum, where he spent the twenty years that he resided in Greece. He was very much concerned for the safety of his country. In this respect, he was a great patriot.

Writings—The great work of Plutarch is his Parallel Lives (Bioi Parallalaios), which contains the biography of forty-six distinguished Greeks and Romans, besides the lives of Artaxerxes Mmnon, Aratus, Galba, Otho, and Homer, which last is probably not by him. The forty-six lives are divided into two parts, and the first part of which contains a Greek and a Roman, and the two lives in each pair are followed by a comparison of the characters of the two persons. These lives are: Theaetes and Romulus, Lycurgus and Numus, Solon and Varro, Herodes Atticus and Moschus, Timoleon and AmyADIUS, Peter and Philip, Pythagoras and Plato, Cicero and Julius Caesar, Plutarch and Titus, Appius Claudius and Varus, Crassus and Demosthenes, and Cicero, Demetrius Poliorcetes and M. Antonius, Dion and M. Brutus. The biographies of Epaminondas, Scipio, Agustus, Tiberius, Caligula, Claudius, Nero, Vitellius, Heptomerus, Pindar, Crates the Cynic, Dio Chrysostom, Aristides, and the poet Aratus are lost. Plutarch's son, Lamprias, made a list of his father's works, which is partly preserved and printed by Fabricius (Bibliotheca Græca).

In the department of biography, Plutarch is the only writer of antiquity who has given himself up to it with a spirit of combining research and imagination. The plan of his biographies is briefly explained by himself in the introduction to the "Life of Alexander the Great," where he makes an apology for the brevity with which he is compelled to treat of the numerous events in the lives of Alexander and Caesar. "For," he says, "I do not write histories, nor lives; nor do the most conspicuous acts of necessity exhibit a man's virtue or his vice, but oftentimes some slight circumstance, a word or a jest, shows a man's character better than battles, with the slaughter of tens of thousands, and the passion of generals and cities. Now, as painters produce a likeness by a representation of the countenance and the expression of the eyes, without troubling themselves about the other parts of the body, so I must be allowed to look rather into the signs of a man's character, and thus give a portrait of his life, leaving others to describe great events and battles." The object then of Plutarch in his biographies was a moral end, and the exhibition of the principal events of a man's life was subordinate to this main design; and though he may not always have adhered to it, yet it is not certain that he could not be said to have a view of what biography should be much more exact than that of most persons who have attempted this style of composition. The life of a statesman or of a general, when written with the view of giving a complete history of all the public events in which he was engaged, is not biography, but history. This extract from Plutarch will also in some measure be an apology for the want of historical order observable in many of the lives. Though altogether deficient in that critical sagacity which discards truth from poetry, and delights in the nature of confusion and conflicting statements, Plutarch has preserved in his Lives a vast number of facts which would otherwise have been unknown to us. He was a great reader, and must have had access to large libraries. It is said that he quotes two hundred and fifty writers, a great part of whose works are now entirely lost. On the sources of Plutarch's Lives the reader may consult an essay by A. H. Le Heron, De Fontibus et Autoritate Vitrearum Parallelarum Plutarchi Commentationes IV (Got. 1826, 8vo). Besides the Lives, a considerable number of Plutarch's essays may be styled historical. They may all be read with pleasure, and some of them with instruction, not so much for their historical value as for the detached curious facts that are scattered so profusely through Plutarch's writings, and for the picture which they exhibit of the author's
own mind. In one of these essays, entitled *On the Malignity of Herodotus*, he has, unfortunately for his own reputation, attacked the veracity and integrity of the father of history, and with the same success that subsequent imitators and imitators have made their puny attacks on a work the merit of which the closest criticism may enhance but can never depreciate. The *Lives of the Ten Orators*, which are attributed to Plutarch, are of little value, and may not be his; still they bear internal evidence, at least negatively, of not being of a later age than that of Plutarch. The *Lives of Plutarch* first appeared in a Latin version by several hands, at Rome, in 2 vols. fol., about 1470. This Latin version formed the basis of various Spanish and Italian translations. The first Greek edition was printed by Philip Guinta (Florence, 1517, fol.). Among more recent editions are those of Bryan (Lond. 1729, 5 vols. 4to), in Greek and Latin, which was completed by Moses du Soul, after Bryan’s death; that of Coray (Par. 1809-1815, 6 vols. 8vo); and that of Schäfer (Leips. 1836, 6 vols. 8vo). The translations are very numerous. The best German translation is said to be by Kaltwasser (Magdeburg, 1799-1800, 10 vols. 8vo). Another German translation appeared at Vienna in 1812. The best Italian translation is by Pompei. The French translation of Amyot, which appeared in 1539, has considerable merit and has been oftentimes reprinted. The English translation of Sir Thomas North (Lond. 1612), which is avowedly made from that of Amyot, is often very happy in point of expression, and is deservedly much esteemed. The *Lives* were also translated into French by Dacier (Par. 1721, 8 vols. 4to). The translation sometimes called Dryden’s, the first volume of which was published in 1688, was executed by a great number of persons. According to a note by Malone (Dryden’s *Prose Works*, i, 351), there were forty-one of them. Dryden himself translated nothing, but he wrote the dedication to the duke of Ormond, and the Life of Plutarch which is prefixed to the translation. The translation by John and William Langborne, an insipid and tasteless version, has the merit of being tolerably correct in rendering the meaning of the original. The last and best English translation is that of professor Long, which however only includes the lives of those Romans who were concerned in the Civil Wars of Rome; this translation, which is enriched with a valuable body of notes, formed five volumes of Knight’s “Monthly Volumes” (1830-1831).

The other writings of Plutarch, which consist of about sixty essays, are generally comprehended under the title of *The Morals*, or *Ethical Works*, many of them being entirely of an ethical character. The minor historical pieces already referred to, of which that on the *Lycurgus* is one of the most remarkable, are also comprised in the collection entitled *Moralia*. Plutarch was fond of the writings of Plato; he was strongly opposed to the Epicureans: if he belonged to any philosophical sect, it was that of the Academicians. But there is nothing like a system of philosophy in his writings, and he is not characterized by depth of thought or originality. He formed for himself a system, if we may so name that which had little of the connected character of a system, out of the writings of various philosophers. But a moral end is always apparent in his *Moralia*, as well as in his biographies. A kind, humane disposition, and a love of everything that is ennobling and excellent, pervade his writings, and give the reader the same kind of pleasure that he has in the company of an esteemed friend, whose singleness of heart, and the love of truth that is evident in what he says, please him.

Plutarch rightly appreciated the importance of education, and he gives many good precepts for the bringing up of children. His philosophy was practical, and in many of its applications, as for instance his “Letter of Cato to his nephew”, “Letter to his wife,” and his *Marriage Precepts”, he is as felicitous in expression as he is sound in his precepts. Notwithstanding all the deductions that the most fastidious critic may make from Plutarch’s moral writings, it cannot be denied that there is something in them which always pleases, and the more so the better we become acquainted with them; and this is an additional merit. With regard to the purely ethical writings of Plutarch, archdeacon Trend says that they indicate a better state of society than is generally attributed to his age. Plutarch does not speak as one crying in the wilderness, but as to a circle of sympathetic hearers who will answer to his appeal. It may be supposed that his native kindliness of heart would prevent him from taking the full measure of the sin with which he was surrounded. No doubt he was deficient in the fierce indignation which consumed the heart of Tacitus and put alash in the bands of Juvenal. But it is certain from many passages in his writings that he took no rose-colored view of life. Several of his statements almost amount to the confession of original sin. Plutarch’s style bears no resemblance to the simplicity of the Attic writers. It has not the air of being much elaborated, andephirousness flowed easily from him. He is nearly always animated and pleasing, and the epiphithet pictorial may be justly applied to him. Sometimes his sentences are long and ill-constructed, and the order of the words appears not the best suited to the subject. But certainly it is not the order in which the best Greek writers of an earlier age would have arranged their thoughts. Sometimes he is obscure, both from this cause and the kind of illustration in which he abounds. He occasionally uses and perhaps affects poetic words, but they are such as give energy to his thoughts, and are not a necessary part of his expression to his language. Altogether he is real with pleasure in the original by those who are familiar with him, but he is somewhat harsh and crabb’d to a stranger. It is his merit, in the age in which he lived, treating of such subjects as biography and morals, not to have fallen into a merely rhetorical style, to have balanced antitheses, and to have contented himself with the inanity of commonplaces. Whatever he says is manly and invigorating in thought, and clear and forcible in expression.

The first Greek edition of the *Moralia*, which is exceedingly incorrect, was printed by the elder Ablus, with the following title, *Plutarachi Opuscula, Iezzi, Gt. (Ven. 1509, fol.). It was afterwards printed at Basle by Froben (1542, fol., and 1574, fol.). The only good edition is that of Trend’s *Moralia*, which was printed and edited by D. Wytenbach, who labored on it twenty-four years. This edition consists of six volumes of text (1795-1800), and two volumes of notes (1810—1821), 4to. There is a print of it which is generally bound in 5 vols. 8vo, with two volumes of notes. The *Moralia* was also printed at Leipsic in 1774-1785, 12 vols. 8vo, with the name of J. J. Reiske, but Reiske did very little to it, for he died in 1774. An edition by J. C. Hutton appeared at Tübingen (1791—1805, 14 vols. 8vo). A good critical edition of all the works of Plutarch is still wanted. See *Math. Qq. Res. July*, 1851, vii: 1552; *Christi. Rev. vol. x. and xi.; Catholic Rev*, Sept. 1857; *Neander, Christian Dogmazien. Presbyteri, Religionen vor dem Christ., p. 185 sq.; Donaldson, Literature (see Index); Costin, *Intellectual Development of the Universe* (see Index in vol. iii.); Lardner, *Works*; *Passages from the History of the Greeks*; *Qu. Res. Oct. 1861; Trend, Plutarch, His Life, His Lives, and His Morals* (Lond. 1873, 12mo); *Smith, Dict. of Class. Bioj. s. v.*

*Plutus* (πλοῦτος, rich), originally simply a name of a Cumaean god of riches, is in the mythology of Greece, the third son of Kronos and Rhea, and the brother of Zeus and Poseidon. On the
Plymouth Brethren, or Darbyites, is the name of a religious body which originated almost simultaneously at Plymouth, England, and Dublin, Ireland, about the year 1830. They are most generally called after the name of the place where they first started in England. At the outset they are called after their principal founder, John Darby; at the time a clergyman of the Episcopal Church of Ireland. He himself gave to his adherents the name of Separatists, because they left the Establishment and determined to maintain a separate existence as a Church.

Early History.—John Darby was born in England of a wealthy family. He had early studied jurisprudence and became a lawyer, but, brought into the Church, he was strongly impressed with a call to the ministry, and, though opposed by his father, he took holy orders. Disinherited by the parent for disobedience, Darby found a friend and patron in his uncle, from whom he obtained his deaconry quite an ample fortune. After ordination, Darby became gradually impressed with the idea that there was no ground for the doctrine of apostolical succession, and that any person feeling called to preach should exercise that liberty. He therefore denounced the claim of the Establishment as unwarranted, and finally broke with the Episcopalians. He, however, still held that there was a true Church, and that all who thought as he did should band themselves together and wait until Christ made his personal appearance, which they anticipated would be speedily. There were a few who united themselves together on the strength of these views, in Plymouth, England, and at Dublin, Ireland. At the former place they seemed to meet with most success. There their numbers increased to seven hundred and up to fifteen hundred, and they came to be called "Plymouth Brethren." (They have never taken this name themselves, but they do not seem to object to it.) The work increased, and bands were formed in London, Exeter, and several other places. Among those who united with them were many persons of wealth, who contributed considerable sums of money to spread their views. They established a newspaper, known as the Christian Witness, Mr. Darby being its chief contributor. It was not long before they were violently opposed by the English clergy. This opposition was so great and so violent that the spread of the new faith was not only seriously checked, but their numbers were greatly reduced. In 1838, or near that time, Mr. Darby left England. He first visited Paris, where he remained for a time, and then went to Switzerland, where he found a more inviting field. The Wesleyan Methodists had continued successful operations in Lausanne. Quite a number had withdrawn from the State Church and united with them. This excited the general attention of the people. Among the new proselytes to Methodism were many who, at the same time, were studiously considering and accepting the Wesleyan doctrine of Christian perfection. Those who held the doctrine of predestination were charged by those who had fully discarded it as having received but half the truth. At Vevey similar excitement prevailed. In this state of things, for the purpose of overthrowing the new faith, an influential member of the State Church at Lausanne invited Mr. Darby to come there and fight the Methodists. He went, and by his preaching, and the publication of a book entitled The Doctrine of the Wesleys regarding Perfection, and their Use of the Holy Ghost, and certain facts and motives which he adduced far bewildering them that not long after the greater part of them abandoned their faith, and either returned to the State Church or united with the Dissenters. Mr. Darby, besides, gave a series of lectures on the prophecies, entitled "Views regarding the actual expectation of the Church, and the Prophecies which establish it." They were largely attended by others than Dissenters, and produced a deep impression upon the public mind. They were published in book form, first in French, and subsequently translated into German and English, and may be found in Mr. Darby's published works. In the latest impression of the least of the author they lifted the veil which had long, if not from the beginning, covered the prophecies. Such was Mr. Darby's influence among the people that the regular ministry was almost entirely ignored, and he became the accepted prophet. In fact, his position had the effect directly to turn the people from the min-
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Istry as a whole. It was his custom to administer the sacrament every Sabbath indiscriminately to Churchmen and Dissenters, which practice earned for him the reputation of being a large-hearted Christian, and also of being the Church one. But really his object was to alienate the people until he could get them under his personal control for "organization, be himself the centre of the organization, as is but too clearly apparent from the fly-sheets or tracts which he published. One of these, entitled Apos/try on the Actual Economy, lays the axe at the root of the tree of the Christian Church, leaving it a shapeless wreck. Another, On the Foundation of the Church, attacks all Dissenters, and denies their right to form any new Church. And still another tract, The Right to preach Jesus possessed by every Christian, denies the existence of any priestly office in the Church, except the universal priesthood of believers. A tract entitled The Promise of the Lord, based on Matt. xviii, 20, gave the shebboleth for the Darbyite gatherings. Another tract, entitled Sosiom, was issued, in which all who hesitated to take part in these gatherings were denominated "aschimismatic." Thus the work of demolition went on. A small seminary was established in which to prepare men for the evangelistic work—that is, to spread their views and make disciples to the result has been a widespread sect, with little or no organic unity.

Later History.—A division took place among the "Brethren," under the leadership of B. W. Newton. It commenced in England and extended to the Continent, Mr. Newton, it is claimed, held with Irving that Christ was not sinless. This notion was repelled by most of the Darbyites, and Newton was subsequently expelled by Mr. Darby. (It might be interesting to inquire how Mr. Darby could consistently expel a man from his society when he ignores all organizations? If there be no organization why is there anything to be expelled from?) The Newton hersely extended to Vevay, where there was much trouble, the "Brethren" splitting into two factions, which was followed soon after by many other societies. Another division took place among them, in which the famous George Müller, of Bristol, England, was the most prominent. Other divisions have occurred, but they are of very little importance. The "Brethren" are more or less numerous in Paris, Lausanne, Holland, Italy, and Belgium, on the Continent; in Plymouth, Exeter, and London, in England; a very few in the West Indies; one in Trinidad; and one in Quebec, Dr. Steele, in the Maritimes. They are an earnest, self-sacrificing people.

Doctrines, etc.—The "Brethren" profess to have no creed but the Bible, and condemn all who avow a creed, as putting human opinions in the place of the Word of God. They seriously doubt there is a Church in the land which has a more clearly defined creed than they have. They denounce all commentaries on the Bible as misleading, and yet Mr. Darby himself has written commentaries quite extensively on the Bible, to say nothing of M'Intosh. In faith they seem to be strongly Antinomian. If once justified, it is their belief that the soul not only can never fall from grace finally, but can never fall into condemnation. The soul's standing remains as pure as Christ himself. In other respects they hold to the greatest and leading doctrines of the Gospel; but as they have no written creed or confession, it is exceedingly difficult to find out exactly what they do hold. Each one is in every respect allowed to hold what he pleases, consistently with continuous practical evidence that he is a real Christian, which includes a belief in the leading doctrines of evangelical Christians. No one pretends in anything to judge for another, or make his convictions obligatory any further than he can, by more perfectly instructing the other, induce him to accept them. Their views of what constitutes worship are also similar. This consists, they say, not in preaching or praying—petitioning—though these exercises may lead to worship, but simply in adoration, praise, and thanksgiving to God for what he is in himself, and what he is for those who render it. Hence worship can only be rendered by true Christians, in the breaking of bread and in the praise of God, and through the call of Christ, and therefore, for believers and for unconverted people are entirely distinct. They hold the obligation of the Church to come together the first day of the week to break bread; hence they observe the Lord's Supper every Sabbath morning, and believers alone are expected to come together. They never preach in the morning, but usually simply exhort, two, or at the most three of them, speaking during the service. In the afternoon or evening of the Sabbath they preach to sinners. The Plymouth Brethren are the opposite extreme to Irvingites and Monomists, and yet resemble these in several respects. They, too, are a protest against the present state of the Church, Protestant as well as Catholic, which they denounce as Babylon, and expect the speedy coming of the Lord. But while the Irvingites and Monomists lay claim to an apostolical hierarchy, the "Brethren," like the Quakers, reject the specific ministry, and all written creeds and outward Church organization. They derive the diuision of the Church from the neglect to recognise the Holy Spirit as Christ's vicar on earth, and the all-sufficient interpreter of the Scriptures. All believers are true spiritual priests, capacitated for worship (Heb. x, 19, 25), and all those who possess the qualifications from these, and not only the laymen from outside the Church, but also the clergy are to spread the Gospel to the whole world and build up the Church, without any ordination of men. This they consider to be the true apostolic mode of worship, according to 1 Cor. xii and xiv. But, unlike the Quakers, they retain the ordinance of baptism, and administer the Lord's Supper every week. As a body they hold to a limited baptism only; but if one comes to them who was baptized in infancy, while they receive him, they generally manage to convince him very soon of the importance of being re baptized. As to the remainder of their creed, they seem to agree most with the Calvinistic system, and are said to be zealous in good works. See Guineas, Who are the Plymouth Brethren? (Phila, 1861); Dennett, Plymouth Brethren, their Rise, etc.; Brit. Qt. Oct. 1875, art. iii.; Presby. Qt. Jan. 1872, p. 48; Marden, Dict. of Churches, p. 91; Joth. deutsch-amer. Zeitschr., 1861, Nr. 21; Dr. Steel, in Christian Holiness, 1876; Brit. and For. Ev. Rev. July, 1885, art. ii.; Lond. Qt. Rev. No. lxxii, 1869, art. iii. (J. H. W.)

Pneumatology (from πνεύμα, spirit, and λόγος, word) is the doctrine of spiritual existence. Considered as the science of mind or spirit, pneumatology consists of three parts: treating of the divine mind, theology; the angelic mind, angelology; and the human mind. This last is now called psychology. *a term to which no competent objection can be made, and which affords us, what the various clumsy paraphrases in use do not, a convenient adjective, psychological* (Sir W. Hamilton, Erida's Works, p. 219, note). The belief in a return from the dead in the last investigations, and spirit life incor- porated in the traditions of the Jews, and prevailed almost universally in the scholastic ages. The mystic Jacob Böhme and Emanuel Swedenborg made it a popular phase of belief in Northern Europe, and Marti- nez Pasqualis and his disciple St. Martin is said to it prevalent among the people of France and in Southern Europe. All these teachers have given accounts of the orders of spiritual beings who held communication with the living. In our own day spiritualism has branched out so extensively that it will be treated separately under that heading.

Pneumatomikoi, i. e. adversaries of the Holy Spirit, is a name properly applied to all those who entertain heretical opinions as to the Scripture doctrine of the Holy Ghost, e. g. the Subellions (q. v.). The
name originated after the subsidence of the Arian controversy, and was applied to that party, distinguished by the denial of the catholic faith regarding the Third Person of the Holy Trinity; some denying his divinity, others his personality also. The name is, however, more generally applied to the adherents of Macedonius, who, after the death of Eusebius of Nicomedia, was called by the Arian faction to the see of Constantinople, in opposition to the catholic bishop Paul. This led to bloody strife, insomuch as a majority of the citizens were for Paul. The Arians got the better of their catholic opposers with the help of the emperor Constantine, who took the part of Macedonius, and established him in the disputed see by force of arms: three thousand persons perished on that occasion. Macedonius, although called to the bishopric of Constantinople by strict Arians, seems not to have been very much of an Arian himself, but persecuted the catholics after the fashion of other Semi-Arian bishops, and became, with Basiliscus of Ancyra, one of the chiefs of the Semi-Arians. As a natural consequence of the rest of their doctrine, the Arians declared the Holy Ghost, who was little spoken of explicitly at the beginning of the Arian difficulties, to be a mere creature, and most of them held him to be an inferior creature to the Son. Not only the strict Arians, but also the Semi-Arians, who called the Son "God" and θεοφόρος questioned the divinity of the Holy Ghost, but retained the doctrine as to the divinity of the Son. They were consequently opposed both by catholics and Arians, but their true controversy was with the former: their content with the latter (Athenasius urges) could only be pretended, insomuch as both agreed in opposing the doctrine of the Trinity (Ad Serap. i, 1, 2, 9, 82). This class, then, differed from the later Macedonian class: it held Homousian doctrine regarding the Son, whereas the Macedonians were Homoioioumians. Athenasius calls them also Τροπικοι, from their figurative interpretations of Scripture; but this is rather an epithet than a proper name.

In comparison with the Macedonian party, this earlier party can have been but small. It was, however, reinforced a few years later, as we shall show, upon the return of a large portion of the Semi-Arian body to catholicity. The adoption of the truth concerning the Son leads almost necessarily to the adoption of the truth concerning the Holy Spirit. The arguments of Athenasius (Ad Serap. i, 27; iv, 7) show forcibly how untenable a position is that which maintains a duality of persons instead of a trinity. The original Monarchian tenet from which the Arians started is much more easily admissible.

The Pneumatomachii of the Macedonian school were the Semi-Arians left behind in schism when, in the year 366, the majority of the sect gave in their assent to orthodoxy, and were received into the Church. Before this time Macedonius, as we have seen above, had joined the Semi-Arian party, but proving thereby unacceptable to the Arians, was deposed by the Council of Constantinople, A.D. 360 (Theodoret, Hist. Eccles. ii, 6). A council was appointed to mediate between the Macedonians and the Arians, and to effect a reconciliation, but just before the meeting thirty-four Asiatic bishops assembled in Caria refused the Homoeousian; and Valens, at the instigation of the Arian Eudoxius, by whom he had been recently baptized, forbade the council (Socrates, Hist. Eccles. vi, 12). From this time, however, Semi-Arianism disappeared from ecclesiastical history. The controversy regarding Christ's divinity ceased, and the denial of the divinity of the Holy Spirit became the distinguishing tenet of the Semi-Arian party, the tenet thus becoming associated with the name of Macedonius which it of late years had newly received. Of course there were some, as we have already had occasion to state, who called them Marathionians, saying that Marathionius, bishop of Nicomedia, had introduced the term Homoioousian (Socrates, Hist. Eccles. ii, 45).

It is to be noticed here that several writers, when
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treating of the present heresy, use the word Semi-Arian in another sense than that now given it. Philaster (Her. c. lxxvi) defines the Semi-Arians thus: "Hi de Patre et Filio bene sentiant, unus qualitatis substantias, esse ess...
Pockels, Carl Friedrich, a German moralist, was born in Würzburg, 1757, and died in Halle, 1800. Having completed his studies at the university in Halle, he was appointed tutor of the princes of Brunswick, and afterwards guardian of one of them, the duke Augustus. When this house lost their estates, he lived as a private citizen at Brunswick. In 1813 he occupied again his former relation to duke Augustus. He died at Brunswick Oct. 29, 1814. Pockels’s works, written in a fluent and elegant style, contain a treasury of sagacious and curious observations on man and society. In his "Beiträge zur Beförderung der Menschenkenntnis" (Berlin, 1788-92, 2 parts, 8vo; followed by Neue Beiträge, etc. (Hamberg, 1798, 8vo)—"Fragmente zur Kenntniss des menschlichen Herzens" (Hanover, 1788-94, 3 vols., 8vo)—"Denkwürdigkeiten zur Besserrung der Charakterzüge" (Halle, 1794, 8vo)—"Versuch einer Charakteristik des westlichen Geschlechts" (Hanover, 1799-1802, 5 vols., 8vo)—formed a work of great value. The author published as a pendant, Der Mann (ibid., 1805-8, 4 vols., 8vo)—Karl Wilhelm Ferdinand von Braunschweig (Stuttgart, 1809, 8vo)—"Über den Umgang mit Kindern" (1811)—"Über Gesellschaft, Geselligkeit und Umgang" (Hanover, 1813, 3 vols., 8vo)—"The Tauchbuch, as keepsake, for the years 1803 and 1804; and, in common with Ch. Ph. Moritz, the Denkwürdigkeiten zur Beförderung des Edlen und Schönem (Berlin, 1786-88, 2 vols., 8vo), some articles in the Magazin zur Erklärungswissensch., and in the Braunschweigisches Magazin (1786-1792)."

Pocklington, John, D.D., an English divine, noted also as an educator, flourished near the middle of the 17th century. He was at one time president of Pembroke Hall and Sidney College, Cambridge. He published Sermons (Lond. 1636)—Allure Christianum (1651, 4to), in answer to William's Holy Table. See Williams, John.

Pococke, Edward (1), an English Orientalist and theologian of great note, not only in his own times, but one whose scholarly acquisitions are gladly acknowledged even in our day, was born Nov. 8, 1604. He studied in Oxford, his native place, at the university, and devoted himself especially to the Oriental tongues, the Hebrew, Arabic, Chaldean, and Syriac, first under the direction of Matthew Pason, and afterwards under that of William Bedwell. Pococke took his bachelor of arts' degree in 1622, and his master's in 1626. Lud. de Dieu publishing a Syriac version of the Apocalypse at Leyden the following year, our author set about the task of preparing those four epistles which were still wanting to a complete edition of the New Testament in that language. These epistles were the second of Peter, the second and third of John, and that of Jude. All the other books, except these five, had been well printed by Albertus Widmanstadius, at Vienna, in 1565, who was sent into the West for that purpose by Ignatius, the Jacobite patriarch of Antioch, in the 16th century. Having met with a manuscript in the Bodleian Library proper to his purpose, Pococke engaged in this work and finished it; but laid it by, not having the courage to publish it, till the death of the bishop of Walmis, in 1654. He then took the acquaintance of Gerard Vossius, who, being then at Oxford, obtained his consent to carry it to Leyden, where it was printed that year, in 4to, under the immediate care and inspection of Lud. de Dieu. In 1628 Pococke had been received a fellow of the principal college of Oxford; but having decided to enter the priesthood, he was ordained priest in 1629, having entered into deacon's orders some time before, and he was appointed chaplain to the English factory at Aleppo, by the interest of Selden, as appears very probable. He arrived at that place, after a long voyage, Oct. 17, 1630. His residence in the East for six years furnished an opportunity of further study in the Oriental tongues. He acquired great skill in the Arabic tongue, and he likewise endeavored to get a further insight, if possible, into the Hebrew; but, through the fault of himself, he found it fruitless from his being very illiterate. He also improved himself in the Ethiopic and Syriac, of which last he made a grammar, with a praxis, for his own use. On Oct. 30, 1631, he received a commission from Land, then bishop of London, to buy for him such ancient Greek coins and such manuscripts, even of Greek or the Oriental Greek or the Oriental, as he should judge most proper for a university library—which commission Pococke executed to the best of his power. He also translated a number of historical works from the Arabic, collected a great quantity of Oriental manuscripts, which he sent to England, and made a careful study of the environs of Aleppo, with respect to natural history: the result of the latter study was intended to furnish a desirable addition to the commentaries of the Old Testament. In 1654 the plague raged furiously at Aleppo; many of the merchants fixed two days' journey from the city, and dwelt in tents upon the mountains: Pococke did not stir, yet neither he nor any of the English caught the infection. In 1656 he received a letter from Laud, then archbishop of Canterbury, informing him of his design to found an Arabic lecture at Oxford, and of naming him to the university as the professor; upon which agreeable news he presently settled his affairs at Aleppo, and took the first opportunity of returning home. On his arrival at Oxford this year, he took the degree of bachelor of divinity in July, and entered on the professorship of Arabic; however he died, the next year, when his friend Mr. John Greaves concerted his voyage to Egypt, it was thought expedient by Laud that Pococke should attend him to Constantinople, in order to perfect himself in the Arabic language, and to purchase more manuscripts. During his absence there, he was for some time chaplain to Sir Peter Wych, then the English ambassador to the Porte, and who became Pococke's most zealous protector. He collected during his stay in that city a number of Oriental manuscripts. In 1659 he received several letters from his friends at home, particularly from a friend of the bishop, pressing him to return home; and accordingly, embarking in August, 1640, he landed in Italy, and passed thence to Paris. Here he met with Grotius, who was then ambassador at the court of France from Sweden, and acquainted him with a project he had to translate his treatise De enviro Christianae Religionis in Arabic, in order to promote the conversion of some of the Mohammedans. Grotius was pleased with and encouraged the proposal, while Pocock did not scruple to observe to him some things towards the end of his book which had not been mentioned by our author. Pococke began a translation, and adding a great many improving opinions which, though commonly charged by Christians upon Mohammedans, yet had no foundation in any of their authentic writings, and were such as they themselves were ready to disclaim. Grotius was so far from being displeased that he heartily thanked
Moses, being six preatory discourses of Moses Maimonides's "Commentary upon the Mishna," written in Arabic, but with the Hebrew letters. This work, which was the first production of the Hebrew press at Oxford, appeared in 1656, together with a Latin translation and a number of notices on the design of the work, and giving the names of some of the persons to whom it would be of use. On his return to England, in 1640, Pocock found himself in very difficult circumstances. His chair of Arabic had been stippeded by archbishop Laud, but after the death of that prelate the revenues had been seized upon. Pocock now devoted himself entirely to study, and escaped by his retreat, as well as by the friendship of John Selden, who enjoyed a great influence in the republican party, the revolutions, if not dangers, which his royalist opinions would have been sure to bring upon him. In 1648 he was presented by his college with the living of Childrey, in Berkshire, and in 1647, in consequence of the exertions of John Selden, he was reinstated in his Oxford chair, and two years later he was appointed professor of Hebrew. The king, who was at that time a prisoner in the Isle of Wight, also bestowed on him a rich canonry. An act of Parliament confirmed the gift; but the canonry thus assigned to him being different from that originally annexed to the professorship, Pocock entered a protest against receiving benefices profanes. In the meantime he composed his Specimen Historiarum Arabum, being extracts from the work of Abul Faraj in the original Arabic, together with a Latin translation and copious notes. This work, which was printed at Oxford in 1646 and 1650 (4to), was reprinted in 1806 by White, with some additions by Sylvestre de Sacy. In November, 1650, about a year after publishing the preceding work, Pocock was ejected from his canonry, and it was intended to deprive him of the Hebrew and Arabic professorships; but, thanks to a petition signed by all the doctors of the university, the master of Oxford at the instance of Pocock, Pocock was suffered to enjoy both places. In 1655 he was on the point of being deprived of his living, on the ground of "ignorance and insufficiency," at least such were the charges preferred against him by Cromwell's committee. Some of his Oxford friends, however, wisely prevented the disgrace to the Roundhead party which would have followed the ejection, upon such grounds, of so eminent a scholar as Pocock. The most determined against this measure was Dr. John Owen (himself one of the Parliamentary commissioners), Seth Ward, and John Walsh, who disliked the stupid and bigoted creatures to their face, and made them sensible of "the infinite contempt and reproach which would reward such treatment of a man whom all the learned, not of England only, but of all Europe, so justly admired for his vast knowledge and extraordinary accomplishments." Meanwhile nothing had sufficed to check either his pious care of his parish or his pursuit of sacred and Oriental learning. In Arabic and Hebrew learning he was allowed to be second to none of his age.

From the first Pocock made his Oriental attainments subservient to Biblical illustration; and his contributions, directly and indirectly, to Biblical learning were numerous and extremely valuable. Of his connection with Walton's Polyglot, his biographer says: "From the beginning scarce a step was taken in that work [not excepting even the Prophetae] till communicated to Mr. Pocock, without whose assistance it must have wanted much of its perfection;" he collated the Arabic Pentateuch, with two copies of Saadia's translation; drew up an account of the Arabic versions of the New Testament, with which he was satisfied; and, in the Appendix to the Polyglot, and lent some of his own rich store of MSS. to the conductors of the work, viz. a Syriac MS. of the entire Old Testament, an Ethiopic MS. of the Psalms, two Syriac MSS. of the Psalms, and a Persian MS. of the Gospels. Soon after his escape from the commission's purposes, Pocock published his Panteac usciousness of Moses Maimonides's "Commentary upon the Mishna," written in Arabic, but with the Hebrew letters. This work, which was the first production of the Hebrew press at Oxford, appeared in 1656, together with a Latin translation and a number of notices on the design of the work, and giving the names of some of the persons to whom it would be of use. On his return to England, in 1640, Pocock found himself in very difficult circumstances. His chair of Arabic had been stippeded by archbishop Laud, but after the death of that prelate the revenues had been seized upon. Pocock now devoted himself entirely to study, and escaped by his retreat, as well as by the friendship of John Selden, who enjoyed a great influence in the republican party, the revolutions, if not dangers, which his royalist opinions would have been sure to bring upon him. In 1648 he was presented by his college with the living of Childrey, in Berkshire, and in 1647, in consequence of the exertions of John Selden, he was reinstated in his Oxford chair, and two years later he was appointed professor of Hebrew. The king, who was at that time a prisoner in the Isle of Wight, also bestowed on him a rich canonry. An act of Parliament confirmed the gift; but the canonry thus assigned to him being different from that originally annexed to the professorship, Pocock entered a protest against receiving benefices profanes. In the meantime he composed his Specimen Historiarum Arabum, being extracts from the work of Abul Faraj in the original Arabic, together with a Latin translation and copious notes. This work, which was printed at Oxford in 1646 and 1650 (4to), was reprinted in 1806 by White, with some additions by Sylvestre de Sacy. In November, 1650, about a year after publishing the preceding work, Pocock was ejected from his canonry, and it was intended to deprive him of the Hebrew and Arabic professorships; but, thanks to a petition signed by all the doctors of the university, the master of Oxford at the instance of Pocock, Pocock was suffered to enjoy both places. In 1655 he was on the point of being deprived of his living, on the ground of "ignorance and insufficiency," at least such were the charges preferred against him by Cromwell's committee. Some of his Oxford friends, however, wisely prevented the disgrace to the Roundhead party which would have followed the ejection, upon such grounds, of so eminent a scholar as Pocock. The most determined against this measure was Dr. John Owen (himself one of the Parliamentary commissioners), Seth Ward, and John Walsh, who disliked the stupid and bigoted creatures to their face, and made them sensible of "the infinite contempt and reproach which would reward such treatment of a man whom all the learned, not of England only, but of all Europe, so justly admired for his vast knowledge and extraordinary accomplishments." Meanwhile nothing had sufficed to check either his pious care of his parish or his pursuit of sacred and Oriental learning. In Arabic and Hebrew learning he was allowed to be second to none of his age.

From the first Pocock made his Oriental attainments subservient to Biblical illustration; and his contributions, directly and indirectly, to Biblical learning were numerous and extremely valuable. Of his connection with Walton's Polyglot, his biographer says: "From the beginning scarce a step was taken in that work [not excepting even the Prophetae] till communicated to Mr. Pocock, without whose assistance it must have wanted much of its perfection;" he collated the Arabic Pentateuch, with two copies of Saadia's translation; drew up an account of the Arabic versions of the New Testament, with which he was satisfied; and, in the Appendix to the Polyglot, and lent some of his own rich store of MSS. to the conductors of the work, viz. a Syriac MS. of the entire Old Testament, an Ethiopic MS. of the Psalms, two Syriac MSS. of the Psalms, and a Persian MS. of the Gospels. Soon after his escape from the commission's purposes, Pocock published his Panteac
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bishop of Osory. He had just been transferred to Meath when he died of apoplexy, in September, 1755. There are some notices of him in the Philosophical Transactions and in the Archæologia. (J. H. W.)

Peculiaries is an ecclesiastical term used for drinking-cups consecrated in churches.

Poderis or Talairis is another name for the ab (q. v.)

Podicco, John Dr. (also called John de Vallatololid or John Corderus), a convert from Judaism and noted as a writer, was born about the year 1635. He is the author of two anti-Jewish works, viz. Cordusius bipae, cited very often by Alfonso de Spina in his Fortalitium fidei (p. 117, 155, 169, 170 sq.), and Declaratio super Aben Eranam in decem procerpia; also quoted by Alfonso de Spina. He was permitted by the king, Don Henry, to hold religious disputations with Jews, and in 1755 such a disputatio took place in the cathedral of Avila, where Moses Cohen de Tordesillas was the spokesman of the Jews. The main points to be discussed were the dogmas of Christianity, the Messiahship of Jesus, his divinity and incarnation, the Trinity, and the virginity of Mary. Four discussions were held, the first of which was published by Tordesillas in his Liber Guerra, or examination of one hundred and twenty-five passages of Scripture usually urged by Christians in favor of their religion. This book, which he designated “The Stronghold of the Faith,” he presented to the synagogue of Avila and Toledo. See Förster, Bibl. Judaica, iii, 485, 467; De Rossi, Joolz, II, 818; Autori Ebrei (Ger. trans. by Hamberger), p. 317; the same, Bibl. Judaica antichristiana, p. 26; Grütz, Grach. d. Juden, viii, 21 sq.; Lino, Hist. d. des Jews, p. 159; Firm, Sephardim, p. 811; Kalmar, Israel und die Kirche, p. 25. (B. F.)

Podoniptae (i.e. Feet-washers) is one of the names by which that branch of the Memnonites, otherwise known as Flemings, are sometimes designated. They maintain that the example of Christ, which has in this instance the force of a law, requires his disciples to wash the feet of their guests in token of their love; and for this reason they have been called Podoniptae. But others deny that this rite was enjoined by Christ. See MEMNONITAE.

Poo, Adam, D.D., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, noted for his devotion to its interests, literary, social, and religious, was born in Columbiana County, Ohio, July 21, 1804. Such limited advantages as the times and the means of his parents afforded him for acquiring an education were eagerly embraced, and in the schools and by private tuition he secured the elements of a good English education and some knowledge of the classics, and formed a taste for reading and study which he continued throughout life. He received his early Christian training in the Presbyterian Church, and ever cherished for it a profound respect; but its distinctive doctrines did not find a response in his heart, and after careful examination and many severe spiritual conflicts he preferred the doctrines of religion as taught by the Methodist Episcopal Church. Having decided to give himself to the work of the ministry, to which he felt called of God, he was licensed to preach, and in 1826 became a travelling preacher in the Ohio Annual Conference. He was effective from that date to the time of the illness which resulted in his death; and as a pastor, and in the other capacities in which he served the Church and her cause, he was a most efficient laborer of the Master. Dr. Poe entered the travelling ministry when the work involved sacrifices and demanded labors of no ordinary character. The circuits were of vast extent. An absence from home of twenty-eight days, with a sermon and a class or prayer meeting for each evening, and a horseback ride of six hundred miles through the forests and the rough
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roads of the border settlements to complete a single round, was common. Unchecked by heat or cold, through drenching rains or chilling sleet or snow, along miry ways, and for unëmerced reaches of distance, wading the rapids and cross- ing the ranges of the cross-country way, the Christ-loving itinerant pressed forward in his tireless rounds, hunting up the lost sheep of the house of Israel, and gathering them into the fold of the great Shepherd. No man ever entered the cause with firmer faith, with greater singleness of purpose, or with more unreserved devotion than did Adam Poe. As he began, so he continued to the end. His whole being was rooted and grounded in God. His pastoral appointments were as follows: 1827, on Brunswick Circuit; 1828, on Huron Circuit; 1829, in charge of Wayne Circuit; 1830, on Columbus Circuit; 1831, on Deer Creek Circuit! 1832-3, on Miami Circuit; 1834, Marietta. In 1835 Dr. Poe succeeded the celebrated William B. Christie as presiding elder of Wooster District, and continued on that and the Tiffin District some five years, when his impaired health demanded relief from such exhausting labors. In 1839 he was stationed in Mansfield; in 1840-41, in Delaware; in 1842, presiding elder on Norwalk District; in 1843 in Delaware a second time; in 1844, agent for the Ohio Wesleyan University; 1846, again in Mansfield; 1847-9, on Norwalk Circuit again; lastly, in 1850. From 1850 to the spring of 1852, he was presiding elder of Mansfield District. At the General Conference of 1852 he was, in a manner highly creditable to himself, elected assistant agent of the Western Book Concern. To this office he was re-elected in 1856. Upon the failure of the health of the Rev. L. Swormstedt in 1840, he was elected principal agent. To this office he was re-elected in 1864. The General Conference of 1868 would have gladly continued him in this relation had it not found him hovering between life and death. He died June 26, 1868. Dr. Poe was a sound thinker, safe rather than brilliant in his theological views, colloquial rather than oratorical in his style of speech, ever interesting and instructive in the pulpit and on the platform. His life was genial and Christian. A man of sterling integrity of character and honesty of purpose, of sound and godly judgment, he enjoyed the confidence of the Church to a degree rarely awarded to living men. Travelling the circuit, laboring in the station, charged with the anxious administration of the expansive district, or managing the vast interests of the Western Book Concern, he was a man to whom one single purpose, to do well the work committed to him by the Church. This was the grand secret of his success. Dr. Poe had a commanding presence. The spirit of benevolence ruled in his heart, and its winning sunshine beamed in his countenance. He was frank almost to bluntness, but this could manifest no unhappiness. He was fearless, but his courage was tempered with wisdom. He was social in a high degree; his winning smile, his genial spirit, and the facility and effectiveness with which he drew upon the rich storehouse of anecdotes or bits never soon forgotten by his intimate friends. Dr. Poe was greatly interested in the educational advantages of the Methodist Episcopal Church, but particularly the Ohio Wesleyan University, of which he may almost be said to have been the founder. His faith in the enterprise, and his devotion to it, were truly heroic. From its inception down to the hour of his death no personal or family interest was dearer to his heart than this grand, central educational institution of the Church in the state of Ohio. He was a member of the board of trustees from the time of its establishment. See Advocate, in the Western Christian Advocate, July 8, 1868; Minutes of the North Ohio Conference, p. 34 sq.; N. Y. Christian Advocate, July 4, 1868. (J. H. W.)

Poe, Daniel, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and brother of the noted poet, born in Columbiana County, Ohio, Oct. 12, 1806. In August, 1822, he united with the Methodist Episcopal Church. Young as he was, he was soon appointed a class-leader, and was licensed to exhort. He prepared at an academy for college, and studied at Augusta College, Kentucky. He was licensed to preach, and was soon called into the Ohio Conference, and appointed to travel the Lesart Falls Circuit, where he labored acceptably and successfully. The next year he was appointed to the Eaton Circuit, and the year following to the Hamilton Circuit, and in 1855 to the Oxford Circuit. In May, 1856, he was sent to the Oneida and Menomonee Mission, west of Green Bay. He commenced a school among the Oneida Indians, and extended his visits to those at Brothertown, and other fragments of tribes scattered through the Wisconsin Territory, and finally succeeded in building up a flourishing Mission, which continues to this day to exert a most salutary influence among this reclaimed savage tribe. In the autumn of 1858 Mr. Poe travelled on horseback, through an almost unbroken wilderness, from Green Bay to Ashland, Ill., to attend the Illinois Conference. He was then transferred back to the Ohio Conference, but he could not get to Ohio in time to receive an appointment that year. In January, 1859, his brother, who was presiding elder of the Tiffin District, employed him on the Northern Circuit, where he labored till the session of his Conference. In 1861 he was appointed to the M'Arthus town Circuit. The next two years he was appointed to Tariton. In September, 1842, he was transferred to the Texas Conference. On his arrival there he addressed himself with his accustomed simple and energy to his work, but one of the greatest needs of the country that first impressed him was the need of schools and teachers. In view of this destination he returned to Ohio, in order to secure a corps of teachers. After a few months he returned to Texas, and shortly after commenced laying the foundations of an institution of learning at San Augustine. The next Conference resolved to adopt it and give it its patronage. But, besides this educational work, Mr. Poe served the San Augustine Circuit, which subjected him to the necessity of travelling some three hundred miles every four weeks. He kept up his engagements with regularity, and to the satisfaction of all concerned, but the exertion necessary to this end proved too much, and in 1844 he fell a prey to disease, and died after a very short illness. His last words were a testimony of the happy servant to whom the Master bade a hearty welcome, as he laid his head upon the breast of Daniel Poe. "As a man of intellect," says bishop Morris, "I should place Poe considerably above the medium, though his mind was sober and practical rather than striking or brilliant. His perceptions were quick and clear, and he had that strong foundation and sound judgment which the generous and most judicious gave great weight to his counsels and great efficiency to his movements. In his moral constitution he was distinguished chiefly for the resolute and the heroic. He had a naturally kind and amiable spirit. He was far from being in petulant in his movements or betrayed in his decisions; but when his purpose was once deliberately and conscientiously formed, it was impossible to divert him from the course of his sober convictions. With the highest degree of physical courage, he united that higher courage which has its foundation in principle and in faith. The sentiment of fear, except as it had respect to God, never found a lodgment in his bosom." His preaching was such as might have been expected from his solid and well-disciplined mind, and his earnest, resolute, and eminently Christian spirit. He spoke with great simplicity and plainness, and was a model of Christian modesty and oratory. His discourses were well-considered, well-disseminated expositions of divine truth. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, vii, 786 sq.; Finley, Sketches: Minutes of Conferences, 1845. (J. H. W.)

Poe, Henry, a son of the noted poet, born in Utrecht in 1856. His master was Abraham Bloemaert. He then went to Rome, where he en-
The same apostle gives a pagan poet the name of prophet (Tit. i, 12, "One of themselves, even a prophet of their own, said, etc."); because, among the heathen, poets were thought to be inspired by Apollo. They spoke by enthusiasm. Oracles were publicly delivered in verse. Poets were interpreters of the will of the gods. The poet quoted by Paul is Epimenides, whom the ancients esteemed to be inspired and favored by the gods. See EPIMEMIDES.

The son of Sirech, intent on praising eminent men, enumerates bards or poets; who were, he says, "Leaders of the people by their counsels, and by their knowledge of learning meet for the people; wise and eloquent in their instructions: such as found out musical tunes, and recited verses in writing" (Eccles. xlii, 4). It is evident that he considered them as of great importance to the community; and we know that they were of great antiquity, for Moses, himself a poet, refers to those who spoke in proverbs (Numb. xxii, 27), of which he inserts a specimen. Jacob was a poet, as appears from his farewell benediction on his sons. It appears extremely probable that the honorable appellation Nebi equally denoted a prophet, a poet, and a musician, as the poets principally were. See POETRY.

Poetry, Hebrew. We propose here to discuss only the poetical elements of the Bible, or ancient Hebrew poetry. For the present, we shall treat this subject under the distinct heads of the character of Hebrew poetry, its existing remains, its classification, its history, and its literature. In doing this we treat the subject from a modern scientific point of view.

1. The Essential Character of Ancient Hebrew Poetry.—Poetry is in its nature the language of the imagination stimulated by the passions. While prose expresses the calm statements of memory and observation, or the deliberate conclusions of the judgment, poetry gives utterance to the impulsive exactions of the soul, the taste, the emotions and the aspirations of the heart. History can only appear in poetry in the guise of legend, and reasoning only in the form of animated colloquy. The phraseology is in keeping with the difference in spirit. Poetry tends to a more exact and elaborate style of language in accordance with the fervid state of the mind. Hence the invention—spontaneous in most instances—of measure, whether of simple numbers or rhyme, to meet this overwrought state of the mental faculties. Biblical poetry parries these characteristics. It is distinguished from the prose compositions of the same book by its peculiarities of diction, as marked as those of other languages, although not so prosodically. The reader is at once made aware of entering the poetical domain by a certain elevation of style, and by the employment of more frequent and extended tropes, as well as by greater abruptness and more decided energy in the phraseology. The formal rhythm consists not—as in Greek and Latin, or even in the modern tongues,—in a measured quantity of syllables of a particular length in utterance, but in a peculiar balance and analogism of the clauses, constituting what is known as a parallelism. Each of these peculiar traits of Hebrew poetry we take space to develop somewhat in detail.

One characteristic of Hebrew poetry, not indeed peculiar to it, but shared by it in common with the literature of other nations, is its intensely national and local coloring. The writers were Hebrews of the Hebrews, drawing their inspiration from the mountains and rivers of Palestine, which they have immortalized in their poetic figures, and even while uttering the sublime and most universal truths never forgetting their own nationality in its narrower and more restricted form. Their images and metaphors, says Munk (Palestine, p. 444 a), are taken chiefly from nature and the phenomena of Palestine and the surrounding countries, from the pastoral life, from agriculture and the national history. The stars of heaven, the sand of the seashore, are the images and symbols of the abstract.
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invading the country, they are the swift torrents or the
roaring waves of the sea, or the clouds that bring on a
tempest; the war-chariots advance swiftly like light-
ing or the whirlwinds. Happiness rises as the dawn
and shines like the daylight; the blessing of God de-
scribes a law as the beautiful morning; the angel of
Heaven is a devouring fire that annihilates the wicked
as the flame which devours the stubble. Unhappiness
is likened to days of clouds and darkness; at times of
great catastrophes the sun sets in broad day, the hear-
cens are shaken, the earth trembles, the stars disappear,
the sun is changed into darkness and the moon into
blood, and so on. The cedar of Lebanon, the oak of
Bashan, are the image of the mighty man, the palm
and the reed of the great and the humble, briers and
thorns of the wicked; the pious man is an olive ever
green, or a tree planted by the water-side. The animal
kingdom furnished equally a large number of images:
the lion, the image of power, is also, like the wolf, bear,
etc., that of tyrants and violent and rapacious men;
and the pious who suffers is a feeble sheep led to the
slaughter. The strong and powerful man is compared
to the he-goat or the bull of Bashan: the kine of
Bashan figure, in the discourses of Amos, as the image of
rich and voluptuous women; the people who rebel
against the divine will are a refractory heifer. Other
images are borrowed from the country life, and from the
life there is a quotation, that the chastisement of God
shall fall upon Israel like a wagon laden with sheaves; the
dead cover the earth as the dung which covers the
surface of the fields. The impious man sows crime and reaps
misery, or he sows the wind and reaps the tempest.
The people yielding to the blows of their enemies are
like the corn crushed beneath the threshing instrument.
God tramples the wine in the wine-press when he chas-
tises the impious and sheds their blood. The wrath of
Jehovah is often represented as an intoxicating cup,
which he has filled to make those to empty who have merited
his chastisement: terrors ascend and anguish go to
the pangs of childbirth. Peoples, towns, and states
are represented by the Hebrew poets under the image
of daughters or wives; in their impiety they are cour-
tesans or adulteresses. The historical allusions of most
frequent occurrence are taken from the catastrophe of
Sodom and Gomorrah, the miracles of the departure
from Egypt, and the appearance of Jehovah on Sinai."
Examples might easily be multiplied in illustration of
this remarkable characteristic of the Hebrew poets:
the metaphor is upon every page of their writings, and
in striking contrast to the vague generalities of the
Indian philosophic poetry. There is accordingly no
poetry which bears a deeper or broader stamp of the
peculiar influences under which it was produced. It
never ceases to be Hebrew in order to become univer-
sal, and yet it is universal while it is Hebrew. The
country, the climate, the institutions, the very peculiar
religious institutions, rites, and observances, the very
singular religious history of the Israelites, are all faith-
fully and vividly reflected in the Hebrew muse, so that
nothing can ever be mistaken for a poem of any
other people. Still it remains true that the heart of
man, at least the heart of all the most civilized nations
of the earth, has been moved and swayed, and is still
pleasingly and most beneficially moved and swayed by
the strains of Biblical poetry.

There is no ancient poetic age that can be put into
comparison with that of the Hebrews but that of the
two classic nations, Greece and Rome, and that of India.
In form and variety we grant that the poetry of these
nations surpasses that of the Hebrews. Epic poetry
and the two highest forms so far as mere art
and the highest possible qualities of style, the Hebrew
literature is somewhat inferior. But the thought is
more than the expression; the kernel than the shell;
and in substance the Hebrew poetry far surpasses every
other. In truth, it dwells in a region to which other
ancient literatures did not and could not attain—a pure,
serene, moral, and religious atmosphere; thus dealing
with man in his highest relations, first anticipating, and
then fulfilling all that is best in man; the image of
Heaven shall presently be more fully, is the great charac-
teristic of Hebrew poetry; it is also the highest merit of
any literature, a merit in which that of the Hebrews is
unapproached. To this high quality it is owing that
the poetry of the Bible has exerted on the loftiest
interests and productions of the human mind, for
three thousand years, the most decided and the most
beneficial influence. Moral and religious truth is
deathless and undecaying; and so the griefs and the
joys of David, or the far-seeing warnings and brilliant
portrayings of Isaiah, repeat themselves in the heart
of each successive generation, and become existent
with the race of man. Thus all moral treasures the
Bible is incomparably the richest. Even for forms of
poetry, in which it is defective, or altogether fails, it
presents the richest materials. Moses has not, as some
have dreamed, left us an epic poem, but he has supplied
the materials out of which the Paradise Lost was
created. The sternly sublime dramas of Samuel Agonistes
is constructed from a few materials found in a chapter
or two which relate to the least cultivated period of
the history of the Hebrew commonwealth. The thought
of modern days, from Tasso down to Byron, all the
great musicians, and nearly all the great painters,
have drawn their best and highest inspiration from the
Bible.

It may have struck the reader as somewhat curious
that the poetical pieces of which we spoke above should,
in the common version of the Bible, be scarcely, if at all,
distinguishable from prose. We do not know whether
there is anything extraordinary in this. Much of clas-
sical poetry, if turned into English prose, would lose
most of its power; and with the Hebrew poetry suffers less
than perhaps any other by transfusion into a prosaic ele-
ment: to which fact it is owing that the book of Psalms, in
the English version, is, notwithstanding its form, eminently poetic. There

are, however, cases in which only the experienced eye
can trace the poetic in and under the prosaic attire
in which it appears in the vulgar translation. Nor until
the subject of Hebrew poetry had been long and well
studied did the learned succeed in detecting many a
poetic gem contained in the Bible. In truth, poetry
and prose were as one with them in the earlier stages
of their existence, and in the earlier stages of their
existence are discriminated only by faint and vanishing lines. If we
regard the thought, prose sometimes even now rises to
the loftiness of poetry. If we regard the clothing,
the simpler form of poetry is scarcely more than prose;
and rhetorical or measured prose passes into the domain
of poetry. A sonnet of Wordsworth could be converted
into prose with a very few changes; a fable of Krum-
macher requires only to be distributed into lines in or-
der to make blank verse. Now in translations the form
is for the most part reserved for poetry, the substance,
and poetic sentiment ranges from the humblest to the
loftiest topics. So with the Hebrew poetry in its
original and native state. Whether in its case poetry
sprang from prose, or prose from poetry, they are both
branches of one tree, and bear in their earlier or later stages
a very close resemblance. The similarity is the greater
in the literature of the Hebrews, because their poetic
forms are less determinate than those of other
nations: they had, indeed, a rhythm; but so had their
prose, and their poetic rhythm was more like that of
our blank verse than of our rhymed verse. Of poetical
feet they appear to have known nothing, and in conse-
quence their verse must be less measured and less
strict. Its melody was rather that of thought than of art
and skill—spontaneous, like their religious feelings, and
therefore deep and impressive, but less subject to law,
POETRY

and escaping from the hard limits of exact definition. Hayne, properly so called, is disposed as well as metre. Yet Hebrew verse, as it had a kind of measured tread, so had it a jingle in its feet, for several lines are sometimes found terminating with the same letter. In the main, however, its essential form was in the thought. Ideas with metaphors recur so that the substance itself marks the form, and the two are so blended into one that their union is essential to constitute poetry. It is, indeed, incorrect to say that "the Hebrew poetry is characterized by the recurrence of similar ideas" (Cattalina's "Hebrew Language," p. 372), if by this it is intended to intimate that such a peculiarity is the sole characteristic of Hebrew poetry. One, and that the chief, characteristic of that poetry is such recurrence; but there are also characteristics in form as well as in thought. Of these it may be sufficient to mention the following:

1. There is a verbal rhythm, in which a harmony is found beyond what prose ordinarily presents; but as the true pronunciation of the Hebrew has long been lost, this quality can only be imperfectly appreciated.

2. There is a correspondence of words, i.e., the words in one verse, or member, answer to the words in another; for as the sense in the one echoes the sense in the other, so also form corresponds with form, and word with word. This correspondence in form will fully appear when we give instances (see below) of the parallelism in sentiment; mean while the idea of it may be formed from these specimens:

"Why art thou cast down, O my soul? And why art thou disquieted in me?" (Psa. xiii, 5).

"The memory of the just is a blessing: But the name of the wicked shall rot." (Prov. x, 7).

"He turneth rivers into a desert, And water-springs into dry ground." (Psa. civ, 32).

In the original this similarity in construction is more exact and more apparent. At the same time it is a free and not a strict correspondence that prevails; a correspondence to be caught and recognised by the ear in the general progress of the poem, or the general structure of a couplet or a triplet, but which is not of a nature to be exactly measured or set forth by such aids as counting with the fingers will afford.

3. Inversion holds a distinguished place in the structure of Hebrew poetry, as in that of every other; yet here again the remark already made holds good; it is only a modified inversion that prevails, by no means (in general) in sentiment; in that of the Greeks and Romans in balance, decision, and prevalence. Every one will, however, recognise this inversion in the following instances, as distinguishing the passages from ordinary prose:

"A mid thought in visions of the night, When deep sleep falleth upon man, Fear and horror came upon me." (Job iv, 13).

"To me men gave ear and waited, To my words they made no reply." (Job xxxii, 21).

"For three transgressions of Damascus, And for four will I turn away its punishment." (Amos 1, 3).

His grave was appointed with the wicked, And with the rich man was his sepulchre." (Isa. lxi, 9).

4. The chief characteristics, however, of Hebrew poetry are found in the peculiar form in which it gives utterance to its ideas. This form has received the name of "parallelism." Ewald justly prefers the term "thought-rhythm," since the rhythm, the music, the peculiar flow and harmony of the verse and of the poem, lie in the distribution of the sentiment in such a manner that the whole import does not come out in lesser than a distich. The leading principle is that a simple verse or distich consists, both in regard to form and substance, of two corresponding members: this has been termed Hebrew rhythm, or parallelismus membrorum. Three kinds may be specified:

(1.) There is, first, the synonymous parallelism, which consists in this, that the two members express the same thought in different words, so that sometimes word answers to word; for example:

"What is man that thou art mindful of him, And the son of man that thou carreat for him!" (Psa. viii, 4).

There is in some cases an inversion in the second line:

"The heavens relate the glory of God, And the work of his hands the firmament declares." (Psa. xix, 7).

"He maketh his messengers winds, His ministers the flaming lightning." (Psa. cvi, 4).

Very often the second member repeats only a part of the first:

"Woe to them that join house to house, That field to field unite!" (Isa. vi, 7).

Sometimes the verb which stands in the first member is omitted in the second:

"O God, thy justice give the king, And thy righteousness to the king's son." (Psa. lxix, 1).

Or the verb may be in the second member:

"With the jawbone of an ass, heaps upon heaps, With the jawbone of an ass have I slain a thousand men." (Judg. li, 16).

The second member may contain an expansion of the first:

"Give to Jehovah, ye sons of God, Give to Jehovah glory and praise." (Psa. xxix, 1).

Indeed the varieties are numerous, since the synonymous parallelism is very frequent.

(2.) The second kind is the antithetic, in which the first member is illustrated by some opposition of thought contained in the second. This less customary kind of parallelism is found mostly in the Proverbs:

"The full man treadeth the honeycomb under foot, To the hungry every bitter thing is sweet." (Prov. xxvii, 7).

Under this head comes the following, with other similar examples:

"Day to day uttereth Instruction, And night to night showeth knowledge." (Psa. xxi, 2).

(3.) The third kind is denominated the synthetic: probably the term peculiar would be more appropriate, since the second member not being a mere echo of the first, subjoins something new to it, while the same structure of the verse is preserved; thus:

"He appointed the moon for seasons, The sun knoweth his going down;" (Psa. cv, 19).

"The law of Jehovah is perfect, reviving the soul; The precepts of Jehovah are sure, instructing the simple." (Psa. xix, 7).

5. Intimately connected with the parallelistic structure is the strophic arrangement of Hebrew poetry. Usually the parallelism itself furnishes the basis of the versification. This correspondence in thought is not, however, of universal occurrence. We find a merely rhythmical parallelism in which the thought is not repeated, but goes forward throughout the verse, which is divided midway into two halves or a distich:

"The word is not upon the tongue, Jehovah thou knowest it altogether." (Psa. cxxix, 4).

"Gird as a man thy loins, I will ask thee; inform thou me." (Job xxxix, 3).

Here poetry distinguishes itself from prose chiefly by the division into two short equal parts. This peculiarity of poetic diction is expressed by the word שִׁירָה, to sing (strictly to play), which properly denotes dividing the matter, and so speaking or singing in separated portions. Among the Arabians, who, however, have syllabic measure, each verse is divided into two hemistiches
by a caesura in the middle. The simple two-membered rhythm hitherto described prevailed especially in the book of Job, the Proverbs, and a portion of the Psalms; but in the last, and still more in the Prophets, there are numerous verses with three, four, or yet more members. In the ordinary course of three members (tristichs) sometimes all three are parallel:

"Happy the man who walketh not in the paths of the unrighteous,
Nor sitteth in the way of sinners,
But sitteth in the seat of seers" (Ps. 1, 1).

Sometimes two of the members stand opposed to the third:

"To all the world goes forth their sound,
To all the ends of the world their words;
For the sun he places a tabernacle in them"

(Psa. xix. 6).

Verses of four members contain either two simple parallels:

"With righteousness shall he judge the poor,
And decide with equity for the afflicted of the people:
He shall smite the earth with the rod of his mouth;
With the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked" (Isa. xi, 4).

Or the first and third answer to each other; also the second and fourth:

"That smote the people in anger
With a continual stroke;"

"That laid it over the nations in wrath
With unmeasured oppression" (Isa. xvi, 6).

If the members are more numerous or disproportionate (Isa. xi, 11), or if the parallelistism is important or irregular, the dictation of poetry is lost and prose ensues; as is the case in Isa. v, 1-6, and frequently in the later prophets, as Jeremiah and Ezekiel. The strophe, however, is frequently preserved in a quite extended form with several subdivisions, and the parallelistism is often carried out in subordinate clauses; instances of this are very common, especially in the book of Ecclesiastes. (See § 4, below.)

It is not to be supposed that each poem consists exclusively of one set of verse; for though this feature does present itself, yet frequently several kinds are found together in one composition, so as to give great ease, freedom, and capability to the style. We select the following beautiful specimen, because a chorus is introduced:

DAVID'S LAMENT OVER SAUL AND JONATHAN.

The Gazette, O Israel, has been cut down on thy heights!

Chorus. How are the mighty fallen!

Tell it not in Gath, publish it not in the streets of Ascalon.
Lest the daughters of the Philistines rejoice, Lest daughters of the uncircumcised exult.
Hills of Gilboa, no dew nor rain come upon you, devoted fields!
For there was slain the heroes' bow.
Saul's bow, never anointed with oil.
From the blood of the slain, from the fat of the mighty, The bow of Jonathan turned not back, And the sword of Saul came not idle home.
Saul and Jonathan! lovely and pleasant in life! And in death ye were not divided. Swifter than eagles, stronger than lions! Ye daughters of Israel! weep for Saul! He clothed you delicately in purple, He put ornaments of gold on your apparel.

Chorus. How are the mighty fallen in the midst of the battle!

O Jonathan, slain in thy high places! I am distressed for thee, brother Jonathan, Very pleasant wast thou to me, Wonderful was thy love, more than the love of woman.

Chorus. How are the mighty fallen, As the weapons of war perished!

We have chosen this ode not only for its singular beauty, but also because it presents another quality of Hebrew poetry—the strophe. In this poem there are three strophes marked by the recurrence three times of the urgent sung by the chorus. The chorus appears to have composed of three parts, corresponding with the parties more immediately addressed in the three several portions of the poem. The first choral song is sung by the entire body of singers, representing Israel; the second song is sung by a chorus of maidens; the third, by first a chorus of youths in a soft and mournful strain, and then by all the choir in full and swelling chorus. But in contrast to the reader's fully understanding the noble effect these "songs of Zion" came on the souls of their hearers, an accurate idea must be formed of the music of the Hebrews. See Music. Referring to the articles which bear on the subject, we merely remark that both music and dancing were connected with sacred song in its earliest manifestations, though it was only at a comparatively late period, when David and Solomon had given their master-powers to the grand performances of the Temple-service, that poetry came forth in all its excellence, and music lent its full aid to its solemn and sublime sentiments.

6. In Hebrew, as in other languages, there is a peculiarity about the diction used in poetry—a kind of poetical dialect, characterized by archaic and irregular forms of words, abrupt constructions, and unusual inflections, which distinguish it from the contemporaneous prose of historical style. It is universally observed that archaic forms and usages of words linger in the poetry of a language after they have fallen out of ordinary use. A few of these forms and usages are here given from Gesenius's Lehrgebände. The Joel and Hiphil voices are used in a transferential sense (Jer. ii. 56; Ezek. x, 7; Job xx. 21; Ps. cx. 4); the apocopated future is used as a present (Job xv. 33; Ps. xv. 6; Isa. xliii. 6). The termination ה is found for the ordinary feminine ו (Exod. xv. 2; Gen. xxii. 22; Psa. cxxxvi. 4); and for the plural ר we have ר (Job xv. 13; Ezek. xxvi. 18) and ר (Jer. xxii. 14; Amos vii. 1). The verbal suffixes יי, יי, יי, and יי (Exod. xix. 9) and the pronominal suffixes to nouns יי, יי, and יי for יי (Hab. iii. 10), are peculiar to the poetical books; as are יי (Psa. cxxvi. 12), יי (Deut. xxxii. 37; Ps. xii. 7), and the more unusual forms יי (Ezek. xi. 16), יי (Ezek. xi. 1), יי (Ezek. xxiii. 20). In poetical language also we find יי for יי or יי for יי for יי for יי for יי for יי; the plural forms of the prepositions יי for יי, יי for יי, יי for יי; and the peculiar forms of the nouns יי for יי, יי for יי, ו for יי, יי for יי, and so on.

II. Existing Remains of Ancient Hebrew Poetry.—The poetry which is found in the Bible, rich and multifarious as it is, appears to be only a remnant of a still wider and fuller sphere of Semitic literature. The New Testament is in fact comprised in our definition, for, besides scattered portions, which, under a promise for a poetic thought, the entire book of the Apocalypse abounds in poetry. In no nation was the union of the requisites of which we have spoken above found in fuller measure than among the Hebrews. Theirs was eminently a poetic temperament; their earliest history was a heroic without reading to be a historic age, while the loftiest of all truths circulated in their souls, and glowed on and started from their lips. Hence their language, in its earliest stages, is surpassingly poetic. In sense the Bible is full of poetry; for very much of its contents, which is merely prosaic in form, rises, by force of the noble sentiments which it enunciates, and the striking or splendid imagery with which these sentiments are adorned, into the sphere of real poetry. Independently of this poetic prose, there is in the Bible much writing which has all the ordinary characteristics of prose. Even the unlearned reader is hardly fast to recognise at once the essence of poetry in various parts of the Bible. It is no slight attestation to the essentially poetic character of Hebrew poetry that its poetical qualities shine through the distorting coverings of a prose style. In the main part of the Biblical poetry is indeed hidden from the ordinary reader by its prose ac-
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companions, standing, as it does, undistinguished in the midst of historical narrations.

It is a phenomenon which is universally observed in the literature of all nations, that the earliest form in which the thoughts and feelings of a people find utterance is the poetic. Prose is an aftergrowth, the vehicle of less spontaneity, of less passion and of less freedom. Snatches of poetry are discovered in the oldest prose compositions. Even in Gen. iv, 22 sq. are found a few lines of poetry, which Herder incorrectly terms "the song of the sword," thinking it commemorative of the first sin. To us it appears to be a fragment of a larger poem, uttered in lamentation for a homicide committed by Lamech, probably in self-defense. See LAMECH. Herder finds in this piece all the characteristics of Hebrew poetry. It is, he says, lyrical, has a proportion between its several lines, and even assonance; in the original the first four lines terminate with the same letter, making a single or semi-rhyme.

Another poetic scrap is found in Exod. xxxii, 18. Being told by Joshua, on occasion of descending from the mount, when the people had made the golden calf, and were tumultuously offering it their worship—

"The sound of war is in the camp;"

Moses said:

"Not the sound of a shout for victory,
Nor the sound of a shout for falling;
The sound of a shout for rejoicing do I hear."
The correspondence in form in the original is here very exact and striking, so that it is difficult to deny that the piece is poetic. If so, are we to conclude that the temperament of the Israelites was so deeply poetical that Moses and Joshua should find the excitement of this occasion sufficient to strike improvisator verses from their lips? Or have we here a quotation from some still older song, which occurred to the minds of the speakers by the force of resemblance? Other instances of scattered poetic pieces may be found in Num. xxi, 14, 15; also ver. 16 and 27; in which passages evidence may be found that we are not in possession of the entire mass of Hebrew, or, at least, Semitic literature.

Further specimens of very early poetry are found in Num. xxxiii, 7 sq.; xxiv, 8, 15. The ordinary train of thought and feeling presented in Hebrew poetry is entirely of a moral or religious kind; but there are occasional pieces on other topics, often from Joel, 2, 15. The entire Song of Solomon many regard as purely an erotic sym, and considered as such it possesses excellences of a very high description. In Amos vi, 5 sq. may be seen a fine passage of satire in a denunciation of the luxuriant extravagance of the rich courts. Subjects of a similar secular kind may be found treated, yet never without a moral or religious aim, in Isa. ix, 3; Jer. xxv, 10; xliii, 33; Rev. xviii, 22 sq. But, independently of the Song of Solomon, the most sensuous ode is perhaps the 45th Psalm, which Herder and Ewald consider an epiphalamium. Further illustrations of this part of the subject appear under the next division.

The poetical character of the Revelation of John is evident to every attentive reader. Many parts are professedly songs, formal expressions of praise, triumph, or mourning. The language is not only highly figurative, but it everywhere abounds with the most poetical images and modes of expression. Bishop Jebb has presented some of the songs in the form of Hebrew poetry: and Prof. Stuart has made the metrical arrangement of a few other portions; he has also expressed his conviction that the form of poetry, as well as its spirit, prevails to a great extent throughout the work. The references to the Old Test. in this book are much more numerous than in any other book of the New Test.; only they are not simple quotations, nor the transference of thoughts to a less poetic style of expression; but they are imitations, in general more poetic than the original. That they are presented in the form of Hebrew, and not of Grecian poetry, can occasion no surprise. No other poetry would accord, either with the habit of the apostle, or with the general character and design of the Bible. But this form of poetry would perfectly harmonize with both. The poetry of the Revelation of John appears to consist of the same description of parallelisms, with those intercalary lines and other irregularities which are found in the larger specimens of Hebrew poetry. The species of which most prevails is the synthetic or constructive; the others being otherwise less suitable to the subject of the composition. There are, however, instances of every kind. Indeed, this book not only possesses the form and the spirit of Hebrew poetry, but is handled as much regularly in its parallelisms as any Hebrew poetry with which it can be justly compared. We give the following passages (Rev. i, 5, 6; xxi, 22):

"The revelation of Jesus Christ, Which God hath prepared before in His New Testament, to give unto His saints, What must come to pass after these things. To the angel of the church in Sardis, To him that hath the key of David, who openeth, and no man shutteth; and shutteth, and no man openeth. Amen! And the angel said unto me, These words are faithful and true: and the Lord of the spirits in heaven, and of the earth, and of the sea, and of the fountains which are under the earth. Amen. The mystery of the seven stars which thou seekest to find, and the seven golden lampstands, which thou seest are the seven churches."

II. Classification of Poetic Styles.—I. According to the Ancient Hebrew Designations.—These appear to have special, if not exclusive reference to what is now known as lyric poetry. The terms are of two classes. See PSALMS.

a. General titles, referring apparently to the musical form or purpose of the compositions.

(1.) יִשְׂרָאֵל, shir, a song in general, adapted for the voice alone.

(2.) מִיסְרָאֵל, mizmôr, which Ewald considers a lyric song, properly so called, but which rather seems to correspond with the Greek ἱαλύς, a psalm, or song to be sung with any instrumental accompaniment. See Psalm.

(3.) נִפְגָּד, niphgad, which Ewald is of opinion is equivalent to the Greek ἱαλύς, is more probably a melody expressly adapted for stringed instruments.

(4.) מַסְקִיל, maskil, of which it may be said that if Ewald's suggestion be not correct, that it denotes a lyrical song requiring nice musical skill, it is difficult to give any more probable explanation. See Mascil.

(5.) מְדִיד, midam, a term of extremely doubtful meaning. See Michtam.

(6.) שִׁגְגוֹדָן, shiggoyon, Psalms vii, 1, a wild, irregular, dithyrambic song, as the word appears to denote; or, according to some, a song to be sung with variations. The former is the more probable meaning. The plural occurs in Hab. iii, 1. See Shiggoyon.

b. But, besides these, there are other divisions of lyrical poetry of great importance, which have regard rather to the subject of the poems than to their form or adaptation for musical accomplishments. Of these we notice:

(1.) מִפְיוֹלָה, tehillah, a hymn of praise. The plural tehillim is the title of the book of Psalms in Hebrew. The 146th Psalm is entitled "David's (Psalms) of praise;" and the subject of the psalm is in accordance with its title, which is suggested by the concluding verse, "The praise of Jehovah shall be upon His holy name." This to class belong the songs which relate to extraordinary deliverances, such as the songs of Moses (Exod. xv) and of Deborah (Judg. v), and the Psalms xixi and xlix, which have all the air of chants to be sung in triumphal processions. Such were the hymns sung in the Temple-services, and by a bold figure the Almighty is apostrophized as "Thou that inhabitest the praises of Israel," which were in the holy
place with the fragrant clouds of incense (Ps. xxii, 8). To the same class also Ewald refers the shorter poems of the like kind with those already quoted, such as Ps. xxx, xxxii, cxxxvi, cxxxi, and Isa. xxxvii, which relate to less general occasions, and commemorate more special duties. The songs of victory sung by the congregation in the Temple, as Ps. xlv, xlvii, xxvii, 7-10, which is a short triumphal ode, and Ps. cxxxix, which praises Jehovah on the occasion of a great natural phenomenon, are likewise all to be classed in this division of lyric poetry. See Hymn.

(2) נֶאֶם, קָנָה, the lament, or dirge, of which there are many examples, whether uttered over an individual or as an outburst of grief for the calamities of the land. The most touchingly pathetic of all is perhaps the lament of David for the death of Saul and Jonathan (2 Sam. i, 19-27), in which passionate emotion is blended with touches of tenderness of which only a strong nature is capable. Compare with this the lament for Abner (2 Sam. iii, 33, 34) and for Absalom (xxviii, 38). Of the same character also, doubtless, were the songs which the singing men and singing women spoke over Josiah at his death (2 Chron. xxxv, 25), and the songs of mourning for the disasters which befell the helpless land of Judah, of which Psalms xlix, lx, cxlii, cxxxvii are examples (comp. Jer. vii, 29; ix, 10 [9]), and the Lamentations of Jeremiah the most memorable instances. See LAMENTATION.

(3) רַעֵשׁ, שִׁיר יִלְדֵיָה, a love-song (Psa. xxxi, 1) in its external form least so. See Canticles.

(4) מַעֲשֵׂה, עָפֶלִיתָה, prayer, is the title of Psa. xvii, lxxxi, xvi, xlii, cxl, and Hab. iii. All these are strictly lyrical compositions, and the title may have been assigned to them either as denoting the object with which they were written, or the use to which they were applied. As Ewald justly observes, all lyric poetry of an elevated kind, in so far as it reveals the soul of the poet, is essentially lyrical in its nature as a prayer; and hence the term “prayer” was applied to a collection of David’s songs, of which Psa. cxlii formed the conclusion. See PRAYER.

Other kinds of poetry there are which occupy the middle ground between the lyric and gnomic, being lyrical in form and spirit, but gnomic in subject. These may be classed as—

(5) מֵרָעָה, מַזָּחִית, properly a similitude, and then a parable, or sententious saying, couched in poetic language. Such are the songs of Balaam (Num. xxiii, 7, 18; xxiv, 15, 20, 21, 25), which are eminently lyrical in their thought; the mocking harp in Num. xxiv, 27-30, which has been conjectured to be a fragment of an old Amoritis harp-song; and the apologue of Jotham (Judg. ix, 7-20), both which last are strongly satirical in tone. But the finest of all is the magnificent prophetic song of triumph over the fall of Babylon (Isa. xiv, 4-27).

(6) מַעֲשֵׂה, chiddah, an enigma (like the riddle of Samson, Judg. xiv, 14), or “dark saying,” as the A. V. has it in Psa. xlix, 5; lxx, 2. The former passage illustrates the musical, and therefore lyrical character of these “dark sayings”: “I will incline mine ear to a parable, I will open my dark sayings upon the harp.” Mazāḥi and chiddah are used as convertible terms in Ezek. xvii, 2.

(7) Lastly, to this class belongs מַעֲשֵׂה, melodah, a mocking, ironical poem (Hab. ii, 6).

2. The Masoretic Distribution.—The Jewish grammarians have attached the poetic accentuation only to the Psalms, Job, and a few passages of Proverbs. The grammarians are no doubt that the Song of Solomon is also poetical; and with these the book of Ecclesiastes was anciently, as it is still usually, conjointed, though the form of composition is less decidedly poetical. To these five are to be added the Lamentations of Jeremiah, and the smaller pieces scattered over the historical and prophetic writings. Keeping these latter out of view, we may say that the Hebrew poetical books are six in number; and these six may be divided into two groups of three, according to the class of poetical composition to which each belongs, viz.: (1) Psalms, Song of Solomon, and Lamentations, which are prose or dramatic poetry, and are the principal work of a single character; and (2) Proverbs, Job, and Ecclesiastes, which are predominantly didactic. In the former the leading aim of the poet is not to instruct, but to give free utterance to the feelings of his own heart; in the latter the instruction of others is the object that is principally aimed at; though neither is the lyrical element altogether excluded from the latter, nor the didactic from the former. Of the more sustained and elaborately epic and dramatic poetry—which was alike alien to the character of the Hebrew mind, and also in a certain measure inconsistent with the purposes of the poet’s writings as a divine revelation—we have no examples, though some have applied the term “dramatic” in a loose sense to the book of Job, and in a more strict sense to the Song of Solomon.

3. Modern Terminology.—For epic poetry the constituent elements do not appear to have existed during the classic period of the Hebrew muse, since epic poetry requires a heroic age—an age, that is, of fabulous wonders, and falsely so-called divine interpositions. But among the Israelites the patriarchal, which might have been an age of myth and reality; and it much raises the religious and historical value of the Biblical literature that neither the singular events of the age of the Judges, ever degenerated into mythology, nor passed from the reality, which was its essence, into the noble fictions into which the imagination, if unchastened and unchecked by religion, might have wrought them; but they retained through all periods their own essential character of Estáas and reality. In the later period, when the religion of Moses had, during the Babylonian captivity, been lowered by the corruptions of the religion of Zoroaster, and an entirely new world of thought introduced, based not on reality but fancy, emanating not from the pure light of heaven, but from the mingled lights and shadows of primitive tradition and human speculation—then there came into existence among the Jews the elements necessary for epic poetry; but the days were gone in which the mind of the nation by its equative strength and absolute subjection to them into a great, uniform, and mere structure; and if we can allow that the Hebrews possessed the rudimental outlines of the epic, we must seek for them not in the canonical, but in the apocryphal books; and while we deny with emphasis that the term Epos can be applied, as some German critics have applied it, to the Pentateuch, we can find only in the book of Judith, and with rather more reason in that of Tobit, anything which approaches to epic poetry. Indeed fiction, which, if it is not the essence, enters for a very large share into both epic and dramatic poetry, was wholly alien from the genius of the Hebrew muse, whose high and noble function was not to invent, but to celebrate the goodness of God; not to indulge the fancy, but to express the deepest feelings of the soul; not to play with words and feign emotions, but to utter profound truth and commemorate great events, and pour forth living sentiments. Of the three kinds of poetry which are illustrated by the Hebrew literature, the lyric occupies the foremost place, commencing, as we have seen, in the pre-Mosaic times, flourishing in rude vigor during the earlier periods of the Hebrew muse, and particularly in the Proverbs. This poetry goes on growing with the nation’s growth and strengthening with its strength, till it reached its highest excellence in David, the warrior-poet, and thenceforth began slowly to decline. In this period art, though subordinate, was not neglected, as indeed is proved by the noble lyrics which have come down to us, and in which the art is
only relatively small and low—that is, the art is inconsiderable and secondary—merely because the topics are so august, the sentiments so grand, the religious impression so profound and sacred. At later periods, when the first glory of the Exile was lost, when the Chaldean name had ceased, art in Hebrew, as is the case in all other poetry, began to claim a larger share of attention, and stands in the poems for a greater portion of their merit. Then the play of the imagination grew predominant over the spontaneous outpourings of the soul, and among other creations of the formal genius which the muse had ceased, art in Hebrew, in which the matter is artistically distributed sometimes under two-and-twenty heads or divisions, corresponding with the number of the Hebrew letters.

\[\text{Gnomic Poetry.} \]

Gnomic poetry is the product of a more advanced age than the lyric. It gives expression to the desire felt by the poet to express the results of the accumulated experiences of life in a form of beauty and permanence. Its thoughtful character requires for its development a time of peacefulness and leisure; for it gives expression, not like the lyric to the sudden and impassioned feelings of the moment, but to calm and philosophic reflection. Being less spontaneous in its origin, its form is of necessity more artificial. The gnomic poetry of the Hebrews has not its measured flow disturbed by the shock of arms or the tumult of camps; it rises silently, like the traditions and proverbs a period of ages, and the ground, the ground is the home life of the nation. The period during which it flourished corresponds to its domestic and settled character. From the time of David onwards through the reigns of the earlier kings, when the nation was quiet and at peace, or, if not at peace, at least so firmly fixed in its acquired territory that its wars were no struggle for existence, gnomic poetry blossomed and bore fruit. We meet with it at intervals up to the time of the Captivity, and, as it is chiefly characteristic of the age of the monarchy, Ewald has appropriated it as one of the "archaistic peddlers" of Hebrew poetry. From the end of the 8th century B.C. the decline of the nation was rapid, and with its glory departed the chief glory of its literature. The poems of this period are distinguished by a smoothness of diction and an external polish which betray tokens of labor and art; the style is less flowing and easy, and, except in rare instances, there is no dash of the ancient vigor. After the Captivity we have nothing but the poems which formed part of the liturgical serices of the Temple.

Whether dramatic poetry, properly so called, ever existed among the Hebrews, is, to say the least, extremely doubtful. In the opinion of some writers the Song of Songs, in its external form, is a rude drama, designed for a simple stage. But the evidence for this view is altogether negative and the expansion of dramatic form, and no good and sufficient reasons have been adduced which would lead us to conclude that the amount of dramatic action exhibited in that poem is more than would be involved in an animated poetic dialogue in which more than two persons take part. Philosophy and the drama appear alike to have been peculiar to the other Semitic nations, and to have manifested themselves among the Semitic tribes only in their crudest and most simple form.

Each of these forms of poetry, as they appear in the Bible, requires a more distinct notice separately.

(1.) Lyrical Poetry.—The literature of the Hebrews abounds with illustrations of all forms of lyrical poetry, in its most manifold and wide-embracing compass, from such short ejaculations as the songs of the two Lamecha, and Psa. xxv. cxvii, and others, to the longer chants of victory and thanksgiving, like the songs of Deborah and David (Judg. v. and xvii), the thoroughly national character of all lyrical poetry has already been alluded to. It is the utterance of the people's life in all its varied phases, and expresses all its most earnest feelings and impulses. In proportion as this expressive vigor was manifested, the individuality embodied in lyrical poetry was in the most case nation red or rather exaggerated.

One truth, and even one side of a truth, is for the time invested with the greatest prominence. All those characteristics will be found in perfection in the lyric poetry of the Hebrews. One other feature which distinguishes it is its form and musical accompaniment. The names by which the various kinds of song were known among the Hebrews will supply some illustration of this. (See above.)

(2.) Gnomic Poetry.—The second grand division of Hebrew poetry is occupied by a class of poems which are peculiarly Semitic and the results of the nearest approaches made by the people of that race to anything like philosophic thought. Reasoning there is none: we have only results, and these rather the product of observation and reflection than of induction or argumentation. As lyric poetry is the expression of the poet's own feelings and impulses, so gnomic poetry is the form in which the desire of communicating knowledge to others finds vent. There might possibly be an intermediate stage in which the poets gave out their experiences for their own pleasure merely, and afterwards applied them to the instruction of others, but this could scarcely have been of long continuance. The impulse to teach makes the teacher, and the teacher must have an audience. It has already been remarked that gnomic poetry, as a whole, requires for its development a period of ages. The period of the floating proverbs which pass current in the mouths of the people, and embody the experiences of many with the wit of one. From this small beginning it arises, at a time when the experience of the nation has become matured, and the mass of truths which are the result of such experience have passed into circulation. The name of Solomon's wisdom was so great that no less than three thousand proverbs are attributed to him, this being the form in which the Hebrew mind found its most congenial utterance. The sayer of sententious sayings was to the Hebrew mind the wise one of the people, the earlier isolated proverbs but few examples remain. One of the earliest occurs in the mouth of David, and in his time it was the proverb of the ancients, "From the wicked cometh wickedness" (1 Sam. xxiv, 18 [14]). Later on, when the fortunes of the nation were waxing, their experience was embodied in terms of sadness and despondency: "The days are prolonged, and every vision faieth," became a saying and a byword (Ezek. xii, 22); and the feeling that the people were suffering for the sins of their fathers took the form of a sentence, "The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge" (Ezek. xviii, 2). Such were the models which the gnomic poet had before him for imitation. These detached sentences may fairly be assumed to be the earliest form, of which the fuller apothegm was the expansion, swelling into sustained exhortations, and even dramatic dialogues. See Proverbs.

(3.) Dramatic Poetry.—The drama, in the sense in which the phrase is applicable to productions such as those of Euripides, Shakespeare, or Schiller, had no place in the literature of the Hebrews. This defect may be owing to a want of the requisite literary culture. Yet we are not willing to assign this as the cause, when we call to mind the high intellectual culture which the Hebrews evinced in lyric and didactic poetry, out of which the drama seems naturally to spring. We rather look for the cause of this in the earnest nature of the Hebrews, and in the solemnity of the subjects with which they had to do in their literary productions. Nor is it any objection to this hypothesis that the drama of modern times had its birth in the religious mysteries of the Middle Ages, since those ages were only secondary in regard to religious truth, standing as a distance from the great realities which they believed and dramatized; whereas the objects of faith with the Israelites were held in all the fresh viviness of primitive facts and newly recognised truths. It is impossible, however, to assert that no forms of the drama existed among the Hebrew people; the most that can be done is to examine
such portions of their literature as have come down to us, for the purpose of ascertaining how far any traces of the drama proper are discernible, and what inferences may be made from them. It is unquestionably true, as Ewald observes, that the Arab reciters of romances will make the people present at their performance act the parts in the drama in recitation, changing their voice and gestures with the change of person and subject. Something of this kind may possibly have existed among the Hebrews; but there is no evidence that it did exist, nor any grounds for making even a probable conjecture with regard to it. A rude kind of farce is described by Mr. Lane (Mod. Egypt, ii, ch. vii.), the players of which "are called Mohababzain. These frequently perform at the festivals prior to weddings and circumcisions at the time of the great; and sometimes attract rings of auditors and spectators in the public places in Cairo. Their performances are scarcely worthy of description: it is chiefly by vulgar gestures and indecent actions that they amuse and obtain applause. The actors are—only men and boys, the part of a woman being always performed by a man or boy in female attire." Then follows a description of one of these plays, the plot of which was extremely simple. But the mere fact of the existence of these rude exhibitions among the Arabs and Egyptians of the present day is of no weight when the point to be decided is whether the Song of Songs was designed to be so represented, as a simple, pastoral drama. Of course, in considering such a question, reference is made only to the external form of the poem, and, in order to prove it, it must be shown that the dramatic is the only form of representation which it could assume, and not that, by the help of two actors and a chorus, it is capable of being exhibited in a dramatic form. All that has been done, in our opinion, is the latter. It is but fair, however, to give the views of those who hold the opposite. Ewald maintains that the Song of Songs is designed for a simple stage, because it develops a complete action and admits of definite pauses in the action, which are only suited to the drama. He distinguishes it in this respect from the book of Job, which is dramatic in form only, though, as it is occupied with a sublime subject, he compares it with tragedy, while the Song of Songs, being taken from the common life of the nation, may be compared to comedy. But M. Réin, who is compelled, in accordance with his own theory of the mission of the Shemitic races, to admit that no trace of anything approaching tragedy in Egypt has ever been discovered, regards the Song of Songs as a drama in the same sense as the products of the Greek and Roman theatres, but as dramatic poetry in the widest application of the term, to designate any composition conducted in dialogue and corresponding to an action. The absence of the regular drama in Egypt is attributed to the want of a complicated mythology, analogous to that possessed by the Indo-European peoples. Monotheism, the characteristic religious belief of the Shemitic races, stifled the growth of a mythology and checked the development of the drama. Be this as it may, some of the most striking representations are to be found among the Hebrews, and are not regarded as having been in Egypt. This is the least trace of a drama at Jerusalem, whatever other foreign innovations may have been adopted; and the burst of indignation which the high priest Jason incurred for attempting to establish a gymnasiun and to introduce the Greek games is a significant symptom of the repugnance which the people felt for such spectacles. The same apathy remains to the present day among the Arabs, and the attempts to introduce theatres and scenes in Algeria have invariably failed. But says M. Réin, the Song of Songs is a dramatic poem: there were no public performances in Palestine, therefore it must have been represented in private; and he is compelled to frame the following hypothesis concerning the matter: that it is a Libretto intended to be completed by the play of the actors and by music, as represented in private families, probably at marriage-feasts, the representation being extended over the several days of the feast. The last supposition removes a difficulty which has been felt to be almost fatal to the idea that the poem is a continuous and developed drama. Each act is complete in itself, but out of a suspended interest, and the structure of the poem is obvious and natural if we regard each act as a separate drama intended for one of the days of the feast. We must look for a parallel to it in the Middle Ages, when, besides the mystery plays, there were scenic representations sufficiently developed. See CANTICLES.

It is scarcely necessary after this to discuss the question whether the book of Job is a dramatic poem or not. Inasmuch as it represents an action and a progress, it is also a drama; and a truly and real drama can only be which develops the working of passion, and the alternations of faith, hope, distrust, triumphant confidence, and black despair, in the struggle which it depicts the human mind as engaged in, while attempting to solve one of the most intricate problems it can be called upon to regard. It is a drama as life is a drama, the most powerful of all tragedies; but that it is a dramatic poem, intended to be represented upon a stage, or capable of being so represented, may be confidently denied. See JOB, BOOK OF.

(4.) It only remains to notice that there are twelve poems in which the letters beginning each verse or couplet or stanza are arranged in alphabetical order. These are seven Psalms (viz. xxxi., xxxii., xxxiii., cxxi., cxxii., cxxix., cxix.), Prov. xxxi., 30-31, and the first four chapters of the book of Lamentations. The device is a very simple one, and was probably adopted for the purpose of assisting the memory, and to make up for the want of a logical connection and progress in the thought. The more sublime poetry does not admit of being thus fettered. The Psalms in which we make no mention of the alphabet are very simple, either, usually didactic. Yet even in these the alphabetical arrangement is seldom quite exact, usually one or two letters are omitted or repeated or transposed. In some of the alphabetic poems the strophical arrangement is marked more distinctly than in any other of the Hebrew poetical compositions; for example, in Ps. cxix., which consists of twenty-two stanzas of eight lines each; and Lam. iii., in which the stanza is of three lines. See PSALMS, BOOK OF.

IV. History of the Treatment of Hebrew Poetry.—In the 18th century among them, does not the influence of critical studies upon the minds of the learned was so great as to imbue them with the belief that the writers of Greece and Rome were the models of all excellence; and consequently, when their learning and critical acumen were directed to the records of another literature, they were unable to divest themselves of the prejudices of early study and habits, and sought for the same excellences which they admired in their favorite models. That this has been the case with regard to most of the speculations on the poetry of the Hebrews, and that the failure of these attempts has been due to the adoration of the Greeks, will be abundantly manifest to any one who is acquainted with the literature of the subject. But, however barren of results, the history of the various theories which have been framed with regard to the external form of Hebrew poetry is a necessary part of the present article.

The form of Hebrew poetry is its distinguishing characteristic, and what this form is has been a vexed question for many ages. The Therapeutae, as described by Philo (De Vitae Contempt. § 8, vol. ii, p. 475, ed. Mangenot), imagined that the Hebrews were under a curious obligation to God, in divers measures and strains; and these were either new or ancient ones composed by the old poets, who had left behind them measures and melodies of trimeter verses, of processional songs, of hymns, of songs sung at the offering of libations or before the altar, of continuous choral songs, beautifully measured and in
strophe of intricate character (§ 10, p. 484). The value of Philo's testimony on this point may be estimated by another passage in his works, in which he claims for Moses a knowledge of numbers and geometry, the theory of rhythm, harmony, and metre, and the whole science of poetry (De Conf. i, 5, vol. ii, p. 84). The evidence of Josephus is as little to be relied upon. Both these writers labored to magnify the greatness of their own nation, and to show that in literature and philosophy the Greeks had been anticipated by the Hebrew barbarians. This idea pervades all their writings, and it must always be borne in mind as the key-note of their testimony on this or any other point. According to Josephus (Ant. ii, 16, 4), the Song of Moses at the Red Sea (Exod. xivy) was composed in the hexameter measure (τὸ ἕξαμετρὸν τερτον); and again (Ant. iv, 8, 44), the song in Deut. xxxii is described as a hexameter poem. The Psalms of David were in various metres, some trimeters and some pentameters (Ant. vii, 12, 3). Eusebius (De Prep. Evang. xi, 3, p. 314, ed. Col. 1668) characterizes the great Song of Moses and the 118th (119th) Psalm as metrical compositions, in what the Greeks call the heroic metre. They are said to be hexameters of sixteen syllables. The other verse compositions of the Hebrews are said to be in trimeters. This saying of Eusebius is attacked by Julian (Civit. Cath. vii, 20) and others, who are wont to change the Hebrews devoid of all culture. Jerome (Pref. in Hlob) appeals to Philo, Josephus, Origen, and Eusebius, for proof that the Psalter, the Lamentations of Jeremiah, and almost all the songs of Scripture, are composed in metre, like the odes of Horace, Pindar, Alc- areus, and Sappho. Again, he says that the book of Job from iii, 8 to xili, 6 is in hexameters, with dactyls and spondees, and frequently, on account of the peculiarity of the Hebrew language, other feet which have not the same syllables but the same time. In Epist. ad Phil. vi, 3 of the same, he speaks of the verses in the psalms which shows in some measure how far we are to understand literally the terms which Jerome has borrowed from the verse literature of Greece and Rome, and applied to the poetry of the Hebrews. The conclusion seems inevitable that these terms are employed simply to denote a general external resemblance, and by no means to indicate the existence among the poets of the Old Testament of a knowledge of the laws of metre, as we are accustomed to understand the term. There are, says Jerome, four alphabetical Psalms, the 111th (112th), 112nd (113rd), and the 118th (119th) and the 144th (145th). In the first two, one letter corresponds to each clause or verse, which is written in trimeter iambics. The others are in tetrameter iambics, like the song in Deuteronomy. In Psal. exviii (exix) eight verses follow of Moses and David; the letter corresponds to a verse. In Lamentations we have four alphabetical acrostics, the first two of which are written in a kind of Sapphic metre; for three clauses which are connected together and begin with one letter (i.e. in the first clause) close with a period in heroic measure (Heroici comma). The choice of his verses in threes each begin with the same letter. The fourth is like the first and second. The Proverbs end with an alphabetical poem in tetrameter iambics, beginning, "A virtuous woman who can find?" In the Pref. in Chron, Exod. Jerome compares the metres of the Psalms to those of Horace and Pindar, now running in iambics, now ringing with Alcaics, now swelling with Sapphics, now beginning with a half foot. What he asks, is more beautiful than the song of Deuteronomy? What more perfect than Job? All these, as Josephus and Origen testify, are composed in hexameters and pentameters. There can be little doubt that these terms are mere generalities, and express no more than a certain rough resemblance, so that the metres of Moses and David, Horace and Pindar, Alcaics and Sapphics, hexameters and pentameters with as much propriety as the first and second chapters of Lamentations may be compared to Sapphic odes. The resemblance of the Hebrew verse composition to the classic metres is expressly denied by Gregory of Nyssa (1 Tract. in Psalms. cap. iv). Augustine (Ep. 151 ad Numerium) confesses his ignorance of Hebrew metrical terms, but adds the Polyaenus, which language believed the Psalms of David to be written in metre. Isidore of Seville (Orig. i, 18) claims for the heroic metre the highest antiquity, inasmuch as the Song of Moses was composed in it, and the book of Job, who was contemporary with Moses, long before the times of Pherecydes and Homer, is written in dactyls and spondees. Joseph Scaliger (Animad. ad Eus. Chron. p. 6 b, etc.) was one of the first to point out the fallacy of Jerome's statement with regard to the metres of the Psalter and the Lamentations, and to assert that these books contained no verse bound by metrical laws, but that their language was merely prose, animated by a poetic spirit. He admitted the Song of Moses in Deuteronomy, the Proverbs, and Job to be the only books in which there was necessarily any trace of rhythm, and this rhythm he compares to that of two dimeter iambics, sometimes of more, sometimes of fewer syllables, as the sense required. Gerhard Vossius (De Nat. et Const. Artis Poet. lib. i, c. 13, § 2) says that in Job and the Proverbs there is rhythm but no metre; that is, regard is had to the number of syllables, but not to their quantity. In the Psalms and Lamentations not even rhythm is observed. But in spite of the opinions pronounced by these high authorities, there were still many who believed in the existence of a Hebrew metre, and in the possibility of recovering it. The theories proposed for this purpose were various. Gomar, professor at Groningen (Davide Lyna, Lugd. Bat. 1687), advocated both rhymes and metre; for the latter he laid down the following rules. The vowel alone, as it is long or short, determines the length of the syllable. Of the same syllable, the period or versicle of the Hebrew poems never contain less than a distich, or two verses, but in proportion as the periods are longer they contain more verses. The last syllable of a verse is indifferently long or short. This system, if it may be called (for it is equally adapted for prose), was supported by many men of note; among others by the younger Buxtorf, Heinsius, L de Dieu, Constant L'Empereur, and Hottinger. On the other hand, it was vigorously attacked by L. Cappelius, Calovius, Danhauser, Pfeiffer, and Sol-Raphael. Towards the middle of the eighteenth century Marcus Meibomius announced to the world, with an amount of pompous assurance which is charming, that he had discovered the lost metrical system of the Hebrews. By the help of this mysterious secret, he was able to translate the Psalms and the Proverbs into Greek verse, not only the Psalms, but the whole Hebrew Scriptures, to their pristine condition, and thus confer upon the world a knowledge of Hebrew greater than any which had existed since the ages which preceded the Alexandrine translators. But Meibomius did not allow his enthusiasm to get the better of his prudence, and the condition on which this portentous secret was to be made public was that six thousand curious men should contribute £5 sterling apiece for a copy of his book, which was to be printed in two volumes folio. It is at almost needless to add that his promise fell to the ground. He published some specimens of his restoration of ten Psalms and six entire chapters of the Old Test. in 1690. The glimpses which he gives of his grand secret are not such as would make us regret that the knowledge of it perished with his life. That whole book, as Meibomius says, is written in distichs, except the first Psalm, which is in a different metre, and serves as an introduction to the rest. They were therefore intended to be sung, not by one priest, or by one chorus, but by two. Meibomius "was severely chastised by J. M. H. Faber, Gellhards and J. Zentner (Hist. der Hebräischen V. poesie in Lxv, 11). In the last century the learned Francis Hare,
bishops of Chichester, published an edition of the Hebrew
Psalms, metrically divided, to which he prefixed a
dissertation on the ancient poetry of the Hebrews
(Psalm. lib. in versiculosis metrice divisi, etc., Lond.
1766). His dissertation was criticized for being too
short; one; every consonant, whether single or
double, has one more. Shekh simple or composite is
not reckoned. The quiescent letters have no more.
Digonos forte compensative has one; so has metely.
The vowels, if not specified as long or short, or hav-
ing the accent on the last syllable, will thus form iambics
and anapaests. But as many have the accent on the
penultimate, these will form trochees. The most
common kinds of feet are iambics and anapaests,
interchanging with trochees and tribrachs. Of verses com-
posed of these feet, though not uniform in respect of
the numbers of the feet, consist, according to Bellerman,
the poems of the Hebrew Scriptures.
Among those who believed in the existence of a He-
brew metre, but in the impossibility of recovering it,
were Carpaev, Louth, Pfeiffer, Herder to a certain ex-
tent, Jahn, Bauer, and Buxtorf. The opinions of Louth,
with regard to Hebrew metre, are summed up by Jubb
(Suct. Litt. p. 16) as follows: He begins by asserting
that certain of the Hebrew writings are not only ani-
mated with the true poetic spirit, but are in some
degree couched in poetic numbers; yet he allows that
the quantity, the rhythm, or modulation of Hebrew poetry,
not only is unknown, but admits of no investigation
by human art or industry; he states, after Abarbanel,
that the Jews themselves disclaim the very memory of met-
rical composition. He terms the conformation of the
sentences the sole indication of metre in these poems; he
barely maintains the credib-
ility of attention having been paid to numbers or feet
in their compositions; and at the same time he con-
fesses the utter impossibility of determining whether
Hebrew poetry was modulated by the ear alone, or ac-
cording to any definite and settled rules of prosody.
The opinions of Scaliger and Vossius have already
been referred to. Vitringa allows to Isaiah a kind of orato-
rial measure, but adds that it could not on this accoun-
t be right either of strophes, antistrophes, epodes, and
the like; but his method is as arbitrary as
Hare’s. The theory of Lautwein (Versuch einer richti-
gen Theorie von der bibl. Verkünb. Tüb. 1773) is an
improvement upon those of his predecessors, inasmuch as
he rejects the measurement of verse by long and short
syllables, and marks the scanzom by the tonal accent.
He assumes little more than a free rhythm: the verses
are distinguished by a certain relation in their contents,
and connected by a poetic euphony. Sir W. Jones
(Comment. Poet. Asiat. 1774) attempted to apply the
rules of English metre to Hebrew. He regards each
as long syllable one which terminated in a consonant or
quiescent letter (N, P, *); but he did not develop any
system. The present Arabic prosody, however, is of
comparatively modern invention; and it is not consist-
ent with probability that there could be any system of
versification among the Hebrews like that imagined by
Sir W. Jones, when in the example he quotes of Cant.
1, 5 he refers the first clause of the verse to the
second, and the last to the fifteenth kind of Arabic metre.
Greve (Ultima Capita Jobi, etc., 1791) believed that in
Hebrew, as in Arabic and Syriac, there was a metre,
but that it was obscured by the false orthography of
the Massorets. He therefore assumed for the Hebrew
an Arabic vocalization, and with this modification
he found iambic trimeters, dimeters, and tetrameters to
be the most common forms of verse, and lays down the
laws of versification accordingly. Bellermann (Versuch
über die Metrik der Hebroider, 1813) was the last who at-
tempted to apply to the old Hebrew metres. He
adopted the Massoretic orthography and determined the quantity of syllables by the accentu-
ation, and what he termed the “Moresystem,” de-
noting by moren the compass of a single syllable. Each
syllable which has not the tone accent must have three
syllables available which has the tone accent must
have either four or two, but generally three. The moren
are reckoned as follows: a long vowel has two; a
short vowel, one; every consonant, whether single or
double, has one more. Shekh simple or composite is
not reckoned. The quiescent letters have no more.
Digonos forte compensative has one; so has metely.
*When no accent is specified, the accent will be
placed on the last syllable of the word. If
the accent is on the penult, then in Hebrew poetry
the accent on the last syllable, will thus form iambics
and anapaests. But as many have the accent on the
penultimate, these will form trochees. The most
common kinds of feet are iambics and anapaests,
interchanging with trochees and tribrachs. Of verses com-
posed of these feet, though not uniform in respect of
the numbers of the feet, consist according to Bellerman,
the poems of the Hebrew Scriptures.
some of them into another language, that they still keep and retain their measure, if not wholly, at least in part, which cannot be the case unless the measures of which it arises from a certain quantity and number of syllables. Louth expresses his general agreement with R. Azariah's exposition of the rhythm of things; but instead of regarding terms or phrases or sentences in single lines, as measures, he considered only that relation and proportion of terms in one line to another which arises from the correspondence of terms and from the form of construction; whence results a rhythm of propositions, and a harmony of sentences.

But Louth's system of parallelism was more completely anticipated by Schlosser in his Dialectic of the existence of which the bishop does not appear to have been aware. It is found in his Horae Heliotriacae, i, 1249-1248, dis. vi, "de Exergasia Sacra." This exergasia he defines to be the conjunction of entire sentences signifying the same thing; so that exergasia bears the same relation to sentences that synonymy does to words. It is only found in those Hebrew writings which rise above the level of historical narrative and the ordinary kind of speech. Ten canons are then laid down, each illustrated by three examples, from which it will be seen how Schlosser corresponded with Louth's.

1. (Perfect) Exergasia is when the members of the two clauses correspond, each to each, as in Ps. xxxiii, 7; Num. xxiv, 17; Luke i, 47. 2. Sometimes in the second clause the subject is omitted, as in Psa. vii, 19; Prov. ii, 11. 3. Sometimes part of the subject is omitted, as in Psa. xxxviii, 30; cii, 28; Isa. liii, 5. 4. The predicate is sometimes omitted in the second clause, as in Num. xxxiv, 5; Psa. xxxiii, 12; cxxix, 6. 5. Sometimes part only of the predicate is omitted, as in Psa. lvi, 30; cii, 1; cxxix, 7. 6. Words are added in one member which are omitted in the other, as in Num. xxxiii, 18; Psa. cii, 29; Dan. xii, 3. 7. Sometimes two propositions will occur, treating of different things, but referring to one general proposition, as in Psa. xxiv, 9; cxxviii, 3; Wnd. iii, 16. 8. Cases occur, in which the second proposition is the contrary of the first, as in Prov. xv, 8; xiv, 1, 11. 9. Entire propositions answer each to each, although the subject and predicate are not the same, as in Psa. li, 7; cxxix, 168; Jer. viii, 22. 10. Exergasia is found with three members, as in Psa. i, 1; cxxix, 3. 11. These canons Schlosser applied to the interpretation of Scripture, all of which he gives examples in the remainder of that and the following Dissertation.

But whatever may have been achieved by his predecessors, there can be no question that the delivery of Louth's lectures on Hebrew poetry, and the subsequent publication of his translation of Isaiah, formed an era in the literature of the subject more marked than any that had preceded it. Of his system we have already given (§ 3) a somewhat detailed account, which we here slightly expand; for whatever may have been done since his time, and whatever modifications of his arrangement may have been introduced, all subsequent writers have confessed their obligations to the two works above mentioned, and have drawn their inspiration from them. Starting with the alphabetical poems as the basis of his investigation, because in them the verses or stanzas were more distinctly marked, Louth came to the conclusion that they consist of verses properly so called, "of verses regulated by some observation of harmony or cadence; of measure, numbers, or rhythm," and that this harmony does not arise from rhyme, but from what he denominates parallelism. Parallelism he defines to be the correspondence of one verse or line with another, and divides it into three classes—synonymous, antithetic, and symmetrical.

(22) Parallel lines, which consist of two lines, as correspond to each other by expressing the same sense in different but equivalent terms, as in the following examples, which are only two of the many given by Louth:...
POETRY

"O Jehovah, in thy strength the king shall rejoice;
And with thy glory how greatly shall he exult!
The desire of his heart thou hast granted unto him;
And the request of his lips thou hast denied no more" (Psa. xxi, 1, 9).

"For the moth shall consume them like a garment;
And the worm shall eat them like wool;
Those that dwell in these shall endure for ever;
And my salvation to the age of ages." (Isa. ii, 1, 8).

It will be observed from the examples which Lowth gives that the parallel lines sometimes consist of three or more synonymous terms, sometimes of two, sometimes only of one. Sometimes the lines consist each of a double member, or two propositions, as Psa. cxliv, 5, 6; Isa. lxv, 21, 22. Parallels are formed also by a repetition of part of the first sentence (Psa. lxxixv, 1, 11, 16; Isa. xxxvi, 5, 6; Hos. vi, 4); and sometimes a part has to be supplied from the former to complete the sentence (2 Sam. xxii, 41; Job xxvi, 5; Isa. xii, 3; Joel iii, 26). In periods of five lines the odd line sometimes comes in between two distichs, as in Job viii, 5, 6; Isa. xlii, 7; Hosea iv, 9; Joel iii, 16 or after two distichs closure the stanza, as in Isa. xlv, 24. Alternate parallelism in stanzas of a four lines is found in Psa. ciii, 11, 12; Isa. xxx, 16; but the following examples of the alternate quatrains are Deut. xxxii, 25, 42, the first line forming a continuous sense with the third, and the second with the fourth (comp. Isa. xxxiv, 6; Gen. xlil, 6). In Isa. 1, 10 we find an alternate quatrains followed by a fifth line. To this first division of Lowth's Jebb objects that the name synonymous is inappropriate, for the second clause, with few exceptions, "diverted the preceding clause, and generally so as to rise above it, forming a sort of climax in the sense." This peculiarity was recognized itself in his 4th Preface, where he says, "item iterant, variant, augent," thus marking a cumulative force in this kind of parallelism.

The same was observed by Apb. Newcome in his Preface to Ezekiel, where examples are given in which the "following clauses so diversify the preceding ones as to rise above them" (Isa. xxxii, 7; xxxii, 16; Psa. xxv, 2; civ, 1). Jebb, in support of his own opinion, appeals to the passages quoted by Lowth (Psa. xxii, 12; evil, 18; Isa. iv, 6, 7), and suggests as a more appropriate name for parallelism of this kind, cognate parallelism (Sacr. Lit. p. 58).

(b.) Lowth's second division is antithetic parallelism; when two lines correspond with each other by an opposition of terms and sentiments; when the second is construed the first, sometimes in expressions, sometimes in sense only, so that the degrees of antithesis are various. As for example:

"A wise son rejoiceth his father;
But a foolish son is the grief of his mother." (Prov. x, 1).

"The memory of the just is a blessing;
But the name of the wicked shall rot." (Prov. x, 7).

The gnomic poetry of the Hebrews abounds with illustrations of antithetic parallelism. Other examples are Psa. xx, 7, 8;

"These are chariots, and those in horse:
But we in the name of Jehovah our God will be strong.
They are bowed down, and fallen;
But we are risen, and maintain ourselves firm." (Comp. also Psa. xxx, 5; xxxvii, 10, 11; Isa. lv, 10; ix, 10. On these two kinds of parallelism Jebb appropriately remarks: "The antithetic parallelism serves to mark the broad distinctions between truth and falsehood, and good and evil; the cognate parallelism charges the more difficult and more critical function of discriminating between different degrees of truth and good on the one hand, of falsehood and evil on the other." (Sacr. Lit. p. 59).

(c.) Synthetic or constructive parallelism, where the parallel "consists only in the similar form of construction; in which word does not answer to word and sentence to sentence, as equivalent or opposite; but there is a corresponding idiom and equality between different propositions, in respect of the shape and turn of the whole sentence, and of the constructive parts—such as noun answering to noun, verb to verb, member to member, negative to negative, interrogative to interrogative." One of the examples of constructive parallels given by Lowth is Isa. l, 5, 6.

"The Lord Jehovah hath opened mine ear,
And I was not rebellious;
Neither did I withdraw myself backward—
I gave my back to the smiters,
And my cheeks to them that plucked off the hair:
For the Lord of hosts girded me with a belt,
That I should not be ashamed and splitting." (Jebb gives as an illustration Psa. xix, 7–10.)

The law of Jehovah is perfect, converting the soul. The testimony of Jehovah is sure, making wise the simple, etc.

It is instructive, as showing how difficult, if not impossible, it is to make any strict classification of Hebrew poetry, to observe that this very passage is given by Gesenius as an example of synonymous parallelism, while De Wette calls it synthetic. The illustration of synthetic parallelism quoted by Gesenius is Psa. xxiv, 4.

"One thing I ask from Jehovah."

It is my dwelling in the house of Jehovah all the days of my life.
To behold the beauty of Jehovah,
And to inquire in his temple.

In this kind of parallelism, as Nordheimer (Gram. Anal. p. 87) observes, "an idea is neither repeated nor followed by its opposite, but is kept in view by the writer, while he proceeds to develop and enforce his meaning by accessory ideas and modifications."

(d.) To the three kinds of parallelism above described, Jebb adds a fourth, which seems rather to be an unnecessary refinement than a true parallelism. He denominates it circumlocutory parallelism, in which he says, "there are stanzas so constructed that, whatever the number of lines, the first line shall be parallel with the last; the second with the penultimate; and so throughout in an order that looks inward, or, to borrow a military phrase, from flanks to centre" (Sacr. Lit. p. 58). Thus:

"My son, if thine heart be wise,
My heart also shall rejoice;
Thy lips shall speak right things." (Prov. xxiii, 15, 10.)

"Unto Thee do I lift up mine eyes, O Thou that dwellest in the heavens,
Behold as the eyes of servants to the hand of their master:
As the eyes of a maiden to the hands of her mistress:
Even so look our eyes to Jehovah our God, until he have mercy upon us." (Psa. cxii, 1, 9).

Upon examining these and the other examples quoted by bishop Jebb in support of his new division, to which he attaches great importance, it will be seen that the peculiarity consists in the structure of the stanza, and not in the nature of the parallelism; and any one who reads Ewald's elaborate treatise on this part of the subject will rise from the reading with the conviction that to attempt to classify Hebrew poetry according to the character of the stanzas employed will be labor lost and in vain, resulting only in a system which is no system, and in rules to which the exceptions are more numerous than the instances.

A few words may now be added with respect to the classification proposed by De Wette, in which more regard was had to the rhythm. The four kinds of parallelism are: 1. That which consists in an equal number of words, phrases, or members, as in Gen. iv. 23. This he calls the original and perfect kind of parallelism of members, which corresponds with metre and rhyme, without being identical with them (Die Paulinen, Einl. §7). Under this head are many minor divisions. 2. Unequal parallelism, in which the number of words in
the members is not the same. This again is divided into
a. The simple, as Psa. lxxxv, 38. b. The composite, consisting of the synonymous (Job x, 1; Psa. xxxvi, 7), the antithetic (Psa. xv, 4), and the synthetic (xv, 5). c. That in which its form is the opposite of the subject, or is composed of four, or smaller (xx, 10). d. Where the composite member grows up into three or more sentences (i, 8; lv, 10). e. Instead of the close parenthesis there sometimes occurs a short additional clause, as in Psa. xxxii, 8. f. Out of the parenthesis, which sometimes is composed of the composite character of one member, another is developed, so that both members are composite (xxxii, 11). This kind of parenthesis again admits of three subdivisions. 4. Rhythmic parenthesis, which lies merely in the external form of the dictum. Thus in Psa. xix, 11 there is nearly an equal number of words; when the thought trails through two members of a verse, as in Psa. cx, 5, it gives rise to a less animated rhythm (comp. also cxxi, 10). 5. Two sentences may be brought together as antithesis and apodosis, or simply to form one compound thought; the external parenthesis may be dispensed with, but the harmony of thought remains. This may be called the intermediate rhythm.

The forms of structure assumed by the verse are many.
(1) There is the single member, which occurs at the commencement of a series in Psa. xvii, 2; xxiii, 1; at the end of a series in Exod. xv, 18; Psa. xxii, 9; and in the middle, after a short pause, in Psa. xxxiv, 7. (2) The binominal verse is most frequently found, consisting of two members of nearly equal weight. (3) Verses of more than two members are formed either by increasing the number of members from two to three, so that the complete fall may be reserved for the third, all three possessing the same power; or by combining four members two and two, as in Psa. xvii, 7; xxvii, 1.

The varieties of this structure of verse are too numerous to be recounted, and the last noticed in Hebrew poetry are so free that of necessity the varieties of verse-structure must be manifold. The gnostic or sententious rhythm, Ewald remarks, is the one which is perfectly symmetrical. Two members of seven or eight syllables, corresponding to the lengths of rise and fall, contain a thesis and antithesis, a subject and its image. This is the constant form of genuine gnostic sentences of the best period. Those of a later date have many members or trails themselves through many verses. The animation of the lyrical rhythm makes it break through all such restraints, and leads to an amplification or reduplication of the normal form; or the passionate rapidity of the thoughts may disturb the simple concord of the members, so that the unequal structure of verse intrudes with all its varieties. To show how impossible it is to attempt a classification of verse uttered under such circumstances, it will be only necessary to quote Ewald's own words: "All these varieties of rhythm, however, exert a perfectly free influence upon every lyrical song, just according as it suits the mood of the moment to vary the simple rhythm. The most beautiful songs of the flourishing period of poetry allow, in fact, the verse of many members to predominate whenever the diction rises with any sublimity; nevertheless, the standard rhythm still returns in each when the diction flags, and the different kinds of the more complex rhythm are essentially subordinated to equal freedom and ease of variation, just as they severally accord with the fluctuating hues of the mood of emotion and of the sense of the diction. The late alphabetical songs are the first in which the fixed choice of a particular versification—a change made with designed art—establishes itself firmly, and maintains itself symmetrical throughout all the verses" (Dichter d. Alteren Bundes, i, 83; translat. in Kittel's Journal, i, 818). It may, however, be generally observed that the older rhythms are the most animated, as if accompanied by the hands and feet of the singer (Num. xi: Exod. xv; Judg. v), and that in the time of David the rhythm had attained its most perfect development. By the end of the 8th century B.C. the decay of versification begins, and to this period belong the artificial forms of verse.

It remains now only to notice the rules of Hebrew poetry as laid down by the Jewish grammarians, to which reference was made in remarking upon the system of R. Azariah. They have the merit of being extremely simple, and are to be found at length, illustrated by many examples, in Mason and Bernard's Heb. Gram. (vol. ii, No. 67), and accompanied by an interesting account of modern Hebrew versification. The rules are briefer than: 1. That a sentence may be divided into members, some of which contain two, three, or even four words, and are accordingly termed binary, ternary, and quaternary members respectively. 2. The sentences are composed either of binary, ternary, or quaternary
members entirely, or of these different members intermixed.

3. That in two consecutive members it is an
elegance to express the same idea in different words.

4. That a word expressed in either of these parallel
members, is generally found in the same sense in
the other member.

5. That a word without an accent, being joined
to another word by Makkês, is generally (though not
always) reckoned with that second word as one. It
will be seen that these rules are essentially the same
with those of Lowth, De Wette, and other writers on
parallelism, and from their simplicity are less open to
objection than any others that have been given.

In conclusion, after reviewing the various theories
which have been framed with regard to the structure
of Hebrew poetry, it must be confessed that beyond
the discovery of very broad general laws, little has been
done towards elaborating a satisfactory system. Prob-
ably this want of success is due to the fact that there is
no system to discover, and that Hebrew poetry, while
possessed in the highest degree of all sweetness and va-
riety of rhythm and melody, is not fettered by laws of
versification as we understand the term. Some advance
is made by Delitzsch in his Commentaries; but
the whole subject admits of a more careful and min-
ute examination of the clauses and phrases than has
yet been achieved.

Modern Hebrew poetry, although tolerably copious,
is altogether cast in the mould of the poems of the se-
veral European nations among whom the Jews are
scattered, and is therefore stiffly artificial, generally with
rhyme, etc. It is of little value theologically. A very
fair collection of specimens may be seen in Martinei's
Hebräische Christomathie (Bamburg, 1837).

W. Literature.—England has the credit of opening a
new path in this branch by the above-noticed publica-
tion of bishop Lowth's elegant and learned Prolectiones
de Sura Poeti Hebraorum (Oxon. 1753, which may
be found also in Ugolini, Theaur. vol. xxxi; the
editors having Michaelis's Nota et Epimenora are to be
preferred; that of Oxon, 1810, is good: the work was
translated into English by Gregor). On the didactic
poetry of the Hebrews the reader may consult Umbreit,
Sprach Sack, Einleitung; Rhode, De Vet. Poëtar. Sapi-
entia Gnom. Hebraeo, imp. et Graeco. (Havn. 1800);
Unger, Of Paralost, Jacob natura, etc. (Leipzig. 1829).
Leiden, Biblica Utriusque, etc. 1829, 92 sq. has given
what is worth attention; see also Hist. abrégée de la
Poésie chez les Hebr. in the "History of the Academy
of Inscriptions," xiii, 94 sq.
The book which has, next to that of Lowth, exerted the greatest
influence, is the one just mentioned, and that of the celebrated
Heider, which has treated the subject with extraordinary
eloquence and learning, Von Geist der Ebräischen
Poesie (1782, to be found in his collected writings; also
Tübingen, 1805; and Carlshagen, 1828); see also Gügler,
Die Heiligkeit der Hebräer (Leipzig, 1814); and Gut-
tenberg, Die poet. Litter. der alten Israelt (Mannh.
1835).
The subject of metre has been skilfully handled by
Bellemann, Versuch über d. Metrik der Hebräer
(Berl. 1813). Much useful information may be found in
De Wette's Einleitung in d. A. Test. (ibid. 1840; tra-
slated into English by Theodore Parker, Boston, 1843).
In Bellows's Bible translations of the poetical portions
may be found, in which regard is paid to rhythm and
poetical form; a very valuable guide in Hebrew poetry,
both for form and substance, may be found in
Noyes's Translation of Job (Cambridge, 1827); of the
Psalms (Boston, 1831); and of the Prophets (ibid.
1833); but the best, fullest, and most satisfactory work
on the subject is by Ewald, Die poet. Bücher des Alten
Bundes in (Gottingen, 1835-6, 9 vols. 8vo). See also Cri-
tics Biblic, i, 111 sqq.; Carpzov, Introd, ad Libr. Can.
Biblicam, 2 (Cambridge, 1836); Schleiermacher, Die Lieder
(Heidelberg, 1798); Jeqb, Sacred Literature, Salischitz, Von
Form der Hebr. Poetie (Königsberg, 1825, which con-
tains the most complete account of all the various the-
ories); Nicolas, Forme de la Poésie Hebraîque (Paris,
1833); Sarchi, Heb. Poetry, Ancient and Modern (Lon.
1854); Wenrich, De Poete Hbr. et Arab. Iuidae (Leip.
1843); and G. B. Bahr, Einleitung in den Hebräischen
Sprache (Leipz. 1853); the commentators of De Wette,
Delitzsch, and Hupfeld on the Psalms; and the words
215 sq.; in Darby, Cyclopedia Bibliograph (Holy
Scriptures, abridged, 1806); various other works of the
same kind.

POETRY, Hebrew (Post-Biblical).—In speaking of
post-Biblical poetry, we mean those poetical productions
which have come down to us from the so-called
Sophistic Age, i.e. from about B.C. 500 to A.D. 70. Productions
written after this period are properly designated by
the name Neo-Hebre Poetry.

The divine service of the second Temple, under Ezra
and his successor, was mainly a restoration, rather than
a new institute; but the inspired material for liturgy
was now more copious. The Psalms, several of which,
like the melodious swan-song of a departing inspiration,
were written in the Ezra-Nehelemiah time, formed of
themselves a primary element. So, at the Feast of Taberna-
cles, the Asaphites chanted the Confession of the 118th
Psalms (Exzra ii, 10, 11; comp. Neh. xi, 24, 1 Chron.
xxvii, 19, 20), and the Psalms given to some Psalteres of
the great Synagogue indicate a stated use of them at
various periods of week-day and Sabbath worship (comp.
Mishna, Taamid, ad fin.; Sopherim, sect. 18; and the
inscriptions for the Psalms in the Septuagint, evidently
rendered from Hebrew ones). Thus Ps. xxviii is called
ψελλος ... της μιας σαββάτου; xxlv, Ευρωπα σαβ-
βάτου; xxvi, περιδε σάββατου; xxix, Χρυσίν ουράνιον;
xviii, πνευμ απαθος; cxviii, πνευμα απαθος; cxv-
θάνους, πνευμα απαθος; cxvii, Ἀλλαξαυα. The
"fifteen Songs of Degrees" (תהלים עשרים ושלושה פסוקים
לヶ月 ושלושה פסוקים), i. e. "the hymn which was said upon the steps of the abyss"
were evidently liturgical, and probably derive their name
from the fifteen semicircular steps at the Nicanor gate
of the great court of the Temple, on which the Levites
stood while singing them.

So the Mishna (Soccah, v, 4): "On the fifteen steps
which led into the women's court, corresponding with
the fifteen songs of degrees, stood the Levites with their instruments of music.
and of anger, and of great Hatred (q. v.) and certain
verses of Psalms were also used, as may be seen from the
treatise Soccah, iv, 5.

The poetry of this period is preserved in four forms:
of Tephillah, Berakah, Shir, and Meshal.

I. P BALLAD FORM. In this form we have the four
collected offered by the high-priest on the Day of
Atonement (q. v.), as preserved in the Jerusalem Gemara
and Midrash Jeladenu, and which run thus: 1. For
Himself and his Family: "Lord, I have committed
iniquity, I have transgressed, I have sinned, I and my
house. Pardon, O Lord, the iniquities and transgres-
sions and the sins which I have committed and sinned
before thee, I and my house, as it is written in the law of
Moses, thy servant: for on that day will be atone for
you to make you clean, from all your transgressions shall
be forgiven thee, and from all the iniquities of the sons
of Aaron, thy consecrated people. I beseech thee, Lord, to pardon the iniquities, trans-
gressions and sins of the house of Jehovah be escaped." (Yomaq, iii, 7). 2. For
Himself and the Priesthood: "Lord, I have committed
iniquity, I have transgressed, I have sinned, I and my
house, and the sons of Aaron, thy consecrated people.
I beseech thee, Lord, to pardon the iniquities, trans-
gressions and sins of the sons of Aaron, thy consecrated people, who have
perversely committed, as it is written in the law of Moses, thy servant: for on
that day, etc. (ibid. iv, 2). 3. For the People at large: "Lord, thy people, the house of
Israel, have done perversely; they have transgressed, they have sinned before thee, I and my
house. Pardon, O Lord, the iniquities, transgressions, and sins which thy people,
the house of Israel, have perversely committed, and by which
they have sinned and transgressed; as it is written in the law of Moses, thy servant: for on that day," etc.

4. *When he came out from the Holy of Holies:* "May it please thee, O Lord our God, and the God of our fathers, that neither this day nor during this year any captivity come upon us; yet if captivity befal us this day or this year, let it be to a place where the law is cultivated. May it please thee, O Lord our God, and the God of our fathers, that no want come upon us either this day or this year; but if want visit us this day or this year, let it be due to the liberality of our charitable deeds. May it please thee, O Lord our God, and the God of our fathers, that this year may become a year of cheapness, of fulness, of intercourse, and of trade: a year with abundance of rain, of sunshine, and of dew: one in which thy people Israel shall not require assistance one from another. And listen not to the prayers of those who go forth on a journey. And as to thy people Israel, may no enemy exalt himself against them. May it please thee, O Lord our God, and the God of our fathers, that the houses of the men of Saron may not become their graves.

The *Berakhah,* or benediction.—The benedictory formula of the name and dominion of God is a most proper and all-pervading element in the Hebrew liturgy. Many of their prayers begin and end with it. The *Berakhah* at the close of several of the Psalms (Psa. xlvi. 12; xcvii. 18; lxgxxv. 53; cxi. 49) are probably added by Ezra, or the prophetical men of his time, to the final arrangement of the canonical Psalm (comp. on these doxologies Grätz, in *Monatsschrift für d. Judenken*, 1872, xxi. 481 sq). Those which accompany the prayers of the *Shemoneh Eshah,* or eighteen benedictions (comp. the art. lutheri), are believed to be of the same period. Thos Maimonides: "These benedictions were appointed by Ezra the sopher, and the betheda: and no man hath power to diminish from or add to them" (Hitlchtori *Keritha Shenot,* i, 7; and Hitlch. Tiflía, i 11). "In the innumerable instances where, in the Mishna and Aboda, this form occurs, in which the everlasting name is hallowed, and the truth of the divine dominion is reverently confessed, it appears to have been the pious desire of the institutions of the synagogue ritual that supplication, with prayer and thanksgiving, should give a spirit and tone to the entire life of the people. Indeed, almost all the affairs of Hebrew life have the prescription of their appropriate benedictions" (comp. Berachot, ch. vix; *Rosh ha-Shanah,* iv; Toseft, ii, 2, etc.).

III. The *Shir,* or Song, *Chant* (from šeôr, יַֽעַר).—"A song," the Arab. sabara, i. q. nasaara, whence zabor, like the Hebrew msoran, of the same meaning, is a metrical composition, designed for chanting, and consisting generally of the strophe, antistrophe, and epode. We have a fine Biblical model in the fifteenth chapter of Exodus, on which see Kennicott and Lowth. Apart from the divine poetry of the Scriptures, there are but scanty remains of Hebrew songs of a date prior to the destruction of Jerusalem. In the Mishna and Gemara we come upon a few reminiscences of them, as in the treatise *Sukkah,* fol. 53, col. 1, where, in connection with the solemnities of the Feast of Tabernacles, we find the following chant:

**THE PIQNEH AND THE MEN OF RENOWN.**

"O happy youth, devoted sage, Who will not put to shame our age!" *The Penitents.*

"O happy, also, is our age, Which now shines for youth, not sage!" *Oaths.*

"O happy be on whom no guilt doth rest, And he who sinned with pardon shall be blest."

These songs were accompanied by the musical instruments of the Levites, who stood on the fifteen steps which led to the court of the women. Here is another, a sort of confession made by the Levites at the same feast. "When the Levites," says the Mishna, "reached the gate that leads out to the east, they turned westward, their faces being towards the Temple, and employed these words:"

"Our fathers, here established by thy grace, Had turned their backs upon thy holy place, And to the rising sun they set their face. But we will turn to thee, Jehovah God; Our eyes are set on thee, Jehovah God."

Another fragment of a song has been preserved in the Mishna (Tosafiuth, ad fin.), and was sung on the first day of Ab, when the collection of wood required in the sanctuary was finished. Then the maidens all went forth, arrayed in white garments specially lent them, that so rich and poor might be on an equality, into the vineyards around Jerusalem, where they danced and sung:

"Around in circle gay the Hebrew maidens see, From them the happy youth their partners choose; Remember beauty soon its charm must lose, And seek to win a maid of fair degree."

"When fading grace and beauty low are laid, Yet her who fears the Lord shall praise awalt; God blessed her and her works: 'Her works have followed her,' it shall be said." *The Mashiach.*—This word, according to its Sanscrit-Shemitic root, denotes comparison or resemblance. "In the older Hebrew writings the word is applied to prophecy, to doctrine, to history in the loftier style, and to instruction given in a kind of poetical form, sometimes with the accompaniment of the harp or other music; because, in these various manners of instruction, material things are employed in the way of parallel or comparison, to illustrate those which are supereminal or spiritual. Hence mashiach became a general name for all poetry which relates to the ordinary or every-day economy of life, with a still more specific application to a distinct epigrammatic saying, proverb, maxim, or reflection, carrying in itself some important principle or rule of conduct. The mashiach, then, may be said to consist commonly of two elements: the thesis, principal fact or lesson, and the type, emblem, or allusion by which it is explained or enunciated. The latter may be one of the phenomena of nature, or an imaginary transaction in common life (parable); or an emblematic group of human agents (apodologie); or of agents non-human, with an understood designation (tafel). Sometimes the mashiach takes a mathematical cast; and the doctrine or principle is laid down after a certain arithmetical proportion or canon, malkah (Prov. vi, 16; xxx, 15, 18, 21; Eccles. xi, 1, 8; xx; xxxvi, 5, 26; i, 27, 28). When there is no image or allusion of these kinds used, the mashiach becomes sometimes an acute, recendite, yet generally pleasant assertion or problem—*graphos,* the 'riddle,' or 'enigma;' in Hebrew, *chidah,* קִדָּה (Judg. xiv, 12); and sometimes an axiom or oracle of practical wisdom—*massa,* מַסָּה, a 'burden,' a weighty saying, from massa, 'to bear;' and when conveyed in a brilliant, sparkling style of speaking it becomes melakhah, מְלָכָה, the pleasant witicism or the pungent reproof. The remaining form of the mashiach is the motto (apophthegm), where some moral is sententiously expressed without a simple, and generally without the parallelism, as we see in the mottoes of the Hebrew sages in the book *Abodah.* Of such mottoes, we mention the following of Hillel:

"The more flesh, the more worms; The more riches, the more care; The more wites, the more witchcraft," etc.; or:

"Because thou madest float, They made thee float: In turn, who made thee float Shall also float!"—this having reference to a skull floating on the water; or:

"Each one who seeks a name, Shall only lose his fame;"
POGGIO, BRACCIOLONI GIOVANNI - FRANCESCO, a celebrated Italian humanist, who contributed richly to the revival of classical studies in the period of the Italian Renaissance, and did much to encourage scholarship in the Church of Rome, was born at Terranova, near Florence, in 1380. He was the grandson of a notary, and studied the Latin language under the direction of Giovanni da Ravenna, the Greek under Emanuelli Chrysoloras, and applied himself also to the Hebrew, a fact which gave rise to the opinions of Huculius and others, who have said that this language was not cultivated in Italy till after the 14th and 15th centuries. After the completion of his education he went to Rome, and was for some time a canon, and finally entered the service of the cardinal di Bari. In 1418 Poggio was appointed apostolic secretary, a poorly paid charge, which he occupied forty years. Thus he spent a large part of his life in brilliant surroundings. Eight popes bequeathed him to another, as if he had belonged to the chancellors of St. Peter. The life which he led in the court was comfortable and friendly. He devoted much of it to inquiries into antiquity. His great title to the esteem of posterity is the zeal he displayed in the search for the monuments of Roman literature. He made his most important discoveries during a protracted stay in Switzerland, whether he repaired in 1414 to attend the Council of Constance. He visited the library of the monastery of St. Gall, which he found in a kind of dungeon. Here he discovered a copy, almost complete, of Quintilian's Institutiones Oratoriae, of which fragments only were known at the time; four books of the Argyrologia of Valerius Flaccus, and the Commentaries of Aesonius Pedianus. Afterwards he found, in divers places, the History of Ammianus Marcellinus and Frontinus's Treatise on Aqueducts. The searches which he caused to be made in the monasteries of France and Germany brought to light the works of Manlius, of Vitruvius, of Columella, of Priscianus, of Nonius Marcellus, a considerable portion of the poems of Lucretius and Silius Italicus, eight orations of Cicero, twelve comedies of Plautus, etc. In the year 1455, with which Poggio criticised several acts of the Council of Constance, especially in the affair of Jerome of Prague, was punished with a short disgrace, during which he visited England. Beauport, bishop of Winchester, received him with distinction. But as little effect followed the brilliant promises of the prelate, and as the English libraries offered no temptation to a man of Poggio's propensities, he left a country the inhabitants of which he describes as plunged in the grossest sensuality, and returned to Rome at the close of 1420. He was reinstated into his former charge. The calm which the pontifical court enjoyed for some years gave him full leisure to correspond with his friends, Leonardo d'Arezzo, Francesco, etc., and to write several dialogues and philosophical treatises, in which he exposes without mercy the fallings of monks and priests, which Poggio was most competent to describe, as he had himself at the time three sons by a mistress, and his own course he excuses in the following pleasantry, in one of his letters to cardinal Julian of St. Angelo: "You say that I have sons, which is not lawful for a clerics; and without a wife, which does not become a laic. I may answer that I have sons, which is fitting for laic; and without a wife, which from the beginning of the world has been the custom of clerics: but I will not defend my failings by any excuse." When, after the accession of Eugenius IV, in 1443, a sedition compelled the pope to retire to Florence, Poggio set out with the same way to join his master. He was taken by soldiers of Piccinino, and given his liberty only after a heavy ransom paid by his friends. In Florence he met Filelfo, against whom he had long entertained a secret jealousy, which changed into actual hatred when he had generated and beloved Niccolò was the object of a violent attack from Filelfo. He launched against his enemy a libel, in which he heaped up all the most injurious and obscene expressions which the Latin language would afford. Filelfo answered him in the same style; whereupon Poggio replied in a still more insulting strain. After a truce of four years this edifying dispute between two of the most distinguished men of their time recommenced: Poggio wrote against Filippo a libel full of the most atrocious accusations, almost all of his own invention. Filelfo again returned the blow, and neither had damaged himself in the eyes of their contemporaries, who enjoyed these invectives as literary dainties. Meanwhile Poggio had bought a villa in the vicinity of Florence, and formed there a museum of sculptures, medals, and other objects of art. Towards the close of 1445 he had married the young and beautiful Vagga di Bondelmonti. He was poor and on the decline of life; but the young heiress of an illustrious and ancient family was in love with his literary fame, which had induced the senate of Florence to grant immunity from taxes for forty years to him and his descendants. His married life was a happy one. He returned to Rome with the papal court, after a sojourn of ten years at Florence. During this period he had published a choice selection of letters, and composed two dialogues, full of the most curious remarks on the manners of his time (On Nobility and On the Misfortunes of Princes). He had, besides, written the panegyrics of Niccolò, Lorenzo di Medici, of the cardinal Albergati, and of Leonardo d'Arezzo. At the request of pope Nicholas V, with whom he was in great favor, he translated into Latin the first five books of Diodorus Siculus; about the same time he dedicated his version of Xenophon's Cyropedia to 'Alfonso, king of Naples, and compelled the king, by the sarcastic remarks with which he filled his letters to his friends, to reward him with a present of six hundred ducats, whereupon he chanted, in the most pompous strain, the encomiums of the king. To please pope Nicholas, he wrote a violent invective against the antipope, Felix V. He wrote also, under the same pope's auspices, an interesting dialogue of which many curious incidents in the history of Italy in the 14th and 15th centuries, contains an account of the journey of the Venetian Niccolo Conti into India and Persia, and a precious description of the monuments of Rome as they were at that time. During the plague which broke out in Rome in 1450, he retired to his birthplace.
where he published his famous Faecitio, a collection of tales, partly borrowed from the French fabliaux, and excessively licentious. This book was eagerly read throughout Europe. Soon afterwards he published his Historia Severalziana Chretiense, a dialogue full of satiric humor. He returned to Rome in 1451, but in 1458 he was offered the position of chancellor of the republic of Florence, and a month after his removal to that city was in addition made prior of the arts. In the latter capacity he had to look to the maintenance of good order and to the public libraries. He has been described as more of a scholar than of his functions: young and beautiful, crowned with blue flowers, blue wings on his shoulders, clothed in a blue garment interwoven with silver, stretched on a bed of flowers resting quietly in the bright air. It is not likely that the Slaves one thousand years ago could have drawn such beauty. 

Pohiman, William John, a missionary of the Reformed (Dutch) church, was born at Albany, N. Y., in 1812, of pious parents who belonged to the Lutheran Church. His father was of German descent. Converted at the age of sixteen, he united with the First Reformed Church of Albany, under the care of Dr. John Ludlow. Devoting himself to the Christian ministry, Pohiman studied three years at the Albany Academy, entered Rutgers College in 1842, graduated in 1884, and then entered the theological seminary at New Brunswick, N. J. A student in this institution he consecrated himself to the foreign missionary work. In August, 1886, he offered himself to the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, in a memorable letter, which concluded with these sentences: "I wish to enrol my name on the list for life. If in the future I cannot nay all your feet. Silver and gold have I none, but such as I have give I thee." Send me abroad to publish glad tidings to the idol-serving nations. Send me to the most desert part of all the howling wildernesses of heathenism, to the most barbarous climes, or to more civilized regions. Send me to the missions of pagans, to the followers of the false prophet, to the Jews or the Gentiles, to Catholics or Protestants. Send me, in fine, whereward God opens an effectual door. Send me—for necessity is laid upon me; yes, woe is unto me, if I preach not the Gospel; though written in an easy, witty, and sometimes elegant manner, they are full of solemnisms, Italicisms, and even barbarisms. His letters are altogether neglected. But the rest of his writings are still read, owing to their variety of subjects, to some ingenious ideas, and to the freedom of speech, sometimes the grace, by which they are characterized. His Works were published at Strasburg (1510, fol.; 1518, 4to), at Paris (1551, 4to; 1515, fol.), and at Basle (1558, fol.). The latter edition, by Hebel, is the best; but it is still incom- plete. Some of his sermons are also preserved; afterwards published apart: De Hypocrisie (Lyons, 1679, 4to), a violent pamphlet against the clergy:—Historia Florentina (Venet. 1716, 4to; and in tom. xx of the Scriptores of Muratori), translated into Italian by Giacomo, the third of the five sons whom Poggio had by his legitimate wife (Venet. 1745, fol.; Florence, 1492 and 1598, 4to):—De Variatiba Fortuna (Par. 1728, 4to), with fifty-seven unpublished Letters of Poggio. The Fascices have often been printed apart (1470, 4to; Ferrara, 1471; Nuremb. 1505; Milan, 1577; Paris, 1478, 4to; Utrecht, 1757, 4to; and Colonia, 1760, 4to). The translation of Diodorus Siculus was published at Venice (1673, 1746, fol.) and at Basle (1580, 1578, fol.). See Thormeis, Vita Poggia (Wittemburg, 1713); Reecanate, Vio (Venet. 1715); Lenfant, Poggiana (1785), and enlarged (1791); Nucetor, Memoires, vol. ix; Shepherd, Life of Poggio (Lond. 1802, 8vo); Niard, Les Grandes Cures de la Republique des Lettres, vol. i; Trollope, History of Florence (see Index in vol. v); Hallam, Literary Hist. of Europe (Harper's edition), 1. 64, 92; id., Middle Ages (2nd ed., ii, 805-310); Piper, Monumental Theologoe, § 148, 150, 153, 214; Milman, Latin Christianity, viii, 123; Edinb. Rev. lxiv, 32 sq.; Schlegel, Hist. of Literature, lect. xi; Hoefer, Newc. Biblio. General, a. v.

Poggoda is in Slavonic mythology the name of a god of the spring and of fine weather. Pogoda is a pure Slavic word, and means weather. He is supposed to have been of a kind and amiable disposition—the god of shady weather, of clear skies, of smiling springs; yet the qualification of dobra (good) would seem to be necessary in such a case. The description given of his exterior appearance is more authentic than that of his functions: young and beautiful, crowned with blue flowers, blue wings on his shoulders, clothed in a blue garment interwoven with silver, stretched on a bed of flowers resting quietly in the bright air. It is not likely that the Slaves one thousand years ago could have drawn such beauty.  

The strictly missionary work in Amoy is now at an end; and the churches there would doubtless live and grow and propagate Christianity, like those of ancient times, even if all American missionaries were withdrawn
from them. Such is the fruit of the labors of Mr. Pohl-
man and his associates and successors. His valuable life and
labors were suddenly ended at Breker's Point by
shipwreck of the vessel on which he was bound from
Hong Kong to Amoy, Jan. 5, 1843. Pirates attacked the
sinking ship, but "Mr. Pohlman sprang from the ship
and was drowned." The ruling principle of Mr. Pohl-
man's life was his consecration to God. He gave himself
and all to Christ, and to the world for Christ's sake.
He spared nothing. He was "totius illius." He was
always, buoyant, frank, earnest, enthusiastic, and
taciturn to the last degree in prosecuting his good pur-
poses. His disposition was very cheerful. He had no
crotchets. But with practical common-sense and in-
tense energy and zeal, he lived and labored for the
kingdom of Christ. His preaching, correspondence,
and public services glowed with this one spirit, which
has left its permanent impress upon the mission and
Church of which he was so conspicuous a servant.
(W. J. R. T.)

Poilly, François de, a French engraver, was born at
Abbeville in 1622 or 1623. His father was a gold-
smith. After working for three years in the studio of
Pierre Daret, he went to Rome in 1649, and remained
there until 1656. He engraved during his stay in Italy
some drawings in a manner which resembles that of
Bloemaert. On his return to France, he engraved with
equality portraits and historic subjects. His por-
traits are sought for even now, perhaps less on account
of the merits of an art which must be confessed to be
somewhat cold and monotonous, than of the persons
they represent. Poilly was honored with the title of
ordinary engraver to the king. He reproduced the
works of Raffaello, Giulio Romano, Guido, Carraccio,
Le Brun, Mignard, Le Sueur, Poussin, Ph. de Cham-
pagne, etc. The great reputation he enjoyed in his
time attracted to his studio a number of pupils, among
them Gerard Edelineck, Nicolas de Poilly, his brother,
Sauveur Boullet, etc. Poilly and his brother lived to-
gether with the Mariette family, for whom Gerard
worked. Poilly died at Paris, March, 1693. Though
Poilly's style is very laborious, there are about four
hundred prints which bear his name, in which how-
ever he was of course assisted by his pupils. His mas-
terpiece is the print from Mignard's celebrated picture,
now lost, of San Carlo Borromeo administrating the Sac-
ramento to the Milanese attacked with the Plague.
A catalogue of his prints was published by R. Hequet in
1787, which, Noue, Histoire, General, etc., v.; Mrs.
Clement, Handbook of Painters, Sculptors, Architects,
and Engravers, etc., v.

Poinen (poupi), i.e. pastor, is a name given to
ministers of the Gospel in the New-Testament writ-
ings and by the early Church. It is a term recommend-
based by the circumstance that Christ had compared him-
selves to a shepherd and his people to a flock; and the
apostle Peter had called him the Chief Shepherd. See
PASTOR.

Pointed. In the English Prayer-book the Psalter,
Venire, Te Deum, etc., are punctuated throughout in
a peculiar manner by the insertion of a colon in or near
the middle of each verse without regard to grammatical
rules. This is done with the design of facilitating
the chanting by presenting to the eye the most nat-
ural division of the verse, or that which will most
readily correspond with the movement of the chant-
tune. In allusion to this, the title of the English
Psalter, unto which states that the Psalms of David are
"pointed (or punctuated) as they are to be sung or said
in churches." In the American editions the grammatic-
ical punctuation has been restored, and the above por-
tion of the title omitted.

Pointed Style, especially applied to the Pointed
arch and architectural term first used in the 14th
century. The Pointed style is used in Egypt, Italy,
Greece, and Mexico in ancient buildings, merely as a
freak of the architect, an accident, or irregularity.
Some authors have traced its origin to the avenues of a
forest; others have seen it in the palm, in the wooden
churches of an earlier period, or the intersecting arcade.
Some refer it to the Goths, Wre Warburton; or to
the Saracens, like Christopher Wren. See Gothic Archi-
ecture.

Pointer, John, an English divine of some note,
flourished in the first half of the 18th century as chap-
lain of Merton College, Oxford, where he was probably
educated, and as rector of Sipton. He published, be-
sides sermons, works of an altogether peculiar character,
Ozomienes Academicae (Lond. 1749, 12mo). See Alli-
bone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, etc.

Points, Hebrew. See MABORAH.

Points, Robert, an English theologian of some re-
pute, flourished near the middle of the 16th century.
He was educated at Oxford University, and was made
permanent fellow of New College in 1564. He was
obliged to go abroad after the accession of queen Mary,
he having embraced the Reformed doctrines, and pre-
ferring exile to abnegation of his religious convictions.
He went to Louvain, and settled there as pastor of a
Protestant congregation. He wrote several contro-
versial tracts against the Romanists, examining their
different characteristic doctrines. Among these are,
Testimonies for the Real Presence (Lond. 1566, 1600): —
Miracles performed by the Eucharist (1570). See
Wood, Athenae Ozomeniæ, iii, 715.

Poiret, Pierre, a French philosopher of mystical
tendency, and a writer whose works are of great im-
portance to the students of French theological thought,
was born at Metz April 16, 1646. He lost his father,
a mechanic, when but six years of age. As he showed
some disposition for the fine arts, he entered as an
apprentice the studio of a sculptor, where he learned the
elementary principles of drawing. As thirteen year-
old, he began to turn his thoughts towards phi-
lanetics and humanities, and from 1661 to 1663 he was tutor at Baile,
and there studied at the same time philosophy and the-
ology. He finally entered the evangelical ministry,
and after reading for a while at Hauuc, was called as
pastor to Heidelberg in 1667; married, and ac-
quired the reputation of a good preacher. In 1673 he
was appointed pastor at Anweiler, in the duchy of
Zweibrücken. Here he familiarized himself with the
writings of the philosopher Descartes, and of the mys-
tics Kempis, Tauler, and Antoinette Bourguin, and
commenced to turn his thoughts towards the spiri-
tual life. In 1673 a dangerous illness converted him
fully to mysticism. The war having disturbed his
peaceful studies, he first took refuge in Holland, then
at Hamburg, in the house of Mlle. Bourignon, to whom
he was married, and after his death attached by feeling for
and admiration. In 1690 he established himself at Amster-
dam. Speaking of his exemplary life there, Bayle says
that "from a great Cartesian he had become so pious
that, in order to apply himself the better to the things
of heaven, he had broken off almost every intercourse
with the earth." In order to live in more complete se-
cision, he retired in 1698 to Rheinsberg, near Leyden,
where he spent more than thirty years in the exercise
of piety, and in the composition of spiritual and ascet-
ic works. He died there May 21, 1719. Poiret is not
the founder of a sect; he established no conveniencies,
because he attached no importance whatever to dog-
matical questions. His theological system lacked
 speculative clearness and consistency, and was rather
a subjective theology of the adoring heart and year-
ing for the assurance of the seeing intelligence; it
rested upon the forms and rules of any particular
Church, and placed the ideal of the Christian life in
retired, uninterrupted communion with self and with
God. For him, morals were the essence of religion.
Hence there was never a more tolerant theologian.
If he had been at all interested in the Church, it was
to preserve the integrity of his conscience. Far from
POIYER
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being indifferent, he was full of zeal for the Christian religion, which he defended on several occasions, especially against Spinoza. All those who were acquainted with him agree in the praise of his meekness, his modesty, the purity of his life, the kindness of his heart. It would be unjust to deny that there are excellence. A human work of the kind, published before by Cassiel, had been published in 1676. Poiret accompanied it with a Letter on the mystical authors; the latter are 180 in number, and Poiret gives most curious details about their characters, principle, life, and works.—Theologie Mystique (ibid. 1702, 12mo).—Poiret etratio adversus Principias J. Locoki (ibid. 1703, 8vo).—Poliotica Mysteriost (ibid. 1708, 8vo).—Posthumae (ibid. 1721, 4to). Poiret translated The Imitation of Jesus Christ (ibid. 1688, 12mo, sep. ed.), which he paraphrased partly according to the interior sense; the works of St. Catherine of Genoa (1691, 12mo), and those of Angele de Foligni (1696, 12mo). He edited the Oeuvres d'Antoines Courton (Amsterdam, 1679 and following, 19 vols. 12mo), with a most circumstantial Life, which was reprinted apart (1698, 2 vols. 12mo), and followed by an apologetic Memoir, inserted in the Nouvelles de la République des Lettres (1699), against the attacks of Sckendorf (Monumentum Necassarium, 1686, 4to): several mystical Oeuvres; and after having published several of the writings of Mme. Guyon, among others, Le Nouveau et Ancien Traitemont (Amsterdam, 1715-1715, 20 vols. 12mo); he gave (1720, 3 vols. 12mo); and her Peupes (1722, 12mo), brought out a complete edition with great care, in 39 vols., furnishing them with elaborate introductions, prefaces, and apologies, sufficient to make several volumes in themselves. In all this there is manifest, as in the editing of Mlle. Bourignon's works, a remarkable willingness to hide himself entirely behind the beloved objects upon which he spends his toil; so that now in many instances it is impossible to tell just how much of the worth and beauty of whole volumes is to be assigned to himself rather than to the reputed authors. Nearly all of Poiret's writings have been translated into Latin, Dutch, and German. See Walch, Religionsmirbeiten ausser der evangel-luther Kirche, liv, 911 sq.; Nicerin, Hist. des Hommes Illustres, iv, 144 sq.; x, 149 sq.; Grisse, Liturgiograph, vol. iii, pt. iii, p. 479 sq.; Erdmann, Versuch einer gesch. d. neueren Philosophie, vol. i, pt. ii, p. 217 sq.; Bibliotheca Ere- mensis, Theol. Philol. tom. iii, pt. i, p. 75; Noack, Mystik, § 217; Niehren, Zeitsschr. fiir d. hist. Theol., 1838-54; Hagenbuch, Forschungen über die Kirchengesch. iv, 356 sq.; Donner, On Speculative Philos. of Europe, p. 201; M.Lovare, de Vita et Scriptis Petri Poiret, in his Posthuma (Amsterdam, 1721, 8vo); Jervis, Hist. of the Church of France (see Index); Hurst, Hist. of Rationalism (see Index); Haag, La France Protestant, s. v.; Histoire des Dogmes (see Index).

Poiyre, François, a French Jesuit, was born in 1584 at Versal. He entered the Society of Jesus at the age of seventeen years; was a successful teacher of humanities, rhetorics, philosophy, and Holy Writ, and was appointed superior of a house of his order at Nancy; rector of the college of Lyons, and of that of Dôle. He left, Igna Hubacq, Histoire de Monseigneur la Marquise de Deuzer a bien mourir (Douai, 1638, 16mo).—Le bon Pasteur (Pont-a-Mousson, 1830, 12mo).—Le Côme des Saints (Par. 1684, 4to, etc.). He died at Dôle Nov. 25, 1687.—Hoefler, Nouv. Biog. Générale, s. v.

Poirier, Germain, Dom, a learned French Benedictine, was born Jan. 8, 1724, at Paris. He was not at the fifteen years of age when he entered the Congregation of Saint-Maur. After teaching philosophy and theology in the houses of his order, he was appointed secretary to the visitor-general of France, and resigned this place for another which was more congenial to his tastes,
that of guardian of the archives of Saint-Denis. In 1762 he published in the *Nouvelle Collection des Historiens de la France*, vol. xi, which contains the reign of Henry I, an excellent Preface, which forms the fourth part of it, and in accordance to Dacier, the most substantial and best work ever written on the first Capetian kings. Tired of the troubles by which his congregation was agitated, he left it in 1765, but re-entered it two years later, and was intrusted with the archives of Saint-Germain-des-Pres. In 1775 he was admitted as free associate of the Academicians. During the Revolution he was a member of the commission of monuments, and exerted himself actively in preserving from destruction a number of valuable manuscripts. In 1796 he was appointed librarian of the Arsenal, and in 1800 he succeeded Legrand d'Aussy in the National Institute.

He united to a rare erudition a no less rare modesty: he worked for the pleasure he found in the work; hence his easy willingness to communicate the fruit of his researches to any one who recurred to him. His death revealed the secret of his virtues and of his benevolence; the blessings of the poor, their testimonies of gratitude—written testimonies, found, with a few pieces of money, in his bureau—were his whole treasure. He wore cheap clothes, and condemned himself to privations, to be able to give food and clothing to the poor. He lived as poor as a beggar. Besides what has been mentioned, he wrote several historical Mémoires, which were read in the academy of which he was a member, etc. See Dacier, Éloge de Dom Poitier (Paris, 1804, 8vo).—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

### Poison

**in the A.V. of the Bible of two Hebrew and two Greek terms, but they are so general as to throw little light upon the knowledge and practice of poisons among the Hebrews.**

1. **מִשְׂמַך** (from the root signifying “to be hot,” is used of the heat produced by wine (Hos. vii, 5), and the hot passion of anger (Deut. xxix, 27, etc.), as well as of the burning venom of poisonous serpents (Deut. xxix, 25, 29; Isa. lvi, 4; 44, 1), in all cases where this denotes animal poison, and not vegetable or mineral. The only allusion to its application is in Job vi, 4, where reference seems to be made to the custom of anointing arrows with the venom of a snake, a practice the origin of which is of very remote antiquity (comp. Homer, *Iliad* ix, 4).—Ovid, *Fast. iv, 386*, etc.—Pliny, xviii, 1). The Soanes, a Caucaian race mentioned by Strabo (xi, 499), were especially skilled in the art. Pliny (vi, 34) mentions a tribe of Arab pirates who infested the Red Sea, and were armed with poisons, which made the Malay of the coast of Borneo. For this purpose the berries of the yew-tree (Pliny, xvi, 20) were employed. The Gauls (Pliny, xxxvii, 76) used a poisonous herb, *lirium*, supposed by some to be the “leopard’s bane,” and the Scythians dipped their arrow-points in vipers’ venom mixed with human blood. These were so deadly that a slight scratch inflicted by them was fatal (Pliny, xii, 115). The practice was so common that the name *rokoos*, originally a poison in which arrows were dipped, was applied to poison generally. See *Aeneas*. In Palestine and the countries adjacent were many venomous snakes as well as insects, such as the scorpion and the scolopendra; but no such practice obtained among the Jews. Poisonous plants were as well known as in other countries, and we have an instance of a miracle wrought by Elisha (2 Kings iv, 38), to prevent mischief by the accidental shedding of oil into a mortar, so prepared for the sons of the prophets. This fruit or vegetable was probably the colocynth; and when those who were about to partake of it were repelled by its nauseous bitterness, the prophet commanded a handful of meal to be thrown into the pot, and thus rendered its contents fit for human food. See *Garum*.

2. **ποιος** (once *ποίος*, Deut. xxxii, 32, roō, if a poison at all, denotes a vegetable poison primarily, and is only twice (Deut. xxxii, 33; Job xx, 16) used of the venom of a serpent. In other passages where it occurs it is translated “gall” in the A.V., except in Hos. x, 4, where it is rendered “hemlock.” In the margin of the A.V. Deut. xxxii, 33, 34 is inserted, “the most subtle and most insidious word in the language.” The use of hemlock in the sense of the word, gave as an alternative “roak, or a poisonous herb.” Beyond the fact that, whether poisonous or not, it was a plant of bitter taste, nothing can be inferred. That bitterness was its prevailing characteristic is evident from its being associated with wormwood (Deut. xxxii, 18 [17]; Num. iii, 10; Amos vi, 13), and from the allusions to “water of roak” in Jer. viii, 14, 15; xxiii, 15. It was not a juice or liquid (Ps. lxix, 21 [22]; comp. Mark xvi, 23), but probably a bitter berry, in which case the expression in Deut. xxxii, 32, “grapes of roak,” may be taken literally. It grew in the fields (Hos. x, 4), was bitter to the taste (Jer. xxiii, 15; Ps. lix, 22; comp. Lam. iii, 5), and bore clusters, perhaps something like the *belladonna* (Deut. xxxii, 32. Yet here the words *ποιος* might also be rendered poisoned grapes, carrying out the figure of the vine, without special allusion to the poison plant). Any special rendering which would suit all the passages is uncertain, since all the old translators have used general expressions (Sept. χαλλ., Vulg. *ācul.,* or else some word like *aquam*), and the words are not necessarily meant to define the poison. The colchicum is *άρώσις*, Vent. *MS. ṛāṣāṅkłośā*, and there is no kindred word found in the other dialects to compare. Oed. (iv, 83 sq.) referred the word to the poisonous colchicum (*Cucumis colchicu*, Linn.), which grows almost everywhere in Arabia and Palestine; a plant with a creeping stem, bright green leaves, and bears a fruit with a strangely bitter juice (Fabri *Exogast.,* ii, 417 sq.). But this fruit is not a berry, but an apple, of the size of a closed hand; nor does the colchicum shoot up among the grain. Michaelis (Rysoms, *et c.* p. 14) would understand the word to mean the *hysaeryuma* or the *darmen* (cf. *Neh. xii., 22*). But this means something quite different from the ordinary. It is therefore the unknown, and perhaps something like the *poopy* in which the heads in which its seeds are contained, and from which the Orientals have extracted the opium (cf. Ps. cxxxix, 19), the word being applied to the fruit or to the pulp or the stem. This opium is said by the ancients to be poisonous, when taken in excess (Pliny, xx, 76). But it may be doubted whether the poppy could be so directly and pre-eminently styled the poison plant (it was even placed on the table as a side-dish, Pliny, xix, 53), and if roak had denoted a plant so well known, surely one of the old interpreters would have discovered it. “Water of roak” would thus be simply “opium”; but it must be admitted that there appears in none of the above passages to be any allusion to the characteristic effects of opium. The effects of the roak are simply nausea and loathing. It was probably a general term for any bitter or nauseous plant, whether poisonous or not, and became afterwards applied to the venom of snakes, as the corresponding word in Chaldee is frequently so used. See *Hemlock*. 3. **ποιος** is strictly speaking, something emitted, something vomited; hence the venom of a serpent (James iii, 8; Rom. iii, 13). See *Serpent*. 4. *Φωμαχον*, prop. medicin., hence often a deadly poison. There is a clear case of suicide by poison related in 2 Macc. x, 13, where the Macchanes Philonos is said to have destroyed himself by this means. But we do not find a trace of it among the Jews, and certainly poison-
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ing in any form was not in favor with them. Nor is there any reference to it in the N.T., though the prac-
tice was finally common at that time in Rome (Sueton.,
Nem., 33, 34, 35; Tobb. 73; Claud. 1). It has been sug-
gested, indeed, that the 

gypania

of Gal. v, 20 (A.V. 
"witchcraft") looked very favorably upon the idea of a set-

ment consistent with the usage of the word in the

Sept. (comp. Exod. vii, 11; viii, 7, 8, etc.) and with its

currence in Rev. x, 21, where it denotes a crime

distantly distinguished from murder (see Rev. xxii, 18;

xii, 17). It more probably refers to the conception of

mariage amongst the Huguenots.

The reference in Mark xvi, 18 seems to be to the

custom of condemnation to death by means of

poison

(serpent, Plato, Lys. 219; Plutarch, Phoc. c. 36; Diog.

Lecrt. ii, 42; Aet. V. ii, 1, 16; ix, 21; comp. J. Jac. Bose,

De cosmographia mortis praet. Lips. 1786). We read in 2

Macc. x. 13 of an example of suicide by poison (comp.

Bose, Hist. p. 25 sq.).

The administration of poisons seems to have been

no unusual crime in the days of the

(see Winer, Ad Galat. p. 120; comp. Philo, Op. ii.

215 sq.), and the Arabian women were especially

noted for their skill in preparing them (Joseph, Ant.

xxi, 4, 1; comp. Rein, Rom. Criminalrecht, p. 427 sq.).

But in the New Testament the words 
gypania

and


gypania
do not refer to this, but to necromancy

(q.v.). On poisoned arrows, see Bow. Swords were

sometimes also dipped in poison (Curt. ix, 8, 20).

See Manual.

POISSY.

See POISSY.

POISSON, NICOLAS-JOSEPH, a French ecclesiastic,

tated as a writer of philosophy, was born in 1637 at

Paris. He entered the Congregation of the Oratory at

the age of twenty-three (1660), and undertook to

deprive the principles of Descartes by writing a general

criticism on all the works of that philosopher. But after

publishing the Traité de la Mécanique amoulo

(Pet. 1669, 4to), and Remarques sur la Méthode

(Ven-

dôme, 1671, 4to), he gave up the project for fear of

compromising his congregation, whom their zeal for the

new philosophy exposed to the resentment of the fol-
ners of Aristotle. The same fear prevented him from

complying with the solicitations of Clerisler and of

the queen Christina, who promised him ample materials

for a Life of Descartes. In 1677 he went to Rome, and

entered secretly to pope Innocent XI, in the name of

the queen of Peru and Saint-Pons, composed by

Nicolos, and thus obtained the condemnation of

sixty-five propositions of lax morals which were then in

vogue in the schools of theology. The real object

of his journey being discovered, he was recalled by

order of Pope Lachaise (1679), and relegated to Nevers,

where bishop Valdier made him a vicar and gave him

the direction of the diocesan seminary. After the death

of this prelate, Poisson retired to a house of his order at

Lyons (1705). But he died, May 3, 1710. He pub-

lished, besides, Acta Ecclesiae Mediolanensis sub senatu

Cardo (Lyons, 1688-89, 2 vols. fol.), valuable for the

number of documents translated by the author from

Italian into Latin:—Delectus actorum Ecclesiae Univer-

sae (Ibid. 1706, 2 vols. fol.). This summary of the

church is the most extensive abridgment which we have

on the subject. He left a number of manuscripts about

them, Vie de Charlotte de Harley-Sancy:—La Descrip-

tion de Rome moderne:—A Relation of his journey to

Rome, etc. See Salmon, Traité de l'Étoile des Conclaves,
p.73 sq.: Morier, Grand Dict. Hist. s.v.—Hoefer, Nachr.

Bisp. Generale, s. v.

POISSY, CONFERENCE OF, an ecclesiastical colloquy

held September, 1681, of great importance in the

reformatory history of the French Church. It has

been somewhat spoken of in the article HUGUENOTS

(q.v.). It was called by Catharine de Melitii, and was

composed of all bishops and archbishops, and the

representatives of the absent prelates of France. It was

intended that the conference should prepare partly for

the anticipated renewal of the Tridéntiais (q.v.); and

partly as a sort of national council, to effect the refor-
mation of the French Church; and partly to help re-
duce the debt of the kingdom by the treasures of the

Church. But however friendly the prelates were to the

state, they did not go very far with the plan of refor-
m of the Church, though all classes of society were then anxiously

discussing not only reform of abuses but of doctrine.

Reformed preachers were invited to participate, and

even Catharine wrote in favor of the project of keeping

the Huguenots within the pale of the Church, and to fa-

cilitate a reconciliation by tolerating a difference of sen-
tment. Pius IV, then the Roman pontiff, objected to the

conference, on the ground that "if every prince were to

take upon himself to bold councils in his own domin-

ions, the Church would soon become a scene of universal

confusion." (Pna Plao, Hist. del Concilio de Trento, liv. v,

§ 58, 72.)

The colloquy was opened Sept. 9, in presence of the

young king, the queen-mother, the princes of the blood,

the great officers of the crown, and a brilliant audience.

Cardinal de Bourg was presiding. The Reformers were

represented by twelve of their most eminent ministers,

headed by Theodore Beza, the favorite disciple and

confidential friend of Calvin. Peter Martyr, who was reck-

oned the ablest theologian of the party, was likewise

present. The proceedings were opened with a speech

by chancellor Lhermitte, in favor of this great coun-

cil, and its advantages over an ecumenical synod. Beza

spoke next in elaborate exposition of the doctrinal sys-
tem of the Reformers as set forth in the "Institutions"

of Calvin. Beza's tone was calm, conciliatory, and

impressive. In treating of the Eucharist, he employed

language which at first seemed almost tantamount to

the Catholic terminology on that vital point. But on

further explanation it appeared that the presence which

he recognised was subjective only; depending not on the

sacrament of the wine of that party, but on the power of

faith; to be sought not in any external substance, but in

the heart of the devout communicant. Beza repudiated both transubstan-

tization (q. v.) and consubstantiation (q. v.).

Cardinal de Bourg objected to Beza's speech, and in a

trembling voice prayed for its interruption on the ground

that the young monarch's mind would be poisoned. Beza,

however, managed to conclude, when, after a few

hasty words of rude remonstrance from the cardinal,

the assembly separated in a state of agitation (De Thos,

Hist. Univ. liv. xxvii: La Place, Commentaire de l'État

de Religion, liv. vi). At the second meeting, several days afterwards,

the cardinal of Lorraine replied to Beza in a very able dis-

course. The doctrine of the real presence, as held in the

Church of Rome, he proceeded to establish by proofs

drawn with great skill from the Holy Bible and the

Church fathers. (The speech is given at full length in

the Collection des Procès-verbaux des Assemblées géné-

rales du Clerc de France, vol. i, "Pièces justification-

s," No. 2.) The sitting was then adjourned. The

sessions which followed did not hold in the royal presence,

and were comparatively private. Though it was

clear that there could be no successful settlement by the

conference, it was resolved by all parties to make a final

effort for approximation, and for this purpose a select

committee of ten persons was named from among the

moderate members of each party. After several days of

negotiation, these divines drew up a formulary upon

the doctrine of the Eucharist, in the terms of which it

was hoped that all sincere friends of peace in the moral

communions might be induced to concur. Its language

was so general, and so purely negative in its tone,

that it was at first difficult to construe it in accordance

with their own propositions. The following was the draft agreed upon:

"We confess that Jesus Christ, in his Holy Supper,

presents, gives, and exhibits to us the true substance of his

body and blood by the operation of his Holy Spirit and

that we receive and eat sacramentally, spiritually,
and by faith the very body which died for us, that we may be bone of his bone and flesh of his flesh; and inasmuch as faith, resting on the Word of God, makes perfect, which is promised, so that thereby we receive actually the true and natural body and blood of our Lord by the power of the Holy Ghost, in that sense we acknowledge the real presence of Christ in the Holy Supper” (Beza, Hist. des Eglises Ref., 1668; Contin. de Flandres, liv. xlvii, 24). Of course such evasion could not prove satisfactory. The doctors of the Sorbonne being appealed to, rejected the formulary as “capacious, insufficient, and heretical;” and then the prelates put forth a counter-statement, asserting the real presence by transubstantiation of the elements, according to the ancient and undoubted traditions of the Church. This they forwarded to the queen, with a request that Beza and his associates might be ordered to signify their acceptance of it without further demur, under pain of being proscribed as heretics and banished from the kingdom.

This peremptory demand was equivalent to a rupture of the negotiations; and the conference of Poissy terminated without satisfactory result.

The actions of the conference were therefore of very little advantage. Several regulations relating to discipline were issued. Concerning the election of bishops, it was ordered that the names of persons nominated by the king to a bishopric should be posted at the cathedral doors, and in other public places, that all persons may have the opportunity of objecting to him if they know anything against him. The following is a summary of the important actions of the synod:

Archbishops and bishops are forbidden to absent themselves from their dioceses for more than three months; are exhorted to apply themselves to preaching and visiting the sick; and to hold annual synods.

Archbishops are directed to summon provincial councils every three years, according to the decrees of the Council of Basle. Excommunications, save for weighty reasons, are forbidden. Curates not to be admitted to the spiritual charges have until they have been examined by the bishop: they are ordered to proceed to priests’ orders within a year from their admission; to reside constantly; to explain the Gospel to their people, and to teach them to pray. Private masses are forbidden to be said while solemn mass is celebrated.

Priests are enjoined to prepare themselves carefully before approaching the holy altar; to pronounce the words distinctly; to do all with decency and gravity; not to suffer any airs, save those of hymns and canticles, to be played upon the organ; to correct the church books; to try to abolish all superfluous practices; to instruct the people that images are exposed to view in the churches for the purpose of reminding them of Jesus Christ and the salut. It is further directed that all images which are in any way indelicate, or which merely illustrate frivolous and ridiculous tales, shall be entirely removed.

These regulations are closed by a profession of faith, in which both Luther and Calvin, and other sects, are specially rejected.

See, besides the authorities already cited, De Felice, History of French Protestantism, p. 101 sq.; Bossuet, Vitae, vol. i; Jervis, Church of France, i, 157-116; Soldan, Gesch. des Protestantismus in Frankreich (1855), etc., vol. i; Ranke, Französische Gesch. i, 236 sq.; Baum, Theodor Beza (1851), vol. ii; Smedley, History of the Ref.; Religion in France, i, 148 sq.; 178; Smiles, History of the Huguenots (see Index); Huntwick, History of the Reformation, p. 136 sq. (J. H. W.)

Pottier, Pierre-Louis, a French religious writer, was born in 1743 at Havre. As soon as he had taken holy orders, he was appointed superior of the seminary of Rouen, by cardinal La Rochefoucauld, archbishop of that city. After submitting to the law which exacted the constitutional oath of clergymen, he recalled it, and retired to the seminary of St. Firmin, at Paris. There, he was afterwards, Sept. 2, 1792, with almost all his companions. He left some works of edification, which had several editions.—Hoefey, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xli, 582.

Pottiers (earlier Pottieres), a corruption of the Latin Pictorium, so called by the Gallic tribe, the Picti, (who inhabited the district in Caesar’s time) is one of the oldest towns in France. It is the capital of the department of Vienne, and is situated on an eminence near the river Charente. Its population is now about 31,034, and it possesses many churches, chapels, and monasteries. Its cathedral, named St. Pierre, is one of the finest in France, and belongs to the 12th century. It contains the ashes of Richard Cœur de Lion, and of Isabella of Aragon, in its present condition, or in the older edifice that occupied its site, of twenty-three ecclesiastical councils.

Potiers, Councils of (Concilium Pictorium), were convened here at different times in the Middle Ages.

1. The first of these was held in 583, and was provoked by a rebellion of monks, under the leadership of Chroidelela, a Frankish princess and nun at Poitiers, who had rebelled against Leobouva, abbess of St. Croix. She was here called to account for leaving her nunnery, and for the violence which she had committed against Godegeist and other bishops; also for the acts of rebellion which she, in concert with Besina, another nun, had committed against their abbess. Being exhorted to ask forgiveness of the abbess, she boldly refused, and threatened to kill her. The bishops, after consulting the council, declared her to be excommunicated, and ordered that she should remain until she should have done penance. They then re-established the abbess, Leobouva, in the government of the monastery. See Labbé, Concil. v, 1593; Gregor, Turon. Hist. d. France, ix, 4; x, 16, 19; Mansi, Concil. i, 1011; x, 455, 456; Hartlib, Concil. iii, 490, 527, 581; Hefele, Concilienw. ii, 51.

2. Another council was held Jan. 13, 1004, convoked by William V, count of Poitiers and duke of Aquitaine. Five bishops were present, who published three canons:

1. Pronounces those persons to be under anathema who pillage the churches, rob the poor, or strike the clergy; and further declares that if they rebel against this sentence the bishops and barons shall assemble and march against them, ravaging all around them until they submit.

The other two canons forbid bishops to take any fees for penance and confirmation; and priests and deacons to retain women in their houses.

See Labbé, Concil. i, 780.

3. The third council was held in 1078, before cardinal Gerard, the Roman legate, against Berenger. The question of the Holy Eucharist was discussed, and the minds of men were so exasperated against Berenger, that he narrowly escaped with his life. See Labbé, Concil. x, 346.

IV. The fourth was held in 1078, by the legate Hugo, bishop of Die, who, by the account which he gave of this council to pope Gregory VII, seems to have encountered the opposition of his plenary. It is supposed that the king of France had forbidden the count of Poitiers to allow the council to be held within his states: that the archbishop of Tours and the bishop of Rennes had rendered themselves almost complete masters of the council, and that the assembly had been disturbed by the armed followers of these prelates. Some attribute to this council, and others to the following one, ten canons, of which these are the most worthy of note:

1. Forbids to receive investitures at the hands of kings and other princes, even in cases of appeals to the Holy See.

2. Forbids simony and pluralities.

3. Forbids bishops to receive any present for consecrating churches, or for giving any benediction.

4. Forbids monks and canons to purchase churches without the assent of the council.

5. Forbids the ordinance of the children of priests, and of bastard, except they be canons or regular monks.

6. Excommunicates clerics who carry arms, or who deal in arms, shall be excommunicated.

See Labbé, Concil. x, 566.

V. The last council convened at Poitiers was held Nov. 11, 1331. In the order of John and Benedict, the two legates of the holy see, who presided in the place of Pascal II. About eighty bishops and abbots were present.

Noricuscius, bishop of Autun, having been found
guilty of simony, was condemned to give up his stole and pastoral ring. Upon his refusal to do so, he was further deposed from his bishopric and from the priesthood, and sentence of excommunication was denounced against him by the legates, as a member of the opposition of many of the bishops and of William, duke of Aquitaine. Lastly, sixteen canons were published:

1. Declares that it is lawful for bishops only to give the teneure (columbar benedictum) to the clergy, and for abbots to do so to monks.
2. Forbids them to require any fee for performing the operation, or even the expenses paid by the layman.
3. Reserves to the bishop the beneficence of the sacred vestments, and of all the vessels, etc., of the altar.
4. Forbids, under excommunication, to buy or sell pews, and to require any allowance (postas) for having given one.
5. Gives permission to regular canons to baptise, preach, administer the sacrament of penance, and bury the dead during their bishop's pleasure.
6. Forbids to allow to three priests who carry about the reliques of saints for the sake of gain.

The pope also nullified the act that the pope had enacted in the Council of Clermont.

See Labbé, Concil. x. 729; Hefele, Conciliengesch. vols. iv and v.

Poix, Louis, A French monastic, was born Oct. 18, 1714, at Croixraut (diocese of Amiens). He devoted himself to the study of the Greek, Hebrew, Chaldee, and Syriac languages, and conceived the design of a Polyglot Bible, to the redaction of which several of his confraterrity (the Capuchin monks) promised to lend a hand. In 1744 the abbot Villery, professor at the College of France, took the direction of this enterprise; but the Bible impatiently expected by the learned world, and in regard to which Benedict XIV addressed a brief of felicitation to Louis de Poix, April 3, 1756, was not published, owing to divers contrarieties which at that time befell the Capuchins. In 1754 Poix wrote a Memorium, in which he advocated the foundation of an institution, without which being a burden to the State, would be of invaluable service to the Church, useful to the learned and men of letters, and honorable to the nation. He proposed the name of "Société Asiatique." During the plan, suggested by him was founded, April 1, 1822, the "Société Asiatique." Louis de Poix died at Paris in 1782.

He published, with the collaboration of several other Capuchins, the following works: Prières que Nercess, Prémontré, donne à la Glive de Russie, pour toutes les âmes fidèles à Jésus-Christ (1770); Propriétés de l'Intelligence des Lières prophétiques (Paris, 1755-56, 16 vols. 12mo.), the fruit of twenty years' labor: Nouvelle Version des Psaumes (ibid. 1762, 2 vols. 12mo.): a Translation of Ecclesiastics (1771, 12mo.): Propriétés de l'Intelligence des Lières prophétiques (Paris, 1755-56, 16 vols. 12mo.); Traité de la Poësie (1764, 12mo.); Traité de la Poësie (1768, 12mo.). He left in manuscript a Dictionnaire Arménien, Latins, Italiens, et Français; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, ii. 585.

Polki, Jehuda, ben-Eliyahu, a Jewish writer of some note, who belonged to the sect of the Karaites, was born and educated at Constantinople in the first half of the 16th century. He made extensive travels through Palestine, Egypt, Iraq, and Persia, and became acquainted with the Karaites. But having no knowledge of the Arabic, he was unable to make use of a large portion of Karaitic literature, as he himself confessed in the preface of his work. In the year 1571 he was at Karah, where he resided, and in the house of the Nasî or head of the Karaites, where he also resided, and was told that all congregations were in possession of such collections, which, however, were very often burned or plundered. He was told that the year before (1570) three hundred very valuable and interesting works of the Karaites had been taken from the synagogue at Karah and burned in the bazaar. Polki finished his work "Hillel we-Yishmael," about 1573, and died in 1575 in his native place. The above-named work, which was published by his son and brother at Constantinople in 1581, treats in a very elaborate way on the laws of incest, the preface of which has been reprinted by Wolf in his Bibl. Hebr. iii. 292 sq. See first, Gesch. des Karaitischen Fusses, 9 sq. (Berlin, 1865), ii. 322 sq. id. Bibl. Jud. ii. 108 sq.; De Rosati, Dizionario storico degli Autori Ebrei, p. 266 (German transl. by Hamberger); Wolf, Bibl. Hebr. iii. 292 sq. (B. P.)

Pol. See Baan.

Polak, Jacob, a Jewish savant, one of the greatest Talmudic authorities in his time, was born about 1460, and died about 1500 at Prague, where under his lead a great Talmudic school had flourished. Polak was a pupil of Jacob Marpola of Nuremberg, from whom he learned a new method of Talmudic casuistry, known as the "Pilpul," in which the time which was disastrous and troublesome to the Jews the study of the Talmud was left to itself, and, guided by no general scientific knowledge, it unavoidably degenerated into a method repulsive to the few who were really profound scholars, or whose minds were less distorted. The transition from the short exposition of words and things which were the timbrel which was to serve the Jews in the study of the Talmud was left to itself, and, guided by no general scientific knowledge, it unavoidably degenerated into a method repulsive to the few who were really profound scholars, or whose minds were less distorted. The transition from the short explanation of words and things which were the timbrel which was to serve the Jews in the study of the Talmud was left to itself, and, guided by no general scientific knowledge, it unavoidably degenerated into a method repulsive to the few who were really profound scholars, or whose minds were less distorted. The transition from the short explanation of words and things which were the timbrel which was to serve the Jews in the study of the Talmud was left to itself, and, guided by no general scientific knowledge, it unavoidably degenerated into a method repulsive to the few who were really profound scholars, or whose minds were less distorted. The transition from the short explanation of words and things which were the timbrel which was to serve the Jews in the study of the Talmud was left to itself, and, guided by no general scientific knowledge, it unavoidably degenerated into a method repulsive to the few who were really profound scholars, or whose minds were less distorted. The transition from the short explanation of words and things which were the timbrel which was to serve the Jews in the study of the Talmud was left to itself, and, guided by no general scientific knowledge, it unavoidably degenerated into a method repulsive to the few who were really profound scholars, or whose minds were less distorted. The transition from the short explanation of words and things which were the timbrel which was to serve the Jews in the study of the Talmud was left to itself, and, guided by no general scientific knowledge, it unavoidably degenerated into a method repulsive to the few who were really profound scholars, or whose minds were less distorted. The transition from the short explanation of words and things which were the timbrel which was to serve the Jews in the study of the Talmud was left to itself, and, guided by no general scientific knowledge, it unfavorably degenerated into a method repulsive to the few who were really profound scholars, or whose minds were less distorted. The transition from the short explanation of words and things which were the timbrel which was to serve the Jews in the study of the Talmud was left to itself, and, guided by no general scientific knowledge, it unfavorably degenerated into a method repulsive to the few who were really profound scholars, or whose minds were less distorted. The transition from the short explanation of words and things which were the timbrel which was to serve the Jews in the study of the Talmud was left to itself, and, guided by no general scientific knowledge, it unfavorably degenerated into a method repulsive to the few who were really profound scholars, or whose minds were less distorted. The transition from the short explanation of words and things which were the timbrel which was to serve the Jews in the study of the Talmud was left to itself, and, guided by no general scientific knowledge, it unfavorably degenerated into a method repulsive to the few who were really profound scholars, or whose minds were less distorted. The transition from the short explanation of words and things which were the timbrel which was to serve the Jews in the study of the Talmud was left to itself, and, guided by no general scientific knowledge, it unfavorably degenerated into a method repulsive to the few who were really profound scholars, or whose minds were less distorted. The transition from the short explanation of words and things which were the timbrel which was to serve the Jews in the study of the Talmud was left to itself, and, guided by no general scientific knowledge, it unfavorably degenerated into a method repulsive to the few who were really profound scholars, or whose minds were less distorted. The transition from the short explanation of words and things which were the timbrel which was to serve the Jews in the study of the Talmud was left to itself, and, guided by no general scientific knowledge, it unfavorably degenerated into a method repulsive to the few who were really profound scholars, or whose minds were less distorted. The transition from the short explanation of words and things which were the timbrel which was to serve the Jews in the study of the Talmud was left to itself, and, guided by no general scientific knowledge, it unfavorably degenerated into a method repulsive to the few who were really profound scholars, or whose minds were less distorted. The transition from the short explanation of words and things which were the timbrel which was to serve the Jews in the study of the Talmud was left to itself, and, guided by no general scientific knowledge, it unfavorably degenerated into a method repulsive to the few who were really profound scholars, or whose minds were less distorted.

Polallion, Marie de L'amage, Dame de, a French lady renowned for her piety, and the founder of a religious order, was born Nov. 29, 1599, at Paris. Belonging to a noble and rich family, and having enjoyed a brilliant education, she was wooed by several gentlemen of high standing, but remaining a virgin up to the close of her earthly existence, gave the preference to a life of monastic quiet. At the instigation of Lebrun, a Dominican who directed
her conscience, she entered a monastery of the Capuchins. But as the weakness of her health did not suffer her to submit to the austere rules of the order, she was free to leave the monastery, and in 1617 she was married to François de Polallion. Her husband died about a year after, and from this time she lived in retirement as tutor of one of the daughters of the duchess of Orleans. Madame de Polallion, in the midst of the most brilliant court of Europe, remained true to her early monastic habits, and when relieved of her duties sought again her former retreat. According to St. Vincent de Paul, she founded the "Institut des Filles de la Providence" in 1609: the members of this sisterhood undertook to educate the children of the poor in the country. She directly that they should be thirty-three in number, and distributed them in the villages of the environs of Paris. Her own means were soon exhausted by the enterprise, but private charity came to the rescue, and Anne of Austria, taking the institution under her protection, presented it in 1651 with a mansion in the suburb of Saint-Marceau. She also helped in the founding of the "Maison des Nouvelles Catholiques," which was liberally endowed by marshal Turenne. The life of Madame de Polallion has frequently been written. She died Dec. 4, 1657.—Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xli, 587.

Polanco is the name of three brothers, esteemed Spanish painters of the 16th century, natives of Seville. Francisco Zurbaran was their master, and they were so proficient in art that even in their own time their works were confounded with those of their master. This mistake, says Quillet, has been quite frequent with those who beheld the paintings of San-Esteban at Seville, where Zurbaran painted St. Peter and St. Stephen, but where the Martyrdom of the patron, the Nativity, which is below, St. Hermengild, and St. Hernan, are works of Polanco. They always worked and lived together. Their great paintings adorn the monuments of Seville. At San-Paolo we find the Apparition of the Angels to Abraham; Tobias the Younger guided by an Angel; Jacob Wrestling; Joseph's Dreams; and in the church of the Guardian Angels, St. Theresa in Ecstasy (1649). The last work of Carlo Polanco, who seems to have been the most celebrated of the brothers, bears the date of 1696.—Hoefer, Nouvelles Biographies Générale, xli, 588.

Poland. Ecclesiastical History of. The Polish historians Narusewicz, Friese, Lelewel, and others assert that Christianity was introduced into the Slavic countries at a very early period by some disciples of St. Peter. In Moravia, Lelewel, in his very accurate researches, admits a bishopric of Posen anterior to the time of king Mieszko I. According to Thietmar of Merseburg, the latter, under the influence of his wife Dambrowska, daughter of the Bohemian duke Boleslas, established the Christian religion in Poland in 965, prevailed upon his subjects to destroy the idols, and founded as early as 966, with the assistance of the German emperor Otto the Great, the bishopric of Posen (Posnani), over which, together with the bishoprics of Czestochova, Miastom, Merseburg, Brandenburg, and Havelberg, etc., the jurisdiction was given to the archbishop of Magdeburg, at the Council of Ravneta, in 967. It follows that the year of foundation, 968, given by Boguchalski and the Annales Posnani, has been accepted erroneously. The diocese of the bishop of Posen extended over the dominions of duke Boleslas, the boundaries of which cannot be ascertained for want of documents. Posen was the only Polish bishopric up to the year 1000, when the emperor Otto III, at the time of a pilgrimage to the tomb of St. Adalbert at Gnesen, founded the archiepiscopate of Gnesen (Gdansk), and ordered to it the bishoprics of Kolobrzeg (Kolberg), Czwartan, and Breslau, all then situated in the duchy of Poland. Stanislas Lubianski's assertion that Crakow was the seat of the oldest Polish bishopric is thus proved to be erroneous, as it could not, as an archbishopric, have been a dependence of Gnesen.

Earliest Years.—The history of the ecclesiastical development of Poland in its first Christian century. Pope Gregory VII complained in 1075 of the small number of the bishops in proportion to the population; the dioceses were too large, and the bishops had not enough time to visit their districts. All this was decided about the limits of the diocese of Gnesen and its dependent bishoprics, among which was then counted the bishopric of Liboss, founded by Miechow in 966; but as the city passed continually from Poland to Germany, and vice versa, its existence was a precarious one. It was lost in 1028, and in 1123, it was found that it had been founded a second time in 1123, and subordinated it to Gnesen; documents relating to it date only from 1133. Another episcopal see dependent upon Gnesen was the bishopric of Plock, whose foundation is referred to Boleslas the Great. It was formerly called Ep. Mazoviorum. Gallus (Chron. Pol. ad ann. 1110) mentions a bishop Simeon: he seems to have been ordained in 1107, and to have died in 1129. A great victory of the Poles over the Prussians and Pomeranians is attributed to his intercession. And still another dependent episcopate was that of Leszno, which was founded by Mieszko II (1025-34), on the banks of the Sila, by Boleslas II, son of Boleslas the Great, and originally called Episcopatus Civitatis, because it was intended for the province of Cujavia; extended afterwards over the largest part of Western Prussia, on the left bank of the Vistula; reached from Gnesen to the Vistula; and was bounded west by the archbishopric of Gnesen, which it also incircled on the south. Gallus (Chron. Polonicus) mentions bishop Paulus, who died in 1110. The bishopric of Ermeland, founded in 1243, came to Poland only in 1466. After the reign of Miezko II (1025-34), general anarchy ensued, and at the same time a general apostacy from the Christian faith. Bishops and priests were without authority, some were killed, and external and civil wars robbed Poland of its wealth, and of a considerable part of its population. In 1089 the Bohemian destroyed Posen and Gnesen, and took away the body of St. Adalbert. A multitude of Poles crossed the Vistula and took refuge in Masovia; wild beasts established their lairs in the churches of St. Adalbert and St. Peter. Kazimierz (Casimir) in that great distress arrived with a body of five hundred soldiers from Germany, and by his bravery and intelligence freed the country from foreign occupation. He retained the power until his death, which occurred in 1058. He promoted the interests of Christianity by all the means in his power. He was succeeded by his son, Boleslas II, whose reign was inferior to his army une: he raised his ambition and pride caused his ruin. At Christmas, 1076, he put the diadem on his head, and was anointed by the bishops of the kingdom. About the same time Gregory VII sent a legate to Poland. A few years afterwards, in 1079, the king, being put under interdict by St. Stanislas, bishop of Cracow, avenged himself by the murder of the prelate. Heretupon the nobility expelled him, and he was obliged to take refuge in Hungary, where he died. He was succeeded by his younger brother, Boleslas Wladislas Hermann, who lived in peace with his neighbors and the clergy, to whom he granted rights and privileges. Having lived many years in childless matrimony with the Bohemian princess Judith, a son was granted him, in consequence of the intercession, it was believed, of St. Agnus. This son was afterwards Boleslas, called Boleslas the Great. At the time Otto, afterwards the apostle of Pomerania, lived at the Polish court. He was instrumental in bringing about Wladislas Herrmann's second marriage with Judith, the widowed sister of the emperor Henry IV. In 1099 the Polish archbishop Czeslaw (Kazimierz) and bishops were exiled, and Boleslas, with permission of the king, dieted his states during his lifetime between Boleslas and Boleslas Wladislas Hermann, who lived in peace with his neighbors and the clergy, to whom he granted rights and privileges. Having lived many years in childless matrimony with the Bohemian princess Judith, a son was granted him, in consequence of the intercession, it was believed, of St. Agnus. This son was afterwards Boleslas, called Boleslas the Great. At the time Otto, afterwards the apostle of Pomerania, lived at the Polish court. He was instrumental in bringing about Wladislas Herrmann's second marriage with Judith, the widowed sister of the emperor Henry IV. In 1099 the Polish archbishop Czeslaw (Kazimierz) and bishops were exiled, and Boleslas, with permission of the king,
and another illegitimate son, Zbiigniew. The latter had lived a few years before, and was pardoned at the intercession of the bishops. Wladislaus died in 1192, at Panshel, the Pope calling the son of the heir, Mieszko III, the future Boleslas II. He married a Russian princess, and undertook expeditions, considered in the light of crusades, against the pagan Pomeranians. In 1103 Walo, chosen bishop of Beuvaus, and, after his return, bishop of Paris, came to Poland as the legate of pope Paschal II, and in his zeal for justice deposed two bishops—"nullo vel precce vel pretio subvenientes." In 1109 Boleslas reported such a complete victory over the Pomeranians that, of their 40,000 warriors, 10,000 only escaped; he took the stronghold of Nakel, thus preparing the way for the spiritual expedition under the imperial banner; and in the last years of the great king were less successful. In 1135 Boleslas recognised at Merseburg the emperor Lothair as his liege lord for Pomerania and Rügen; promised a tribute for twelve years, and carried the sword of the emperor to the imperial cathedral church. In 1139 he divided his dominions among the four oldest of his sons, and died Oct. 28, 1139. In 1128 the papal legate Egidius, bishop of Tuscenum, sent by Calixtus II, had to establish more distinctly the limits between the dioceses, and this division greatly increased the temporal sovereignty in nowise affected the Church. But the Church was far from enjoying in Poland the privileges she possessed in other parts of Christian Europe. Her goods and subjects stood under the secular laws; there was no immunity from taxes, and the bishops were altogether dependent on the princes. Still at the beginning of the 13th century the princes disposed of the prebends of the cathedrals, and took hold of the goods of the bishops at their demise, as the patrons did of the heritage of curates. A number of priests lived in concubines. There were considerable charges at the elections of bishops, which had become, in some sense, the possession of certain families. The disensions of the successors of Boleslas, as was to be expected, dismembered the empire after a century of bloodshed. Prussians, Lithuanians, Mongols, and other tribes devastated the country. The authority of the Church, already undermined by the papacy, appeared more frequently, synods became more frequent too, and altogether the Church sought for herself the rights she had long attained elsewhere. The Templars, assisted by Crusaders from the West, attacked the pa
gans of the country, and the Latin Church, as it were, the Western Christians to arms against the barbarians. In 1157 the emperor Frederick I indicted a crusade of the Germans against Poland, to re-establish the tie of vassalage that once united the land with Germany. The Poles were defeated, and Boleslas appeared at Krynówko before the emperor barefooted, and with a naked sword tied around his neck. Wladislaus died in Germany, and was succeeded by Boleslas IV, who died in 1173, leaving an only son, Leszek; but it was his brother Mieszko who succeeded him. The people, led by the bishop of Kraków, invoked against Mieszko, and his younger brother, Casimir Sprawiedliwy (the Just), was put in his place. In 1180 there was a synod of Polish bishops. They threatened with indiget whoever should rob the peasants of their stores, appropriate the heritage of an ecclesiastic, or refuse to marry within a certain wherewithal. Church property had been taken. At Cracow, who died May 4, 1194, at table, while talking with the bishops about salvation—"non sine venenii suspicioe." Fulko assembled the prelates, and prevailed upon them to recognise the sons of Casimir. Helena, Casimir's widow, made arrangements with the Poles; the minor sons, recognised him as archduke, and left him Cracow: her son Leszek was to be his successor. This Mieszko II, who died 1202 at Kalisch, and Leszek waived in favor of his son Wladislaus his own rights to Cracow. In these years the endeavors of the popes for the reformation of the Polish Church were crowned with some success. Clement III sent in 1189 cardinal Giovanni Malabranca to collect contributions for a crusade, and reform the clergy of Poland; several regulations for that purpose were agreed upon at the Synod of Cracow. Cardinal Peter canet came there in 1192; but it was not until 1197, when the Pope and the King were in Prague, that the edict against the matrimony of clergy was confirmed, the wrath of the clergy so great that his life was put in danger. He held another synod at Cracow, where he insisted on the same views; journeyed through the bishoprics, giving his attention to a dereliction of moral morals more deplorable than the marriage of ecclesiastics, and traditional with the Poles: for he besought the laymen to seek some consecration for their wild copulations. He made slow work of it, and it required all the energies of archbishop Henry Kemelius to establish, little by little, a more Christian spirit in the Polish clergy. A last cardinal, Peter, bishop of Poznan, was freely elected by the chapter of Posen. The dukes at that time promised to touch nothing of the heritage of prelates save gold, silver, etc., and waived their judicary rights on clergymen and their subjects. In 1231 Wladislaus, the Good, became the only Elector of Great Poland. At this epoch some crusades against the Prussians took place, and the Poles, though slowly and reluctantly, had a part in them. We find the same bishoprics in the 13th and 14th centuries, but not in those dim metaphors by which the interest of the Church required (see Gregory VII, Epist. ad Bo
delaum, Pol. regem, lxxiii)). The first bishop of Posen, Jordan, and the duke Boleslas Chrobry distinguished themselves by their successful attempts to expand the Christian faith; Bodzants, archbishop of Gnesen, in the 14th century, by the conversion of the barbarians of Lithuania and Samogitia. This prelate extended his diocese, augmented by a half, over Pomerollia and Neringa, and added Silesia to his spiritual dominions: in one word, the country between the Netze River, the Vistula, the sources of the Vistula, the Koire, the Samb, and the Golen, constituted the territory of his arch
episcopal see. In consequence of these aggressions the new bishoprics of Wilna, in the grand-duchy of Lithuania, and of Wornie and Mienikli, in the duchy of Samogitia, were established—the first in 1187, the latter in 1417. The Reformation Period and Since.—In order to make clear the history of the Polish Church in the Reformation period, it is necessary to retrace our steps to the 11th century. It was then that the neighboring churches of Germany acquired a great influence over the Poles, while morals more deplorable than the marriage of ecclesiastics, and traditional with the Poles: for he besought the laymen to seek some consecration for their wild copulations. He made slow work of it, and it required all the energies of archbishop Henry Kemelius to establish, little by little, a more Christian spirit in the Polish clergy. A last cardinal, Peter, bishop of Poznan, was freely elected by the chapter of Posen. The dukes at that time promised to touch nothing of the heritage of prelates save gold, silver, etc., and waived their judicary rights on clergymen and their subjects. In 1231 Wladislaus, the Good, became the only Elector of Great Poland. At this epoch some crusades against the Prussians took place, and the Poles, though slowly and reluctantly, had a part in them. We find the same bishoprics in the 13th and 14th centuries, but not in those dim metaphors by which the interest of the Church required (see Gregory VII, Epist. ad Bo
delaum, Pol. regem, lxxiii)). The first bishop of Posen, Jordan, and the duke Boleslas Chrobry distinguished themselves by their successful attempts to expand the Christian faith; Bodzants, archbishop of Gnesen, in the 14th century, by the conversion of the barbarians of Lithuania and Samogitia. This prelate extended his diocese, augmented by a half, over Pomerollia and Neringa, and added Silesia to his spiritual dominions: in one word, the country between the Netze River, the Vistula, the sources of the Vistula, the Koire, the Samb, and the Golen, constituted the territory of his arch
episcopal see. In consequence of these aggressions the new bishoprics of Wilna, in the grand-duchy of Lithuania, and of Wornie and Mienikli, in the duchy of Samogitia, were established—the first in 1187, the latter in 1417. The Reformation Period and Since.—In order to make clear the history of the Polish Church in the Reformation period, it is necessary to retrace our steps to the 11th century. It was then that the neighboring churches of Germany acquired a great influence over the Poles, while particularly from Germany, to Poland, built everywhere convents and churches, and at the same time used the Romish ritual in opposition to the simple worship of the Polish national churches, which, however, maintained their ground till the 14th century. The Hussites (q. v.) from Bohemia found a favorable field in Poland for the propagation of their peculiar tenets, and the Romish clergy in consequence took active measures for the purpose of checking the spread of the obnoxious doctrines. With this view the parish priests were ordered to seize and bring before the bishops all who were suspected of holding Hussite sentiments. Severe enactments were passed for the punishment of the heretics. But in the face of all opposition the new doctrines were embraced by some of the nobler families in the land, and the refuting party indeed was very numerous when their leader was slain on the field of battle. But although the doctrines of Huss
had found many supporters in Poland, the national feeling was still in favor of the dominant Church. We appeal to the account of the progress of Protestantism in Poland dependent largely on Gardiner, "Dictionary of Religion," p. 670 sq.

"In the commencement of the 15th century a powerful impulse was given to the cause of Polish education and literature by the establishment of the University of Cracow, and the encouragement given in that seminary to national literature. Nevertheless, the doctrines of Protestantism spread in all the other parts of his dominions without persecuting those who embraced the new faith. Indeed, even in Dunlop's account of the Reformation, in the course of a few years, began to be again preached openly. The walls were not sufficient to check its progress, so that in the subsequent reign it became the dominant creed of that city, without, however, losing up on the religious liberty of the Roman Catholics.

"The works of Luther found many readers, and even admirers among the nobility and gentry, composed of both clergy and laymen, met frequently to discuss re-ligious questions. The Universities of Cracow, Lemberg, and other places became centers of the Reformation, which the rise of the Reformation brought prominently before the public mind. It was in connection with this period of the history of Poland that the great Reformation of the nation began to be talked of, as a creed by several individuals, and the foundation laid in Poland for that sect whose members were afterwards known by the name of Socinians (q. v.). The spread of this heresy, however, was limited to the upper classes of society. During the middle ages, sectarians and heretics were not permitted to hold public recitations or meetings; and their number was small. The synagogues of the Reformers found ready acceptance; a result in no small degree owing to the arrival of Bohemian Brethren, to the number of about a thousand, who had been driven from their own country, and found a home in the province of Posen. This event happened in 1534, and the public worship of the Brethren being conducted in the Bohemian language, which was intelligible to the Polish people, at once gained many followers. The sympathies of multitudes. The Roman bishop of Posen, alarmed at the influence which the Brethren were exerting, and determined to procure such legislation as would maintain a royal edict for their expulsion from the country. This order they immediately obeyed, and proceeded to Roskow.1095 After the death of Frederick, in 1535, however, some of them returned to Poland, where they remained, and established themselves among the Polish nobility. They refused to follow the law which limited their labors without being molested in any form. Their congregations rapidly increased, and in a short time they reduced to virtual effect many of the principles of Great Poland alone, while many others were formed in different parts of the country.

"A dream of the Poles about this time which was providentially overruled for the still wider diffusion of Protestantism was established at the University of Cracow, having taken offence at some real or imagined affront offered them by the rector, repaired in person to the University, and obtained the resignation of the bishop of Cracow, by which the new majority of them returned home imbued with Protestant principles. The Reformed doctrine now made extraordinary progress, particularly in the province of Cracow. In vain did the Polish clergy denounce the growing heresy; all their remonstrances were unsatisfactory, and at length they convened a general synod in 1551 to consider the whole subject. On this occasion the solid body which had been the subject of all the diocesan orders, and had been presided over by the archbishop, was speedily separated, and the person of the bishop was transferred to the episcopalsee of Cracow, and the title of archbishop was made the exclusive right of the pope. This was the state of affairs in 1552 when the diet was convened; and scarcely had its deliberations been commenced, when a general hostility was excited by the members to the episcopal Inquisition. The result was that at this diet religious liberty for all confessions was virtually established in Poland. At the diet of 1596 the king was earnestly urged to cooperate the national synod with the help of the pope, which was at once called, and the pope gave his assent. It was proposed, also, to invite to this assembly the most distinguished Reformers, such as Calvin, Beza, Melan- chthon, and others. The latter proposal met with the approval of the diet of Prussia, and the Reformers in Poland were chiefly turned towards John a Lasco of the University of Cracow, and some of his colleagues, with the view of publishing the cause of the Reformation in Germany, Switzerland, and England. For a long time he remained within the limits of the province of Prussia and the neighboring States of Austria, and was kept in close contact with many of the Protestant princes in various parts of Europe, several of whom invited him to take up his residence in their dominions to assist them in their enterprises. It was with the object of complete the reformation of the Church in that country, prevailed upon Lasco to allow himself to be nom-
The establishment of a Reformed Polish Church was much impeded by the dissensions which divided the Protestants among themselves. When, however, less than three parties existed in Poland, each adhering to its own denomination. The Waldensian Confession had its own ardent admirers, chiefly in Great Poland; the Genevese or Calvinistic Confession in Lwów, and the Lutheran or Augsburg Confession in towns inhabited by Germans of the Bohemian and Moravian races. The Genevese Confession was received almost at all points, that their respective supporters found
no difficulty in forming a union in 1555, not indeed incorporating it in one body, but holding spiritual fellowship, each Church retaining its own separate hierarchy. This union being the first which took place under Henry II, the protector of the Reformation, caused great joy among the Reformers in different parts of Europe. The two churches thus united wished to lucidate also the alliance but the doctrines of the Augsburg Confession on the subject of the Eucharist seemed likely to prove an insuperable obstacle in the way, as the Lutheran churches for an attempt, however, was made to effect so desirable an object. In this effort, the Bohemian and Genevans churches of Poland were convoked in 1557, and presided over by John Asko. At this synod overtures were made by the Bohemians to join the Lutherans, but to no effect, and they still continued to accuse the Bohemian Church of heresy. The obstacles thus thrown in the way of the two churches by the Tartar man and for two centuries the Bohemians to exert themselves still more actively for its attainment. They forwarded copies of their Confession of Faith to the Protestant princes of Germany, and to the chief Reformers, both of that country and of Switzerland, and received strong testimonials of approval—so strong, indeed, as to silence for a time the objections of the Lutherns. Shortly, however, the good understanding between the two churches was interrupted by demands of some Polish Lutheran divines that the other Protestant denominations should subscribe the Confession of Augsburg. The Bohemians, therefore, in 1558, submitted their confession to the University of Wittenberg, which, having received from that learned body a strong expression of their approbation, which so operated upon the minds of the Lutherns that from that time they ceased to charge the Bohemians with heresy and impurity.

The long-desired union was at length effected in 1570, and the treaty of union of Sandomir, in April of that year, finally concluded and signed the terms of union under the name of the Consensus of Sandomir, (q.v.) to which the last act of the utmost alarm among the Romanists, who endeavored to bring it into disharmony, was to union itself to the substantially whole church and perfect.

The confession, which had been effected, differed on a point of vital importance: the power of Christ in the Eucharist. The union, accordingly, was rather nominal than real; and many Lutherans directed their whole efforts towards bringing it about that the disruption of the alliance which had been established at Sandomir. This hostility of the Lutherns to the union, therefore, was very considerable and injurious to the interests of Protestantism in general, and a number of noble families, followed by thousands of the common people, disdained with the bitter contumacies which raged among the Protestants of different denominations, denounced the principles of the Reformation, and returned to the Church of Rome. Another circumstance which tended to weaken the Protestant Church of Poland was the rise of a sect called Socinians, a movement of great numbers of foreigners, who sought an asylum from religious persecution. Among these, besides many Italian and French refugees, there were a good number of Scotch families settled in different parts of Poland, having escaped from the authority of the Church of Rome, but even in the national Church, and in the national Church itself, not only was the prime favorite, but the main portion of the clergy, even of the Inquisitors, and a considerable proportion of the laity, would have welcomed any proposal to correct the flagrant abuses which prevailed, had not the Church of Rome, by the authority of the Church of Rome, and the king gave him a written testimony in favor of that protest.

Henry IV passed the fears of the Protestants were far from being allayed, and they resolved carefully to watch the conduct of the new monarch, who, besides being a Protestant, was a member of the Protestant party, insisted that on that solemn occasion the crown should be kissed, not even in the midst of the ceremony, when the crown was about to be placed on Henry's head, Firly boldly advanced the matter, and, standing, kissing in the name of the Protestants of that, unless the Polish oath was taken, the coronation would not even be allowed, the whole being decided in favor of the king, put into the king's hand as he knelt on the steps of the altar, and taking, the crown, said in the Polish language, "If you shall not swear, you shall not reign."

The Intrepid conduct of the Protestant leader struck the
The assembly with awe, and the king had no alternative but to accept it. The country, with the consent of the Polish nobility, was saved from utter overthrow, and the nation delivered from an impending civil war.

The Polish nobility, in its turn, saw the favor of the monarch, formed projects for extending their influence, and, as a result, the power of the country. Henry had become a ready tool in the hands of the priests. This feeling, combined with distrust, and the desire to replace the Roman Catholic religion, led to the suppression of the Jesuits in Poland.

The queen, who had so much strength, was able to suppress the Jesuits. In 1566, when Sigismund III, in whose reign the Roman party acquired power, and the Jesuits were suppressed, the nobility became disaffected with the general confession, and sought to devise schemes for its suppression. The Jesuits had so much influence in the country that Poland was finally united to the Polish Catholic Church.

Stephen Batory, prince of Transylvania, who had earned so high a reputation, was immediately succeeded by the new monarch. For all opposition from the Roman clergy, he was elected by the diet of the Protestants, and, as a result, the Jesuits were suppressed. The Jesuits were expelled from the country, and all the offices of state and posts of honor were abolished in the country.

The Jesuits were expelled from the country, and all the offices of state and posts of honor were abolished in the country. This action was followed by a general insurrection, which was put down by the Jesuits and other religious bodies. The Jesuits were again suppressed, and all the offices of state and posts of honor were abolished in the country.

The Jesuits were expelled from the country, and all the offices of state and posts of honor were abolished in the country. This action was followed by a general insurrection, which was put down by the Jesuits and other religious bodies. The Jesuits were again suppressed, and all the offices of state and posts of honor were abolished in the country.

The Jesuits were expelled from the country, and all the offices of state and posts of honor were abolished in the country. This action was followed by a general insurrection, which was put down by the Jesuits and other religious bodies. The Jesuits were again suppressed, and all the offices of state and posts of honor were abolished in the country.

The Jesuits were expelled from the country, and all the offices of state and posts of honor were abolished in the country. This action was followed by a general insurrection, which was put down by the Jesuits and other religious bodies. The Jesuits were again suppressed, and all the offices of state and posts of honor were abolished in the country.
abolishing all the restrictions imposed in later times. But such favorable circumstances were of short continuance, as soon as news from his throne by Peter, the czar of Russia, and Augustus II again restored to his kith and kin the fruits of his labors, which were only terminated by the mediation of Peter the Great, who concluded a treaty at Warsaw in 1716, into which the Romanists were introduced, and to get a close inserted into the following effect: That all the Protestant churches which had been built since 1703 should be demolished, and that the Romanists should be permitted to remain except in places where they had churches previously to the above-meantioned laws. Foreign ministers were allowed to have divine service in their dwellings, but the native who should come to them would be subjected to the above-men- 
tioned penalties.

The terms of this treaty excited feelings of discontent and alarm, not only in the minds of the Protestants, but also of the more enlightened portion of the Roman Cathol. 

acters of Poland in 1713, which lasted from 1713 to 1723, the Protestant was melancholy in the extreme; and, despairing of relief from every other quarter, they threw themselves under the patronage of foreign preachers, by whose interference they were admitted, in 1717, to equal rights with the Roman Catholics. This was followed by the abolition of the Order of the Jesuits in 1773. Augustus had throughout his reign kept Poland in a state of subservience to Russia, and he added his successor to the Austrian on the throne. When Catherine II, empress of Russia, obtained possession of the Polish Russian province, part of the people accepted the covenant of the Greek Church, and part joined the Russian Church. Even the most bigoted Romanists were galled under this course, so that when, in 1793, the higher clergy of Lithuania and White Russia declared the readiness of their people to join the Russian-Greek Church and, according, these Uniates, or United Greeks, to the number of 2,000,000, were received back into the Muscovite branch of the Eastern Church on their solemn disavowal of the pope's supremacy, and declaration of their belief in the sole Headship of Christ over his Church.

The authorities of the determined to force the infallibility dogma on the Church of Rome has had its damaging consequences on Episcopal Christianity in Poland and Russia. After the encyclical of 1784 the Russian government saw itself forced to urge the union with the Russian Church on the Polish Christians of the Uniate. Several pope has confirmed to the United Greeks the privileges of the use of the vernacular tongue and the marriage of the clergy, and of the protestant movement, which, however, had been introduced by some of the clergy, tending to assimilation to Rome, the government has often been in the habit of thing said to the Vatican. When the encyclical came to the papal, only two ways seemed to be open—either to submit to the new orders or openly defy them. In Sedletz the decision was prompt, and one sixth of the whole population of the government determined to ask the "White Czar" to admit them into his Church. Though the parish priests in no case commenced the movement, when once it had once taken root they joined their forces. The government took no notice of the first petition sent in till convinced that the movement was perfectly sponta- 

daneous and not under the influence of the secular authorities, the emperor authorized the governor-gen- 

eral of Warsaw to admit them into the Russian Church; and on Sunday, Jan. 26, the public ceremony was per- 
formed in the square in the town of Sedletz. Of the 50,000 people admitted, 36 were priests. The first 
part of the ceremony was that of the柴, to which the archbishop of Warsaw proceeded, with all the deferent priests and deacons from the forty-five parishes, and where a sol- 

den act of consecration was performed in the parish church.

The Berlin correspondent of the London Times, under date of Dec. 22nd, 1825, writes: "The box movement in steady process in Poland, and will very shortly lead to the extinction of the Catholic Church. Nearly 250,000 persons in the provinces of Stedos, Litwini, Suwalki, and Lomza have already embraced the established faith of the empire. The number of Catholics is not less than 30,000, and as the priests who are adverse to the move- 

ment are running away to Galicia, the last trace of the sect has disappeared. The political advantage accru- 

ing to the Russian government from this wholesome con- 

version of a religious community, half Roman Catholic and half Greek, cannot well be overrated. Not only are they all their adherents, but the emperor empowers them to establish schools in the parishes, and to have in each a schoolmaster, at the expense of the state; but this, in 1824, was followed up by the commencement of a German

POLAND, MISSION AMONG THE JEWS IN. The Polish mission was commenced by the London Society for promoting Christianity among the Jews in 1821. The first missionaries there were the late Dr. A. de Saulcy, a graduate of the University of Leyden, and Dr. Radzyń, of the University of Dublin, and the Rev. W. F. Becker. The centre of their operation was made in Warsaw. For a while all seemed promising, but the missionaries were compelled for a time to quit Warsaw. Early in the year 1822 the missionaries were summoned to appear before the "Commission of the Religious Confession," and had to sign a protocol as to what was their object, of which it was said that it would be sent to St. Petersburg. Learning, however, that the answer which would be given them would be that foreign missions were not permitted in Poland, and that the Jews wished to be converted there were priests enough for that purpose, the missionaries—in order to avoid being sent out of the country, and hoping to get per- 

mission from the emperor Alexander—left Warsaw and went to Berlin. The permission was granted for Poland, but also for Russia. The first two missions were now joined by two others, Media, Wends and Hof, and in the winter of 1822 missionary operations were fairly commenced at Warsaw. In the year 1825 a service according to the ritual of the Church of England was established in the Reformed Church of Warsaw, and having received ordination in England; and this, in 1828, was followed up by the commencement of a German mission among the Jews in Poland.
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service in the same place in the afternoon. As the labor increased two more missionaries were sent, Messrs. Reichardt and Wermelskirch. Visits were paid to various towns, and for a time Lublin was made the scene of the mission. Chief ware among the "Cherem," or Jewish excommunication, pronounced against those who should have any intercourse with the missionaries, the work went on with great blessings, and in the year 1851 the number of those who were baptized through the mission in Poland was 926, some of which were subsequently received in the Church. We have now brought the history of the Polish mission down to that period when the door was closed against it. The war of England with Russia effected this change, for it could not reasonably be expected, while this war was carried on, that an English mission, however peaceful its object, would be tolerated in the very heart of the Russian empire, and indications were not wanting that soon its work was to cease. Various tracts about to be printed, which had already received the sanction of the Consistory, were unaccountably detained at the censor's office; and in the month of May, 1854, "the missionaries in Warsaw were summoned before the Russian authorities to receive various injunctions and restrictive orders on pain of being expelled from the country. One of these was at first to offer no correspondence with the committee to the Russian government, who promised to forward it to London; and to circulate no books, not even the Bible, among Christians. The letters and journals were from that time submitted as printed, but never reached London. This state of things continued in all the other Polish cities, and the missionaries were again summoned to appear before the Russian authorities to hear an imperial order read, which imposed upon them and their brethren in the country the discontinuance of all missionary work from that day, and to be prepared to leave the country in three weeks, viz. on the 18th of May, the New-year's day of the Russian Church."

Thus closed the Polish mission, just three weeks before the death of the Russian emperor, a mission which had not been in vain, for, besides the 861 members of the house of Israel who were admitted by baptism into the Christian Church, more than 10,000 people of different languages, and upwards of 10,000 New Testament sheets have been circulated, of which many had come into the hands of Jews.

The missionary work which had thus been suspended for over twenty years was again resumed in the year 1877, permission having been granted by the present emperor. To the Rev. J. C. Hartmann, one of the oldest missionaries of the society, was intrusted the temporary charge of the mission-field at Warsaw, where about 100,000 Jews reside, divided between the Talmudists, Chasidim, and Reformers. According to the latest report of 1877, the Warsaw station is now occupied by the Revs. O. J. Ellis and H. H. F. Hartmann, son of the above, N. D. Rapport, A. E. Eiland, and a colporteur. Comp. the Jewish Intelligence and the Annual Reports of the London Society. (B.P.)

Pole (22), nē, a flagstaff, Numb. xxi. 8, 9; hence the flag or standard itself, "sign," "banner," etc., as elsewhere.

Pole, Reginald, a famous English cardinal, who figures so prominently in the English Reformation period, upon whose character rests the stigma of duplicity and selfishness, and against whom both Protestants and Romanists have written in censure or praise, was descended from royal blood, being a younger son of Sir Richard Pole, lord Mowbray, who was created king's prelate by Henry VII, and Margaret, daughter of George, the duke of Clarence, and younger brother to king Edward IV. Pole was born at Stourton Castle, Staffordshire, in March, 1503. When seven years old he was sent to the Carthusian monks at Sheen for instruction. At twelve he became a student at Magdalen College, Oxford, where the famous Linacre and Will. Latimer, two great masters of Latin and Greek, were his teachers. At fifteen he took the B.A. and entered into deacon's orders, and several years later that Luther began to preach against indulgences, Pole was made prebendar of St. John's priory, to which preferment the deanery of Exeter and others were soon after added by king Henry VIII, who greatly admired Pole, and desired his elevation to the highest ecclesiastical dignity. At the age of nineteen Pole went to Italy, there to continue his studies, and was by the king afforded support suitable to his rank. He visited different universities, and finally rested at Padua, where he entered a distinguished group of scholars, among whom were Leonius, a great philosopher and theologian, Longino, a poet, and Lapset, a learned Englishman. These masters were his constant companions, and they have told us how he became the delight of that part of the world for his learning, politeness, and piety. From Padua he went to Venice, where he continued for some time, and then visited other parts of Italy. Having spent five years abroad, he was recalled home; but being desirous to see the jubilee, which was celebrated this year at Rome, he went to that city: whence, passing by Florence, he returned to England, where he arrived about the end of 1555. He was received by the queen, and, through the influence of the great nobility with great affection and honor, and was highly esteemed, not only on account of his learning, but for the sweetness of his nature and politeness of his manners. Devotion and study, however, being what he so delighted in, he retired to his old habitation among the Carthusian monks at Sheen, and spent the two years in the free enjoyment of them. In 1559, when.
king Harry determined upon his divorce from Catharine of Aragon, Pole, foreseeing the troubles consequent upon this, and how he must needs be involved in them, resolved to withdraw, and obtained leave of his majesty to go to Rome. He proceed to his seat near Rome, prosecuting the affair of the divorce, and sending to the most noted universities in Europe for their opinion upon the illegitimacy of his marriage, commanded him to concourse with his agents in procuring the approval for his contemplated step from the faculty of the University of Paris. Pole left the affair to the commissioners, excusing himself to the king as unfit for the employ, since his studies had lain another way. Henry was angry, upon which Pole returned to England in order to pacify him; but failing in this, and unwilling to make a tool of himself to the king in his questionable designs, Pole returned to Spain, where he continued two years. It has been asserted that scruples of conscience and of religion were not his only motive: that, though a priest, he was not without hope of marrying the princess Mary Tudor, and that it was not without such views that Catharine of Aragon had committed the education of her daughter to his mother, the countess of Salisbury. Henry at length perceiving that the court of Rome resolved to oppose the affair of the divorce by means to shake off their authority, and to rely upon his own subjects. Pole was again pressed, but as steadfastly refused as before, even under the temptation of being made archbishop of York if he should comply with the king's demands. The king having dismissed Pole in anger, he consulted his safety by leaving the kingdom, and resigned the company of the distinguished men he had known abroad. The first year he spent at Avignon; but as his health declined there he went to Padua, making now and then excursions to his friends at Venice. The literary circle in which he moved was formed by Caraffa (Paul IV), Sadoletto, Gilberto, Fregoso, archbishop of Salerno, Bembo, and Contarini. These men even embraced the doctrine of justification, and in their social meetings discussed the means of reforming the papacy—their great principle being to preserve the unity of the Church under the papal government. In Italy, during the reign of Henry VIII, Reginald Pole rose to great distinction, and on the accession of Paul III in 1534 was raised to the cardinalate, as were his friends just mentioned. Thus the days passed very agreeably in Italy, while fresh troubles were arising there. Henry had not only divorced Catharine, but married Anne Boleyn, and resolved to throw off the papal yoke and assert his right to the supremacy, with the title of Supreme Head of the Church. To this end he procured a book to be written in defence of that title by Sampson, bishop of Chichester, which he was ready to fulfill the promises made by him to the pope if Francis assisted him without afterthought. Francis, in his turn, protested his good-will, but, beheld the legate not to enter his states if he did not bring some positive proof of the emperor's sincerity. After carrying on negotiations for several months, Pole came to the conclusion that he was being deluded on both sides, and advised the pope to wait patiently for a better opportunity to turn up in the course of political events. His share in these negotiations proved fatal to his relations. Henry wreaked his savage vengeance on him in person. Pole was not only divorced from Catharine, and his aged mother, lady Salisbury, who was dragged to the scaffold May 17, 1541. The second brother of the cardinal, Sir Geoffrey, saved his life by revealing the secrets of his relations and friends. In 1539 cardinal Pole was sent to Vincenza, where, on the exercise of his ecclesiastical functions, in 1542, he was dispossessed by his piety, the encouragement he gave to letters, and his tolerance towards the Protestants. In 1545 he repaired to Trent, under strong escort, to superintend the works preparatory to the council. After the death of Henry (1547), he wrote to the Privy Council in Rome, with the legislature of the Catholic communion, and to Edward VI in justification of his acts; but his letters were left unopened. Pole's book, De uniate ecclesiastica, was published in Rome in 1556; and though, as Burnet says, "it was more esteemed for the high quality of the author than for any sound reasoning in it," it yet gave most certain proof of his invincible attachment and zeal for the see of Rome, and was therefore sufficient to build the strongest confidence upon. Accordingly Pole was employed in negotiations and transactions of high concernment, was consulted by the pope in all affairs relating to kings and sovereign princes, was made one of his legates at the Council of Trent, and, lastly, his penman when occasion required. Thus, for instance, when the pope's power to remove that council was contested by the emperor, his wishes were consulted, and his name among them Pole, went to represent England. In vain his mother, brothers, and friends tried to dissuade him from going to Rome.

After some wavering, the exhortations of his friend Contarini prevailed over the fears of his family, and he went to Rome in 1586. There he was, against his earnest wish, created cardinal, Dec. 22, 1586. Two months afterward, Feb. 15 (1587) Pope Sixtus V passed the legate on the other side of the Alps, and sent him on a most delicate and dangerous errand. The rebellion of the northern Catholics against Henry VIII seemed to the pope a favorable occasion to attempt the reconciliation of England with the Roman see. The legate's instructions were to promote a good understanding between the emperor and the king of France, to establish himself in the Netherlands, and if circumstances allowed of such a course to pass over to England. Scurrely had he passed, and stood only at Cambrai. The regent here refused to allow him to enter the Netherlands; though he did stay with the prince-bishop of Liège, he was obliged to make his way back to Rome (August, 1587). At the same time Henry VIII set a price of fifty thousand crowns on his head, and promised to the emperor a subsidy of £150,000 a year in consideration of his extrication. If the pope had had up to that time shrunk from extreme measures against the schism of England, it was because he felt powerless to put them into execution. Having succeeded in restoring peace between the two great rulers of the Continent, he at last published his bull of excommunication. Pole was sent in secret mission to the courts of Spain and France; but, forestalled by the English agents, he could only get evasive answers. Charles, at Toledo, declared, that he had more urgent business to attend to, but that he was ready to fulfill the promises made by him to the pope if Francis assisted him without afterthought. Francis, in his turn, protested his good-will, but, beheld the legate not to enter his states if he did not bring some positive proof of the emperor's sincerity.
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We come not to condemn, but reconcile;
We come not to compel, but call again;
We come not to destroy, but edify.

Nor yet to question things already done:
These are forgiven—matters of the past—
And range with justice and with offence thrown
Into the blind sea of forgetfulness.

(Queen Mary, act iii, scene iii).

In a later scene he makes bishop Gardiner (q. v.) the persecutor, and Pole the advocate and friend of the heretic:

"Indeed, I cannot follow with your grace;
Rather would say—the shepherd doth not kill
The sheep that wander from his fold, but sends
His careful dog to bring them to the fold."

(Act III, scene iv).

There is somewhat to favor this interpretation of Pole's acts.
After the death of pope Julius, and his successor Marcellus, who rapidly followed him to the grave, the queen recommended Pole to the popedom; but Peter Caraffa, who took the name of Paul IV, was elected before her despatches arrived. This pope, who had never liked our cardinal, was pleased with Gardiner, bishop of Winchester, whose temper exactly tallied with his own; and therefore favored his views and projects, suspecting a design in queen Mary to marry Pole, contrived means to stop his progress; nor did he arrive in England till November, 1554, when his marriage with Philip of Spain was completed. (The English ecclesiastical historian thinks that Pole was delayed by bishop Gardiner, who himself disdained this distinguished post.) On his arrival Pole was conducted to the archbishop's palace at Lambeth, Cranmer being then attainder and imprisoned; and on the 28th went to the Parliament and made a long and grave speech, inviting them to a reconciliation with the apostolic see, for which purpose, he said, he was sent by the common pastor of Christendom. This speech of Pole occasioned some motion in the queen, which she vainly thought was a child quickened within her womb; so that she put forward some resolution, some not scrupling to say that as John the Baptist leaped in his mother's womb at the salutation of the Virgin, so here the like happiness attended the salutation of Christ's vicar. The Parliament being absolved by Pole, all went to the royal chapel, where the Te Deum was sung on the occasion; and thus, the pope's authority being now restored, the cardinal, two days afterwards, made his public entry into London, with all the solemnities of a legate, and presently set about reforming the Church and freeing it from heresy. In convocation assembled, in which by which, 1, churches, hospitals, and schools founded during the schisms should be preserved; 2, persons who had married at unlawful degrees without dispensation should be considered as legitimately united; 5, buyers of ecclesiastical property should not be disturbed in their possession. But such a triumph did not satisfy the fanatics. Encouraged by the chancellor, Gardiner, they filled England during four years with those horrors which left forever a bloody stain on Mary's memory. Pole had formerly been suspected of favoring the Reformation, but was exemplary piety and charity, as well as generosity becoming his birth. Though by nature he was more inclined to study and contemplation than to active life, yet he was prudent and dexterous in business, so that he would have been a finished character had not his superstitious devotion to the see of Rome been from the path his own convictions marked out to him. Burnet, who has drawn Pole in very favorable colors, acknowledges this fault in the great cardinal. Froude's delineation of Pole as a narrow-minded and fanatical bigot is precisely the reverse; for Pole, like his friend Contarini, was a leading member of that moderate party of Romanists who, though they dreaded the disruption of Christendom, desired a reform not only in the discipline but also in the doctrine of the Church. From this position he was only scared by fear of losing his mind. This betrays a weakness, it is true, but..."
rather of ambition than of fanaticism or narrow-mindedness. It is, besides, unjust to make Pole the sole responsible party for the persecutions which were inaugurated; for Fox (vii, 308) has furnished clear evidence against such an insinuation. He even gives two instances in which Pole personally interfering to save Protestants from execution. All that Pole did, even at the work was to suffer the law to take its course, and not preventing what he knew should not have been done. But, of course, this is bad enough; we only desire that it be made no worse. Hook has taken a view very much dependent on Froude. In the instructions which Pole was putting out at the time of his decease for the clergy, and in the devotional books which he was putting together for his people, it is hard to find anything but good-sense, deep piety, and hearty benevolence.

Pole wrote various controversial and theological tracts, besides the work above referred to. Among these publications are: Liber de Concilio (Venet. 1562, 8vo, and elsewhere); Reformatio Anglica ex Decreto Ignatis Sedis Apostolicae Legati anno MDLVI (Rome, 1562, 4to); one of the most elegant pieces of composition in the Latin language, and which, for perspicuity, good-sense, and solid reasoning, is equal to the importance of the occasion on which it was written (Philips, Sacred Literature); De Summo Pontifice Christi in Terris, a discourse on pontifical duties; a Treatise of Justification (London, 1563, 4to); this work is reprinted to have been “found among the writings of cardinal Pole.” See Hume, Hist. of England, ch. xxxvii (very favorable); Froude, Hist. of England, vi, 369 sq.; Collier, Eccles. Hist. of England (see Index in vol. vii); Secker's History of the Church of England, ii, 575 sq.; Soames, Hist. of the Ref., i, 251 sq.; ii, 185 sq., 229 sq., 327 sq., 357 sq.; iv, 66 sq., 77, 238, 495, 545 sq., 577 sq., 595; Foukken, De Chirkidum, i, § 68; Hook, Lives of the Archbishop of Canterbury (Lond. 1689), vol. iii; Hackett, History of the Reformation and Reconciliation of the Church with Christ, bohm. Hist. of the Prot. Religion, p. 194, 206, 212; North Brit. Rev. Jan. 1870, p. 283; Westminster Rev. Apr, 1871, p. 266; and especially the references in Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s. v.

Pole-axes were the ensigns of legates a latere, carried with silver pillars (gal. ii) before cardinals Wolsey and Pole.

Polehampton, Henry Stedman, an English divine, was born in 1524, and educated at Pembroke College, Oxford. He took holy orders, and was ordained deacon in 1548; in the year following became assistant curate of St. Chad's, Shrewsbury; in 1553 chaplain in the service of M. Fitzjames, bishop of Shrewsbury. During the great Sepoy Rebellion he was shot through the body in the insurrection at Lucknow, and died July 20, 1587. He was a good man, and his loss was greatly deplored in all England, as well as among the English of India. See Memoirs, Letters, and Diary of the late Rev. Henry Polehampton, and the Rev. Thomas Stedman Polehampton (Lond. 1858, 8vo, and often); London Atheneum, 1858, pt. ii, 431 sq., 487.

Polehampton, Thomas Stedman, brother of the preceding; of lesser note, died at the controversy. See Polehampton, Henry S.

 Polemics (from polemikos, scolding) is the controversy of scientific theology. It is also sometimes called by German theologians elenchics, and differs from apologetics (q. v.) in that it is not simply intended to defend Christianity in general, but aims to attack a rival or disputed system in particular, and is the discussion of its innermost secrets (q. v.), with the view of establishing peace within the Christian fold. This distinction has not always been observed in Christian theology, but is of rather recent date. As a rule, the theologians of the Church mixed the polemical and apologetical elements in all theological controversy. In our own century, however, and especially since the days of Schleiermacher, theological encyclopedists have insisted upon a strict severance of polemics from apologetics and symbolics (q. v.), and have dealt with it in an independent manner. In theory nothing can be more accurately defined and distinguished than apologetics and polemics; they bear the same relation to each other as inorganic and organic chemistry as in the distinction of operations. In practice, however, it is impossible always to separate the apologetic and the polemical element. See the art. APOLOGY. In the ages of the Church fathers no great difficulty was encountered, because their object was to combat the Jewish or Asiatic systems of religion, and their writings therefore bear a predominant polemical coloring. But it is one thing to combat a single religious system like paganism, and it is quite another to attack heresy within the Church, or to make war on religious systems claiming a like foundation. Polemics, then, narrowed down to its proper sphere, is the controversy within the Christian fold regarding the essentials of the Church faith. In the early Church the polemical activity was confined to heresies and schismaticas. Indeed, from the death of Origen to John of Damascus (A.D. 254-730)—the time which elapsed between the Sabellian and the Monoletheit controversy—the polemics of the Church were developed much more prominently than either the apologetic tendency, as in the preceding period, or the systematic tendency, as in the next period. The heresies which called out the polemics of the Church ran from 300 till the outburst of the Reformation differed in tendency from those of the preceding period in their opposition to the whole ecclesiastical system rather than to any particular doctrines. But with the establishment of Protestantism the polemical activity began in real earnest, and from the time to this has continued to develop and expand in strength both among Romanists and Protestants. Among the former it has been specially cultivated by the Jesuits, who, on account of the many methods which they have proposed for their own defense (see Index, p. 64, et al.), have been investigated in Appendix “Methodists” (comp. Pett, Thol. Encyclopaedia, § 63, p. 386 sq.). They even published large works containing the modus operandi for controversies of a confessional nature, under the title Thesaurus Polemicus (Vitus Fischer, 1753; Gazzaniga, 1778 sq.). The Protestants were not far behind, and provided material under the more appropriate title of a Synopsis Controversiarum (Abraham Calow, 1658; Maseria, 1701), to which may be added Walch, Einleitung in die polemischen Gottesgelehrtheit (Jena, 1732, 8vo), his own method (1711); Schubert, Naturgeschichte der Polemik (1756-58); Baumgarten, Untersuchung theologischer Streitigkeiten (1762-64); Mosheim, Unterrichttheologie (1763 sq.); Bock, Lehrb. für die neueste Polemik (1782). No work of importance on the science of polemics appeared until Schleiermacher treated it in his Darstellung des theol. Studiums (Berlin, 1811); and his ideas found further and fuller elucidation by his disciples Sack in his Christliche Polemik (Bonn, 1838), and by Pelt in his Thol. Encyclopaedia (1843); Hagenbach, Theol. Encyclop. (1864, and since); Hill, System of Divinity (N. Y., 1847, 8vo); McClintock, Encyclop. and Method of Thol. Science (N. Y., 1873). The literature of polemics is divided properly into:

I. Treatises on the Controversy between Protestants and Romanists.
   1. General Treatises by writers of the Church of Rome.
      a. General Treatises against Popery by Protestant Divines.
   2. Treatises on the Arian Controversy.
   3. Treatises on the Socinian Controversy.
   4. Treatises occasioned by the Controversies of the Church of England and Dissenters.
      1. The Anglian Controversy.
      2. Treatises on the 89 Articles.
   4. Controversial Treatises on Dissent.
   5. Treatises on Berengarius.

The various publications on these divisions must be sought for under their respective headings. We will refer the reader here for general treatises to the works.
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died by Werner, Gesch. der apologet. u. polemischen Lit., and to Spanheim, Controversiarum de Religione cum Divinitatis Hostie Christiana Prorake et cum Judaica Eclesiae Historico Theologica, and Hornsch. Summa Controversiarum: Clarim. Encyclopaedia Theologiae Epitome (Lugd. 1835, 8vo), § 91, p. 499 sqq. See, too, Mohler's Symbolik; Piper, Monumental-Theologiae, § 153 sq.

1. The principles which should govern the Christian theologian are those of an honest offensive warfare. They may be condensed into the following points: (1) The question is not about persons, but about things. Only when both stand and fall together may personalities be allowed. (2) The attack must be directed at the Scriptures, because they are the only divine witness. The polemic is most formidable: as soon as the principles of the adversary have been refuted the hostility must cease.

2. We must not impede to the adversary more wrong than he is really guilty of; or else the attack itself assumes the appearance of a wrong, and will be considered in that light by every third party, even if successful. Polemics, then, must take the cause of the adversary just as it is; they must not attribute to him any opinions which can only be made his own by exaggerating his expressions, or even by putting into his own mouth statements which he has never really made. It is impudent to think too little of an adversary. The reasons given by him must be recognized in all their force, and on the basis of full acknowledgment the proof must be given that they are not convincing. (5) A struggle with unequal forces is not honorable. The polemic, then, will have to prove either that the weapons of his adversary are illegal, or, if this cannot be done, to inquire into his standpoint and his reasons, and to prove in error the cause in its very principles. (6) If the polemic thus succeeds in reducing his adversary ad absurdum, i.e. to an illogical condition, which, by reason of its untenability, forces him hors de combat, the vanquished is turned into a friend and convert, and the truth has indeed triumphed, as God would have it.

POLEMICS, JEWISH. The friendly relation which existed at first between the Church and the Synagogue could not always last, and a separation became a matter of necessity. The result was that the non-identification of Christianity with Judaism gave rise to bitterness and enmity, and some excommunications were instigated and encouraged by the Jews. The Christians were no more called so, but "Minim," or heretics. So great became at last the enmity, that a celebrated Jewish sage (Tarphon) declared that, although the Christians were the only callers of the Minim, they contained the sacred names of the Deity which ought to be burned; that heathenism was less dangerous than Christianity; that heathens offended from ignorance, while Christians did so with full knowledge; and that he would prefer seeking shelter in a heathen temple rather than in a meeting-place of the "Minim" (Targ. Sabbath 116 a). Another and more moderate rabbi (Jahnel) also recommended the burning of every copy of the Gospels, as in his opinion inciting to rebellion against God, and to hatred against the commonwealth of Israel (Mekh. S. 101 b). By and by all friendly relations between the two parties entirely ceased, and the mutual estrangement was such that the ordinary civilities of life were not to be exchanged, and the bread, wine, oil, and meat used by Christians were declared polluted.

One of the earliest polemics against Christianity is that of R. Simlai, of the 3rd century, who became famous for his virulent opposition to Christianity. His polemics were especially directed against the doctrine of the Trinity (comp. Genesis Rabba, c. 8; Jerus. Berach. ix, 11 & 12 a). It has been suggested, and with apparent probability, that the failure of this attack was in store for the controversy with Origen. Another polemic was R. Abba, of the 4th century, who likewise attacked the Trinity and the ascension of Christ (Jerus. Taumith, ii, 259; Genesis Rabba, c. 29; Exodus Rabba, c. 29). Of this R. Abbahu, we also read (Abodah Zarah, ed. 4 a) that he recommended a certain R. Saphra to a noble Christian. At this recommendation the Christian permitted R. Saphra an exemption for thirteen years. When the Christian asked R. Saphra about the meaning of the passage in Amos iii. 2, and perceived his ignorance, he asked R. Abbahu about its meaning. Having received a satisfactory answer, the Christian asked, "Why is R. Saphra, whom you recommended to me as a great man, so ignorant in the Scriptures, which thou didst explain right away?" To this R. Abbahu answered, "We, who come in contact with you Christians, are obliged, for our self-preservation, to study the Scriptures, because you dispute so often with us from the Scriptures, and because we know that you study the Scriptures: but the other Jews, who live among Gentiles, have no need of that, since they do not dispute with them concerning the Scriptures." What a gloomy picture! The Jews read the Bible, not only, because they are concerned about the "one thing needful," but only for the sake of controversy! Next in order are those passages of the Talmud which speak of Jesus and of Hulyus, and have been expurgated in the earliest editions. Eisenmenger has collected a great many of these passages in his Neu-entdeckte Judenthum and has brought together, in his Jesus in Talmude (Altorf, 1699, 2 vols.

We now give an alphabetical list of such as were against Christianity, and who, for the most part, have been treated upon in this Cyclopaedia, to which reference is made: Abenduos, Jacob (q. v.), carried on a controversy with Hulyus, 1699, and translated the Cussari into Spanish.

Abrahanel, Isaac (q. v.), whose commentaries contain the strongest invectives against Christianity; and so likewise his son Jacob, and Jacob ben Joseph, and Jacob ben Isaac, and Jacob ben Judah.

Abba, Joseph, who died in 1444, took part in the conference held with Jerome de Santa Maria, which place at Tortosa in 1414-14 under the presidency of Peter de Luna, afterwards Benedict XIII. He is the author of the Sermon Ikarim, or the Book of Principles. "This book," says R. Wise, "was the first, and for a long time the only one which attacked the dogmas of the Roman Catholic Church. His opponents spoke, wrote, and argued so much against him that he became quite popular in Christian circles, and thus also a forerunner of the Reformation." This effusion of the Cincinnati rabbi is of course only to be taken cum grano salis, for a personal acquaintance with the work would have told him that only the last division contains what is called anti-Christianism. Arama, Isaac, one of the Spanish exiles, impugns Christianity in his Kabbalah, i.e. "the Heavy Vision."

Bechach ben Asher's attacks upon Christianity can only be found in the earliest editions of his commentary on the Pentateuch.

Farrissol, Abraham (q. v.), the author of a few works, i.e. "the Shield of Abraham," written against Christianity.

Isaac-Jacob ben-Saul, of the 18th century, wrote his Buch der Verzeichnung, Eine Unterweisung wie man seine Religion gegen die Angriffe des Christenthums, and wie man ihn gegen die Einfuhrung der Polnisch autoren soll (Amsterdam, 1699).

Jechiel ben Joseph (q. v.), author of Rabbi, was a member of the conference held at Paris between Nicolo Donin and some Jewish savans. Jechiel would not admit that the Jesus mentioned in the Talmud is Jesus of Nazareth, but another, a discovery which was copied by later writers. But Jews themselves acknowledge this as the failure of the sect of antichristians, for Dr. Levin, in his prize essay, Die Religionsparoditung des R. Jechiel von Paris, (published in Gritti's Monatschrift, 1869, p. 183), "We must regard the attempt of R. Jechiel
Polêmô, Antonius, a highly celebrated sophist and rhetorician, who flourished under Trajan, Hadrian, and the first Antoninus, and was in high favor with the two first emperors (Suid. a. r. V.; Philostr. p. 532). He is placed at the sixteenth year of Hadrian, A.D. 135, by Eusebius (Chron.). His life is related at considerable length by Philostratus (Vit. Sophist. i. 25, p. 530—544). He was born of a consular family at Laodicea, but spent the greater part of his life at Smyrna. During the later part of his life he was put at a very early age the highest honors, in return for which he did much to promote their prosperity, especially by his influence with the emperors. Nor, in performing these services, did he neglect his native city Laodicea, which was so interested an account of him with the emperors Hadrian and Antoninus is given by Philostratus (p. 533, 534). Among the sophists and rhetoricians whom he heard were Timocrates, Scopelianus, Dion Chrysostomus, and Apollonius. His most celebrated disciple was Aristides. His chief contemporaries were Herodes Atticus, Marcus Byzantinus, Dionysius Milesius, and Favorinus, who was his chief rival. Among his imitators in subsequent times was St. Gregory Nazianzen. His style of oratory was imposing rather than pleasing; and his character was haughty and reserved. During the later part of his life he was sometimes tortured by the gout that he resolved to put an end to his existence: he had himself shut up in the tomb of his ancestors at Laodicea, where he died of hunger, at the age of sixty-five. The exact time of his death is not known, but it must have been some time after A.D. 143, as he was heard in that year by Verus. The only extant work of Polêmô is the funeral orations for Cynegrius and Callimachus, the generals who fell at Marathon, which are supposed to be pronounced by their fathers, each extolling his own son above the other. Philostratus mentions several others of his rhetorical compositions, the subjects of which are chiefly taken from Athenian history, and an oration which he pronounced, by command of Hadrian, at the dedication of the temple of Zeus Olympius at Athens, in A.D. 185. His Astylena were first printed by H. Stephanus, in his collection of the declamations of Polêmô, Himierus, and other rhetoricians (Paris, 1547, 4to; afterwards by themselves in Greek, Paris, 1586, 4to; and in Greek and Latin, Tolome, 1687, 8vo). The latest and best edition of that of Caspar Colosi (Leips. 1819, 8vo). See Fabricius, Bibl. Graec. vi. 244; Clinton, Festi Romani, a. s. 188, 185, 143. There is a coin of Hadrian, bearing the inscription ΠΟΛΕΜΟΥ ΑΝΩΝΥΜΟ. ΑΝΘΡΟΠΟΙΟΕΙΝ (Basel, Loric. Rei Num. a. s. v.; Polêmô; Eckhel, Doct. Num. V. ii, 562). This coin is in a class which Eckhel has extolled in a dissertation (vol. iv. c. 19, p. 368—374). There is a question respecting the identity of this sophist with Po lmô, the author of a short Greek work on Physiognomy, who, it is supposed, was a Christian, and must have lived in or before the 3d century. See the discussion on this question by Passow, Uber Polêmôs Zeitsalter, in the Archiv für Philologie und Pädagogie (i. 7—9), 1826.

Polêmô (Πολιμând) of Attirós, (1) an eminent Platonic philosopher; and for some time the head of the Academy, was the son of Philostratus, a man of wealth and political distinction. In his youth Polêmô was extremely prodigal; but one day, when he was about thirty, he broke into the school of Xenocrates at the head of a band of revellers. His attention was so restored by the discourse, which the master continued calmly in spite of the interruption, and which tended to be upon temperance, that he tore off his garland and remained an attentive listener, and from that day he adopted an abstemious course of life, and continued to be the chief teacher at his school, of which, on the death of Xenocrates, he became the head, in Ol. 116, B.C. 815. According to Eusebius (Chron.) he died in Ol. 126, 4, B.C. 273. Diogenes also says that he died at a great age.
and of natural decay. He was a close follower of Xeni-
cratic in all things, and an intimate friend of Crates
and Crantor, who were his disciples, as well as Zeno
and Arcesilaus; Crates was his successor in the Academ-
y. Poleno gave his attention mainly to ethics, and
etested the object of philosophy to be to exercise men in
courage, virtue, and the science of Socrates. His
character was grave and severe, and he took pride in
displaying the mastery which he had acquired over
emotions of every sort. In literature he was most
admired Homer and Sophocles, and he is said to have
been the author of the remark that Homer is an epic
Sophocles, and Sophocles a tragic Homer. He left,
according to Diogenes, several treatises, none of which
were extant in the time of Suidas. There is, however,
a quotation made by Clemens Alexanderius, either from
him or from another philosopher of the same name, in
which other works of his (Strom. vii, 117), and another
passage (Strom. ii, 410) upon happiness, which
agrees precisely with the statement of Cicero (De Fin.
iv, 5), that Poleno placed the summum bonum in living
according to the laws of nature. Cicero gives (Acad.
iv, 1, 35; 8, 26) the following as Poleno’s definition of
happiness: —

"Honeste vivere, frumentum rebus iis, quas primas ho-
nimi sunt conciliat." "

See Diog. Laert. iv, 16-20; Suid. n. v.; Plut. De
del. et Am. Sec. 32, p. 71 e; Lucian, Il. Am. 16 (ii, 811); Athen. ii, 44 e; Cic.
Acad. i, 9 11; ii, 91 f; Emp. ii, 16; De Orat. iii, 18; De
Orat. iii, 11; iv, 6, 16; iv, 4, 5, 7, et al.; Horat. Serm.
i, 3, 263, fol.; Val. Max. vi, 9; Menag. Ad Diog. Laert. L. c.; Fabri-
cius, Bibli. Graec. iii, 183; comp. p. 322, note h; Smith, Dict.
of. Gr. and Rom. Diog. and Mythol. a. v.; Uebere-
weg, Hist. Philos. i, 133-135; Butler, Dist. of. Anc.
Philos. (see Index).

(2) Another Platonian philosopher was the disciple of
Poleno; but very little is known of him (Porphyry,
Pol. V. v.; Fabricius, L. c.; Clinton, Fl. H. sub ann.
B.C. 315, vol. ii, 5d ed.)

(3) Of Athens by citizenship, but by birth either of
Ilion or Samos or Scydon, a Stoic philosopher and
as an emigrant, surnamed οἰκετήρ, was the son of
Eucrates, and a contemporary of Aristophanes
of Byzantium, in the time of Poleno Ephiphi-
ous, at the beginning of the 2nd century B.C. (Suid.
a. v.; Athen. vi, 224; Clinton, Fl. H. iv vol. iii, sub ann.
B.C. 199.) In philosophy he was a disciple of Pana-
tia. He made extensive journeys through Greece,
to collect materials for his geographical works, in the
course of which he paid particular attention to the in-
scriptions on the various monuments and other objects
of which he obtained the surname of Στρατηγός (Ath. i. c.;
Caspar, ad loc.). As the collector of these inscriptions,
he was one of the earliest contributors to the Greek
Archaeology, and he wrote works on the same sub-
ject, chiefly as illustrated by the crowning of the
Gordons of the Archaic Age. (Ant.

Anaximenes and other writers make very numerous
quotations from his works, the titles of which it is
unnecessary to give at length. They are chiefly de-
scriptions of different parts of Greece; some are on
the monuments preserved in various places, and several
are controversial, among which is one against
Eratosthenes. See Fabricius, Bibli. Graec. iii, 184; Voas-
Clinton, Fl. H. iii, 524, where a list of his works is
given.

Polben, Jonas, a Polish prelate of some note, flour-
sired in the first half of the 16th century. He was of
noble parentage, and having decided to give himself to
the service of the Church, studied theology in the Uni-
versity of Cracow, and in Germany and other Conti-
nental high schools. He also visited Rome. After fill-
ing various minor ecclesiastical offices, he was made
bishop of Saalrand, a province at that time paying fealty
to Poland, but under the secular rule of prince Albrecht
of Brandenburg. In 1522 this prince, who had refused
homage to the new king Sigismund, went to Germany,
in company with John Henry, Elector of Saxony, and
Polben, to secure the independence of Poland and to
accept the Protestant doctrines at the Diet of Nurem-
berg, which they finally did in 1524. Bishop Polben
died shortly after this event. See Krausse, Sketch of
the Rise and Progress of the Protestant Church in
Poland, vol. ii; Alkog, Kirchengesch. ii, 327, 328; Theiner, Her-
szog Albrecht von Preussen, etc. (Augsb. 1846). See
also Prussia.

J. H. W.

Polhemus, Abraham, D.D., a minister of the
(Dutch) Reformed Church in America, was a lineal
descendant of the Rev. Johannes T. Polhemus, the first
minister of the Dutch Church of Brooklyn, Long Island,
who had previously been a missionary of the Reformed
Church of Holland at Itamarac, Brazil. He came to
this country in 1854, and died in 1876. But little more
is known of him than these few dates and facts of his
ministry. The account of his notice of his death in his
family, the Rev. C. S. Polhemus, of New York, L. I., in 1872; graduated at Rutgers College in
1831, and at the theological seminary in New Bruns-
wick in 1833. Immediately after his licensure by the
classis of New York, in 1835, he settled at Hopewell,
Dutchess Co., N. Y., and remained there until 1847,
when he removed to New York, N. J., and took charge of
the newly organized North Reformed Church in May
of that year. In October following he died at Newburgh,
N. Y., of fever, after an illness of several weeks. He
was a man of majestic physical proportions, tall, broad-
shouldered, handsome, of amiable instincts and attrac-
tive manners. The attachment of his parishioners and
friends to him was almost unbounded. He was modest,
yet energetic, frank and cordial, but always digni-
died and commanding respect. His pastoral qualifi-
cations were finely developed. As a preacher, he was
easy, graceful, impressive in manner, solid and instruc-
tive in matter, evangelical and Catholic in spirit, and
full of "an union from the Holy One" which gave him
great acceptance with the people. He was a leading
man in the council of the Church and in her benevolent
and educational institutions, and, had he lived, would
have been eagerly sought for other high positions.
His piety partook of the characteristics to which it
gave its own burnedish splendor. His death was a
scene of glorious Christian triumph, which reminds one
of the experience of a few hours before. A loud
exclamation, "I see Jesus! Now that I have seen
him, I never can come back again. I see Jesus!
Did I not tell you I should see Jesus? My soul is
ravished with the sight." After a while he added, "I
have perfect assurance; not a doubt, not a fear." His
last sermon was on the death of Stephen, and the sub-
ject made a deep impression on his own heart. From
the beginning of his sickness he felt that he would
never recover, though with occasional encouragements
to the contrary, and he prayed that, like Stephen, he
might see Jesus. The ambulance came on his dying bed.
A handsome memorial volume has been published, con-
taining his biography and a selection of his sermons.
His memory has been an inspiration to the church
whose foundations he laid with faith and prayer, and
which, after only the short life of twenty years, he
was destined to lead in person to heaven. (W. J. E. T.)

Polhemus, Johannes T. See POLHEMUS, ABRA-
HAM.

Polhill, Edward, a learned English Calvinistic lay-
man, flourished in the second half of the 17th century
as justice of the peace at Burwash, Sussex. He wrote,
The Divine Will considered in its Eternal Decrees, etc.
(1673, 8vo)—Answer to Dr. Sherlock's Discovere (1675,
8vo)—Precious Faith, considered in its Nature, Work-


POLIANDER

ing, and Growth (1675, 12mo)—Speculum Theologiae in Christo, or a View of some Divine Truths (1678, 4to)—Christus in Corde, or Mystical Union between Christ and Believers (considered (1680, sm. 8vo, and often)—: Arma- tura Dei, or a Preparation for Suffering in an Evil Day (1683, sm. 8vo, and 12mo). Several of his works were published in Ward's Library of Standard Divinity. "Everything of Pohill is evangelical and valuable," was the testimony of Cotton Mather; and Williams says: "All the works of this learned layman contain many excellent representations of Christ in his relations; and interested with a train of certain devotion." Of course Arminians fail to see the consistency of his Bible interpretations, but they nevertheless admire his unction and experience, and regard his writings as precious practical religious works. See Eklectic Rev. 4th series, xviii, 202. (J. H. W.)

POLIANDER, Johan (originally Grammann), a German theologian of the Reformation period, was born at Neustadt in 1487. He studied at Leipzig, where in 1516 he became magistrate, and in 1520 baccalaureate of theology. When the famous disputation between Dr. Eek and Luther and Carlstadt took place, he was Eek's able advocate, and the disputation exposed him of the truth of the evangelical doctrine, and in 1520 he commenced to preach in accordance with it. The consequence was that he had to leave Leipzig, and in 1522 went to Wittenberg. At the recommendation of Luther, the duke Albrecht of Prussia called Poliander to Königsberg, and in 1523 he became the last of the cloister at St. Blasie, where he remained until his death in 1541. Poliander is the author of the well-known hymn Nun lob'st mein Seel den Herrn (Engl. trans. by Mills, Hymn Germanic, No. 75, p. 139, "Now to the Lord sing praises"). See Koch, Geschichte d. deutschen Kirchenl. 1, 363 sq.; Theol. und Gesch. d. Kirchenges. 6, 170; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. xii, 18-20. (B. F.)

POLIÁS (Πολίας), a surname given by the Athenians to Athena, or Athens, as being the goddess who protected the city.

POLIDORO, CALDARA, called Caravaggio, from his birthplace, was an eminent Italian painter of the Pre-Raphaelites. He was born in 1499, near Milan. He went to Rome at the time when Leo X was raising some new edifices in the Vatican, and not knowing how to get his bread otherwise, for Polidoro was very young, he hired out as a day-laborer to carry stones and mortar, and at last attended services there at work. He detested this way till he was eighteen, when he was led to think of devoting his life to painting. It happened thus: Several young painters were employed by Raffaele in the same place to execute his designs. Polidoro, who often carried them mortar to make their fresco, was touched with the sight of the paintings, and the pleasure he took to see the painters work stirred up the talent which he had for painting. In this disposition, he was very officious and compliant to the young painters, pushed himself into their acquaintance, and opened to them his intention; whereupon they gave him lessons, which emboldened him to proceed. He applied himself with all his might to designing, and advanced so rapidly that Raffaele was astonished, and set him to work with the other young painters; and Polidoro distinguished himself so much from all the rest, that, as he had the greatest facility in executing his most exquisite designs in the Vatican, so he had the greatest glory. The care he had seen Raffaele take in designing the antique sculptures showed him the way to do the like. He spent whole days and nights in designing those beautiful things, and studied antiquity to the nicest exactness. The works with which he enriched the frontispieces of several buildings at Rome are proofs of the pains he took in studying the antique. He did very few easel pieces, most of his productions being in fresco, and of the same color, in imitation of the bas-reliefs. In this way he made use of the manner called scratching, consisting in the preparation of a black ground, on which is placed a white plaster, and where, taking off this white with an iron bodkin, we discover through the holes the black, which serves for shadows. Scratched work lasts longest, but being very rough, is unpleasant to the sight. He associated himself with his friend, and their friendship lasted till the death of the latter, who died of the plague in 1526. After this, Polidoro, having by Raffaele's assistance filled Rome with his pieces, thought to have enjoyed his ease and the fruits of his labors; when the Spaniards in 1537 besieging that city, all the men of art were forced to fly, or were ruined by the miseries of the war. In this exigency Polidoro retired to Naples, where he was obliged to work for ordinary painters, and had no opportunity of making himself noted; for the Neapolitan nobility in those days were more solicitous to get good horses than good pictures. Seeing himself therefore without business, and forced to spend what he had got at Rome, he went to Sicily; and, understanding architecture as well as painting, the citizens of Messina employed him to make the triumphal arches for the reception of Charles V coming from Tunis. This being finished, and finding nothing further, he set out for Rome, but, scarcely out of the place, was murdered by his servant for his money. This happened in 1548. Polidoro's principal work was done at Messina, and represented Christ bearing his Cross. This, with several other portraits of sacred subjects, is now in the Studj Gallery at Naples. His works have power, life, and passion, and he may be said to have originated the style which in later times formed the basis of the Neapolitan school. See Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, x, v. Dr. Pakenham, Handbook of Painters, etc. p. 171, 172. (J. H. W.)

POLIES (Πολίες), a festival annually observed at Thebes, in Greece, in honor of Apollo, when a bull was wont to be sacrificed.

POLIUS (Πολίος), a surname of Zeus, or Jupiter, under which he was worshipped at Athens, as the protector of the city. The god had an altar on the Acropolis, on which a bull was sacrificed.

POLIGNAC, MELCHIOR DE, Cardinal, was one of the most illustrious scholars and courtiers of France in the latter years of Louis XIV, and in the early reign of Louis XV; an ecclesiastical and high dignitary of the Roman Catholic Church; a distinguished diplomatist, archaeologist, philosopher, and poet. He is in the last place, if those of this profession on whom he has operated, is likely to survive, though with continually fading lustre. The elegant Latinist, whose name was for half a century in the mouths of the fashionable ladies of the court, and of the learned in their staidier re- quests; in whose verses passed current in the gay world for years before they were committed to the press, and continued in circulation for half a century after the death of their author and the oblivion of their source; furnishing to America an inscription in honor of Franklin—

"Erigit fulminque Jovi Pheroequo sagittas,
Whose poem was anxiously and frequently desired by Leibnitz, but who died without seeing it, thirty years before it saw the light—this elegant Latinist is now remembered only by a few, and the work which gave him renown is known to still fewer, being almost as inaccessible as it is unsought. Yet Polignac can never be entirely forgotten, for he linked himself by his poetic labors with Lucretius; and so long as the profound but dreamy philosophy, and the exquisite but melancholy graces of the greatest of Roman poets are admired, so long will Polignac shine in their reflected from the great luminary with which he is in opposition.

LIFE.—Melchior de Polignac, the descendant of one of the oldest houses of Auvergne, was born Oct. 11, 1661, at Puy-en-Velay, then Le Puy, the capital of the present department of Haute-Loire, in France. Puy is in the
heart of the mountainous region of Middle France, the region of which Puy-de-Dôme is the centre. It lies at the foot of Mont Anis, in a rugged valley between the great arms of the Cevennes. It is on the left bank of the Upper Loire, and is watered also by its two small tributaries, the Boron and the Délaine. The mountain landscape is wild and romantic, and is consecrated by romantic associations. The ground on which the city stands is so rugged and broken that the streets in the higher town are unfit for wheels, and are often mere stairs, like those of Valetta. The cathedral is encased by an approach of 120 steps. Within a minute or two of the foot of the Virgin Mary, carved by resident Christians of Lebanon from the cedars of that mountain, though sceptically suspected to have been an idol of the Egyptian Isis. In the suburb of L'Àguillette, the church of St. Michel crowns a basaltic rock 265 feet in height, and is gained by a flight of 216 steps hewn out of the rock. In the Dominican church of St. Laurent are the tomb and part of the remains of Bertrand Duguesclin, the great constable of France. Near by, and close to the village of Expaule, are the ruins of the ancient castle of Polignac, supposed to have been erected on the site of the temple of the Celtic Apollo. From this circumstance—the Templum Apollinicum—the family of Polignac claimed to have derived its appellation. The tremendous forces of volcanic action are manifest in the country round about; ancient ruins are parry passed with the volcanic breeca. The race and the birthplace of the future cardinal were thus encompassed with the evidences on which were founded legends and traditions, pagan and Christian—antiquarian, classical, ecclesiastical, chivalrous, and poetic—which might well inspire the quick fancy of the descendant of an ancient family in that marvellous land; and they were ed in scenes of natural beauty or sublimity which feed his imagination in those years of youth which susceptible to all external influences. Who shall say who is favored with whom he had a mind in the circumstances in which infancy and childhood are passed—in that imperishable period of ex- gie life when it is facile to all impressions? There is interesting recollections of Polignac's boyhood. As a cadet of a noble house, he was destined for the church, and was educated at Paris in the colleges of Mont and Harcourt. He completed his courses by study of theology at the Sorbonne, and was early led with a living through the intervention of his father. The young abbe soon attracted attention by attentiveness of his task, the polish of his conversation, and the elegance of his manners. He is said to have added to "a distinct address and personal appearance a sweet and graceful eloquence, which became masculine and pow- ered the close of his baronage," Madame de Sévigné, who bad him in her Letters as "a man of the world, eting sprightliness, knowing all things and all things; yet with all the gentleness, brill- iant complaisance which could be desired in the sense of life" (March 18, 1690). Equally fatter- nesses of his grace, the politeness of his manners, the polish of his conversation, and the elegance of his manners. He is said to have added to "a distinct address and personal appearance a sweet and graceful eloquence, which became masculine and pow- ered the close of his baronage," Madame de Sévigné, who bad him in her Letters as "a man of the world, eting sprightliness, knowing all things and all things; yet with all the gentleness, brill- iant complaisance which could be desired in the sense of life" (March 18, 1690). Equally fatter-
plenipotentiaries of the Dutch provinces arrogant, exacting, and impracticable. He rebuked their domineering tone by remarking, "It is very evident, gentle
men, that you are unused to victory." Nothing was offered, however, towards the peace service, but two years later he was sent to the Congress of Utrecht, where he appeared in the habit of a layman, and under the name of the Comte de Polignac. The Dutch negotiators, suspecting the existence of secret articles between France and England, threatened to expel the French ambassadors from their territory. Hereupon Polignac retorted, "We will not depart: we will treat of you, among you, and without you." He refused, however, to sign the treaty, as it excluded from the English throne the Stuart family, to whose head he was indelibly attached for his nomination to the cardinalate.

Before the negotiations at Utrecht were closed, the promotion of Polignac was promulgated, and he received the cardinal's hat at Antwerp, Feb. 10, 1713. In the summer of the same year the beretta was delivered to him at Versailles by Louis XIV himself. He did not neglect his poetic defence of Christianity even in the perplexity of diplomatic cares. He added new passages to his poem during his sojourn at Utrecht, and read his poetic labors to the eminent and aged scholar Le Clerc. On the return to Paris he received the appointment of master of the Royal Chapel, an office which he resigned after three years' tenure. His influence and acceptability at court declined after the death of the great monarch. His stately manners belonged to the old regime, and were uncongenial to the license of the modern. He was involved in the conspiracy of Cellamare through his attachment to the duke and duchess of Maine, and his opposition to the regent Orleans. He was exiled to his abbey of Anchin, in Flanders; and though his arrival was distasteful to the simple and unenlightened Flemish monks, he won their regard by his gentleness and consideration, by the integrity of his government, and by the decoration of their church. He employed himself here with the continuation of his poem; but after three years returned to Paris on the death of the cardinal Dubois and of the regent. In 1724 he attended the conclave in Rome which resulted in the election of Benedict XIII, and rendered himself singularly acceptable to him and to his successor, Clement XII. He was appointed shortly after his arrival in Rome ambassador of France at the papal court, to which he arranged with a happy termination the long controversy of the Gallican Church on the subject of the bull Unigenitus. He returned to his native land in 1730, "laden with the spoils of Rome"—both the tributes paid to his dexterity, wit, eloquence, and fascination of manner, and the treasures brought from the capital of the ancient world. During his absence he had been appointed, in 1726, archbishop of Auch, and in 1728 Commandeur des Ordres du Roi.

During this long political and diplomatic career there had been many intervals of literary retirement, as we have seen, when he had been successfully employed in the acquisition and application of various knowledge. His poetic taste and his learned labors he never entirely laid aside, but rendered them profitable to himself and attractive to statesmen and courtiers wherever his wanderings led him. His public avocations were thus far from filling up the measure of his distinction. In 1704 he succeeded the illustrious Bossuet as a member of the Royal Academy of France. His inaugural address on this occasion was greatly admired. For more than twenty years after its delivery the marquis de Chastellux, as流入inspired the French, observed during the century in which the Academy had existed, and declared it to be "the most perfect model for those who have a like task to fulfill." In 1715 he was elected an honorary member of the Academy of Sciences, and in 1731 a corresponding member of the Academy of Sciences in Berlin. These honors were fairly merited. He had through life been a diligent explorer and collector of antiquities. He gathered a large and valuable cabinet of coins and medals. He brought together at great expense a splendid assemblage of archaic remains, due in great measure to his frequent and long-continued residence at Rome. He instituted and undertook the restoration of the sculptures of the Colosseum and the Pantheon, and discovered and restored the ancient columns of the Temple of Minerva Medica. To the people and to the republic he dedicated at the request of the French government a splendid monument. His诩led and art and character and his munificence to the church and to the state have been acknowledged throughout the whole Christian world. The pope, under whose pontificate Polignac lived, pronounced him a saint. The king of France, on the occasion of his death, devoted an elaborate and eloquent eulogy, a striking expression of the respect in which he was held by the French nation. He was one of the great statesmen of Europe. He died at Paris Nov. 20, 1741, and his collection was scattered at his death. His habits had been elegant and courtly—his living generous—his public employments and his private pursuits expensive—his ample means consumed in costly accumulations. He was buried in the Abbey of St. Denis, and after his decease his books, his gems, his medals, his sculptures, and his numerous articles of virtu were offered for sale. His statues were purchased by Frederick the Great, and were transported to Berlin, where they were destroyed on the capture of that city in the Seven-Years' War. All that remains as a memorial of Polignac is his conflagration of Lutetius.

Even that great work—for it merits the epithet of great both by its design and by its execution—the great Latin poem which preserves his reputation, was left in incomplete state at the time of his decease. It was recovered after the death of Polignac when it was discovered, during the course of the period in which the Academy of Sciences had existed, that it was written on sheets of different papers and had not been published when the Academy was first instituted. These papers were fairly merited. He had through life been a diligent explorer and collector of antiquities. He gathered a large and valuable cabinet of coins and medals. He brought together at great expense a splendid assemblage of archaic remains, due in great measure to his frequent and long-continued residence at Rome. He instituted and undertook the restoration of the sculptures of the Colosseum and the Pantheon, and discovered and restored the ancient columns of the Temple of Minerva Medica. To the people and to the republic he dedicated at the request of the French government a splendid monument. His herald and art and character and his munificence to the church and to the state have been acknowledged throughout the whole Christian world. The pope, under whose pontificate Polignac lived, pronounced him a saint. The king of France, on the occasion of his death, devoted an elaborate and eloquent eulogy, a striking expression of the respect in which he was held by the French nation. He was one of the great statesmen of Europe. He died at Paris Nov. 20, 1741, and his collection was scattered at his death. His habits had been elegant and courtly—his living generous—his public employments and his private pursuits expensive—his ample means consumed in costly accumulations. He was buried in the Abbey of St. Denis, and after his decease his books, his gems, his medals, his sculptures, and his numerous articles of virtu were offered for sale. His statues were purchased by Frederick the Great, and were transported to Berlin, where they were destroyed on the capture of that city in the Seven-Years' War. All that remains as a memorial of Polignac is his conflagration of Lutetius.
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abb de Rothelin, appointing him his literary executor, to revise, arrange, connect, complete the scattered leaves, to express the sentiments and the ideas of the author, to give this work a form and a unity. The profound and unerring judgment for the performance of these duties seems to have been early made. The marquis d'Argenson reports it in his Mémoires, published fifteen years before Polignac's death: "A poem against Lucretius, of equal length, equal in design, and divided into nine books, requires the life of a man to carry it to perfection. The cardinal began too late, and cannot flatter himself with the hope of living to finish it. It is said that he means to charge the abbé de Rothelin with the task, who, from vanity, will not refuse it, and will think it an honor to put the work in the shape of his esteemed friend. It may appear before the public. But to this end the aid of some able professor of the university will be necessary: the abbé will never accomplish it of himself. But when, at present, will read a Latin poem entirely philosophical, of five or six thousand lines? Greek is entirely forgotten; it is to be feared that Latin will soon be so, and that the cardinal de Polignac, the abbé de Rothelin, and a certain M. Le Beau, coming up in the university, will be called the last of the Romans." From vanity also, from the love of learning, from zeal for philosophy, or from all these motives, the cardinal proposed the execution of that great and important task intrusted to him was faithfully and creditably discharged by the abbé de Rothelin. With the counsel and assistance of the abbate Cercati, rector of the University of Pisa, he prepared the work for the press. The author wrote it during his stay at Pisa, and it was printed in 1747. He, too, died without seeing the fruit of his labors; and the long expected work, which for forty years had been a mark of polite culture to know (Anti-Lucrétien ou poème éthérique), appeared at Paris under the superintendence of Prof. Le Beau, to whom the charge of editing it had been consigned by Rothelin. It was reissued at London in 1748. D'Argenson thought that translations would be left unread; but translations soon diffused the fame of the work among those who were ignorant of the classic tongues. At the commencement of the century, while the poem was in its crude infancy, a translation was begun by the dukes of Maine and Bourbon. The French version of Bougainville was issued in 1759, and the Italian of Ricci was produced in Spiegel at Verona in 1767 (3 vols. 4to).

The Anti-Lucrétien. — The philosophical poem of cardinal Polignac, as published by Le Beau, and, apparently, as originally designed by its author, consists of nine books; but it closes without epilogue, peroration, or envoy. Notwithstanding its length, its protracted meditation, and its elaborate execution, it ends like that of Gounet (Hervé), it has the grace of a simple and Fiddle, but "breaks off in the middle." It wants simplicity and completion. It is fragmentary and desultory, deficient and redundant. Its arguments are ingenious without being convincing, and its polemics are more dazzling than satisfactory. The blind and fanatical Cartesianism of the poet confines him in a labyrinth of bewildering errors, and conceals from him at once the vagaries and weaknesses of his master, and the strength and profundity of those who had risen up to oppose his philosophic hallucinations. He is dissatisfied by the mortifications in which he has involved himself. He forgets his specific function as the antagonist of Epicurean ethics and physics, and devotes himself with more earnest energy to the refutation of all anti-Cartesians, whom he assimilates to and often identifies with the Epicurean herd. He is in consequence both disconcerted and unjust in the treatment of his brilliant predecessors and contemporaries. The statement and confusion of the doctrines of Spinoza might have been very acceptable to the Cartesian and theologians of his own day, who, with the Anti-Lucrétien, by a harmonious and highly appreciated (iii. 903-872; iv. 1293-1307). It may be highly approved even now by those who still retain the old fanatical delusions and the old anomalies in regard to Spinoza, and who cannot recognise in him Coleridge's "God-intoxicated sage." See Spinoza But surely the language in which the cardinal assails the author of the system, and proceeds to explain Newton himself, does equal discredit to his good sense and to his scientific perspicacity (ii. 905-1006; iv. 903-1124). He does it, it is true, allow a faint echo of the universal admiration for Newton to escape him:

"Dizam
Tantœ pace viri, quo non soliter alter
Naturam rerum ad leges componentes motus,
Ac Mundi partes justas et perpetuae
Et radium solis transvaso praeclatum fracturam
Septem in primigenius perennisuroque colores
Solvere (ii. 904-980).

Yet how different is this depreciatory commendation from the enthusiastic eulogy bestowed on Des Cartes! (VIII. 66-69).

This is the manifest reflection of the tribute of Lucretius to the "Graias homo," Epicurus. We may endure with patience Polignac's contempt for the materialistic tendencies of Locke's philosophy, and his omission of his contemporaries, Malebranche and the much greater Leibnitz (an omission which may be explained and excused), but we cannot fail to observe his utter inability to discern the scientific acumen, and the wonderful faculty of logical co-ordination and development, which characterized his chosen antagonist Lucretius. One of the most extraordinary things in the Anti-Lucretius is the opening, in which he announces his subject and its difficulties, and does earnest homage to the exquisite graces of the Latin poet. But this inauguration of his thesis does not prevent him from speaking of the spirit and doctrines of Lucretius in terms which reveal rather the controversialist eager to display his own powers in the best light than the sincere inquirer anxious to discover and to promulgate only the truth. With all our regard for the courtly and clerical poet, we must confess him to be more of a dilettante than a philosopher or adept in science.

But, while thus taking exception to the substance and argumentation of the poem, and to the narrowness and fanaticism inseparable from the advocacy of fantastic and erroneous theories, attention may be justly called to the general execution of the difficult task, and to many episodical disquisitions, which assail by anticipation the speculations of Darwin and the evolutionists, and present many topics and many suggestions which merit careful examination in connection with the scientific controversies that distract our own day by the restatement of the battle of old ages. Whatever deductions may be properly made from the Anti-Lucrétien on the score of scientific superficiality and philosophic aberration, the work merits high praise on account of its design and execution; and still deserves consideration as a memorable and singularly graceful production of the modern Latin muse.

The versification and expression of Polignac have been unfavorably compared with the excellences of some of the earlier Latinists. In making the comparison with Vida, one of the chief of those elders, some advantage may be derived from the directness, the unequal, counterpart to one of his poems. The description of the game of chess in the Anti-Lucrétien may be fairly considered in connection with the Scacchia, Ludus, of the Cremonese poet. The same ingenuity in rendering the stiffness of classic Latinity plastic, for the purpose of describing things and processes entirely unknown to the classical vocabulary, may be admired in both. In the one instance chess is employed only as an illustration, and the description occupies only fifteen lines (Anti-Lucr. iii. 892-906); in the other it constitutes the thesis of a descriptive poem. In a few lines, and in a mere illustration, there is, of course, no opportunity for detail. Nor is there room for such elaborate intricacy of narration—such subtle twisting in and twisting
out of facile diction—nor for such surprising felicity of adaptation of old forms to new and undesigned uses, in the later episode as in the earlier poems. There is nothing, however, in the narrower field which, for curious dexterity, admits of being added as a parallel for Vida's marvellous explanation of the diverse movements of the pieces at chess (Souace, 85—185), or for his explanation of the manuveres and fortunes of the game. But it may be permitted to act upon the artist's maxim, "non est posse dicere," and we may discern in the episode of Polignac (notwithstanding the deficiency of materials for an accurate and minute comparison) a command over the resources of the Latin tongue which is not unworthy of Vida, even in such fantastic sports of fancy and event as Polignac's. If the larger factors of the poet are considered, Vida's epic, the Christiad, fails to exhibit such compass of expression, such grace and dignity, and even melody of utterance, or such vigor of imagination, as the Anti-Lucrutius. Both Vida and Polignac, it is true, fall into the unclassical frailty of terminating their hexameters too frequently with monosyllables and enclitics. They are careless of their caesuras, and repeat too often certain easy forms and mannerisms. There may be more liquidity and smoothness in Vida, but there is more elevation and a more masculine gravity in Polignac. If the study of the two poets coincided with unconscious limitation to the transparent fluency of Virgil, the latter with equal success, but with deliberate endeavor, reproduces the peculiarities, and not rarely the splendors, of Lucrutius, in the very diction of the greater Roman poet. But the better judgment may be passed on either the absolute or the relative merit of the Anti-Lucrutius, it remains a very remarkable poem, which deserves to be reclaimed from the oblivion in which it has been suffered to remain so long. It was a praiseworthy and noble effort to repel the advances of scepticism in the day of Spinoza and Locke and Bayle; "to justify the ways of God to man," by explaining the wonder of the universe in consonance with a lively and intelligent faith in a wise, beneficent, and sustaining Creator. Despite of its imperfections, its disconnections, its disorder and incompleteness, the study of the poem may be advantageously renewed after the lapse of a century, though other weapons may be required for the reanimated conflict between faith and science than can thence be drawn, in consequence of the vast changes which have since been made in all the implements of intellectual warfare.

Literature.—It results from the long neglect into which the Anti-Lucrutius had fallen that the bibliographer of the subject is exceedingly scant and unsatisfactory. The histories of philosophy pass it by with little or no notice; the editors of Lucrutius, and the commentators on the De Natura Rerum, have scarcely bestowed more attention upon it. There is very little to assist investigation which is not due to the contemporaries of Polignac. Under these circumstances, the only references which it seems expedient to make are, Bibliographie Universelle, s. v. Polignac; De Boze, Eloge de M. le Cardinal de Polignac, prononcé dans l'Académie Royale des Inscriptions et des Belles-Lettres; De Mairan, Eloge de M. le Cardinal de Polignac, prononcé dans l'Académie Royale des Sciences; Fanchet, Hist. du Cardinal de Polignac (Paris, 1772, 2 vols.); St. Simon, Mémoires; D'Argenson, Mémoires; Anti-Lucrutius, sive de Ivo et Natura Libri Novem (Lond. 1746, 2 vols. 12mo). The recent History of French Literature by Van Laun, though extending over three octavo volumes, has not a word on Polignac, so much has his memory fallen into neglect. For the relation of Polignac to the important ecclesiastical events of his time, see Jervis, Hist. of the Church of France, ii, 181, 224, and the articles Noailles in this Cyclopaedia. (C. F. H.)

Polish Brethren. See Socinians.

Politeness. See Courtesy.

Politi, Adriano, an Italian writer, was born at Si-ena at the close of the 16th century. He chose the ecclesiastical career, and was attached as secretary to the Cardinal Sermonti in 1566, and private secretary to Cardinal Sermonti in 1575. He died about the middle of the 17th century. Politi edited Opere di C. Tacito (Rome, 1611, 4to), and another and more satisfactory edition (Venice, 1644, 4to):—Dizionario Toscano (ibid. 1615, 8vo): this work, an abridgment of the Dizionario della Crusca or Dictionary of the Tuscan Language, was accused of having with littleness introduced into it some errors and falsehoods, and was thrown into jail:—Ordo Romana historia legenda (ibid. 1627, 4to, and in vol. iii of Roberti's Miscellanea).—Hoefler, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xii, 616.

Politi, Alessandro, an Italian writer, was born July 15, 1725. If he is to be believed, after studying under the Jesuits, he entered at the age of fifteen the Congregation of the Regular Clerks of the Pious Schools, and was conspicuous among its members by his rare endu- tion. He was called upon to teach rhetoric and peri- patetic philosophy at Florence in 1700. Barring a period of about three years, during which he was a pro- fessor of theology at Genoa (1718-18), he spent the greatest part of his life in his native city, availing himself of the manifold resources he could find there to im- prove his knowledge of Greek literature, his favorite study. In 1730 he was called to the chair of theology vacant in the University of Pisa. Accustomed to live among his books, aloof from the world, Politi was of an irritable disposition, and sensitive in the extreme to the slightest criticism. He was fond of displaying his er-udition, and his unforgiving, censorious nature, and his was a most harassing job. He died July 25, 1752. He left, Philosophia Peripatetica, ex mente amici Thomae (Florence, 1708, 12mo):—De patria in tempore condendi potestate, lib. ii (ibid. 1712, 8vo);—Eustachi Commentarii in Homerii Iliadem, with notes and Latin version (ibid. 1730-33, 8 vols. fol.):—Eustachi Commentarii in Dionysium Peripiteum, and Greek and Latin (Col-ogne, 1742, 8vo):—Orationes XII ad Academiam Pia- num (Lucca, 1746, 8vo):—Martyriogogum Romanum caustigatum (vol. i, Florence, 1751, 8vo); and many un- published works. All his orations have been collected (Pisa, 1774, 8vo). See Fabrioni, Vite Italiani, vol. viii; Tiptalp, Biog. degli Ital. illustr., vol. iv.—Hoefler, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xii, 616.

Politi, Giovanni, an Italian canonist, was born June 8, 1738, at Pizzano (Frioul). He studied at Padua, obtained in 1763 the diploma as a doctor of civil and canon law, and was a professor of literature at the catedrario of Portogruaro, and also of ecclesiastical jurisprudence, in which he was remarkably proficient. In 1800 he repaired to Concordia, where the bishop provided him with a canonicate. He published one consider- able work, De pramenti reconditae ecclesiasticae univer- sitatis (Venice, 1787, 9 vols. 4to), which was approved by a brief of Pius VI.—Hoefler, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xii, 617.

Politian or Poliziano, Angelo, a noted scholar of the Renaissance period, flourished in France and Italy, and was the favorite of the Medici at Flo- rence. He was born at Montepulciano, in Tuscany, in 1494, and was the son of Benedetto Arengario, a doctor of law. In 1514 he was appointed his father's heir and assumed that of Poliziano, from his native town Moss Politianus. Lorenzo de Medici took care of his educa- tion, placed him under good preceptors, and provided for all his wants. He afterwards entered into clerical orders, and became a doctor of law, and was made by Lorenzo a canon of the cathedral of Florence. He was also intrusted with the education of the ducal children, as well as with the care of the duke's library and collection of antiquities, and he was his guest and com-panion for the remainder of his life. Poliziano had studied Latin under Cristoforo Landino, Greek under Andronicus of Thessalonica, and philosophy under Fi- cino and Archipollus of Constantinople. He was after- wards appointed professor of Latin and Greek at Flor-
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en a chair which he filled with great reputation. He wrote scholia and notes on many ancient authors—Ovid, Cautilus, Statius, Suetonius, Pliny the Younger, and the "Scripturae Historiae Augustae"; he translated into Latin the history of Herodotus, the manual of Epictetus, the sphaerium of Hipponocrates, some dialogues of Plato, and other works of Aristotle. His attitude of the Middle Ages of Poliziano, published at Florence in 1489, consist chiefly of observations he had made on the ancient authors, which he arranged for the press at the request of Lorenzo. Merula made an attempt to depreciate this work, which led to an angry controversy between the two scholars, in the midst of which Merula died. Poliziano had also a violent controversy with Bartolomeo Scala. Poliziano was conciliated and vain, and very irritable, and his temper led him into an unbecoming altercation with Madame Clarice, Lorenzo's wife, because she interfered in the education of her children, a thing which Poliziano seemed to think preposterous in a woman; and at last his behavior to her was so impertinent that she turned him out of her house in the country, and wrote to her husband at Florence to inform him of what she had done. The persecution between the offended woman and the irascible scholar was impracticable, gave Poliziano apartments in one of his houses at Fiesole, where he wrote his Latin poem. During Lorenzo's last illness, Poliziano attended at his death-bed of his patron, who gave him to know, by the signs of affection affecting moody on Lorenzo's death, and not long after died himself, in September, 1494, and was buried in the church of San Marco, agreeably to his request. —English Cydes, &c. See Müller, De Polizio (Altorf, 1869); Werner, Politianus (Magdeh. 1718); Mencken, Hist. Vita A. Poliziano (Leips. 1786, 4to); Bonfous, De Politian Vita et Operibus (Paris, 1845, 8vo); Greswell, Memoirs of Politian; Roscic, Lives of Lorenzo de Medici and of Leo X; Tiraboschi, Storia della Letterat. Ital.; Christian Schools and Schools (Lond. 1867, 2 vols. 8vo), ii. 321 sqq.; 329; Lawrence, Historical Studies (N. Y. 1867, 8vo), p. 66.

Polity, Civil, of the Jews. See Government.

Polity (Gr. συνολοσ) is the term generally used to signify government or forms of government and administration in the Christian Church. Church polity may be considered in reference to its historical development during successive centuries, and also in reference to the various systems of government heretofore and now recognized as the churches.

Historical Development. —Nothing is more obvious from the New-Testament record than the simplicity which characterized the primary organization of the Church. In this particular Christianism was in marked contrast with Judaism. Without temple, tabernacle, or altar, without priests or Levites, and almost without ceremonies, it made known at once its character and purposes as spiritual and not carnal, as, in fact, a kingdom of God "not of this world." The first form of Church organization was that in which the Lord Jesus Christ and a group of His disciples were associated together as believers. At this stage the ordinances were established by direct appointment of the Saviour himself, who also gave the great command to His disciples to "Go teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." Following the crucifixion, the resurrection, and ascension of the Lord Jesus, the Church had for a short period a second form of organization, in which the apostles were the only officers to teach and guide the followers of the Lord. The promised gift of the Holy Ghost was miraculously imparted and signalled by a great awakening at Jerusalem, in which the Lord added to the Church daily such as were saved. This period of increase was followed by the appointment of deacons or officers of help, who were especially chosen to relieve the apostles of their minor duties of a semi-secular kind, that they might give themselves "to prayer and the ministry of the Word." Notwithstanding their primary duties, some if not all of the deacons also devoted themselves to the preaching of the Word, as may be seen from the examples of Stephen and Philip. Following there appear to have been no other officers in the Church besides the apostles and deacons. The next phase of Church administration is that in which elders were appointed. As no specific account is given of the mode of their appointment, we are left to infer that it may have occurred as a natural designation of respect for seniority either among the deacons or the influential members of the Church, somewhat after the analogy of eldership among the Jews. Certain it is that as churches multiplied, the apostles recognized, possibly appointed, and actually ordained elders who from the first had greater or less functions of government, and were also active agents of evangelization. Elders were known at Jerusalem about A.D. 41, or eight years after the Pentecost. A few years later they were ordained generally. All the churches at the council at Jerusalem they were associated with the apostles and brethren (xxv, 4, 6, 23). The elders of the New Testament appear to have been evangelists, teachers, and pastors, and in a collective capacity to have ordained ministers of different grades. Near the close of the New Testament period the term bishop is used a few times by the inspired writers Luke and Paul, indicating an additional office growing up out of the presbyterate, somewhat as the latter had done from the diakonos. On questions that have arisen respecting the office of bishop in the New-Testament Church modern controversies in reference to Church polity have largely centred. One theory is that the apostles appointed bishops to be their direct and only official successors having the prerogative of ordaining future ministers of divine right. An opposite theory is that the kuedo and kuedo of the New Testament were absolutely identical in office and order, and, consequently, that every elder was a bishop. The more probable theory lies between these extremes. It is that the episcopate was a natural sequence of the presbyterate, not specifically appointed, but, in fact, recognized by the apostles. Whereas for the work of evangelization not only an elder but elders were ordained in the principal churches, there would exist in every body of elders the necessity of a presiding or primacy for the purpose of policy, administration, or direction. Thus one of the number would be designated, either by seniority or formal choice, as a primus inter pares, who should serve as overseer (muzsbox) of the body and the flock under them. According to this theory, the episcopate was an office of su-preminence rather than a distinct clerical order; and in this respect it was analogous if not identical in its functions with that of such apostolic legates as were Timothy and Titus. Nevertheless, it was an office of such importance in the administration of the affairs of the Church that it was well adapted to the necessities of the times that it soon became general. Nothing in its original character would prevent its being held in rotation by several elders in the same church or diocese, yet a successful administration of it would tend to its perpetuation in the same individual. Hence it soon became an office for life.

The episcopacy of the primitive Church was diocesan, and in many cases dioceses embraced only single churches. But as Christian influences radiated from these churches, and contiguous churches were established, the diocese was expanded to the secular divisions in importance. At this early period an error crept into the Church which had a great influence upon its polity in after-times. It was that of attributing priestly functions to the Christian ministry. Soon after the custom became current of calling presbyters priests, it also be-
came customary to call bishops high-priests, and deacons Levites, and thus a full hierarchical system was initiated in the Church. After the conversion of Constantine this system became gradually expanded, until it exceeded in pomp and detail of ceremony the whole ritual of Judaism, and threw the pontifical rites of Greek and Roman religion into the background. From the Christian bishop as the primitive centre, episcopal councils expanded upwards into archbishops, metropolitan, patriarchs, and episcopacy; downwards into deacon, presbyter, and finally, the bishop himself as the centre of the Church. The bishops' powers were increased by the addition of archbishops, metropolitan, patriarchs, and the patriarchal or archiepiscopal authority. The upper expansion of the episcopate was the bishop's seat, called the patri
depos of Christianity, and the Roman Church was content with nothing less than a universal patriarchate or papacy (q.v.).

To state somewhat more fully the organization of the Church in the 4th and 5th centuries, it may be said that the Church of that period consisted of several orders of men. Eusebius reckons three, viz., the ἡγόμενος, πρεσbyteroi, and καθορίζομενοι, i.e., rulers, bishops, and cattacthemenoi. Origen reckons five orders; but then he divides the clergy into three orders, to make up the number of the seven last classes, when compared together, and to the same thing. Under the ἡγόμενος, or bishops, were comprehended the clergy, bishops, priests, and deacons; under the πρεσbyteroi, or bishops, the baptized laity; and under the καθορίζομενοι, or cathach
cumens, the candidates for baptism. The believers were called Christian; the catechumen imperfect. The former, having received baptism, were allowed to partake of the Eucharist, to join in all the prayers and the Church, and to hear discourses upon the most profound mysteries of religion; more particularly the use of the Lord's Prayer was the sole prerogative of the believers, whence it was called Ἐκκλησία πιστῶν, the prayer of believers. From all these privileges the catechumen were excluded. See Catechumens. The distinction between the laity and the clergy is by churchmen deduced on the very beginnings of the Christian Church; yet Rigidius, Salmasius, and Salzen insist that there was originally no distinction, but that it is an innovation, and was called forth by the ambition of the clergy of the 3rd century, in which Cyprian and Tertullian are the chief advocates. See Cyprian.

The various orders of the clergy were appointed to their several offices in the Church by solemn forms of consecration or ordination, and had their respective privileges, immunities, and revenues. The unity and worship of the Church were secured by laws both ecclesiastical and civil. The ecclesiastical laws were either the canons of the Church, or orders made by each bishop for the better regulation of his particular diocese, or laws made in provincial synods for the government of all the dioceses of a province; or, lastly, laws respecting the whole Christian Church, made in general councils or assemblies of bishops from all parts of the Christian world. See Synods. The civil laws of the Church were those decrees and edicts made from time to time by the emperors, either restraining the power of the Church, or granting it new privileges, or confirming the old. The breach of these laws was severely punished both by the Church and State. The ecclesiastical councils resolving offenses among the clergy were chiefly suspended from the office and deprivation of the rights and privileges of the order. Those respecting the laity consisted chiefly in excommunication or refraction from the communion of the Church, and penance both public and private. See Ecclesiastical Polity.

The idea of the papacy or spiritual supremacy of Rome was not fully developed before the middle of the 7th century, when Theodore of Rome, not content with the title of ocumenical patriarch, assumed that of sovereign pontiff. From that period the successive claims of the papacy—viz., temporal sovereignty, the viceracy of Peter and Paul, of Christ and of God, the dominion of the kingdom of heaven, and the theocratic monarchy of the world—went on progressively, until in the assumption of infallibility (q.v.). Meantime, as a system of ecclesiasticism, the papacy has retained most of the offices of the ancient Church, and added to them that of cardinal (q.v.), nuncio, chancellor, chamberlain, chancellor, and professor, and the procurator, and numerous others of a political and ceremonial character. Within the sphere of papal authority no serious controversy ever arose on the subject of Church polity. Ceremonial expansion, unchecked by any idea of scriptural example or restraint, was for centuries the order of progress. It was not till the Reformation was so far inaugurated as to feel the necessity of organizing churches after the type of the New Testament that any important discussions took place respecting the principles of Church government. The Reformed churches on the Continent, generally speaking, adhered to the principles of the Reformation and of the Catholic church in the 16th century. The Lutherans practiced the papal office under the title of superintendent. But scarcely any two of the principal Reformed churches agreed in detail as to their plan of organization, nor were these minor differences regarded as of any serious importance. See Church Government.

Systems of Church Government. England is the country that has given birth to the chief controversies concerning Church polity which have prevailed in modern times. As the Reformation in England was largely political in its character, it is not only resulted in the transfer of the cathedrals, churches, colleges, etc., built under Roman supremacy, to the Reformed Church of England, but also many Roman Catholic ceremonies, and usages. Hence from the first that Church was divided into two parties in reference to Church polity. Had they been content with temperate discussion, and with the peaceful separation of those who could not harmonize their views, the result might have been very different. But fortunately both parties had inherited the principle of intolerance, either from the Roman Church or from preceding times, and also the theory of state rule in matters of religious faith and practice. To these false principles may be charged some of the most pitiable and disgraceful facts in the history of Great Britain. The oppressive legislation, the stirs, the persecution, the massacre of the martyrs was in the succession repeated of Henry VIII, of Bloody Mary, of queen Elizabeth, of James I, of Charles I and II, and even under the protectorate of Cromwell, are sufficient to impress any mind with the extent of human misery, and of reproach to the Christian name caused by the errors allowed to. In all history there is not a single more significant commentary upon the sin of constraining men's consciences by the arbitrary standards of human authority. It was not till after more than a hundred and fifty years of party strife and bloodshed that in 1660 the Toleration Act was passed. But the establishment of the Church from the faith and polity of the Established Church was legalized. Even after that it was a long time before many could see, and even yet it does not seem possible for all to understand, that details of Church polity were never appointed by divine authority, but design

ably left by the Heven for the guidance and the government on the basis of great principles rather than to be governed by fixed and uniform precepts. Scotland had adopted Presbyterianism from the Reformed churches of the Continent as early as 1550, but even after toleration it was several years before Presbyterianism became popular in England. Independency in various forms seemed to be preferred by the English Nonconformists and Dissenters. Between them and Presbyterians the one hand, and the advocates of prelacy or episcopacy by divine right on the other, controversy
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has never ceased. But since the controversy has been
limited to words it has been an innocent, though often
an exciting one, owing to the many phases it has as-
sumed from time to time.

While the Church of England has continually au-
tegnized the Church of Rome on the ground of papal
sacraments, it has been consistent in recognizing the
dependence on it by the High and Low Church parties
within its own pale, and more especially since the period of
the Oxford Tracts (q.v.) and the more recent ritualistic
discussions. All the English controversies respecting
Church polity have found their way to this country,
but with greatly altered conditions of the various par-
ties. Independence having escaped from persecution
by way of Holland, itself established a species of theoc-
ocracy and became a persecutor in New England. But
its period of intolerance was brief; and, on the whole,
the Church of England and the United States have been
remarkably free from the spirit and practice of intoler-
ance. The free institutions of the country and the ab-
solute separation of the State from all the churches have
tended to place all on a common level, and to make all
alike dependent upon good arguments and good prac-
tice as means of securing public respect and increasing
strength.

Controversies on Church polity in America have
cricket prevailed in the rivalry of denominations. For
the past, almost all churches, while considering their
own theories of polity, have respected those of others.
Discussions conducted after that manner have greatly
extended the feeling of Christian fraternity, and at the
same time made almost universal the opinion that par-
ticular forms of Church government are of quite inferior
importance as compared with the essential elements of
Christian faith and practice. On the other hand, pre-
tentious claims and intolerant practice have tended to
defeat their own aims and to secure public disapproba-

Notwithstanding numberless varieties in unim-
portant particulars, the distinctive systems of Church
government are few. Designated by the highest au-

tority recognized in each, they may be enumerated as
the Congregational, the Presbyterian, the Episcopal,
the Patriarchal, and the Papal. The details of these
systems may be seen by reference to articles on the
churches adhering to them severally.

Literature.—The controversial literature of the sub-
ject of Church polity is very nearly identical with that
of the subject of ordination (q.v.). The general, his-
torical, and didactic literature of Church polity is also
quite extensive. The following list of books will at
least fairly represent it in its different branches and
phases: Migne, Dictionnaire des Cérémonies et des Rites
sacres (Par. 3 vola. 8vo); also Dictionnaire de Discipline
Ecclesiastique (2 vola. 8vo); Amyrard, Du Gouvernement
de l'Eglise; Marwenn, Churchmanchip of the New Test.

Brokensy, Government of the Church for the First
Three Centuries; Kay, External Government of the
Church in the First Three Centuries; Parker, Church
Government of the First Six Hundred Years; Thornliked, The Forms of
Church Government; Cartwright, Directory of Church
Governments of the Church of England; Wil-
berforce, Church Courts and Discipline; Clergyman's As-

Clay, Essays on Church Policy; Birk, Church
and State; Baptist Noel, Church and State; Thompson,
Church and State; Clergyman's Instructor; Bannerman,
The Church of Christ; Cunningham; Discussions on
Church Principles; Canons of the Prot. Episc. Church;

Vinton, Manual Commentary on the Canon Law and
Constitution of the Prot. Episc. Church; Dobney, Three
Churches; Udén, New England Theocracy; Upham,
Ricke Discipline; Parchurd, Congregationism; Saw-
y, Tryon, Church Government; J. C. Miller, A

pulication; Miller, On Presbyterianism; also Ruling
Eliders; Engles, Ruling Elders; Form of Government;
Cambridge Platform of Church Discipline; Bacon,
Church Manual; Cummings, Congregational Diction-
bry; Letheram Liturgy; Kurtz, Why are you a Luth-
ern? King, Presbyterian Church Government; also On
the Eldership; Hiscox, Baptist Church Directory; Wiley,
Church Policy; Schmucker, Lutheran Manual; Grint-
drodt, Compendium of the Laws and Regulations of Wes-
leyan Methodism; Barrett, Ministry and Polity of the
Christian Church; Disciplinarian of the Methodist
Church; Baker, On the Discipline; Emory, Hist. of
the Discipline; Sherman, Hist. of the Discipline;

Porter, Compendium of Methodism; also Helps to Of-
cial Members; Bond, Economy of Methodism; Stevens, Ch.

Policy; Hodgson, Policy of Methodism; Morris, Church
Policy; Crane, Methodism and its Methods. (D. P. K.)

Polichchos (pola/choc), a surname of several de-
ties among the ancient Greeks, who were believed to be
the guardians of cities.

Polisiano. See Politian.

Polk, Leonidas, a noted American prelate of the
Protestant Episcopal Church, and a general in the late
war between the Northern and Southern States, was
born at Raleigh, N. C., in 1806. He was educated for
the army in the United States military academy at
West Point, N. Y., but had served only a few months
as lieutenant when he determined to take orders in
the Protestant Episcopal Church. He was ordained deacon
in 1830, and in 1831 he was made a rector of a church
at New Orleans. In 1835 he was made the missionary bishop of Arkansas and the
Indian Territory, south of 36° 30', and in 1841 bishop of
Louisiana. He then took up his residence at Lau-
perche parish, where he had extensive plantations.
Being a man of wealth and enjoying a life of ease, he
never paid very much attention to ecclesiastical labors,
and did but little to strengthen the work of the Church
within the range of his diocese. At the outbreak of
hostilities against the North he was on the side of the
planters, and did all in his power to further the seces-
sion movement. Not only did he speak upon these
subjects, but contributed from his purse, but he offered his services to the
Southern Confederacy as soon as established, and
was made a general in their army. He early urged
upon Jefferson Davis and the other Confederate authorities
the importance of fortifying and holding the stra-
tegical points of the Mississippi Valley, and in other
ways proved himself a far-seeing and skilful adviser of
their cause. He took part in several battles, and though
not always very prominent in action, was ever indis-

pensable in council, and contributed greatly to what-
soever success the Confederate cause achieved in the
years and surroundings. During a reconnaissance near Mari-
etta, Ga., he was killed by a cannon-shot, June 14, 1864.
He had never resigned his episcopal dignity, but was
buriel with military honors. Though bishop Polk gave
his life in what we consider an unworthy cause, we
must revere his memory for his sterling qualities as a
man who was not afraid to do what he believed to be
his duty. He was noted for his kindness of heart
and the most devout Christian life, such as he understood
it to be. See Men of the Times, s. v.; American
Annual Cyclop., 1860, p. 673; Drake, Dict. of American
Biography, s. v.

Poll (pol/o, gulgoleth, Num. 1, 2, 18, 20, 22; iii,
47; 1 Chron. xxiii, 3, 24), the head (as rendered in 1
Chron. x, 10), or skull (as in Judg. ix, 58; 2 Kings i, 35).
The verb "to poll" in the A. V. is the rendering of
pol, pol, or pol, all signifying to shear.

Poliajulo, Antonio, a noted Italian artist of the
Florentine school of painters and sculptors, flourished
in the second half of the 15th century. He was the pupil
of Lorenzo Ghiberti, and assisted this master in the
celebrated gates of the Baptistery of San Giovanni. Anto-
nio is said to have been the first artist who studied
the dead subject for the purposes of design. In 1484 he
was invited to Rome by pope Innocent VIII, to elabo-
rate a monument of the dead then but just expired Sixtus
IV, which is now in the chapel of the Sacrament of St.
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Peter's, where is also the monument of Innocent VIII, which he afterwards elaborated. His brother Pietro was likewise an artist of some celebrity. The two brothers wrought many great productions jointly. Their best is the Martirdom of St. Sebastian, painted in 1475, and for some years was considered a masterpiece of the school. It is now in the National Gallery at London, and it is engraved in the Etchings of Lastri. It is a fine work, without being refined or in the least idealistic. See Mrs. Clement, Handbook of Painters, etc., p. 462.

Pollerio, Pietro. See POLLAJUOLO, ANTONIO.

Pollaiole, Simone, a distinguished Italian architect, noted as the builder of many beautiful ecclesiastic buildings. He was born at Bologna in 1454. He was related to Antonio del Pollaiulo, and lived with him some time at Rome. Becoming a devoted follower of Savonarola, he was discarded by the churchmen, and in his later years was obliged to spend his talents in secular labors. He was one of the most prominent architects in the building of the Strozzi Palace. He died in 1529.

Pollard, William, an English Wesleyan minister, was born at Guisborough, in Yorkshire, in 1792. He was converted when but a youth, and soon after felt called of God to preach the Gospel. He prepared himself for the ministry, which he not only enjoyed, but one in which his labors always met with success. He was a man of great piety and sound faith, a faithful dispenser of the Word of Life, and an exemplary teacher. He possessed a strong memory and a cultivated mind, richly stored with divine truth. He died at Newport, Pagnell, April 21, 1833.

Pollinctori, an appellation given by the Romans to those who washed and anointed the dead preparatory to burial.

Pollo, a name common to a number of Lutheran theologians, of whom we mention the following:

1. Joachim, who was born Aug. 26, 1557, at Breslau, in Silesia. He pursued his studies at Leipzig, where he became magister of philosophy in 1577. In 1602 he was pastor at Buntzlau, in 1607 provost of the Church of the Holy Ghost and pastor of St. Bernard in Breslau; in 1615 he was made assessor of the evangelical consistory; in 1618 he was appointed pastor of St. Mary Magdalen. He died July 31, 1683. Lucas Pollio left a number of sermons behind him.

2. Lucas, who was born at Breslau in 1586. He studied at Frankfurt and Wittenberg. In the latter place he especially attended the lectures of Melancthon on the Greek language. In 1582 he was appointed professor of the St. Elizabeth Gymnasium in Breslau; but three years afterwards, in 1585, he went to Leipzig for the study of Hebrew and theology. In the same year he was appointed dean of St. Elizabeth in his native place, and in 1607 he was made pastor of St. Mary Magdalen. He died July 31, 1683. Lucas Pollio left a number of sermons behind him.

3. Lucas, son of Joachim, who was born Aug. 4, 1605, at Breslau. He studied at Leipzig, where he also was archbishop of St. Nicola. He died April 25, 1648. See P. Tafel, "Pastores der Kirche zu St. Elisabeth in Breslau"; the same, "Pastores zu St. Maria Magdalenae; Adami Viri theol. German. eruditiss. in 1, 158; Jocher, "Gelehrten-Lexikon," s. v. (B. P.)

Pollok, Robert, M.A., the noted author of the Course of Time, a Scotch bard of no mean order, and a minister of the Church, was born at Muirhouse, parish of Edinburgh, south-east of Glasgow, on Oct. 14, 1739, and was born to the more part of humble parentage. In his youth he worked on his father's farm, but evincing more than ordinary mental strength and love for study, he was encouraged to prepare for college, and was entered in the University of Glasgow in 1752. He graduated five years after, and determined upon the life of the holy ministry, for which he then began his studies at the seminary of the United Sessions Church. He was ready for ordination in 1827, and was in that year licensed to preach. His first public discourse, which was delivered on May 3, 1827, is spoken of as a most brilliant and interesting effort, and although it was written in one night with the aid of very little power and promise, at the same time gave indications that the Church would too soon be deprived of its service. Such was the fatigue occasioned by this single exertion that he was immediately confined to his bed; and although in a few days he was partially restored, he preached only three times afterwards. Just before he had received his license, Pollok had finished the poem on which his great literary reputation rests, the Course of Time. The object of the poet, whose sentiments are strongly Calvinistic, is that the picture is rather of a gloomy cast, to describe the spiritual life and destiny of man; and he varies his religious speculations with episodical pictures and narrations to illustrate the effects of virtue or vice. A work so ambitious from the hands of a country student, attached to a small body of Dissenters, was not likely to find a patron among publishers. It happened to be shown to Prof. Wilson, of Edinburgh, as a curiosity; but this great man hesitated not to recognise worth even in a young and unknown student, and the work was by him so heartily commended for its great poetical merit that its publication was arranged with Mrs. Blackwood, of Edinburgh. The Course speedily passed through several editions. It was a novelty in the class of evangelical religious literature to which it belonged, and besides pleasing those who are partial to that class of religious literature, it was a boon to many who are inclined to read religious books, but are repelled by their general dryness and insignificance, while it was warmly admired by the literary world at large. Pollok's partial admirers expected for him a place on a level with Milton. After the novelty of such a phenomenon had, however, passed off, the book became neglected by purely literary readers; and at this day it may be said that it is estimated too highly by the religious and perhaps too insignificantly by the literary world. It is certainly a work of great power, however meagre in fancy. There are many flashes of original genius which light up the crude and unwieldy design, and as for the narrow range of thought and knowledge, and as for the still pomposity that pervades the diction. There are in it a few passages which are strikingly and most poetically imaginative, and in some of which are good fashions. It has also, however, a considerable amount of sentiment deeply tinged with religious asceticism, and whole pages of plain and humble prose. These defects, it should be borne in mind, Pollok would in all probability have removed himself, guided by a more ripe judgment, in a careful revision, had Providence been pleased to prolong his life. His mind was evidently imbued with Paradise Lost, and he follows Milton often to the verge of direct imitation; but even as the work stands it is the undoubted production of a poetical genius, and it will always be read with profit and delight. Before the publication of his poem Pollok had undermined his constitution by excessive mental labor, and he scarcely lived to see its success. On the recommendation and through the assistance of the friends his genius had secured him, he was preparing to set out for Italy, when his death was brought on by a number of consumptive tendencies; while but on the eve of leaving Britain he was so greatly reduced that he tarried at Devonshire Place, Shirley Common, near Southampton. He there expired on Sept. 18, 1857.
by a calm faith in that religion he had preached, and a cheerful hope in that redemption which had been the theme of his song. The reception which the *Course of Time* has met with from the public is a sufficient testimony to the talents of its lamented author. His name is now recorded among the list of those illustrious Cuss-Scotheni who have done honor to their country; who, from obscurity, have secured for themselves an unfading reputation; and who will be remembered by distant generations with enthusiasm and admiration. His earliest publications—Helen of the Ciles, Ralph Carmell, and the *Persecuted Family*—were in prose, and were issued anonymously. They have been republished, with his name, in one volume, entitled *Tales of the Coss/Card*, and have passed through several editions. A very inadequate memoir of Robert Pollok, by his brother, with extracts from his correspondence, has been published by Messrs. Blackwood (Edinb. 1842), and there is a short memoir prefixed to the *Course of Time*.


**Birthplace of Pollok.**

**Pollex, a tutelary deity of mariners in ancient times (Acta xxviii, 11), whose image was placed either at the prow or stern of the ship.** See Carson.

**Pollex, Julius (Τολος Ἡλειας), a celebrated Greek sophist and grammarian, who flourished near the close of the 2d century, was a native of Anacretris, in Egypt, and, after preparatory training under his father, studied at Athens under the rhetorician Adrian.** He finally opened a school himself, and was subsequently appointed by the emperor Commodus to the chair of rhetoric. Several of his contemporaries were attacked him, and in many ways aimed to detract from his scholarly repute. He was the author of several works of which Suidas has preserved the titles. None of them are of interest to us except the *Ovomastorai, Biaθλος*, which has come down to us, and is valuable because it treats in the first part of the gods, and their worship. See Fabricius, *Bll. Græca*, vi. 141; Grilletlachen, *Gesch. der klass. Philologie*, iii. 166 sq.

**Polonez Frares. See Socians.**

**Polatsk (Polish, *Poznoc*), *Synod op*, an important ecclesiastical gathering, was held on Feb. 12, 1839, and was attended by all the Greek Uniate bishops in Russia, assisted by several of the most distinguished of their clergy. Its most important action was a synodal ordinance drawn up and signed by Joseph, bishop of Lithuanus; Basil, bishop of Orsha; Anthony, bishop of Brest, and twenty-one other dignitaries, in which they declare their firm and unalterable decision to acknowledge anew the unity of their Church with the orthodox Catholic Eastern Church; and, consequently, thenceforth, together with the flocks committed to their care, to continue in the same sentiment with the holy Eastern orthodox patriarchs, and in obedience to the holy governing synod of all the Russian." This act was appended the declaration of thirteen hundred and five pariah priests and monastic brethren, which number was afterwards increased to sixteen hundred and seven. Besides their act, a petition was drawn up to the emperor Nicholas, praying him to sanction the union of the Uniate with the Orthodox Church; this, together with the synodal act above, was submitted to the holy governing synod for examination and approval. The synod shortly after issued its decree upon the subject, by which it was ordained:

1. To receive the bishops, clergy, and flocks of the hitherto called Greek Uniate Church into full and complete communion with the holy orthodox Catholic Eastern Church, and so to be hereafter and forever harmoniously incorporated with the Church of all the Russians.

2. To confer the general blessing of the most holy synod on the bishops and clergy of all the participants, to their faith and love to the supreme bishop of our confession, Jesus Christ, that he would confirm them from above in the confession they have made, and that he would directly direct the work of their ministry to the perfecting of the saints.

This decree was signed by Seraphim, metropolitan of Novgorod and St. Petersburg, by Philaret of Kiev, Philaret of Moscow, and three prelates, besides two other ecclesiastics. It was confirmed March 25, 1839, by the emperor's own hand, with these words: "I thank God, and accept it." See Blackmore's *Mouraviæ*, *Russian Church*, Append. iv, p. 480.

**Polus, a Greek sophist, lived about B.C. 400.** He was born in Agistrium (Gygentrai), and studied under the celebrated sophist Gorgias, a Sicilian like himself. In his dialogue *Gorgias*, or *about Rhetoric*, Plato introduces Socrates in discussion with some of his disciples, among whom is Polus. The point in contest is at first the nature of rhetoric, but as the debate progresses it expands its limits, and touches the question whether the unrighteous can be happy, and whether it is not preferable to suffer injustice rather than to inflict it. The notoriety of Polus rests exclusively on the part assigned to him by Plato in this dialogue. There remains nothing of his writings, yet he seems to be a true disciple of Gorgias, to have written a rhetorical treatise; for Plato puts the following words in the mouth of Socrates: "To tell you the truth, Polus, I do not consider truth as an art, but only as a thing which you boast of having made an art of, in a writing which I have of late perused."

**Polwhele, Richard, an English divine noted as an antiquarian, historian, poet, and miscellaneous writer, whose works are exceedingly voluminous, was born at Truro in 1708, where he was also educated, and where, when a boy, with the assistance of the celebrated Dr. Wolcott, then a physician in that town, he first essayed as a poet. He took holy orders, and finally settled in his native place, where he died in 1838. He is noted rather for his secular productions, though he published also on religious topics. His principal works are *The History of Cornwall* (7 Vols., 1716); *The History of the County of Osbrih* (3 Vols.);--*Traditions and Recollections* (2 Vols.);--*The Rural Rector* (3 Vols.);--*Biographical Sketches in Cornwall* (3 Vols.);--*Anecdotes of Methodism*:--*Illustrations of Scriptural Characters*:--several volumes of *Sermone*; with numerous pamphlets, and they constitute part of a miscellaneous character. See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s. v.**
being chief husband. In the Himalayan and sub-Himalayan regions adjoining and under the influence of Tibet it is of frequent occurrence, in the same form as in the valley of Cashmere, in Ladak, among the Koech, and among the Telengese. Farther south in India it is common among the Males in the islands of the Nicobar and the Ceylon Islands. In Ceylon, and going eastward, it is not uncommon in New Zealand, and in one or two of the Pacific islands. Going northward, it is also common in the Aleutian Islands, and taking the continent to the west and north of the Aleutians, it is found among the Koryaks, to the north of the Okhotsk Sea. Crossing the Russian empire to the west side, we meet it among the Saporogian Cossacks; and thus have traced it at points half round the globe. This is not all, however. It is found in several parts of Africa; and it occurs again in many parts of America among the Red men. We have the authority of Humboldt for its prevalence among the tribes on the Orinoco, and in the same form as in Tibet. Among the Avaroes and the Mayupres, he says, "brothers have often but one wife." Humboldt also vouches for its former prevalence in Lancerota, one of the Canary Islands. Thus polyandry is a phenomenon of human life independent of race and country. See Latham, Journ. Linn. Soc., iv, 1850, i, 24; Sollas, op. cit., ii, 394, 404, 460, 472; Humboldt, Personal Narrative (Williams's translation, 1819), vol. v, p. 549; and vol. i, chap. i, p. 84; Hamilton, New Account of the East Indies (Edinb. 1727), i, 274, 308; Reade, Savage Africa, p. 43; Erman, Travels in Siberia, ii, 381; Seignior Gaya, Marriage Ceremonies (translation (2d ed. Lound. 1698), p. 79, 96; Emerson Tennant, Ceylon (3d ed. 1859), ii, 429; "Legend of Rupe," Grey's Polynesian Mythology (1865), p. 81; A Summer Ramble in the Himalaya (1860), p. 202; Vigne, Kashmir, i, 37; Journal Asiat. Soc. of Bengal, i, 854; Asiat. Soc. Bengal, v, 15.

From ancient history we learn that the area over which polyandry at one time existed was even more extended; while in certain cantons of Media, according to Strabo (ii, 798; and see Goguet, vol. iii, bk. vi, c. i), polygynia was authorized by express law, which ordained every inhabitant to maintain at least seven wives; in other cantons precisely the opposite rule prevailed—a woman was allowed to have many husbands, and they looked with contempt on those who had less than five. The other instance that in his time polyandry of the Tibetan type prevailed among the lower classes in the Laus di Bello Gallico, lib. v, c. xiv. We find direct evidence of its existence among the Pics in the Irish Nennius (App. ii), not to mention the traces of it remaining in the Pictish laws of succession. Indeed, to pass over communities in which something like promiscuity of intercourse between the sexes is said to have prevailed—such as the Massagetes, Agathyrsi, and the ancient Spartans—we find several among which polyandry, or a modified promiscuity, must have been the rule. Assuming that the sexual obligation laid on younger brothers in their turn to marry the wives of their deceased elder brother is a relic of polyandry of the Tibetan type, then we must hold that polyandry prevailed at one time throughout India (Institutes of Menu, ch. iii, § 175, and ch. ix, § 57, 60), among the ancient Hebrews (Deut. xxv, 5-11); in Siam, Burmah, in Syria among the Ostiaks, the But (Bodo), the Kasia, and the Paharies of Gburghal. Traces of it indeed remained in the time of Tacitus among the Germans (Tac. Germ. xx, Latham's edition, p. 67 sq.). In short, polyandry may be considered as one of the most natural forms in the human race, as a distinct advance from a state of promiscuity, on the assumption that pure promiscuity ever existed. Of the origin of this peculiar institution our space forbids us to write; but we believe it to be connected with the want of balance between the numbers of the sexes, due to the practice of female infanticide, which is its almost inviable accompaniment. Tribes of warriors, wholly devoted to a military life, find women an incumbrance rather than a solace; and from this cause, and probably from the difficulties of subsistence, formed the practice of killing their female children, sparing them only when they would be useful. As the practice spread, it would lead to polyandry, and once instituted, the custom would in many cases continue to exist after the habits and necessities which produced it disappeared. In several places, as in Ladak, where polygyny prevails, the sexes are now either equally balanced, or the female sex predominates. In cases polygyny and polyandry are commonly found existing side by side. The subject is one which demands, and as yet has not received, full investigation.—Chambers, s. v. See also London Academy, Nov. 21, 1874, p. 567; Lubbock, Origin of Civilization (see Index); Blackwood's Magazine, January, 1875, p. 69 sq., 82 sq.

Polycarp (Πολύκαρπος), a distinguished father of the Christian Church, is one of a small number who were distinguished from the rest by the title apostolic fathers, as having been contemporaries of some of the apostles. The period of his death is well ascertained to have been by martyrdom in A.D. 155, in the reign of Antoninus Pius (see Waddington, Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions, tom. xxvi, pt. ii, p. 232 sq.). The period of his birth is not known, and we can only determine his age when he died by the fact that he was 85 years of age when he was declared to have been reputed to have been a Christian eighty-six years, and according to this statement was born probably about A.D. 69. But if with other crises we suppose him to have been converted at a riper age he must be referred to the reign of Nero. However, there seems no reason to doubt that he was contemporary with the apostle John, and known to him, the lengthened period of whose life connects so fortunately the men of the 2d century with those who had been in personal attendance on the Saviour. It is this circumstance that gives to his life its chief importance, and makes one of these persons, and thence arises the main value of the few and in other respects unimportant writings which remain of the apostolic fathers. The lives form links in the chain of Christian tradition; and their compositions recognise by frequent quotations the writings which remain of evangelists and apostles. (In the following account of Polycarp we rely largely upon Smith's Dict. of Class. Biog. s. v.)

Life.—An ancient life, or rather a fragment of a life of Polycarp, ascribed to Bollandus to a certain Polycarp, is of unknown date, and given in a Latin translation in the Acta Sanctorum Januarii (a. d. 26), ii, 695, et seq., dwells much on the early history of Polycarp, but the record (if indeed it be the work of Pionius) is some centuries later than its subject, and is evidently false in several particulars. We are inclined to think, however, that it embodies some genuine traditions of Polycarp's history. According to this account, the apostle Paul visited Smyrna in his way from Galatia, through the propocultural Asia to Jerusalem (the writer apparently confounding two journeys recorded in Acts xvi, 22 and 23, and having collected the narrators, instructed them in the proper time of keeping Easter. After Paul's departure, his host, Strates, the brother of Timotheus, became bishop of the infant Church; or, for the passage is not clear, Strates became an elder and Bucolus was bishop. It was during the episcopate of Bucolus (whether he was the contemporary or the successor of Strates) that Callisto, a female member of the Church, eminent for riches and works of charity, was warned of God in a dream to go to the gate of the gate of the city of Gathe in the theater gate, where she would find a little boy (pseruleum) named Polycarp, of Eastern origin, who had been reduced to slavery, and was in the hands of two men, from whom she was to redeem him. Callisto, obedient to the vision, rose, went to the gate, found the two men with the child, as it had been revealed to her; and having redeemed the boy, brought
him home, educated him with maternal affection in the Christian faith, and, when he attained to manhood, first made him ruler over her house, then adopted him as her son, and finally left him heir to all her wealth. Polycarp had been from childhood distinguished by his benevolence, piety, and self-denial; by the gravity of his deportment. His presence was the terror of the ungodly, the solace of the righteous, the terror and the solace of the Scriptures. These qualities early attracted the notice and regard of the bishop, Bucolus, who loved him with fatherly affection, and was in return regarded by him with filial love. By Bucolus he was ordained first to the office of deacon, in which capacity he labored diligently, confuting heathens, Jews, and heretics; delivering catechetical homilies in the church, and writing epistles, of which that to the Philippians is the only extant specimen. He was subsequently, when of mature age (his hair was already turning gray), and still maturer, a presbyter, ordained by Bucolus, on whose death he was elected and consecrated bishop. We omit to notice the various miracles said to have been wrought by Polycarp, or to have occurred on different occasions in his life.

Such are the leading facts recorded in this ancient narrative, which has been well authenticated by the statements of Tilmont. That it has been interpolated with many fabulous admixtures of a later date is clear; but we think there are some things in it which indicate that it embodies earlier and truer elements. The difficulties in the narrative are sometimes later additions. The chief ground for rejecting the narrative altogether is the supposed difficulty of reconciling them with the more trustworthy statements of Irenæus (Epistolæ ad Florianum, apud Euseb. Hist. Eccles., v. 20), who, in his boyhood, had known, perhaps lived with Polycarp, and of other writers. According to Irenæus (Epistolæ ad Victoriam. Papaum, apud Euseb. Hist. Eccles., v. 24), Polycarp had intercourse with "John and others of the apostles"; or still more expressly (Ad. v. Hæræn, iii. 8, et apud Euseb. Hist. Eccles., iv. 14), he was instructed (perhaps by the mouth of Christ) in Christian doctrine, and conversed familiarly with many who had seen Christ; was by the apostles appointed (cæsaraeæarch) bishop of the Church at Smyrna; and always taught what he had learned from the Apostles. Tertullian (De Præscriptionibus Hereticis, c. 32) and Jerome (De Viris Iustis, c. 17) distinctly mention John as the Apostle by whom Polycarp was ordained. But we question if the expressions of Irenæus, when critically examined and stripped of the rhetorical exaggeration with which his natural reverence for Polycarp has invested them, will prove that such steps had ever been taken by the apostles. This is the case with hearing of some of the apostles; and was, with their sanction, appointed bishop of the Church at Smyrna. That John was one of the apostles referred to by Irenæus is not the slightest reason to doubt; and we are disposed, with Tilmont, to regard Philip, whom Polycrates of Ephesus (apud Euseb. Hist. Eccles., v. 24) states to have ended his days in the Phrygian Hierapolis, as another of those with whom Polycarp had intercourse. We believe that intercourse with these apostles, and perhaps with some other old disciples who had seen Jesus Christ, would be the more probable, and not inconsistent with the general truth of the ancient narrative given by Bollandus. His statement of the ordinance of Polycarp by the apostles may perhaps be reduced to the fact that John, of whom alone Tertullian (l.c.) makes mention, was among "the bishops of the neighboring churches," who came, according to the narrative, to the consecration of Polycarp. This circumstance enables us to fix that consecration in or before A.D. 104, the latest date assigned to the death of the venerable bishop, and which is not inconsistent with the narrative. It may be borne in mind, too, that the whole subject of the ordination of these early bishops is perplexed by ecclesiastical writers utterly neglecting the circumstance that in some of the larger churches there was in the apostolic age a plurality of bishops (comp. Phil. i. 21), not to speak of the grave and much disputed question of the identity of bishops and presbyters. The apostolic ordination mentioned by Irenæus and Tertullian may, therefore, have taken place during the lifetime of Bucolus, and have been antecedent to the precendency which, on his death, Polycarp obtained. We are the more disposed to admit the early origin and the truth of the matter of the ordination, because in the narration, as the natural tendency of a forger of a later age would have been to exaggerate the opportunities of apostolic intercourse, and the sanctions of apostolic authority, which Polycarp certainly possessed.

Polycarp was bishop of Smyrna for some time when Ignatius of Antioch passed through that city on his way to suffer death at Rome, some time between A.D. 107 and 116. Ignatius seems to have enjoyed much this intercourse with Polycarp, whom he had known, apparently, in former days, when they were both hearers of the apostle John ( Martyr. Ignatii, c. 3). The sentiment of esteem was reciprocated by Polycarp (Epistolæ ad Philipp. c. 18), who collected several of the epistles of Ignatius, and sent them to the Church at Philippi, accompanied by an epistle of his own. Polycarp himself had visited Rome, while Antichrist was yet alive, and was well known in the capital, whose episcopate extended, according to Tilmont's calculation, from A.D. 167 to 168. Irenæus has recorded (Epistolæ ad Victor. apud Euseb. H. E. v. 14) the difference of opinion of these two holy men on the existence of the second coming of Christ in the time of one thing; and the second coming of Christ, and three churches in adhesion to the custom of the Asiatic churches, derived, as they affirmed, from the apostles; as well as their mutual kindness and forbearance, notwithstanding this difference. Indeed, the character of Polycarp appears to have attracted general regard: Irenæus retained for him a feeling of deepest reverence (Epistolæ ad Flor. apud Euseb. H. E. v. 21); Jerome speaks of him (De Viris Iustis, c. 17) as "totius Asiae princeps," the most eminent man in all proconsular Asia. A anecdote given elsewhere shows that even reputed heretics, notwithstanding their declared opposition, desisted from their heresies to possess his esteem; and it is not improbable that the reverence excited by his character conducted to his success in restoring them to the communion of the Church. It has been conjectured that he was the angel of the Church at Smyrna to whom Jesus Christ directed the letter in the Apocalypse (ii. 8-11); and also that he was the bishop to whom the apostle John, according to a beautiful anecdote recorded by Clement of Alexandria (Liber "Quis Dives solvit," c. 42), committed the care of a young man, who, forsaking his patron, became a disciple of John, that he might be made a bishop. These are mere conjectures, and of little probability.

The martyrdom of Polycarp occurred, according to Eusebius (H. E. iv. 15), in the persecution under the emperors Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus; and is recorded in a letter of the Church at Smyrna to the churches of Philomelium and other places, which is still extant, and of which Eusebius (ibid.) has given the chief part. The persecution began: one Germanicus, an ancient man, was thrown to the wild beasts, and was saved, and several others, including some who were brought from Philadelphia, were put to death at Smyrna. Polycarp had at first intended to remain in the city and brave the danger of martyrdom; but the entreaties of his flock led him to withdraw to a retreat in the adjacent country, where he passed his time in prayer. After the passage of some days before his apprehension, he had a remarkable dream, which his anticipation of his fate led him to interpret as an intimation that he should be burned alive—a foreboding but too exactly verified by the event. Messengers having been sent to apprehend him, he withdrew to another place, but the place was discovered by the confession of a child, who had been forced by torture to make known where he was. Polycarp might still have escaped by leaving the place on the approach of those sent to apprehend him; but he refused, saying, "The will of God be done." His
venerable figure and calm and courteous deportment commanded the respect of his captors; and a prayer offered by him affected some of them with remorse for their share in his apprehension. The officer into whose custody he was delivered, with the usual laxity of police procedure, had persuaded him, by adisplay of pity, to offer divine honors and sacrifice to the emperor; but his steady refusal changed their pity into anger, and they violently threw him down from the carriage in which they were conveying him. On entering the assembly place where the procuress, Stratus Quadratus, was, a voice which the excited feelings of the old man and his companions led them to regard as from heaven, exclaimed, "Be strong, O Polycarp! and quit you like a man." The procuress was, like others, moved by his appearance, and exalted him to consider his advanced age, and comply with the requirements of government: "Swear by the fortune of Caesar, recant, and cry 'Away with the godless (τοὺς διασομούς)." Looking first round upon the heathen multitude, and then up to heaven, the old man sighed and said, "Away with the godless." The procuress again urged him, "Swear by Caesar's fortune, and I will release thee." Revile Christ." Eighty and six years have I served him," was the reply, "and he never did me wrong: how then can I revile my King and my Saviour?" Threats of being thrown to wild beasts were offered, but he refused to be moved; and his bold avowal that he was a Christian provoked the wrath of the assembled multitude. "This man," they shouted, "is the teacher of impiety, the father of the Christians, the man that does away with our gods (οἱ θεοτριφθείς Θεοὺς αὐθαίρετος);" who teaches many not to adhere to nor to worship the gods." They demanded that he should be thrown to wild beasts, and when the Asiarch, Philip of Tralles, who presided over the games which were going on, evaded the demand, on the plea that the combatants who were exposed were knotted, they demanded that he should not be burned alive. The demand was complied with; and the populace, in their rage, soon collected from the baths and workshops logs and fagots for the pile. The old man ungirded himself, laid aside his garments, and took his place in the midst of the fuel; and when they would have secured him with nails to the stake, said, "Let me remain as I am; for he that has enabled me to brave the fire will so strengthen me that, without your fastening me with nails, I shall, unmove, endure its fierceness." After he had offered a short but beautiful petition that he might be killed by the high wind driven by the flames on one side, so that he was roasted rather than burned; and the executioner was ordered to despatch him with a sword. On his striking him with it, so great a quantity of blood flowed from the wound as to quench the flames, which were however, resuscitated, in order to consume his lifeless body. His ashes were collected by the pious care of the Christians of his flock, and deposited in a suitable place of interment. The day and year of Polycarp's martyrdom are involved in considerable doubt. Samuel Petis places it in A.D. 175; Usher, Pagl, and Bocchus (Bocchus, A.D. 169; Eusebius (Chronicon) places it earlier, in the seventh year of Marcus Aurelius, who acceded to the throne March 7, A.D. 161; Scaliger, Le Moine, and Cave place it in A.D. 167; Tillemon in 166; the Chronicon Paschale in the consobrini of Eunanus and Pastor, A.D. 163; and Pearson, who differs widely from all other critics, in A.D. 147, in the reign of Titus Antoninus Pius. Pearson brings various reasons in support of his opinion, which reasons are examined by Tillemon in one of his careful and elaborate notes. Polycarp is referenced as a scholar both in the Greek and Roman churches; by the former on Feb. 23, by the latter on Jan. 26, or (at Paris) on April 27. The Greeks of Smyrna, on his festival, used formerly to visit devoutly what is shown as his tomb, near the ruins of an ancient church or chapel, on the hill called Ares against the city of Aristeo. Although the Discovery of Asia Minor, ii, 397 is disposed to think that the tradition as to his place of interment is correct.

The principal authorities for the history of Polycarp have been cited. The account of Eusebius (H. E. iv. 14, 15, and add. iv. 21), and of Eusebius, Anecdot. vi. 15, 19, 20, gives account of the original and modern narrative, and forms the letter of the Church at Smyrna, giving an account of his martyrdom, which will be noticed below. Halloe (Illumin. Eccles. Orientalis Scripturam Videt, Cave (Apostolici, or the Lives, etc., of the Primitive Fathers), and Tillemon (Memorab. vol. ii) have collected the chief notices of the ancients, and emended them in their narrative. See also Ceiller, Hist. des Autres Sai- ceres, i, 672, etc. The English reader may consult (besides Cave's work just mentioned) Landner, Credibilitas, etc., pt. ii, ch. vii; Neander, Church Hist. transl. by Rose, i, 106, etc. Milman, Hist. of the Messiah, bk. ii, ch. vii; and other ecclesiastical historians.

Works.—There is extant only one short treatise by this father, Προς Φιλοκαρπιον ιεροσαλημ, Ad Philοκaρpιον Epistola. That he wrote such an epistle, and that it was known in their time, is attested by Irenæus (Ad. Hæres, iii, 5, and Epistol. ad Florum, apud Eusebius, H. E. iv. 14, and v. 20, Eusebius (H. E. iii. 30; iv. 14), Jerome (De Viris Ilustr. c. 17), and later writers who it is needless to enumerate; and, notwithstanding the objections of the Magdeburg Centurions (Cent. ii. c. 14), that the letter is not so old as Cyprian (100 years), it is, however, only denied the genuineness of a part; of Mau- theue de la Roche; and, at a later period, of Semler, our present copies have been received by the great majority of critics as substantially genuine. Some have suspected the text to be interpolated; but the suspicion is perhaps somewhat strengthened by the evident affer- ded by the Syriac version of the epistles of Ignatius, lately published by Mr. Cureton, of the extensive inter- polation of those contemporary and kindred productions. The Epistolae ad Philoepiscopus is extant in the Greek original; it was first published in black letter in the Latin version by Juc. Faber Stapulenaus, with the works of the pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita and of Igni- tius (Paris, 1498, fol.), under the title of Theologia Vi- rificans; and was reprinted at Strasburg in 1501; at Paris, 1515; at Basel, 1522; at Colone, 1526; in- digested, with the Clementina (4to), 1546; at Cologne, with the Latin version of the writings of the pseudo- Dionysius, 1557; and with the Clementina and the Latin version of the Epistle of Ignatius (fol.), 1569. It appeared also in the following collections: the Micropro- baphites (Basel, 1528, fol.); the Orthographiae of Euse- bius (ibid. 1555), the Ordothsographia of Gruenius (ibid. 1569), the Melia Patrum of Francis Bois (Lond. 1650, 8vo), and in the various editions of the Bibliotheca Patrum, from its first publication by De la Bigne in 1575. The Greek text was first published by Hallat; subjoined to the life of Polycarp, in his Illustrium Eccles. Orientalis Scripturarum Vitas et Documenta (vol. i, Douai, 1633, fol.); and was again published by Usher, with the Epistle of Ignatius (Oxford, 1644, 4to), not in the Appendix Ignatiana (which came out in 1647, as a separate form of the work of Malposch, who first published the work of Ignatius, who is sub- stitute, 1568); and in the Patris Apostolici of Cotelerius (Paris, 1672, 2 vols. fol.), and Amsterdam, 1724, of Iti- tigius (Leipsic, 1699, 8vo), of Frey (Bazel, 1742), and of Rostell (1746, 2 vols, 8vo). It is given likewise in the ecclesiastical history of Archbishop (Oxford, 1702, and 4to); and Smith (ibid. 1708, 4to). It is contained also in the
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Faria Sacra of Le Moyne (vol. i, Leyden, 1668, 4to), and in the Bibliotheca Patrum of Gallandius (vol. i, Ven. 1765, 4to). Of more recent editions may be mentioned those of Hornebeck, Scripta Genuina Græca Patrum Apostoliciromaticus (Copenhagen, 1829, 4to); Rouillé, Scriptores Ordinarii Operaethiopiaca quæדram (vol. i, Oxford, 1832, 8vo); and Jacobson, Patrum Apostoliciromaticus quæ supersunt (vol. ii, ibid, 1838, 8vo); and Hefe, Patrum Apostoliciromaticorum Opera (Tubingen, 1839, 8vo). There are English versions of this epistle by Wake and Clements, and one in Cave's Apostolic, or Life of the Primitive Fathers.

That Polycarp wrote other Epistles is attested by Irenæus (Epistol. ad Flor.), one, Ἱππότος Ἀρμενίως, Αδ Αθέναιες, is quoted by St. Maximus in his Prologi ad Libros Dionysi Aretapagitis, and by Joannes Maximus, but is supposed to be spurious; at any rate it is now lost; another, Προς Ἀρσαράγιν, Ἀδ Αἰγυπτίοις, is mentioned by Suidas (s.v. Ἀρσαράγιος), to be supposed is also spurious. The life of Polycarp, ascribed to Pionius, states that he wrote various Tractatus, Homilies, and Epistles, and especially the book De Obitu S. Joannis (Irenæus, Hæres. i, 27, 5). According to Halloix (c.), some extracts from a MS. said to be extant in an abbey in Northern Italy had been given in a Conco de S. Joanne Evangeliata by Francisius Humblot; but even Halloix evidently doubted their genuineness. Some fragments ascribed to Polycarp, cited in a Latin version, in a Catena in Quattuor Evangelia by Victor of Capua, were published by Francisius Feuerlentius subjoined to lib. iii, c. 8 of his Annales ab Exinanu, and were subsequently reprinted by Halloix (c.), Usher (Appendix Ignatiana, p. 81, etc.), Maderus (c.), Cotelerius (c.), Iltigius (c.), and Gallandius (c.), under the title of Fragmenta Quinti e Responsionem Capitula S. Polycarpi adscripta; but their genuineness is very doubtful. See Cave, Hist. Lit. ad ann. 108, i, 44, etc. (Oxford, 1740, fol.); Iltigius, De Patribus, Patris, etc., passim; Fabricius, Hist. Lat. ii, 670; etc.; Ceillier, Autres Sacres, c. L.; Lardner, Credibil. ii, c. xii, etc.; Gallandus, Bibliothe. Patrum, proleg. ad vol. i, c. ix; Jacobson, c. i, proleg. p. I, etc., lxx; Bähler, Christl. Kirche, i, 30 sq.; Ilgen, Zeitschrift f. hist. Theol. 1866, vol. i; Milman, Hist. of Latin Christianity (see Index); Jodhe, f. deutsche Theloth. 1870, iii, 545; Jortin, Remarques, i, 329 sq.; Amer. Rev. Hist., iii, 517: Riddle, Christian Antiquities (see Index); Hefele, Patrum Apostoliciromaticorum Opera, p. xxiv, in Liber I. ibid. Lit. i, 812; Alsing, Patrologie, i, 51 sq.; Kilten, Anc. Church, p. 365 sq.; Fisher, Beginning of Christianity (N. Y. 1877, 8vo), p. 321 sq., 552 sq.

The Τῆς Συμφωνίας εἰσέρχεσθαι πάροι μορφῶν τῶν τοῦ Πολυκάρπου συνταγμάτων εἰκονίζεται is almost entirely incorporated in the Historia Ecclesiastica of Eusebius (iv, 15); it is also extant in its original form, in which it was first published by archbishop Usher, in his Appendix Ignatiana (Lond. 1647, 4to); and was reprinted in the Acta Martyrum Sincera et Selecta of Rainer (Paris, 1668, 4to), and in the Patres Apostolici of Cotelerius (as De Poli, 1672, fol., of which Brabant, [rather Amsterdam], 1658; and Amsterdam, 1724); it was also reprinted by Maderus, in his edition of the Epistolae Polycarpi, already mentioned; it is also in his Bibliotheca Patrum Apostolicherum (Leips., 1839, 8vo); and by Smith, in his edition of the Epistola of Ignatius (reprinted at Beale by Frey, 1742, 8vo); by Russel, in his Patres Apostolici (vol. ii, Lond., 1746, 8vo); and by Gallandus, in his Bibliotheca Patrum (vol. i, Venice, 1765, 8vo); and by Jacobson, in his Patrum Apostolicherum quæ supersunt (vol. iv, 1839, 8vo). There is the ancient Latin version, which is given with the Greek text by Usher; and there are modern Latin versions given by other editors of the Greek text, or in the Acta Sacerdotum Januarii (ad d. 20), i, 720, etc. There are English versions by archbishop Wake (Lond. 1658, 8vo, often reprinted), by Chevalier (Cambridge, 1884, 8vo), and by Dalrymple, in his Remains of Christian Antiquity (Edinburgh, 1776, 8vo). See Cave, C. L. p. 85; Fabricius, L. c. p. 51; Lardner, L. c. c. 7; Ceillier, L. c. p. 695; Iltigius, Gallandius, and Jacobson, l. c.

Polycarp the Ascetic. There is extant in Greek a life of the female saint Synetes, which has been ascribed to various authors. Some MSS. show that the ecclesiastical historian Nicephorus Callistis (H. E. viii, 40) ascribes it to Athanasius; but Montfaucon, though he gives the piece with a Latin version in his edition of the works of Athanasius (ii, 681, etc.), classes it among the spurious works, and declares that the difference of style, and the absence of any external testimony to show whether it was written in the fourth or six centuries after Athanasius, leave no room to doubt its spuriousness. A copy, which was among the papers of Combes, contains a clause, stating that the discourses or sayings of the saint had been reported by "the lesse Angres Arsenius de Pegada;" but this does not seem to describe him as the compiler of the narrative, but only as the author from whom part of the materials were derived. It is then most reasonable to follow the very ancient MS. in the Vatican Library, which ascribes the biography to Polycarp the Ascetic; but where or when this Polycarp lived cannot be determined. The biography was first published in the Latin version of David Colvillis in the Acta Sactorum Januarii, i, 242, etc. The original Greek text is said to have been published with some other pieces (Ingolstadt, 1603, 4to); and it is given with a new translation in Sire, as E. E. viii, 40. See also in the Exegesis Græca Monumenta of Cotelierius (Paris, 1677, 4to), i, 201, etc. The MS. used by Cotelierius contained neither the author's name nor the final clause about Arsenius of Pegada. The title of the piece is Ριβιο και ραββικα της ιερας και ἄνδειου μηνός ἦσσω (in Montfaucon's edition, ἔν της γίγνης και μακρυσις και ἀπανταλακοῦν της Συνετῆς, Ηύη και Άρσης καπελικάς μανιατικῆς κατασκευής μετα πρακτικής (or, according to Montfaucon, μανιατικά ραββικα μενιατικά) Synetes). See Fabricius, Biblioth. Græc. i, 329.

Polyeuct, the first martyr of Armenia, was a soldier in a Roman legion when he converted to the Christian faith by one of his friends (Neracès). For his faith he was sentenced to be beheaded. His martyrdom took place in 257. The Roman Catholic Church observes his memory on Feb. 13. The French painter Delaunay, made this picture of martyrdom the subject of one of his most beautiful tragedies.—Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, s. v.

Polygamy was anciently and still is a prevailing custom in the East (comp. of the Persians, Strabo, xv, 733; Herod. i, 135; iii, 88; Rhode, Hist. Socie., p. 445; of the Indians, Strabo, xv, 714; of the Medes, xi, 526; of the Greeks, vii, 297; see also xvii, 885; on the Egyptians, see Herod. ii, 92; comp. Dios. Sic. i, 80; Hengstenberg, Mos. p. 210 sq.), which stands in close connection with the great fruitfulness of Eastern women; and some have tried to show that it is connected with a preponderance of female births (Marit, Reis, p. 14), but this is denied by Burdach (Physiol. i, 408 sq.) and the most recent authorities. Even the Mosaic law did not forbid polygamy (Polygyna), which, indeed, existed among the Israelites from the beginning of their nation (Gen. xxvii, 9; xxix, passim; xxxvii, 2; xlvi, 10), but seems to be expressly permitted (Deut. xxvii, 16 sq.; Exod. xxii, 9 sq.; Lev. xviii, 18), and there are several direct instances under the law (Judg. viii, 30), and more indirect ones (x, 4; xii, 9), of polygamy, or at least bigamy, chiefly in the time of the Judges. Yet the lawgiver had certainly placed difficulties in the way of polygamy by many remarkable directions (comp. the Koran, iv, 3, which allows a Musulman but four wedded wives, without, however, limiting the number of his concubines). The Mosaic law aimed at matrimonial rather than removing evils which were inseparable from
The state of society in that day. Its enactments were directed—

(a.) To the discouragement of polygamy; this object was forwarded by the following enactments: (1.) The castration of young men, which is usually associated with marriage, is forbidden (Deut. xxiii, 1), and thus the attendants in the harem were not easily to be obtained; while marriageable women might reasonably expect each to obtain a separate husband. (2.) Every act of sexual intercourse rendered the man unclean for a day (Lev. xv, 18), which, with a considerable number of women, each of them having her peculiar claims upon him, would have been very burdensome. (3.) The favoring of one wife among several was forbidden (Exod. xxi, 8 sq.), and the man was required to perform his marriage obligations in equal measure to every wife. This limitation also would be oppressive to many. Besides all this, the mutual jealousy of the several wives of one man, which is the inevitable consequence of polygamy (1 Sam. i, 2 sq.; 2 Chron. xi, 21), renders home life unpleasant (Niebuhr, Beschreibung, p. 73 sq.). The same reason keeps some Turks from polygamy now (D'Ohsson, ii, 366 sq.; Volney, ii, 360 sq.). The result was that most Israelites contented themselves with a single wife (see Prov. xii, 4; xiii, 11; xxxi, 10 sq.), or at most took one or two concubines in addition. The same aspect appears to have been the case with the ancient Egyptians (Wilkinson, Anc. Egyptians, ii, 62 sq.). In the age before the Captivity monogamy appears to have prevailed (comp. Tobit i, 11; ii, 19; viii, 4, 13; Susan. 29, 63; Matt. xviii, 25; Luke i, 5; Acta v, 1). It became acknowledge, too, as a prescriptive obligation, although the doctors of the law still held to their old canon, that a man might marry wives at pleasure—a hundred if he would—provided that he had means of support for them. Hence we cannot in 1 Tim. iii, 2; Titus i, 6, think of a simultaneous polygamy (comp. Amschler, p. 122 sq.), as, although we must confess that Paul's expressions, taken alone, most naturally bear this interpretation. The Talmudists insist that no Jew can have more than four wives at once, and a king, at most, but eighteen (Otero, Lex. Rubbin, p. 228 sq.; see esp. Selden, Jus Nat. et Gent. v, 6; Buschor, Sponsal. p. 47 sq., in Ugolino, Theaur., vol. xxx; Michaelis, Mos. Ritu. ii, 171 sq.; Jahn, i, ii, 235 sq.; comp. Selden, De Polygamia, bk. vii, in his Otia theolog. p. 349 sq.). According to Deut. xxvi, 17, kings were forbidden to take many wives; but in spite of this prohibition they (as e.g. David, 2 Sam. v, 15; Solomon, 1 Kings xi, 8; Rehoboam, 2 Chron. xvi, 11; Abijah, xiii, 21, and others; and so Herod the Great, Josephus, Ant. xvii, 1, 8) had large harems, for whose service they procured eunuchs in foreign lands. See HAREM.

(b) The second object of the Mosaic regulations on the subject was to obviate the injustice frequently consequent upon the exercise of the rights of a father or a master. This was attained by the humane regulations relative to a captive whom a man might wish to marry (Deut. xxv, 10-14), to a purchased wife (Exod. xxii, 7-11), and to a slave who either was married at the time of his purchase, or who, having since received a wife at the hands of his master, was unwilling to be parted from her (xxi, 2-6), and, lastly, by the law relating to the legal distribution of property among the children of the different wives (Deut. xxv, 15-17). These provisions embrace two quite distinct cases. (1.) The regulations in Exod. xxii, 7-11 deserve a detailed notice, as exhibiting the extent to which the power of the head of a family might be carried. It must be premised that this case was brought about by the Hebrew parents being under age at the time of her sale (otherwise her father would have no power to sell), and that the object of the purchase was that when arrived at puberty she should become the wife of her master, as is implied in the difference in the law relating to her (Exod. xxii, 7) and to a slave purchased for ordinary work (Deut. xv, 12-17), as well as in the term amud, "maid-servant," which is elsewhere used convertible with "concubine" (Judg. ix, 18; comp. viii, 31). With regard to such it is enacted (1) that she is not to "go out as the maidservants" (i.e. be freed after six years' service, or in the year of jubilee; Deut. xxiv, 14), and that the master either already has made, or intends to make her his wife (ver. 7); (2) but, if he has no such intention, he is not entitled to retain her in the event of any other person of the Israelites being willing to purchase her for him for the same purpose (ver. 6); (3) he might, however, assign her to his son, and in this case she was to be treated as a daughter, and not as a slave (ver. 9): (4) if either he or his son, having married her, took another wife, she was still to be treated as a wife in all respects (ver. 10); and, lastly, if neither of the three contingencies took place (i.e. if he neither married her himself, nor gave her to his son, nor had her redeemed), then the maiden was to become absolutely free without waiting for the expiration of the six years or for the year of jubilee (ver. 11). (2) In the other case (Deut. xxii, 10-14) we must assume that the wife was a non-Israelite slave; otherwise the wife would, as a matter of course, be freed along with her husband in the year of jubilee. In this case the law itself speaks of the absolute property of the master, and the position of the wife would be analogous to that of a Roman, the "concubine," who was not considered capable of any connubium. The issue of such a marriage would remain slaves in accordance with the maxim of the Talmudists, that the child is liable to its mother's disqualification (Ammak. i, 12). Josephus (Ant. iv, 8, 9) states that in the year of jubilee the slave, having married during service, carried off his wife and children with him: this, however, may refer to an Israelite maid-servant. See Captive.

(c.) The third object of the Mosaic statutes on this subject is to obviate the injustice attending upon a man who is not at liberty, and who was required to be attended to, and this was effected by rendering divorce a formal proceeding, not to be done by word of mouth as heretofore, but by a "bill of divorcement" (Deut. xxiv, 1), which would generally demand time and the intervention of a third party, thus rendering divorce a less easy process, and furnishing the wife in the event of its being carried out, with a legal evidence of her marriageability: we may also notice that Moses wholly prohibited divorce in case the wife had been seduced prior to marriage (xxii, 29), or her chastity had been grievously injured (xxiv, 8). See Divorce.

(d.) The fourth object, which was to enforce purity of life during the maintenance of the matrimonial bond, forms the subject of one of the ten commandments (Exod. xxx, 14), any violation of which was punishable with death (Lev. xv, 10; Deut. xxiii, 22), even in the case of a betrothed person (Deut. xxiii, 23, 24). See Adultery.

The practical results of these regulations may have been very salutary, but on this point we have but small opportunities of judging. The usages themselves, to which we have referred, are full of force to a late period. We have instances of the arbitrary exercise of the paternal authority in the cases of Achan (Judg. i, 12), Izbaz (xii, 9), Samson (xiv, 20; xv, 2), and Michal (1 Sam. xviii, 25). The case of Abishag, and the language of Adonijah in reference to her (1 Kings i, 2; ii, 17), prove that a servant had no protection at the disposal of his or her master. Polygamy also prevailed, as we are expressly informed in reference to Gideon (Judg. viii, 30), Elkanah (1 Sam. i, 2), Saul (2 Sam. xii, 8), David (v, 13), Solomon (1 Kings xi, 3), that there were many marriages in Canaan (viii, 8, 9), Rehoboam (2 Chron. xii, 21), Abijah (xiii, 21), and Joash (xxix, 8); and as we may also infer from the number of children in the cases of Jair, Izbaz, and Abdon (Judg. x, 4; xii, 9, 14). It does not, however, follow that it was the general practice of the country: the inconveniences attendant on polygamy
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in small houses or with scanty incomes are so great as to put a serious bar to its general adoption, and hence in modern countries where it is fully established the practice is restricted to comparatively few (Niebuhr, Voyag., p. 63; Lane, i, 289). The same rule holds good, and comes immediately before him. The practice of polygamy are exhibited in the jealousies between the wives of Abraham (Gen. xvi, 6), and of Elkanah (1 Sam. i, 6); and the cases cited above rather lead to the inference that it was confined to the wealthy. Meanwhile it may be noted that the theory of monogamy was retained in common practice; and that the picture of domestic bliss portrayed in the poetical writings of this period (Ps. cxviii, 3; Prov. v, 18; xviii, 22; xix, 14; xxxi, 10-29; Eccles. i, 9). The sanctity of the marriage-bond was too frequently violated, as appears from the frequent allusions to the "strange woman" in the book of Proverbs (ii, 16; v, 20, etc), and in the denunciations of the prophets against the prevalence of adultery (Jer. v, 8; Ezek. xviii, 11; xxiii, 11).

In the Coot-Babylonian period monogamy appears to have become more prevalent than at any previous time; indeed, we have no instance of polygamy during this period on record in the Bible, all the marriages noticed being with single wives (Tob. 9, 11; i1; Susan. 29; G. Matt. xviii, 25; Luke i, 5; Acts v, 1). During the Mosaic period the practice had passed away in Ecles. xxvi, 1-27. The practice of polygamy nevertheless still existed; Herod the Great had no less than nine wives at one time (Josephus, Ant. xvi, 1, 8); the Talmudists frequently assume it as a well-known fact (e. g. Lev. xix, 1; Deut. xxii, 29; and the early Christian writers, in their comments on 1 Tim. iii, 2, explain it of polygamy in terms which leave no doubt as to the fact of its prevalence in the apostolic age. Michaelis (Laws of Moses, iii, 5, § 96) asserts that polygamy ceased entirely after the return from the Captivity; Selden, on the contrary, maintains that it remained among the Jews until the time of Honorius and Arcadius (cir. A.D. 400), when it was prohibited by an imperial edict (Ux. Ebr. i, 9). See MARRIAGE.

POLYGAMY, CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE CONCERNING. Jesus does not directly forbid polygamy, nor even revert to the subject, since it had been almost universally given up. No case of polygamy among the Jews is presented in the Gospel narrative; and when a wife is mentioned, it is stated or implied in the account that she is the wife of a man. The special evil of the society was the facility with which a divorce could be obtained by a man for any reason, often a trifling cause. Our Lord, when the Pharisees asked him (Matt. xix, 3-9) whether it was lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause, replied that God at the beginning made them one male and one female (Gen. i, 27), and indirectly condemning polygamy as contrary to the original institution of marriage: with a male and a female only polygamy was impossible. He then declares that the bond of marriage is indissoluble; the husband and wife are no more twain, but one flesh; and what God hath joined together let no man put asunder: and afterwards replies to their question on divorce: "Moses because of the hardness of your hearts suffered you to put away your wives: but from the beginning it was not so." The practice of polygamy then existed by permission, not by command. It was a positive temporary regulation of Moses as a political governor, not of God as a moral ruler. The Jews had become hardened in their hearts; they were harsh and severe even to their own flesh. Their nearest relatives they treated with the utmost severity. It will not be brought into such a state that they could feel and understand the force of law, it was necessary for their rulers meanwhile to devise prudential regulations for the purpose of checking their lawlessness. All the evils of that early and idolatrous age of the world could not be remedied in a moment; and such was the state of society that not even until the advent of the Saviour was the institution of marriage restored to its primate integrity by revoking the permission of polygamy and divorce. The teaching of the apostle Paul, too, is worthy of most serious attention, as the subject of polygamy must have come immediately before him. The converts in the apostolic age may be divided into three classes: Jews, Romans, and Greeks. Polygamy, though not unknown among the Jews, had fallen, as we have said, into general disuse. It was positively forbidden by the Roman law, though divorce was even more frequent among the Romans than the Jews; but in the Oecumenia was the common usage of the Greeks. Thus Theodoret says: Πάλιν γαί ετώθεναν καὶ Ἑλληνες καὶ Ιουδαῖοι καὶ ἔως καὶ γυναῖκες γυναῖκας γυμνὰ γάμος κατὰ γυμνόν γυναικόν (Com. in 1 Tim. iii, 2). The epistles of Paul were generally addressed to Grecian converts: let us see, then, how he dealt with the question, which must have come directly before him. Two ways were open to the apostle: either a partial or temporary toleration, or an immediate and direct prohibition of the custom. The multitude of Greek converts were undoubtedly polygamists; it must seem a hard necessity, and would produce much domestic discontent and misery, to compel converts to abandon their wives legally married according to the Grecian law. Did, then, the apostle permit the usage temporarily, either till that general permission, or until the converts were willing to conform to the higher Christian standard? We most emphatically reply that the apostle never for even the briefest period tolerated polygamy among baptized or Christian disciples, and that it never existed in the Christian Church at all. Had it been tolerated even temporarily, some notice or reference to it would be found in the apostolic epistles. The sincerity of converts must have been put to a severe test: to give up their wives no doubt often involved a painful sacrifice to Christian duty, yet so emphatic and so absolute was the apostolic prohibition that not a murmur of opposition was heard from Corinth, Ephesus, Philippi, Thessalonica, and other Christian communities. The apostle often censures Grecian converts for their violation of Christian duty; some of them having fallen from their regenerate state, and abandoned themselves to their old sins; but we find no reference to polygamy in his epistles, nothing which implies that it was continued or even known among them. There is no mention, however remote or indirect, of a wife's wife. This silence can only intimate the utter abandonment of that usage among them, as clearly as the most emphatic statement. It could not have been tacitly allowed as indifferent, or permitted even for a brief period; since it must be remembered that the apostle had expressly forbidden polygamy, and if it existed at all in the Christian communities to which he wrote, it could only have been in defiance of his direct prohibition. No language can be plainer than that of 1 Cor. xii, 7: "Let every man have his own wife, and every woman her own husband; let the husband depart from his wife, but a husband put away his wife." Again, the non-existence of polygamy in the apostolic churches is implied in the same apostle's comparison of marriage to the union of Christ and his Church. The apostle says: "The husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the Head of the Church" (Eph. v, 23). But as Christ and Church, as Paul says, is one body (Eph. iv, 4), there would be no meaning in the comparison, no similarity in the things compared, if the husband might have a plurality of wives: the marriage union would not then be the representation of any unity of person with the one body, which is his Church. Taking, again, the testimony of the Catholic Church, the evidence against polygamy will appear most positive and decisive. The mind of the divine Legislator was so clearly and inexpressably stamped on his followers, that the usage in early and later ages of the Church was
utterly unknown; there is no instance on record of a baptized polygamist for fifteen hundred years after Christ. Catholic, schismatic, and heretic, amid all their differences, agreed at least on this point. No professing Christian ever entertained the grossest belief or scandalous views on the subject of marriage, even ventured to revive the interdicted usage. The testimony of the Church, clearly brought before us by the consentient practice of Christians in all ages, is too explicit to leave room for further controversy; or any real doubt of the teaching of the New Testament. Besides, the practice in the whole world was strictly uniform, with one exception in the 16th century. In an evil hour Luther unhappily gave permission to one of his followers to marry a second wife during the lifetime of the first—the landgrave of Hesse. He was the first and the only Protestant polygamist of the Christian Church.

In recent times the question of polygamy has re-opened in the Christian Church, and has assumed great importance. Bishop Colenso in Africa, and missionaries of several denominations in India, have deemed it expedient to allow heathen polygamists to retain their wives after baptism; though, on becoming Christians, they are forbidden to add to the number of them. Polygamy converts are not allowed, as being it is supposed in an inferior state, to bear office in the Church. *No expression of the subject and corresponding practice can only be founded on an opinion or theory, which, if true, would render polygamy universally allowable among Christians. Let us ask ourselves the question, Is polygamy, according to the new dispensation, allowable, indifferent, or sinful? If it is indifferent, why should it only be partially concealed, and not permitted at all times? If it be wrong or sinful, how can we be justified in allowing it even during the shortest period? Its temporary permission among heathen converts rests on no authority, scriptural or patristic, or any other place whatever; no authoritative precedent can be quoted, though it is obvious that the same reasons for it might have been alleged in the apostolic age, and also, it may be added, by missionaries in any subsequent period, as in modern times. In truth, its permission under any circumstances can only be logical sequence lead to its full sanction, as in the foul and degraded system of Mormonism. But the defenders of modern polygamy will perhaps say that their strongest argument in its defence has not yet been examined: they lay especial stress on the examples of the Old Testament, which is precisely the real reason why they venture to allow it, maintaining that God would not have permitted it for many ages had it been necessarily immoral or sinful. But are they prepared to say—which is the real question at issue—that in the New Testament there is no positive prohibition on the subject of marriage? If there be, the argument derived from the permitted usage of the old dispensation is of no value whatever, and may thus be stated: there was no positive law on the subject in the old dispensation, and hence many of the Jews were polygamists; there is a direct law or precept in the New Testament, and as such binding on believers, by which the Christian is limited to one wife. But should it be asserted that there is no positive precept on marriage in the New Testament, it will be inconsistent with the old dispensation for instruction and guidance; in which case, why should we permit polygamy only for a time, or in the case of heathen converts, instead of allowing Christians universally to follow, if they please, the example of the patriarchs and saints of the Jewish Church? By polygamy they were permitted to follow the conversions of heathenism, on the ground that there is no positive precept on the subject in the New Testament, and that we may have recourse to the permission of the Jewish law, no reason most assuredly can be given why Christians generally should not be permitted to avail themselves of the sanction given to polygamy in the old dispensation, and by the example of its patriarchs and saints. *"Experience," says Dr. Spring, "has abundantly and painfully proved that polygamy debases and brutalizes both the body and the mind, and renders society incapable of those generous and refined affections which, if duly cultivated, would be found to be the inheritance even of our fallen nature. Where is an instance in which polygamy has not been the source of many and bitter calamities in the domestic circle and in the Church? What has it brought forth, save heaven-taught progeny? Where has it been distinguished for any of the moral virtues; or, rather, where has it not been distinguished for the most fearful degeneracy of mankind? Where has it ever been friendly to posterity? It might be shewn that the number of male infants exceeds that of females in the proportion of nineteen to eighteen, the excess of the males scarcely providing for their greater consumption by war, seafaring, and other dangerous or unhealthy occupations. It seems to have been 'the order of nature and of Providence'; and the practice was the object of modern men. And where has polygamy ever been friendly to the physical and intellectual character of the population? The Turks are polygamists, and so are the Asiatics; but how inferior a people to the ancient Greeks and Romans? The practice of polygamy has sometimes been alleged to originate in the influence of climate, but the fact cannot be denied that in the coldest as well as in the warmest climates it is found to exist. And though it must be admitted to prevail more extensively in regions situated towards the south, the means by which it is supposed to be found in ancient usage or religion. The manners of different countries have varied in nothing more than in their domestic constitutions. Less polished and more luxurious nations have either not perceived the vices or interests of polygamy, or, if they have, have declared that they who in such countries possessed the power of reforming the laws have been unwilling to resign their own gratifications. Polygamy is retained at this day in all Mohammedan countries, and throughout the whole Eastern world (see a recent article on this subject in the Westminster Review, Oct., 1867); and even in countries like Algiers, where the French controlling influence is manifest, the Jews practice polygamy to a large extent. *But among Western, or, better, Christian nations, it is universally prohibited. In Sweden it is punished with death. In England, besides the nullity of the second marriage, it subjects the offender to transportation or imprisonment and branding for the first offence, and to capital punishment for the second. About the middle of the 16th century, Bernardinus Ochinos, general of the Order of Capuchins, in Mercaturas,二人itas Hypotyphsytive, *Diologues in favor of polygamy, to which Theodore Beza wrote a reply. In 1682 a work entitled Polygamy Triumphant appeared under the name of Theophilus

* In 1834 the conference of missionaries of various denominations in Calcutta, including those of the Baptist, the Methodist, the Lourch, and Missiary Societies, the Church of Scotland, and the American Presbyterian Board, after having had the whole subject frequently under discussion, and after much and serious deliberation, unanimously agreed on the following propositions, though, in their expression, has been heretofore a matter of opinion among them on various points: *If a convert before becoming a Christian has married more wives than one, he is not to be permitted to marry again, nor to any office in the Church. In no other case is polygamy to be tolerated among Christians" (Brown, Hist. of Missions, III. 365, 366). If proof of having given that polygamy was allowed in the early Church, all controversy on the subject would have been at an end; its permission in modern times to converts from heathenism might have been allowed, and even in many cases be desirable; but the statement itself is not support whatever either from Scripture or the writings of the fathers, or from reason.
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Atheism. The true name of the author was Ly-erus, a native of Saxony. In 1780 Martin Madan published Thelphthoria, or a Treatise on Female Ruin, in which he defended polygamy on the part of the man, and was comparatively strong. The monogamous practice occurs among the Mormons. (q. v.) This strange sect teaches that the use and foundation of marriage is to raise up a peculiar, holy people for the kingdom of God the Son, that at the millennium they may be raised to reign with him; and the glory of the man will be in proportion to the size of his household of children, wives, and servants. Quoting the Scripture that "the man is not without the woman, nor the woman without the man," they affirm that it is the duty of every man to marry at least once, and that a woman cannot enter into the heavenly kingdom without a husband to introduce her as belonging to himself. The addition of wives after the first to a man's family is called a "sealing," as a process which constitutes a relation with all the rights and sanctions of marriage. This introduction and continuance of the benevolent and immoral practice of polygamy is likely, sooner or later, to prove destructive to the whole system of Mormonism.

The argument against polygamy from a strictly ethical and social standpoint is thus presented by Paley: "The equality in the character of marriage, and the entrance into the world intimates the intention of God that one woman should be assigned to one man; for if to one man be allowed an exclusive right to five or more women, four or more men must be deprived of the exclusive possession of any; which could never have been the order intended. It seems also a significant indication of the divine will that he at first created only one woman to one man. Had God intended polygamy for the species, it is probable he would have begun with it; especially as he gave to Adam more wives than one, the multiplication of the human race would have proceeded with a quicker progress. Polygamy not only violates the constitution of nature, and the apparent design of the Deity, but produces to the parties themselves, and to the public, the following bad effects: contentions and jealousies among the wives of the same husband; distracted affections, or the loss of all affection in the husband himself; a voluptuousness in the rich which dissolves the vigor of their intellectual as well as active faculties, producing that indolence and imbecility that has been so strongly characterized of the nations of the East; the abatement of one half of the human species, who, in countries where polygamy obtains, are degraded into instruments of physical pleasure to the other half; neglect of children; and the manifold and sometimes unnatural mixtures of the like character in the offspring. In one quarter century of their nation, the French government were compelled to pass a law for the support of orphans. For these evil, polygamy does not offer a single advantage. In the article of population, which it has been thought to promote, the community gain nothing (nothing, I mean, compared with a state in which marriage is nearly universal); for the question is not, whether one man will have more children by five or more wives than by one, but whether these five wives would not bear the same or a greater number of children to five separate husbands. And as to the care of children when produced, and the sending of them into the world in situations in which they may be likely to form and bring up families of their own, upon which the increase and succession of the human species in a great degree depend, this is less provided for and less practicable where twenty or thirty children are to be supported by the attention of one, than if they were divided into five or six families, to each of which were assigned the industry and inheritance (of two parents). Thus far Dr. Paley. We shall close this article with the words of an excellent writer on this subject, Dr. Samuel Richardson, who says, "that the primitive institution of marriage limited it to one man and one woman; that this institution was adhered to by Noah and his sons, amid the degeneracy of the age in which they lived, and in spite of the example of polygamy which the accursed race of Cain had introduced; when we consider how few men of great station (in any degree) examined the effects of polygamy on the faithful; how much it brought its own punishment with it; and how dubious and equivocal those passages are in which it appears to have the sanction of the divine approbation; when to these reflections we add another respecting the limited views and temporary nature of the more ancient dispensations and institutions of religion, how often the imperfections and even vices of the patriarchs and people of God in old time are recorded, without any express notification of their criminality—how much is said to be commanded which our reverence for the holiness of God and his law will only suffer us to suppose were for wise ends permitted; how frequently the messengers of God adapted themselves to the genius of the people to whom they were sent, and the circumstances of the times in which they lived; above all, when we examine the equity, and bENEVOLENCE OF THE CHRISTIAN LAW, THE EXPPLICIT DECLARATIONS OF OUR Lord AND HIS APOSTLE PAUL RESPECTING THE INSTITUTION OF MARRIAGE, ITS DESIGN AND LIMITATION; WHEN WE REFLECT, TOO, ON THE TESTIMONY OF THE MOST ANCIENT FATHERS, WHO COULD NOT POSSIBLY BE IGNORANT OF THE GENERAL AND COMMUNITY PRACTICE OF THE CHURCH; AND, FINALLY, WHEN WE CONSIDER THESE ADDITIONS WHICH ARE MADE ON JUSTICE TO THE FEMALE SEX, AND ALL THE REGULATIONS OF DOMESTIC ECONOMY AND NATIONAL POLICY, WE MUST WHOLLY CONDEMN THE REVIVAL OF POLYGAMY." See Paley, Moral Philosophy, i, 819-836; Madan, Thelphthoria; Towers, Wills, Penn, R. Hill, Palmer, and Hawes, Anaemia to Madan; Monthly Rec. lxii, 338; and also vol. lxxix; Beattie, Elements of Moral Science, ii, 127-129; Wutke, Christian Ethics, ii, 506 (see Harless, Ethics, see infra) and the literature quoted in the article Marriage.

Polyglot Bibles. Although the earliest specimen of a polyglot was that of a projected work of the celebrated printer Aldus Manutius, of which one page only was published, the first of this kind was the Complutensium Polyglott, entitled Biblia Sacra Polyglotta, completentia Versione Testamentum, Hebraico, Chaldaico, Graeco, et Latino idiomate; Novum Testamentum Graecum et Latinum; et vocabularium Hebraicum et Chaldaeum, cum grammatica Hebraica; necnon dictionario Graeco, De monimentis et miraculis Constantini Porta Ximenes de Cimero (5 vols. fol., in Complutens Universitate, 1514-17). As the title already indicates, we are indebted for this work to the celebrated cardinal, statesman, and general, Francis Ximenes de Cimeros [see XIMENES] who published it at his own expense at the cost of 50,000 ducats or about £15,000, completed in 1517, and published in 1522. The editors were Elius Antonius, Ducas, Fincianus, Stunica, Zamaora, Coronelius, and Johannes de Vergara. The last three were originally Jews. The first four volumes contain the O. T., with the HEBREW, LATIN, and GREEK, in three columns, the TARGUM, and a Latin version of the same. The position of the Latin between the Hebrew and the Greek was to indicate that just as Christ was crucified between two thieves, so the Roman Church, represented by St. Jerome's version, is crucified between the synagoge, represented by the Hebrew text, and the Eastern Church, denoted by the Greek version. The fifth volume contains the Greek Testament, with the Latin Vulgate. The last volume consists of vocabularies, indexes, etc. The Greek Testament was finished in 1517; but the whole work was modern, and not of much critical value (see Dr. Bowring's letter, Monthly Repository for 1827, p. 572). There is little doubt that the celebrated text of the Three Witnesses in this edition was translated from the Latin. There were only 600 copies printed of this splendid work, of which three were on vellum. One of these was sold in England in 1829 for 600 guineas.
The Antwerp Polyglot was published in 1569-72, in 8 vols. fol., at the expense of Philip II, king of Spain, whence it is also called Philipine Bible. It contains, in addition to the Complutensian texts, a Chaldean phrase, the Syriac version, and the Latin translation of Arias Montanus, which was a correction of that of Paginus. It also contains lexicons and grammars of the various languages of the originals and versions. See Arias Montanus.

The Paris Polyglot, in addition to the contents of the former works, has a Syriac and Arabic version of both the O.T. and N.T., with the Samaritan Pentateuch, now published for the first time, and edited by J. Morin, and a Hebrew Bible containing the most ancient transmission of the same. It was published in 1645, in 10 vols. large folio. The editor of this valuable but unwieldy work was Michael le Jay, who was ruined by the publication. See Le Jay.

The London Polyglot, edited by Brian Walton, afterwards bishop of Chester, is much more comprehensive than any of the former. It was published in 1657, in 6 vols. fol. The first volume, besides preludia and a lengthy introduction (published separately by A. Dathie, Lips., 1777), contains the Pentateuch, exhibiting on one page the Hebrew text, with the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Latin Vulgate of the Clementine edition, the Septuagint of the Roman edition, and the various readings of the Cod. Alex., the Latin version of Flaminianus Nobilissimus, the Syriac with a Latin version, the Targum of Jonathan, and the Greek text of Mill of the N.T., together with Luther's German, Diodati's Italian, Ostervald's French, Scio's Spanish, and the English A.V. of the Bible. The prolegomena of S. Lee are a very useful help to the student. The cheapest and most generally useful polyglot is one entitled Polyglotta Bibliae Hebraeae, Vetricae, Samaritanae, Targumicae, Syriacae, Latinae, Aegyptiacae, Arabicae, Septuaginta, Vulgate, et sacri scripturae veteris et novi testamenti originalis, together with the Septuagint, the Syriac (of the New Testament), the Vulgate, the Authorized English and German, and the most approved French Versions, edited by E. De Levante (Lond. 1876, 6 vols. royal 4to).

There are also polyglots of several portions of the Bible, of which one of the most valuable is that published at Constantinople, in Hebrew, Chaldee, Persian, and Arabic, in 1466. The Rabbinical Bibles (q.v.) are in many cases also to some extent polyglot. Besides the article BRANCHE, there is another BRANCHE, edited by Emeric (Witten. 1668); Darling, Cyclopaedia Bibliothecarica (Holy Scriptures), col. 39 sq.; Rosenmüller, Handbuch der biblischen Literatur, iii, 281 sq.; Le Long-Masch, Bibliotheca Sacra, i, 381 sq.; Eichhorn, Einleitung in das A. Test. (Index in vol. v. s. v. Polyglotte); Simon, Die Codices, et Targum. Critica du Verum Testament. (Paris, 1866), p. 514 sq.; Carpez, Critica Sacra (Lipsia, 1748), p. 367 sq.; Kortholt, Tract. de varia Scripturae editione, cap. xxxii, p. 574 sq.; Tenzel, Diction. Phr. de Biblia Polyglotta (Witten. 1866); Celsius, De Biblia Polyglotta dissertation (Upsala, 1707); Wolf, Bibbia, Hebr. vol. ii, § 10, p. 882 sq.; Walton, Prolegom. § 14; Hottinger, Bibliothecar. Quadrupartitum, p. 183 sq.; Alter, Bibliograph. Nachrichten (Wien, 1779), p. 30 sq.; Reuss, Bibliotheca Nova Testamentorum, etc. (Brussels, 1873), § 5; and his art. Polyglotta-Bibror in Herzog, Reuss, Enzyklop., the art. Polyglotta-Bibliö in Klauber, Delay, Geschichte des Alter Test. (Jena, 1869), p. 207, 254, 255; and, as far as the Complutensian Polyglot is concerned, the excellent monograph of Delitzsch, Studien zur Entschatungs geschichte der Polyglotta-Bibro des Carminals Ximenes (Leips. 1871). (B.P.)

Polyhistor, Alexander, a Roman writer whose works have been used by the Church fathers, a native of Cyzicus in Phrygia, according to some, and of Mileitus according to others, was a geographer and historian, who lived in the 7th century of Rome, and was taken prisoner by the Romans in the war of Sulla against Mithridates. Being purchased by Cornelius Lentulus, he was intrusted by him with the education of his children, and at last received his freedom. He then assumed the name of Cornelius, after that of his patron. He resided chiefly at Rome, and had a country-house at Laurentum, in which, having taken fire while he was there, he perished in the flames. He is often mentioned and quoted by Pline the Elder, Diogenes Laertius, Clemens Alexandrinus, and Eusebius, as a man of very extensive learning; in consequence of which he is called Polyhistor. He wrote a work in forty books, each book being the description of a distinct country. Stephanus Byzantinus mentions his account of Bithynia, Caria, Paphlagonia, Syria, Libya, Crete, and other countries. Clemens Alexandrinus quotes his 'Treatise on the Jews,' of which Eusebius has inserted fragments in his 'Church History.' Clemens Alexandrinus mentions another work of Polyhistor, on the Symbol of Pythagoras; and Cyril of Alexandria, in his work against Julian, quotes
POLYHYMnia

his authority on the early history of the world. Unfortunately none of Polybius's works have come down to us.

Polyhymnia, a daughter of Zeus, or Jupiter, and one of the nine Muses. She presided over lyric poetry, and was believed to have invented the lyre.

Polynesia, or the region of many islands (παλεῖς, μασος, and φηγοῦσα σε αἰeither the name usually given, which is of origination, to the numerous groups of islands, and some few single islands, scattered throughout the great Pacific Ocean, between the eastern shores of Asia and the western shores of America. In its widest signification, the term Polynesia might be understood as embracing, besides the groups hereafter to be mentioned, the various islands, large and small, of the Indian Archipelago, in one direction, and the vast island of New Holland (q. v.) or Australia, with its dependency of Van Diemen's Land, in another. Including these, the whole region has sometimes been called Oceanica, and sometimes Australasia—generally, however, in modern times, to the exclusion of the islands in the Indian Archipelago, to which certain writers have given the name of Malayasia. In proportion, also, as the area of maritime discovery has become enlarged, it has been thought convenient by some geographers to narrow still further the limits of Polynesia, to the exclusion of Australia and Van Diemen's Land; while others, again, exclude Papua (q. v.) or New Guinea, New Ireland (q. v.), Solomon's Isles (q. v.), the Louisiade group, the New Hebrides (q. v.), and the Fidschi Islands, and retain others of great and single islands, together with New Zealand (q. v.), from the area of Polynesia, and give to these, in union with Australia, the collective designation of Australasia. To all these, with the exception of New Zealand, French writers have given the name of Melanesia, or the Black Islands; while a similar name, Kelenonesia, has been given to them by Prichard and Latham—purely, however, on ethnological grounds, as we shall presently notice. Thus we have the three geographical divisions of Malayasia, Australasia, and Polynesia, the last mentioned of which embraces all the groups and single islands not included under the other two. Accepting this arrangement, still the limits between Australasia and Polynesia have not been very accurately defined; indeed, scarcely any two geographers appear to be quite agreed upon the subject; neither shall we pretend to decide between the classifications. The following list, however, comprises all the principal groups and single islands not previously named as coming under the division of Australasia—viz.: 1. North of the equator—the Ladrones or Marian Islands, the Pamilacan, the Caroline Islands, and the Borneo, Formosa, Leyte, and the Sandwich Islands, Gilbert's or King George's Archipelago, and the Galapagos. 2. South of the equator—the Ellice group, the Phoenix and Union groups, the Fiji Islands, the Friendly Islands, the Navigator's Islands, Cook's or Harvey Islands, the Society Islands, the Dangerous Archipelago, the Marquesas Islands, Kermadec Island, and Easter Island. (In the former part of this article we largely depend upon Chamber's Cyclopedia, and in the latter part upon Gardner's Faiths of all Nations.)

Geographical Description.—These islands, which extend from about 30° north of the equator to about 30° south of it, are some of them volcanic in their origin, and some of them coralline. The volcanic islands generally rise to a considerable height above the level of the ocean, and are therefore called the high islands, in contradistinction to the coralline or low islands. They contain many craters, the igneous fountain of which are the principal the Friendly Islands, one of which, Otaheite or Tahiti, has a mountain rising to the height of 10,000 feet; the Marquesas Islands (q. v.), also very high; the Samoan (q. v.) or Navigator's Islands; and the Sandwich Islands (q. v.), of the latter of the foyers of which possesses several both active and extinct craters, 18,000, 14,000, and even 16,000 feet high. The Gala-
to Easter Island, and from the Sandwich Islands to New Zealand, became inhabited by tribes different from, but still related to, the Polynesians. That line, whichever it be, where the continuity of successive islands is the greatest, and whereon the fewest considerable interspaces of ocean are to be found. This is the general answer a priori, subject to modifications from the propensity of the Polynesian nature, and from prodigious effort, he elevated them to the height of a tree called kava-riki, which is as large as the sycamore. By the third attempt he carried them to the summits of the mountains; and, after a long interval of repose, and by a most prodigious effort, he elevated them to the station. This vast undertaking, however, was greatly facilitated by myths of dragon-flies, which with their wings severed the cords that confined the heavens to the earth. Now this individual was deified; and up to the moment that Christianity was embraced, the deified inhabitants were considered as the "smallest of the heavens." The Polynesians had various other gods who were deified men. The chief of these deities, to whom mothers dedicated their children, were Hirn, the god of thieves, and Oro, the god of war. The idols worshipped were different in almost every island and district. Besides the numerous objects of adoration, the islanders generally, and the Samoans in particular, had a vague idea of a Supreme Being, to whom they gave the name of Tangaroa. The mode in which these gods were adored is thus described by Mr. Williams: "The worship presented to their eyes a spectacle of prayers, incantations, and offerings of pigs, fish, vegetable food, native cloth, canoes, and other valuable property. To these must be added human sacrifices, which, at some of the islands, were fearfully common. An idea of their address to their addresses to the gods may be formed of their anguish in the sentence with which they invariably concluded. Having presented the gift, the priest would say, 'Now, if you are a god of mercy, come this way, and be propitious to this offering; but if you are a god of anger, go outside the world, you shall neither have temples, offerings, nor worshippers here.' The infliction of injuries upon themselves was another mode in which they worshipped their gods. It was a frequent practice with the Sandwich Islanders, in performing some of their rites, to knock out their front teeth, and the Friendly Islanders to cut off one or two of the bones of their little fingers. This, indeed, was so common that scarce an adult could be found who had not in this way mutilated his hands. On one occasion, the daughter of a chief, a fine young woman about eighteen years of age, was standing by my side, and as I saw by the state of the wound that she had recently performed the ceremony, I took her hand, and asked her why she had cut off her finger. Her affecting reply was that her mother was ill, and that, fearful lest her mother should die, she had done this to induce the gods to save her. 'Well,' said I, 'how did you do it?' 'I knocked a hole in the shell, and worked it about till the joint was separated, and then I allowed the blood to stream from it.' This was my offering to persuade the gods to restore my mother.' When, at a future period, another offering is required, they sever the second joint of the same finger; and when a third or fourth is demanded, they amputate the same bones of the other little finger; and when they have no more joints which they can conveniently spare, they rub the stumps of their mutilated fingers with rough stones, until the blood again streams from the wound. Thus 'in the sorrows multiplied who hasten after other gods.'

The most affecting of the religious observances of the Polynesians was the sacrifice of human victims. This horrid custom did not prevail at the Navigator Islands; but it was carried to a fearful extent at the Harvey group, and still more at the Tahitian and Hauhau islands. At one ceremony, called the Feast of Restoration, no fewer than seven human beings were offered in sacrifice. On the eve of war, also, it was customary to offer human victims. It may be interesting to notice some of the circumstances in which the last mentioned were offered at Tahiti. "Pomare was about to fight a battle, which would confirm him in, or deprive him of, his dominions. To propitiate the gods, therefore, by the most valuable offerings he could command, was with
him an object of the highest concern. For this purpose rolls of native cloth, pigs, fish, and immense quantities of other food were presented at the maraes; but still a tabu, or sacrifice, was demanded. Pomare, therefore, sent two of his messengers to the house of the victim whom he had marked for the occasion. On reaching the house they were received by the wife where her husband was. She replied that he was in such a place, planting bananas. 'Well,' they continued, 'we are thirsty; give us some cocoa-nut water.' She told them that she had no nuts in the house, but that they were at liberty to climb the tree and take as many as they desired. They then requested her to lend them the o, which is a piece of iron-wood, about four feet long and an inch and a half in diameter, with which the natives open the cocoa-nut. She cheerfully complied with their wishes, little imagining that she was giving them the instrument which, in a few moments, was to inflict a fatal blow upon the head of her husband. Upon receiving the o, the men left the house, and went in search of their victim; and the woman, having become rather suspicious, followed them shortly after, and reached the place where the Barotome to see the blow which would fall. She rushed forward to give vent to her agonized feelings and take a last embrace; but she was immediately seized and bound hand and foot, while the body of her murdered husband was placed in a long basket made of cocoa-nut leaves and borne home from her eight days after the act of murder was performed, and afterwards always exercised great care to prevent the wife or daughter, or any female relative, from touching the corpse, for so polluted were females considered that a victim would have been desecrated by a woman's touch or breath to such a degree as to have rendered it unfit for an offering to the gods. While the men were carrying their victim to the maraes, he recovered from the stunning effect of the blow, and, bound as he was in the cocoa-nut leaf basket, he said to his murderers, 'Friends, I know what you intend to do with me; you are about to kill me, and offer me as a tabu to your savage gods; and I also know that it is useless for me to beg for mercy, for you will not spare my life. You may kill my body, but you cannot hurt my soul; for I have begun to pray to Jesus, the knowledge of whom the missionaries have brought to our island: you may kill my body, but you cannot hurt my soul.' Instead of being moved to compassion by his affecting address, they laid him down upon the ground, placed a stone under his head, and with another beat it to pieces. In this state they carried him to their 'savage gods.' Thus passed the last sacrifice offered for so long after Christianity was embraced, and the altars of their gods ceased to be stained with human blood.

The Polynesians, in their heathen state, had very peculiar opinions on the subject of a future world. The Tahitians believed that there were two places for departed spirits. Among the Rarotongans paradise was a very long house encircled with beautiful shrubs and flowers, which never lost their bloom or fragrance. The inmates, enjoying perpetual youth and beauty, spent their days in dancing, festivity, and merriment. The hell of the Rarotongans consisted of a place where the poor souls had to crawl around this house, witnessing the enjoyment of its inmates without the possibility of sharing it. The terms on which any one could find an entrance into paradise, as Mr. Williams informs us, were these: 'In order to secure the admission of a departed spirit to future joys, the corpse was dressed in the best attire the relatives could provide, the head was wreathed with flowers, and other decorations were added. A pig was then baked whole, and placed upon the body of the deceased, surrounded by a pile of vegetable food. After this the corpse was placed in the best attire the relatives could provide, the head was wreathed with flowers, and other decorations were added. A pig was then baked whole, and placed upon the body of the deceased, surrounded by a pile of vegetable food. After this the corpse was placed in the best attire the relatives could provide, the head was wreathed with flowers, and other decorations were added. A pig was then baked whole, and placed upon the body of the deceased, surrounded by a pile of vegetable food.

Heard from the sea-birds above, or from the sound of the surf below, the waves, brought to its shore by the current, some have of these shores, some of which have of yet been only par-
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literally explored." The superstitious of the taboo, the use of kava as an intoxicating drink, cannibalism, infanticide, tattooing, and circumcision are now fast disappearing under the influence of Christianity. Unfortunately, however, the contact of these islanders with civilization has not been always productive of unmixed good; the introduction among them of the use of ardent spirits, and of the vices and diseases of Europeans, having thinned the population to a lamentable extent. Far from artistic in the best sense of the word, the natives of Polynesia will be found in some of our articles on the groups regarded as being the most important. See Littell's "Living Ages," 1854 (No. 518), art. iii; The London Reg. 1854, pt. ii, p. 43 sq.; Edinburgh Reg. July, 1876, art. ix; Miss. World, No. 680, p. 167 sq.; No. 458; Lond. Acad. July 15, 1876, p. 92 sq.; Gardiner, Dict. of Relig. Faiths, n. v.; Lubbuck, Orig. of Civilization (see Index).

Polypheus, in the Homeric mythology, the son of Poseidon and the nymph Thoosa, the most celebrated of the fabulous Cyclopes who inhabited the island of Sicily. He was of immense size, and had only one eye. When Ulysses landed on that island, he entered the cave of Polypheus with twelve companions, of which number this tremendous cannibal ate six. The others stood expecting the same fate, but their cunning leader made Polypheus drunk, then burned out his single eye with a blazing torch, and so escaped, leaving the giant to die of hunger and thirst.

Polystaurion (many crossed), a name given to the cloak of the Greek patriarchs, on account of the many crosses which ornament it.

Polytheism, a general name for those systems of religion which involve a belief in more deities than one.

I. Name.—Neither this word nor the similar ones, atheism, monotheism, theism, are to be found in the ordinary Greek or Latin vocabularies. Philo the Jew, in his "Legge," employs such words as the neuter adjective πολυθεῖον with the article to express the idea; also the forms πολυθεῖος, and in Philo δειον, with the sense now attached to endings in μόνος. Polytheism denotes the belief that there is a plurality of gods, and for the sake of convenience may include dualism, which, however, can be used also to signify the doctrine of two principles that are not necessarily both divine. If it be asked what is intended by gods, we answer: (1) That in the word polytheism the notion of gods does not include the idea of a demiurge or a creator of the world. The latter idea is conveyed by the term "theism," and is generally supposed to belong to the human mind, not to the fact that the human mind cannot readily admit the idea of more than one such being. While, then, monotheism generally means the doctrine of one absolute infinite being, polytheism is not its exact opposite, except in the sense that it treats of the many deities of the most of the ancient nations as inferior to those of the one. This is an accommodation to the state of facts; but in philosophical writing monotheism may itself be divided into absolute and relative, as Schelling has done, with whom the latter denotes the worship of one being, thought of not as infinite, but as limited in his nature. Atheism, again, denies the real existence of any kind of gods; it is alike opposed to polytheism and to monotheism. The idea of God, the infinite one, is not transferable to gods many, and hence there is a necessary vagueness in the heathen conception of their deities, as it respects power, knowledge, duration, especially a parte ante, and other properties. The question, then, arises as to gradations of gods, and as to the difference between them and demigods, heroes, etc. The worship of the latter was in the past as much as the worship of the gods (Josh. xxxii, 2). Some traces of the worship of the one god appear in the history of Melchisedek and of Balaam. Yet all the nations with whom the Jews came into contact worshipped not only more gods than one, but worshipped them by means of images, with the exception of those addicted to the religion of Zoroaster. And many of the Pantheistic, among heathen nations were the results of philosophical reflection, as in Brahminism, where a pantheistic doo-
trine of the universe prevailed; or in Iranism, where the reforms attributed to Zoroaster show a progress from the earlier Vedic religion, or from something like it. So much the more wonderful is it that the one simplest people of arts and crafts, and innumerable temptations to idolatry and defections from their ancestral faith, to an exalted monotheistic idea of the Godhead, which has been the origin of all the monotheism now existing in the world. (8) Philosophers are divided on the point of the priority of the two religions, systems, the belief in one god or many gods. Although some deists of a former age regarded monotheism as the earlier of the two, the only consistent ground for those who deny supernatural revelation is that of Mr. Hume. This is, in brief, that the natural progress of human thought is from the less perfect through abstraction to the more perfect; that polytheism was universally diffused, and that monotheism, if earlier, could not have been lost. It is needless to say that a great part of the thinking of the present age runs in the same channel. Man was a savage before he became possessed of arts or settled any of the problems of the universe, just as species are evolved out of earlier less finished forms. The many gods were lost out of popular worship, according to Mr. Hume, by adulation, or the zealous attempt of some worshippers to extil the one God manifesting in a manner which is an unfortunate way of accounting for a result that has never been reached, unless it can be shown that an elimination took place in the Jewish system. Opposite to this is Schelling's view in his lectures on mythology, written after he had left his first philosophical position: this was, in brief, that monotheism was prior in the order of time, but without any dogmatic definition or distinct view of the divine attributes. At the same time man was awake to all impressions from the material world, in which the great objects seemed to him full of power and life. In the vision of a worship of nature, which at length drew a part of men away from the worship of the God above nature. This defection made those who resisted it aware, as they were not before, of the vastness, the absoluteness of the one God. Thus the human mind, in the case of those who adhered to the primeval worship, was enlarged in its religious conceptions: it may even be regarded as a part of the scheme of Providence that the apostasy of some helped the infantile race to take grander views of the Supreme Being. (c) The account given in the Scriptures is that the second Adam, man, who was the creature of the Creation, but, as man fell away from God, he did not like to retain him in his knowledge, and that the teachings of the world itself concerning him were rejected (Rom. i., 19-20). He therefore devised a religion and an idolatry of his own, which were consistent with foul wickedness. As the world became darker in its apprehensions of God, God began a new revelation of himself to Abraham, when primeval monotheism was in danger of utterly fading out of human belief. If now we may suppose that polytheism arose when men were but children in art, and that such religious thoughts which went farthest from the central points of the primeval world would easily fall into barbarism, and their religions might show the influences of their new and less favorable situations. (d) Have any traces remained in the world of this primeval monotheism? A number of Christian writers have given an affirmative answer, but they put their reasons for their opinions on diverse grounds. First, we may notice such writers as Cudworth, who in an uncritical way collect together the expressions of writers of every age, and give as much weight to later philosophers as to earlier authors. There is no doubt that philosophers like Plato reached a first principle of the world, or that, before him, Anaxagoras conceived of mind putting already existing matter into appropriate forms. But their voice is not that of popular religion, and in those may be those who have noticed a subordinate among the objects of worship. The supreme god of Greece is a monarch, father of gods and men, with very great powers, the head of moral order, the chief agent in providence. Some of the poets speak of him in terms truly sublime, as in the Suppliants of Eschylus and in the Agamemnon of Sophocles which breathe the spirit of the Scriptures. But all that can be fairly drawn from such evidence is what Naegelsbach draws from it in his Posthomerische Theologie—that there was in the best age of Grecian authors a certain monotheistic tendency which had no decisive control over Greek faith. "This tendency," to use his words, "was an almost unconscious, a ufrete one, an obscure impulse, a light that shineth in darkness, but the darkness comprehended it not." "The religious consciousness, on the one hand, so to speak, reduced the world of gods to Zeus, but on the other could not shake off the plurality of divine forms which nature first furnished to it." If there was any monotheism in the Greek religion it had its representative in Zeus. But what kind of a representative was he? He was not eternal, but born; he was not a creator, for the Greek theology never embraced a creation. He was not all-powerful, but was generally represented as controlled by fate. He had in the popular faith and mythology attributes most unlike those of a divine being. He was, in short, a monarch or semidivine personage surrounded on all sides from the conception of a holy or an absolute being. How could a holy and absolute being become so completely changed in the faith of a nation as to lose not only his absolute character, but also what ought naturally to be fixed in the minds of men—his purity and holiness? We can conceive of men changing their gods, passing from one to many, or from many to one, but we cannot conceive of one and the same god as undergoing such utter transmutations. Still further it has been urged, with justice, that monotheism and polytheism are different names for the same divinity from nature: the second identifies it with nature, and incorporates it in natural objects. The two are entirely different: how can the one slide into or retain characteristics of the other? This argument, however, does not derive its force from the oneness or manifoldness of the objects of worship, but from their essential relations to the world, so that a passing over from the worship of one not absolute god to that of more than one, also not absolute, is far from being incredible. Hence, if we could accept Schelling's view of the creation, we should have an account of the limit of addition to or subtraction from the number of divinities. Nor can we maintain that traces of a primitive monotheism are certainly preserved in the religions of the other nations of antiquity. The earliest records of the Aruian race, as they appear in the Vedas, give us no indication that one god was of a higher class than the rest. Indra, as Prof. Whitney (Orient. and Ling. Studies, p. 86) remarks, "stands at the head of the Vedic divinities. By this it is not meant, however, that he is king among them, endowed with any authority over the rest, but that his worship system had taken place as should establish a relation of this kind among its gods. They are as independent, each in his own domain, as the natural phenomena of which they are the personifications." And the further remark is made that the nature of Varuna's attributes and of his concern with the affairs of human life place him decidedly above Indra. Further, in the later stages of the Indian religions, a deity, comparatively subordinate, Vishnu, has reached a chief place, while the old gods have fallen more or less out of worship. The Iranian or Persian religions contain very considerable conceptions of its supreme divinity, Ormazd, or Ahura Mazda, i.e. the wise lord—called also Spontomaiyus, or the holy-thinking one—the holy spirit, according to Spiegel, while Haag explains this name as denoting the 'white spirit.' It is a question as to which of these two systems the Parsee professes this religion stands very far above all others
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of the same race. But if Ormazd is a creator, Ahriman (or Angramainyus), the bad spirit, is a creator also; and while there is an evident effort of philosophical reflection to elevate Ormazd, who perhaps represents Varsevand, the primeval god, or the older faith—such, for instance, as Mithra—the religion has not succeeded in attaining to the position of a pure monotheism, but is a dualism with decided remains of polytheism. Once more the supreme divinity of the Greeks and Romans, Zeus or Jupiter, i.e. Div-o-pater, is now thought by the best etymologists to answer to Dyuaus-pita, a mythological conception of the Vedas, who is spoken of as the father of Indra, but who either dropped out of or never fully entered into the Vedic religious system. If he dropped out, we find him retained by other portions of the Indo-European race; if he had not entered into it, we find other members of the same family bringing forward this personality as their chief god. While the Greek and Italic branches did this, we find in Scandinavian mythology a god Tyr, answering, as Jacob Grimm (Deutsche Mythol. ch. ix) shows, to Ziu or Zio, with a genitive Ziwaus or Ziezws, in Old High-German, and thus standing for the same being as Zeus or Jupiter. How can we believe that the representative of monotheism was thus raised or depressed, that he took places where his supposed supreme god, himself gave way to Odin (Wotan)? The true explanation is that the head of the gods, differing in rank but not in nature from the rest, rose and fell in his station, or even dropped out of worship altogether, owing to changes within a nation or race which we cannot understand. This is one only of the many changes through which polytheism passed. It never had any stability or permanent condition. We only add that if Zeus can be explained, as etymology points out, to be the personification of the bright sky or daylight, this again must be regarded as a secondary explanation such a divinity as handing down the monotheistic idea, because this was only one of the most prominent of visible objects. The same remarks in general may be made in respect to the religions of all cultivated races—the Assyrian and Babylonian, the Egyptian and the Mexican religions, for instance. We do not deny that individual reflection may have risen above the level of the religions themselves, or that philosophical doctrine may have sought to mix itself with the prevailing mythologies, but that the polytheistic religions, including the Vedic mythology, are the only form of religion, the visible luminary itself, was among the first divinities of heathenism. The luminary was considered as alive, and possessed of the power of seeing things upon the earth. When Hades snatched away the virgin Proserpine, and carried her to his realms below through a chasm of the earth to be his wife, no one heard her cries for help except Heleon, son of Hyperion and Hecate. Zeus, to whom she cried for help, "was sitting apart from the gods in a throned temple, and receiving choice offerings from mortal men," so he did not hear her (Hymn. to Demeter, 13). Zeus is the living life of the world. A belief in a living deity is at the bottom of every religion, in which he was by no means a very important deity, are all to be referred to the heavenly body, endowed with perception, and noting as well as hearing what takes place here below. The people believed that the sun was a living being, and the philosophers had the same faith. They had long since have ascribed a fiery body and a vital principle to it, and Anaxagoras so offended the Athenians by his doctrine that the sun was a red-hot stone or mass of metal that he was accused of impiety, and, although defended by Pericles, was fined forty talents and taken away (Plat. Apol. Sect., 26 D: Diog. Laert. ii, § 12 sq.). In the same manner the worship of the sun, as distinguished from the sun-gods, appears in the Vedas, although of less importance than these latter; the Greeks attributed the same worship to this luminary among the Persians; and Plato makes Socrates use the following words: "It seems to me that the earliest inhabitants of Greece held those to be gods whom many of the barbarians now regard as such—sun, moon, stars, and heaven" (Cratyl. 387 C). In the Scriptures the worship of the heavenly bodies is shrouded in mystery, and the sole apostasy from God to which Israel was tempted: "Take ye good heed to yourselves ... lest thou lift up thine eyes unto heaven, and when thou seest the sun, and the stars, and the earth, and all the host of heaven, shouldest be driven to worship them, and serve them" (Deut. iv, 16-19). But it is the duty of every one of us, let the world be divided into this kind of worship at an early age, to form their own opinions and form their own conclusions."
the reign of Josiah, who put down "them that burned incense to the sun, and to the moon, and to the pian-
etes, and to all the host of heaven." We hardly need to remind the reader of the prevalence of such wor-
sips, in Babylonia and Assyria, nor to the fact that sun-worship was the foundation probably of the honors paid to Baal and Moloch among the Ammonites, in Canaan and in Carthage, nor to the importance of this element in the Egyptian religion. We only add that the religion of Peru—that is, the religion of the Incas, which superseded an older religion—was direct sun-worship, and that the same was spread over a large part of this continent, among the tribes even of the Rockies in North America. The heathen powers of the Dakotahs have their Sun-dance, and the Sun Dance is said to date from 1872 one of their practices was to look steadily many minutes at the blazing orb, as an act, it was under-
stood, of religious worship. This is only one of those objects of nature to which were paid divine hon-
ors. The earth, as the general nursing mother, the sea, the sky, the life in the air, in trees, even in ani-
mals, all seemed to be divine. The Earth particularly—as the Great Mother, the Syrian goddess Cybele, De-
meter, Ceres—although exalted into a person separate from the earth, as the cause and Mother of all things, and ultimately to which man was worshipped, and venerated, in every coun-
try, as in Asia Minor, with the most frantic rites.

But polytheism would have been comparatively dead, and possessed of fewer attractions to the religious sentiment of many, if it had stopped short in its develop-
ment, as heathenism in nature. The next step was to convert these comparatively fixed objects, exhibiting superhuman agency to the eyes of men, into persons separated from the objects themselves. The sun, re-
garded as a god, in this process became a sun-god; this is, his personality was no longer identified with the sun, and confined to its orb, but he became free to go whithersoever he would, and exercise supernatural powers away from the sun, his proper seat. This was a very great stage through which the religions of all the higher races passed. The spirit of the sun, pos-
sessed of will and feelings like a man's, but of more than human power, is now free to move abroad, to mingle in human affairs, and thus to transcend his first agency by a very much wider and more varied new one. It is possible for him thus to become mytholo-
getic and to his effects which he produces become great events in history.

The sun-god's rays to the imagina-
tion become darts, and as the rays of the sun in summer cause malignant fevers, so he is conceived of as shooting his arrows at men and beasts, the cause being some offence or disdain done to his sacred rites or to his ser-
crved. So the sun's burning of the body illustrates what we mean, it being assumed, what is now generally ad-
mitted, but what some eminent scholars have denied, that Apollo is indeed a sun-god. This the Greeks of the time of Sophocles and Euripides held, but they held it more as an inference than from any traditional opinion. But, furthermore, the sun-god might become the espe-
cial object of worship of a city or a tribe—their tutelary god; and thus he acquired a new character, and stood in new relations to a part of a people. From them his worship might spread over the whole of a tribe or of a race, and his old natural origin would be almost lost out of sight; he would have outgrown, so to speak, his youthful properties. In this way it could happen that a war-god could be developed out of the divinity of a nation of warriors, although his attributes at first might have had no relation to armed strife. Thus the Roman god Mars was the divinity of an agricultural people, it seems probable, a god of spring and of fructification, before he became a god of war. Apollo also, if a god of the sun and of light at first, had from this source naturally the attributes of a destroyer and of a healer (Cf. later as protecting the names Apollo and Pan, the aweter and healer), of a pure one and a purifier; to which were added his connection with mu-
sic and poetry, as well as his prophetic office of giving forth oracles as a mediator between Zeus and mortals. The relations of Apollo to social life in its various de-
partments may have been manifold, but it is hard to see how this can be done.

We have reached the point where we can state in brief several laws, as they may be called, of polytheism, which might be illustrated by an infinite number of facts, but will, we trust, commend themselves to our readers, after what has been said, without much explana-
tion. (1) To a great extent, the God of the ancients was the Sun, or the creator. (2) To a great extent, the foundation is the worship of nature, i.e. of objects in nature which strike the attention of man, and are important aids to his well-being in the world. (3) These objects are conceived of as living existences, and as having, together with the phenomena of nature, the feelings and the will of men. (4) In the course of time, the living thing or god in the natural object becomes detached from it, is conceived of as an agent in human affairs, and may greatly enlarge its sphere of operations. (4) This process changes the attributes and the relations of the divinities. (5) In the later stages, the mythological processes, the religions of heathenism may for some time be in a constant flux, and this will last as long as faith in the gods and the mytho-
logical spirit lasts. (5) Among the changes may be mentioned the fairies, the gods of the country, the district becomes the god of a race; (6) foreign gods are introduced; (c) the same divinity, through the help of a new name, becomes a new personality by the side perhaps of the old one; (d) old divinities drop out of use; (e) the importance of different gods may change; (f) what is called theocratic, that is, a confusion of gods, takes place, but generally this is due to philosophical reflection: this is sometimes a pantheistic process, and in the later stages of Greek history it is carried so far that all the leading gods are considered to be forms or expressions for one and the same power; (g) in the most cultiva-
ted nations of heathenism there came on a time when the mythology was rejected as being immoral, or was explained on various principles so as to bring it within the limits of the natural, or the religious, attacks of a scepticism produced by moral feeling or philosophical doctrine, lost its hold on the national mind. This would naturally destroy the life of the nation, unless some new religion should take its place.

To illustrate the changes through which the heathen religions pass, and the influence of the natural objects that appears in the Vedas as a simple worship of the gods of light, fire, etc.; then passes into Brahminism, where Yisnu, an inferior god of the Vedas, and Siva, perhaps the same as the storm-god Rudra of the Vedas, take the principal place, and divide in their manifold mytholo-
gies the worship of the nation between their respective religions. A second instance is presented by the religion of Rome, which in its early stage was a punc-
tilious, superstitious veneration of certain divinities, somewhat allied to those of Greece, together with other vague, shadowy powers, and in its second stage adopted many of the gods and much of the mythology of Greece, so as to throw its own indigenous religion into the shade. Then, in its third stage, Rome almost entirely lost its old religion, and was a common harbor for all Oriental superstitions—the worship of Cybele and Isis and Mi-
thra, and the Virgo Celestia from Carthage, and the Mo-loch-Jupiters of Syria. A third instance, with less clear outlines, is presented by Mexico, the religion of which seems to be a composite made up of parts from the religion of the Mayas, from that of the Toltecs, from that of the Aztecs, and perhaps from other quarters. (6) From this exposition it would seem safe to affirm that few religions preserve
anything more than the spirit of their original form. They continue to be religions of nature, that is, of divine power as it appears in the diversified objects of nature. Hence the philosophy which arises in heathen countries will be apt to be pantheistic, to confound God and nature.

Polytheism, in any true view of it, must be considered in its relation to mythology; but we must speak of that in a more liberal and perhaps in a more native manner, viz., as mythology, for we have already considered mythology by itself. Mythology takes up the raw material, so to speak, furnished by heathen theology, and converts it into history, mingling with it much of poetic invention, but all its elements are in the same order of things that the earliest successors of the mythological age believed in their religion in this shape, as presented to them by the imaginations of a prior age unconsciously coloring what they received for true. Mythology starts with attributing to its divinities human form and feelings (anthropomorphism and anthropopathism); and, of course, from these premises infers in regard to events of life certain specific feelings on the part of the gods, resentful or kindly, out of which the events grew. It attributes sex to the gods on natural principles, for in every other respect they differ from the nature of things.

Not always is the sun masculine nor the moon feminine, but all things are alive, and, according to the especial mode of thinking in each nation, male or female. Causation, again, is conceived of under the image of human life, and the life of the gods is conceived of as coming into being, they themselves were begotten by parents, until the mind landed in a first cause, which was blind and impersonal. Thus theogonies arose, such as we find in Greece, Phoenicia, Scandinavia, and even among the savage races of this continent. See Myths and Laws, A room was thus opened for the impure imagination, which, not content with imputing to the gods love and lust towards each other, without regard to the laws of kindred or wedlock, represented them as enamoured of men or women also, and thus the progenitors of extraordinary persons, demi-gods or heroes. From this conception the way was easy towards attributing to extraordinary persons some divine sire or mother, and of alloying them to the celestials. And as thus the gods were only a little higher than mortals, the distance was bridged over, so that demi-gods were both mortal and divine. Hence it became easier to fall down into the worship of men of great power or skill, until in the old age of some of the religions we find kings receiving divine honors even in their lifetime, and deified after their death. This veneration for the phenomena of dream and the so-called phenomena of dreams. In the human mind, so that a doctrine like that of Euenusmus had easy currency when the divine had sunk so low—the doctrine, namely, that all the gods were originally dead men, and were deified on account of great achievements and services to mankind. This is a wilderness where one is in danger of getting lost, and, if one would attempt explanations, must do so with caution. There are many forms of explanation. There is the physical, where phenomena of nature are turned into gods; or the dream, where the dream-solved, meets us of explaining how an event of nature which happens every day is represented in mythology as a unique occurrence in history. There is, again, historical mythology, that in which some fact is the basis, and the drapery is mythological invention. But in adding this drapery, and in other such inventions, the poets did not feel that they were chargeable with fraud, any more than Milton blamed himself for uniting his own poetical threads with the wool of Scripture truth. There was also a mythology breathing an allegorical meaning into the winds, especially Bora, which was more or less worshipped in Greece; and the same is true of volcanic or other subterranean phenomena. In India, and even among our Red men, a similar kind of nature-worship prevailed; in some of the North American Indian tribes the religious system. We have in Greece a working up of this that goes under the name of Hesiod, and may belong to the 8th century B.C.; and the fragments of another also ascribed to a primitive poet, Orpheus, but later by one or two centuries than that of Hesiod. A comparison of these seems to show that the theological poets were in the habit of changing the myths which they had to deal with, either by altering the persons or drawing their materials from earlier poems where a different religious philosophy was exhibited. The mythology of Greece was fully grown in the age of Homer; it is not true that he and Hesiod created it, but rather that they are the witnesses of faith and gave it a form of greater beauty. Nor is it true, as we think, that a priestly class gave the first form to mythology. More true it is to say that a nation did this, and an age—a very long age, perhaps. We are not to conceive of a body of philosophers teaching in figures, the shadows of things real, those realities that lay in sunshine before their own minds; on the contrary, the mythological spirit was spread over all; it was the way in which all conceived of things supernatural.

A word or two may not be inappropriate here in regard to objects of veneration which the Greeks had, a state of things, that is, such as do not attain to the rank of principal divinities, or even of divinities at all, but still played a not unimportant part in some heathen religions. Among these we name, (1) the representations of the human life of the gods, their actions of coming into being, they themselves were begotten by parents, until the mind landed in a first cause, which was blind and impersonal. Thus theogonies arose, such as we find in Greece, Phoenicia, Scandinavia, and even among the savage races of this continent. See Myths and Laws, a room was thus opened for the impure imagination, which, not content with imputing to the gods love and lust towards each other, without regard to the laws of kindred or wedlock, represented them as enamoured of men or women also, and thus the progenitors of extraordinary persons, demi-gods or heroes. From this conception the way was easy towards attributing to extraordinary persons some divine sire or mother, and of alloying them to the celestials. And as thus the gods were only a little higher than mortals, the distance was bridged over, so that demi-gods were both mortal and divine. Hence it became easier to fall down into the worship of men of great power or skill, until in the old age of some of the religions we find kings receiving divine honors even in their lifetime, and deified after their death. This veneration for the phenomena of dream and the so-called phenomena of dreams. In the human mind, so that a doctrine like that of Euenusmus had easy currency when the divine had sunk so low—the doctrine, namely, that all the gods were originally dead men, and were deified on account of great achievements and services to mankind. This is a wilderness where one is in danger of getting lost, and, if one would attempt explanations, must do so with caution. There are many forms of explanation. There is the physical, where phenomena of nature are turned into gods; or the dream, where the dream-solved, meets us of explaining how an event of nature which happens every day is represented in mythology as a unique occurrence in history. There is, again, historical mythology, that in which some fact is the basis, and the drapery is mythological invention. But in adding this drapery, and in other such inventions, the poets did not feel that they were chargeable with fraud, any more than Milton blamed himself for uniting his own poetical threads with the wool of Scripture truth. There was also a mythology breathing an allegorical meaning into the winds, especially Bora, which was more or less worshipped in Greece; and the same is true of volcanic or other subterranean phenomena. In India, and even among our Red men, a similar kind of nature-worship prevailed; in some of the North American Indian tribes the
north-west wind attained to a high rank among the divinities, was confounded even with the Great Spirit, and played quite an important role in the mythologies. (6) Evil, that is malevolent, spirits, had a place in some religions of the uncultivated races, but in general not a very important place, nor were they worshipped except by way of propitiation. Such were the Brahmās of India, the daeva of Iran, the god Typhon of Egypt, etc. 

We have come in the course of our subject to the religions of the uncultivated races, a department of the religions of mankind, where it is difficult to solve all the problems or to get upon entirely satisfactory grounds. Most of the religions have been divided, as by Wuttke (Gesch. d. Heil. Myst. vol. i.), into fetichism and shamanism; but as authors differ greatly in the meaning which they attach to the first of these words, and as what is called shamanism may be found everywhere, we cannot make much headway in our subject by the help of these words. We shall come upon fetichism again when we speak of worship; at present we content ourselves with saying that a fetich, as first used by Des Brosses in his Essai sur le Culte des Dieux Fétiches (1709), signified any object, however great or small, of which a god or spirit was supposed to have the time to reside, and which might be used as a preservative against evil or malignant influences. The word—in the Portuguese form feticco, connected with the Italian faustico, made by art, from the Latin fausticus—which was the object of worship, or by accident. The fetich-worshipper chooses and discards, according to a freak, the object in which his divinity is supposed to lodge. To use Wuttke's language, while in sun or star worship the heavenly body is the object of worship, in feticco worship, "I am the god," the worships of a fetich says to the worshipped object, "thou mayest be, I will permit thee to be, my god." (U. S. vol. i. § 26). Others, as Meiners (Allg. Gesch. d. Religion [Hanover, 1806], vol. i. bk. ii. and J. G. Müller (Amer. Uebers. p. 74, 75), regard the fetich as in the belief of the worshipper's part, a symbol of divinity, but, like the sun or moon, a god. The fetich-worshipper carries his subdivision of nature, which is divine to the rude heathen, further down than the higher races do; he worships many worthless objects. These definitions are not satisfactory to us, nor do they point out any generic difference between the fetich-worshipper and the worshipper of an image of Athene Polia by a principal artist of Greece. For (1) if the fetich were a precious thing in itself, doubtless the Negrito worships the thing he values, and the reason is that he is paid for it. The selection and rejection need not be accounted for, but the worthlessness of the object must greatly contribute to the inconstancy of the devotee. (2) There are villages as well as house fetiches in Africa, and these seem to have a more fixed hold on the religious feeling. (3) It is a soft feeling, and not essentially like the use of saints' bones for the same purpose, and the feeling is like that of the cultivated heathen towards his graven image. This feeling is to be accounted for in part by a confusion of the subjective and the objective. The sense of necessity, caused by the necessity of the fetich, is attributed to the object itself. (4) Some fetiches have the rude beginnings of kinship to men. Here, certainly, there is image-worship in its infancy. (5) The belief in spirits which—to say the least—very many rude races have, is inconsistent with Müller's view of the fetich as the nature-worship of a detached part of nature. The spirit has the fetich for its house, it dwells there, as the Greek god was conceived by the mass of the people to inhabit the statue, and as the pictures of saints in some Catholic lands wink with their eyes because the saint is there in the belief of the superstitious. The fetich is discarded, perhaps, because it ceases to awaken certain religious feelings which it awakened for some reason at first, and so the Negro looks for some other reminder of the spirit's or the divinity's presence. (6) Some fetiches are living animals, and here the inquiry arises, which we must dismiss for the present, whether these are conceived of as tenanted by higher beings, or as symbols of higher beings. The same answer, as it appears to us, must be given as it regards Egyptian or Indian animal-worship, as it regards that which prevails in Africa or America.

We conclude, then, that fetich-worship is not essentially distinct from idol-worship, and we may find all the characteristics of it in the religions of the cultivated men. Among the Greeks, as belonging to an early period of their religion before sculpture had made much proficiency, we find such memorials of gods as three-cornered pillars in the temples of the Charites at Cyzicus, conical pillars of Apollo, the pillar of Hera at Argos, and a plunk of wood sacred to her at Samos, not too sacred to be cut down, and a stone of the mother of the gods, transferred from Pessinus to Rome, and there venerated and carried about in processions. These were fetiches, and so were wrought images, as long as the faith continued that the god was present in the outward object. The most characteristic mark of fetich-worship—as it seems to us—was that which struck the eyes of the first travelers in Africa—its connection with charms, and in general the prevalence of witchcraft, and of various magic arts. The religions are religions of fear, in which the supernatural is selected at will, and thus stands in the way of the higher religious ideas. This cannot have been coeval with the religions themselves. It must have taken some time, perhaps ages, to develop the system of witchcraft or magic arts as we now know them, and to make them a part of their degradation, by which, according to the natural course of things, their degradation has been increased. 

Shamanism may be defined as the worship of spirits, so called from the Shaman or priest-conjurer of many religions in the northern part of the world. The spiritual world seems to embrace all things that have life, and in some parts the spirit detaches itself from the tree or other living thing at will, to return there again. This kind of religion has prevailed, or once prevailed, among the Finns, Huns, ancestors of the Magyars, Mongols, Japanese, Chinese, and in Tibet. Something like it is found among the Red men and other aborigines of this western continent. 

Some of the Northern Asiatics make a threefold division of spirits: first, the souls or powers which have been taken from the body; second, the spirits of deceased ancestors; thirdly, spirits, some of which may have been human souls, which have a wider sphere of action, such as have relations to a whole tribe or as protectors in certain undertakings. These may be kindly or malignant.
POLYTHEISM

may have denoted at first place of thunder, heaven, then god of heaven, then god in general. The Lapps of Norway have the same in the air, those in the heavens, and others above the heavens. Among the last is a higher god, who creates everything through his son—which must be a conception borrowed from the Christians in their neighborhood. Among the Tungus, the supreme god is the sphere of operation in the spirit system; but above them all is a god of heaven, Boa, who knows all things, but does not concern himself with what comes to pass, nor punish the wicked; and, besides him, a spirit of the sun, more powerful than the rest, to whom prayers are offered. A spirit of the moon would also have dreams come; spirits of the stars, who are protectors of particular men, etc. (Comp. Castrén's lectures on Finnish mythology, translated from the Swedish.) In the religions of our continent the Great Spirit has been supposed, without reason, to have corresponded with God, the sun, north-west wind, etc. The spirits are supposed to be capable of detaching themselves from their corporeal frame, and of taking various forms as they see fit.

It is a most interesting inquiry, but one in which it is difficult to reach certainty, whether there are in the uncultivated races remembrances of a primary monotheistic faith. The difficulty is due to several causes, the first of which is their reserve, often extreme, in communicating with persons higher in the scale of civilization; and the second, their attachment to what some persons may say. Another circumstance to be considered is the propagation of religious ideas from foreign sources—in Africa on both sides of the continent from the Mohammedan which has long been making progress, and in this continent from Christianity. The Bed men near the whites have forgotten their former human sacrifices and cannibalism, and neglect of parents in extreme old age; and they seem to have imitated some religious notions from the white men which have modified their religions. We find, also, this to be sometimes confused by some tribes in Africa that they believe in a being above all, but neglect him because he is too far off, too high to concern himself with their affairs. This may be an excuse for neglect of worship of such a being, or it may be conformable to a real but obscure tradition. We may say that the supreme god to have been in the primeval religion of their fathers, and to have been thrust out of worship by the spiritual weakness and imbecility of fallen man. In some tribes, again, there appear to be no such faint traces of monotheism as were found in Egypt. In Southern Africa, once told the present writer that he never found any such embers of an early religion among those with whom he was conversant. The question is thus one not so easily settled. We close what we have to say of the brief citation from the important work of Waitz (Anthropol. d. Natureveldt, pt. ii, p. 167). He is speaking of the religion of the Negroes. After denying the justice of imputing to them a peculiar and rude form of polytheism, he adds that "the deeper penetration into their religions, to which of late a number of conscientious investigators have attained, leads to the surprising result that a number of Negro tribes, among whom the influence of nations that stand higher in point of culture cannot be pointed out nor scarcely be suspected, have made greater and greater advances in the development of the religious conceptions than almost all other nations in a state of nature. And this to such a degree that, if we may not call them monotheists, still we may assert of them that they stand on the borders of monotheism; while yet their religion is mingled with a great amount of gross superstition, which in the case of other peoples where it is found seems entirely to cover up with its rank growth the purer religious conceptions."

II. Observations.—We have considered polytheism thus far on the side of its nature and origin. We proceed next to a brief exposition of its practical side, or its outward worship, including prayers, invocations of gods, and temples, liturgical services, and offerings.

(1.) Throughout paganism it has been felt that the gods must be approached in a certain way, and the knowledge of that way has been in the hands of a certain priestly or priest-tain tribe or class of men, and not by general credo songs, or formulae, the knowledge of these preserved to this class alone. Moreover, a method of ascertaining the divine will grew up of which they alone had the knowledge. Whatever rites were necessary to propitiate the anger of the gods, or to secure their favor, they alone could ensue. If any occult science relating to human destiny or the divine will existed, they possessed it exclusively. They had from their position such advantages that they first would have the literature, science, philosophy, and history of the nation in their keeping. Thus to a great extent they controlled the progress of events, stood by the side of rulers to direct their counsels, trained the people, shaped the theory of religion, turned it perhaps into a new direction.

The influence and standing of the priests varied with the freedom of the nation, with the compactness of the priestly order, and with various other causes. In some countries, as in Egypt and in India, they formed one of the leading castes, and all knowledge, secular or religious, was in their hands. In the Persian or Zoroastrian religion the priestly class was in the records, has also in the inscription of Behistun (of the time of Darius Hystaspes), in the Greek and Latin writers, the name of Magi. The Magi, according to Herodotus, were a Median tribe, which, becoming necessary for the offices of religion, was diffused over Persia also, and perhaps over East Iran or Bactria. They resembled the tribe of Levi in their living in villages, and had no great political power, owing perhaps to the almost religious authority of the Persian king. The Avesta consists, to a great degree, of long prayers, of invitations to the gods to be present at acts of worship, and the like, and religion entered into all the important concerns of life. Frequent purifications, and the maintenance also of the sacred fire, fall to their office. It is difficult to explain the connection between these Magi and the practice of magic, for there were Babylonian Magi, but the word was probably indigenous in Iran. Duncker, the historian, finds the connection in the formule of conjuration which they used in order to drive away the devus or deva, the evil-minded spirit-servants of Ahriman, an angel of light who had turned into a demon. As for the spirits, just as prayer in India was conceived of as putting a force on the gods.

Greece differed from the nations already mentioned in having no order of priests: any one might assume the office, and discharge the duties of the priest. Formed, and "there is no trace of a priestly discipline propagated by instruction through generations, nor is there any trace of an abiding connection between the priests of different cities" (K. Ostfried Muller, Proleg. p. 249, 290). At Rome the religious institutions took a stronger root, in conformity with the regard for precedent, the formality and the superstition which characterized the early Roman people. The public priesthoods were originally in patrician hands, and the priests long monopolized the knowledge of the calendar and the legal formulae. Moreover, the private rights of families seem to have been thought of more importance than was the case among the Greeks. But there was no caste, there were no hereditary public priestly offices, and politics, becoming a vastly more inviting field, drew to itself the attention and efforts of all men who aspired to influence. The magistrate observed the signs in the heavens and regulated the meeting of public bodies in accordance with their own wishes, under pretence of religious scruples. North
of Rome lay the Etruscans, belonging to another race, who had a gloomy religion, in which the art of divination played a more important part than in that of any other nation of which we have knowledge. Here the leading men held the office of priests and the principal priesthoods were hereditary. Beyond the Alps, in Gaul, the Druids formed a great corporation, at the head of which was a kind of pope; while Julius Caesar was struck by the want of a compact priestly class in Germany, and says that the race was not given to sacrifices. In ancient Greece it was not by this means that the Mexicans had a very numerous body of priests, some five thousand of whom are said to have belonged to the great temple at the capital. Over the hierarchy of priests two chiefs selected from leading families presided, who in the main gave to them a high authority in state affairs. Under these chiefs a third, with his subordinates, had superintendence over the lower priests and the seminaries. There were also monks in Mexico, as well as in other adjoining countries, who have been compared with the similar bodies in Buddhist countries. In Peru, owing to the sacred dignity of the Incas, the priests, unless they permitted to the race of the Children of the Sun, had less independent weight than the similar class in Mexico, and the simplicity of the religion may have conduced to the same result.

A kind of spirit worship is mentioned by Tacitus that the virgins of the sun, who, like the Roman vestals, had to keep alive the sacred symbol of fire.

(2.) The objects of worship were either invisible, or distant and yet visible, or something near at hand, in which a divine power was thought to reside. In the first case especially there was a long ing in the pagan mind for some representation or image which might keep the presence of the deity in mind, and thus give a sense of protection to the worshipper. Image-worship, idolatry, arose from a desire, it seems, of guarding the image in the unseen power, or from conceiving that the divine power is lodged in or belongs to the object present before the eyes as being inherent or represented by it. Image-worship has been diffused over the heathen world, but some nations have rejected it. The religion of Ormuzd rejected images and even temples with a kind of fanatical hatred. We believe that there are no traces of it in the Vedas. The Romans at first had only symbols and not forms in the houses of their gods. The probability is therefore that through the whole of the Indo-European race, idol-worship was not known at first; but in Egypt, in Greece, in the Hamitic and in some of the Semitic peoples, on this continent, in Africa, and over the world, no earlier period can be traced than one in which either image symbol or fetish-worship existed. For the recognition of the divinity of nature, one would suppose that images would not be needed by the pagan religious sentiment. The heavenly bodies especially are so great a part of the time in sight that no memorial of them would be needed. Thus we find that in Babylon and Assyria, where sun and star worship, as already stated, was predominant in the worship of sun and star gods, prevailed, Idols were common. Yet we find images of Bel, Nebel, and Merodach (Mercury and Jupiter, spoken of by the prophets (Isa. xlv, 1 f; Jer. 1, 2), while the Phoenician and Canaanite sun-god Baal is represented by pillars of stone and wood 2 Kings x, 26, 27), and Asherah, probably the same as Ashtar, by wooden posts (groves in our version, pasûm). It seems not unlikely that in proportion to the pagan mind's separation of a divinity from the object out of which it grew, the tendency to represent it by images, and especially "after the figure of man" (Isa. xlv, 13), would become more controlling, but to this there seem to be exceptions. As for the direct worship of other objects of nature, as trees and animals, especially snakes, there is no reason why this kind of worship should need images.

And here we come to the difficulty whether the animal is a symbol or a fetish, that is, a tenement of a god; and we may doubt also whether in different parts of the world, as in Egypt and on this continent, the same conceptions lay under this species of culture.

In Egypt the sacred crocodile and Anubis were certainly regarded as incarnations; but many reptiles cannot have preceded and given rise to this belief? The representations with which the Egyptian religion abounds of gods in a composite form, partly human, partly bestial, hawk- or jackal-headed, etc., show a symbolizing of particular qualities united to the expression of intelligence like that of man. But, on the other hand, the worship of animals elsewhere, the great number of sacred animals in Egypt, which it was a crime to kill, and the mummies of which were preserved, seem to point to a stage of worship in that strange country where the marvellous instincts and powers of animals pointed to a god within them all.

After what has been said in another place we need not speak at length of fetish-worship. The vagueness of the word ought to be cured by definitions, or it ought to be driven out of works on the pagan religions. If a fetish is a material in which a god or spirit is conceived to dwell for the time, a spell-bound protector and coadjutor of those who offer him worship, this is a distinct idea; or if it is a tenement chosen by the gods to become the abode of their worship, the fetish is another thing, but when we find, together with stones, mountains, water, wind and fire, plants, animals, and men, heavily bodies also in a certain stage of human culture reckoned as fetishes, it seems as if fetish-worship might be made to include everything. In Greece the Thessalian sorceresses were thought to be able to bring the moon down out of the skies, and to work magic arts by her help. That is, Hecate, the moon-goddess, was believed to be wandering abroad at night, and, being identified with the moon, was thought to have power over all things. The general notion of power over objects of nature appears in the rude fetish-worship of Africa. A clear line cannot be drawn between the religious conceptions of paganism in the lower and in its higher culture.

We have spoken of mixed human and animal forms, where the symbol was the main idea. The highest attainment of idol-worship is to represent the divinity under the form of man. God made man in his image; the pagan lover of beauty makes his god in the form of a man's likeness, not known as at first; but in Egypt, in Greece, in the Hamitic and in some of the Semitic peoples, on this continent, in Africa, and over the world, no earlier period can be traced than one in which either image symbol or fetish-worship existed. For the recognition of the divinity of nature, one would suppose that images would not be needed by the pagan religious sentiment. The heavenly bodies especially are so great a part of the time in sight that no memorial of them would be needed. Thus we find that in Babylonia and Assyria, where sun and star worship, as already stated, was predominant in the worship of sun and star gods, prevailed, Idols were common. Yet we find images of Bel, Nebel, and Merodach (Mercury and Jupiter, spoken of by the prophets (Isa. xlv, 1 f; Jer. 1, 2), while the Phoenician and Canaanite sun-god Baal is represented by pillars of stone and wood 2 Kings x, 26, 27), and Asherah, probably the same as Ashtar, by wooden posts (groves in our version, pasûm). It seems not unlikely that in proportion to the pagan mind's separation of a divinity from the object out of which it grew, the tendency to represent it by images, and especially "after the figure of man" (Isa. xlv, 13), would become more controlling, but to this there seem to be exceptions. As for the direct worship of other objects of nature, as trees and animals, especially snakes, there is no reason why this kind of worship should need images.

And here we come to the difficulty whether the animal is a symbol or a fetish, that is, a tenement of a god; and we may doubt also whether in different parts of the world, as in Egypt and on this continent, the same conceptions lay under this species of culture.

The images of the gods, rather than the desire of shelter for the worshipper, gave rise to the temples, which were houses of a divinity; thus Zeus is a god's dwelling from a room, or the dwelling, and edes, in Latin, in the singular is usually a temple, but in the plural a human abode. But neither image nor temple was as important for worship as the altar, which might stand afar from any temple, or near a temple and outside of it, or, it might be, within the temple, with no roof, or an opening in the roof, for the purpose
of giving free passage to incense and the smoke of sacrifices into the upper air. When the altar of the god and his statue generally stood above, that the worshipper might look upwards to the representation of the divinity. The temple as well as the statue, in the progress of refinement and of the ritualistic spirit, gained an importance that did not belong to them in the earlier times. It is in the temple principally that architecture in most heathen lands has found the motive for its cultivation, as it was the images of the gods chiefly which promoted the progress of sculpture. We have already had occasion to say that in the Persian religion there were preparations and ceremonies which were, in some respects, similar to the sacrifice of the ancient Greeks. The rite of Egyptian fire and light was an obstacle in the way of confining religious rites within the walls of temples, and the pure original faith of Iran had little need of altars.

4. Worship, in the narrow sense of the word, may include public and private prayers and other liturgical services, with offerings unbloody or bloody, and their attendant lustrations or purifications. Some of these rites, especially such as symbolized certain mythological events, might be secret, but of these mysteries we have no direct records.

Prayer, the natural voice of the being who realizes his dependence, might be informal in the family religion of the pagan, or attended with formalities; it might need the presence of a priest, especially on certain occasions of family or public life. The head of the household might act as priest. In public worship a class of priests took the lead; it was felt that a certain form of words had a peculiar efficacy, and from this notion perhaps belief in incantations derived its birth. In some religions the liturgical forms have been excessively minute and elaborate. We have already referred to the religion of Iran as an example of this. The Avesta is chiefly liturgical. The first part of the Yasna, and a smaller collection, the Vispered, consist principally of praises, thanksgivings, and invocations addressed to various superior beings, the angels, and to other beings at the offerings of the Haoma and at other celebrations. The Yashta or Yasna, a part of the Khordâ-Avesta (Lesser Avesta), consists of prayers and praises addressed to various objects of veneration, as to Mithras, Vṛthraqna or Behram, and the souls of the good. In the early religion of India the three first Vedas, the Rig-Veda, the Sāman-Veda, and the Yajur-Veda, contain a thousand hymns in ten books, the first seven of which consist of hymns addressed to Agni, the fire-god, to Indra, and others. In the ninth book are classed hymns intended for the ceremonies of initiation and preparation. The Sāman-Veda takes most of its materials from the Rig, and adapts them to the purposes of chanting. The Yajur-Veda consists of formulas proper to accompany the various actions of religious worship, and belongs to a time when the worship had become complicated and the importance of the priest had increased. The Romans were in their early days a devout and reverential, but also a formal people. The same adherence to legal precedent which built up their law appeared in the minute observances of their religion; formulas of words had a certain independent power; a breach of silence at prayer and sacrifice was ominous; the evocations addressed to the divinities of conquered towns that they would leave their old abodes were conceived to have the force of a charm; and they were afraid to let it be known what god was the especial guardian of Rome, lest their enemies should practice the same evocations against them. In India, also, prayer was thought of as having a magical power. The old invocation of the sun, called the Gayatri, is of such potency, it is said, that the Brahmin can obtain happiness by whether he performs other religious services or not. The repeating of it in the morning dawn until the sun appears removes every unperceived fault of the night, and a similar repetition in the evening twillight is equally effectual (Wuthe, U. S. vol. ii, § 106, from Manu, ii, 87, 101, 102).

The offerings and sacrifices of a public nature were usually attended by lustrations, which are not to be confounded with purifications of a propitiatory character practiced by those who sought cleansing from guilt. Both kinds of lustrations, however, had the same moral idea, the necessity of a pure mind, for their foundation. In or near the Greek temples, and marking the division line between profane and sacred ground, stood the vessel of holy water (perirkhanterium), for the uses of those who entered the pure interior. After this preparation came the offerings with prayers and praises. In the Oriental religion these offerings were only unbloody, or at least the bloody offerings or sacrifices played a small part. The institutions of Numa sanctioned only such things as the fruits of the field, and the mola salus, or broken grains of spelt mixed with salt. Not even incense was then used by the simple Romans. The usages changed greatly in this particular at a later time, owing to the influence of the Greek settlements in Southern Italy. Among the Hindu horses and horned cattle were frequent victims in the earlier times, but afterwards became less common. In the books of the Vedas nothing is said of animal sacrifices, but it is prescribed that for certain offences (as a fine or an atonement?) a hundred smaller cattle should be offered up. But in Persian history, whether in accordance with or in violation of the precepts of the religion, many sacrifices were made of animal victims. Xerxes offered on his march towards Greece honored the Trojan Athena by sacrificing a thousand cows. At the Strymon the Magi offered up white horses, and at a spot in Thrace called the Nine Bulls nine boys and nine girls from among the native inhabitants were buried alive. Sacrifices in marks that no pieces of the victim were given, as elsewhere, to the gods, since they had need only of the animal's soul. Instead of victims, the great offering in the Indian religion of the Vedic period was that of the soma, a sacred plant or some other plant of the milk-weed tribe, the stalk of which was crushed between stones, and the narcotic juice, mixed with butter, was left to ferment. This mixture was supposed to nourish, strengthen, and even intoxicate the gods. The most absurd superstitious connections were connected with this sacred substance: it was originally in heaven, and came down with the rain to the earth; it was something that a man might offer to the higher gods only, and could feel that he had rendered a favor by it, and had a right to a return. Finally the soma became identified with the moon-god as the cause of fruitfulness. An analogous name in Iran is the Haoma, and obtained from the same or similar plants, played a great part in the services of the old religion of that country. Similar notions that the divine powers partook of and enjoyed sacrifices which were offered to them may be found elsewhere in many religions, but probably none so extravagant.

Sacrifices of victims, or bloody offerings, were sooner or later almost universal. What victim should be selected depended on a variety of considerations. Sometimes it was an animal that injured the gifts presented to a god, or injured that which he protected, as a goat, the destroyer of the vine, was offered to Dionysus, and a swine, which rooted in the ground, to Demeter. Sometimes it was an animal under the god's protection. Sometimes, again, there was a symbolism in the sacrifice, as when a black-colored animal was offered to the Dii Manes at Rome, or a heifer never yoked to Minerva. In Egypt, notwithstanding that the number of sacred animals was very considerable, other victims were selected for offerings. Thus a pig was presented to the god answering to the Hebrew figure of Aspera; a sheep to the mother of the gods, but not to Isis; a cat to Horus; a cockroach, or some kind of Musca, at least, to the goddess identified with Thetis.
Throughout a large part of the world human beings were offered as sacrifices to the gods of the heathen, and the farther back we penetrate into antiquity the more common is this horrid practice. There are two forms of it, the sacrifice of children, especially of the first-born, in connection with the worship of Moloch—perhaps of Baal and other kindred gods—prevalent, as in Phoenicia, the land of Canaan, Moab, perhaps, and Carthage, and traces of the same may be found in the island of Crete. Also in some parts of this continent the same practice seems to have gained some footing to that of the prophet Micah (vi, 7), the law of Moses (Lev. xx, 2-5), the historical books (2 Kings xvi, 3; comp. Deut. xii, 31), and other parts of the Scriptures refer, unless in some of these passages simple illustration by fire without burning may be intended. But far more common was the sacrifice of grown-up men. As nations grew more humane, this practice was softened down; either men condemned to death, who had to die at any rate, were selected as the victims, or a person was scourged or cut out until the blood ran, or the rite was performed upon an image substituted for a human being. Such substitution can be traced in Egypt, Greece, and Rome. In India human sacrifices were introduced, when the obscene and cruel Siva religion spread among the people, into his worship and that of his wife Durga, or Kali. The Brahmana is by Ward and others as saying that Kali "felt a pleasure for a month in the blood of fish offered to her; for nine months in that of wild animals; for a hundred years in that of a tiger; and in that of a lion, a stag, or a man, for a thousand years. Three men’s blood appeased her for a hundred years, her bounty." The offering of blood is like the drink of the gods (the Soma); Brahma and all the gods assemble at the offering" (Ward, iii, 174; Wutke, ii, 355; Asiatic Res. v, 371). In other countries, as in Gaul, in Mexico, in Peru, above all in Mexico, this practice assembles a people, is a common sight, and even now shows itself debased and made savage by his religion. There is ground for believing that cannibalism may have grown out of the sacrificial feasts after battle, when an enemy was slaughtered to the gods who gave the victory.

We ask at this stage of the subject, what was the meaning of pagan offerings? As they understood their religious rites, the unbloody were expressions of gratitude and acknowledgment for protection. Whatever the form of offering was, the god was conceived of as being pleased with them. How did they account for this? They were based on the idea that the gods enjoyed offerings as we enjoy food. The faith of the Aryan in race in regard to the Soma offering, and the idea that the smoke of burning sacrifices was agreeable to the divinities, show the greater forms of anthropomorphism. Sacrifices of a public nature may be regarded as feasts to which a god or gods were invited; the altar was the public hearth; the victim was partaken of by all the worshippers after due purifications, libations, and other preparations; the god had his share of the meal, which went up to him in the skies. At the bottom of all this, however, was that the worshipper gave up something of value, and thus showed his devotion to his protectors. But this explanation does not exhaust the entire meaning of animal sacrifices. Thus certain animals not used for food, as dogs, horses, wolves, bears, and even asses, were in some Greek rites the appropriate victims, the probable reason for which is given by K. Otfried Müller (Dorier, i, 279) that animals hated by a particular god he would be pleased to see bleeding at his altar. The sacrifice of a dog to Hecate may be accounted for from the dog’s baying at the moon, and of a stag to Artemis because she was a huntress. But there were also propitiatory sacrifices required by a feeling of guilt and of dread. Here life is given for life. It seems impossible to put less meaning into such rite than that the worshipper acknowledged his life to be forfeited, and hoped by something which not only had value but was also a living object, to avert through confession made in this way the divine wrath. Human sacrifices were still more significant. In the case of children, especially of the first-born, the supplication that the child may not die where most frequently a case, as an expression of gratitude, does not seem at all natural. It was, in short, a sacrifice made for the benefit of the family, caused by a painful sense of ill desert; it was giving the fruit of the body for the sin of the soul. The more general sacrifices of human beings, especially of grown-up men, were more frequent, and usually where some great crime had been committed by persons unknown, or when pestilence or defeat by enemies be- tokened the wrath of protecting divinities, must be regarded as an acknowledgment of sin, and a way of transferring and appeasing divine anger. Wrath demanded or exposed to death. The death of one or more freed the rest. In the Greek myths, the self-devotion of an innocent virgin, like Macaria in the Hera- cidae of Euripides, and in Roman history more clearly the act of the two Decii, father and son, their self-consecration, and their death as a base of blunted the power of the hostile army; point to a faith that victory might be secured by voluntary death for others. This is the highest form that human sacrifice took in heathen antiquity.

It remains to give the briefest possible estimate of the heathen religions in their influences on man. With regard to their lower forms, as seen in wild races, they are to a great extent religions of fear; dread of superior powers weighs on the minds even of flight-hearted African negroes. A feeling of sin, and yet a very faint and half-conscious one, must be presupposed in their minds in order that this dread may exist; but the dread is greatly increased by magic practices which are kept up by priestly imposture. In the higher races it would be folly to deny that in the course of time, and of course in the same way, man can be debased and made savage by his religion. There is ground for believing that cannibalism may have grown out of the sacrificial feasts after battle, when an enemy was slaughtered to the gods who gave the victory.
III. Literature. From the immense mass of works relating to the pagan religions we can only make a selection.


2. Explanations of Mythology. — (a.) From the Old Testament, its events and characters, as by Vossius, De hebraeis gentilis (Amsterdam, 1642); De Jandt, Demonstr. evangeli. (Paris, 1762); and others of that school, now nearly forgotten. (b.) K. Ottf. Muller, Prolegomen zu einer wissenchaftl. Mythologie (Gottingen, 1823); Max Muller in his second course of Lectures on Language.

3. General Progymnasmata on Heathen Religion or on Mythologies. — Janier (Paris, 1710-1738) and Jacob Bryant, now forgotten; Creuzer, Symbolik (1st ed. 1819-1821, 4 vols.), with Mone's Heidenth., d. nordl. Europas (Leipsi and Darmstadt, 1822, 1823, 2 vols.); Meiners, Allgemeine Gesch. d. Religionen (Hanover, 1806, 1807, 2 vols.); Stuhr, Relig. Systeme d. Worlds (Berlin, 1826-1828, 2 vols.); Schwenk, Mythologie (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1824-1825, 7 vols.; Eckermann, Lehrb. d. Religionen, etc. (Halle, 1840, 1849, 4 vols.).

4. The Ancient Mythographers. — (a.) Heathen authors, as Hesiod, Theogonie (Heidelberg, 1710, 8 vols.); Orph. Hymn. (Putz, 1782, 2 vols.); (b.) The attacks on heathenism by early Christian writers, as Clement of Alexandria in his Protrept.; and in part of the Stromata; Theodore, De Graeco, affect. cur., with the Latin writers, esp. Arnobius, Augustine in parts of the City of God, Julius Firmicus, Minucius Felix (1789, 3 vols.); etc.


7. Egyptian Mythology. — Jablonskis Pantheon Egypt. (Frankfort-on-the-Oder, 1750-1752); Lepsius, Uber d. ersten ägypt. Götterkreis in the "Trans of the Berlin Acad." (1831); also his Todtenbuch (Leipsi, 1842); Dunsen, Agyptens Stiele, etc. (in Germ. and Engl.; bk. i. esp. treat. of the religion); Duncker, Gesch. der Alterth. (1st ed. Berlin, 1852; vol. i. treats of Egypt; four editions have appeared); Roth, Gesch. der umbäudl. Philos. (in vol. i. Mannheim, 1862); also works of Wilkinson and others on Egyptian antiqu., Bruchegh, etc.

8. Semitic Religions. — Movers, Die Phänomen (Berlin, u. Bonn, 1849-1856, 2 vols.); Duncker (ut sup. in vol. ii.); the writers on Assy. and Babyl. monuments, as Layard, the Rawlinsons, Oppert, G. Smith, Le Normant, Schrader, in his Assyri.-babyl. Keilbucher (Leipsi, 1867), and Keilbucher u. das Alter Testament (Grossen, 1872).

9. Iranian Religion. — Spiegel, in his Avesta, with introductions, and in other works; Windischmann's Zoroastri. Stud. (Basle, 1891); Röth (ut sup. in vol. i.); Haug, Essays (Bombay, 1862); Duncker (ut sup. in vol. ii. of which the second ed. [1867] appeared also with the title, Gesch. d. Arier.).

10. Indian Religions. — Besides the writers on the Vedic literature and transl. of the Vedas, Lassen, Ind. Aetherkunde (4 vols.; in vol. i. p. 378-792); Duncker (ut sup. in vol. i.); Max Müller, in several works; Whitacre, Or. Landsk. (New York, 1873); Wutke (ut sup. in vol. i.); Ward's View, etc. (Lond. 1872, 3 vols.); with the writers on Buddhism, as Bouonau, Köppen, etc.

11. Chinese Religions. — Wutke (ut sup. in vol. i.) a number of transl., as of the Tao-King by Guizhi and De Guiguin (Paris, 1770); of Meng-Tsen by Stanislas Julien (Paris, 1824); the Y-King, by Mohl (1884); Tahiui, by Neumann (1887); Legge's Chinese Classics; also Stuhlr's Reicks-Reigion d. Chinesen; Plath, Relig. u. Cultus d. chinesen (2 pts., reprint from the "Transactions of the Royal Bavarian Academy of Science, etc.


Pomarancio is the surname of Cristoforo Roncalli, a painter of the Florentine school. He was born in 1552 at Pomarancio, and was a pupil of Niccolò Ciregioni, who took him to Rome quite young to assist him in his works. At the same time, under the direction of Ignazio Falda, he studied painting. He was associated with the picture of St. John of Valvano in the cathedral of S. Giovanni in Reggio, the younger Palma, and others, in finishing the logge of Raffael. This work being achieved, he painted, on slate, for Santa Maria degli Angeli at Rome, a Death of Aniasius and Soppahura, a scene described by Erasmus, a mosaic of the basilica of St. Peter. After painting at San Giovanni di Laterano The Baptism of Constantine, at San Giacomo the Resurrection of Christ, at San Gregorio a St. Andreu, one of his best works, he was selected to paint the cupola of the church of Loreto, getting the preference of Guido and Caracciolo. He avenged himself by having his rival's face disfigured by a spadassin. The cupola of Loreto, in the ornamentation of which Roncalli was assisted by Jaconetti, Pietro Lombardo, and Lorenzo Gariberti, offers a great variety and abundance of subjects. Although these paintings have suffered much, some heads of uncommon beauty are still discernible. Some subjects from the life of the Virgin, executed by Pomarancio, were the occasion of his being made a knight of the Order of Christ by Paul V. He worked in divers other places of the Penitenc: there is a Noli me tangere at the Ermitani of San Severino; a St. Francis in Prayers, at San Agostino of Ancona; a St. Paulus at Osimo; and at the Palazzo Galli of the same place is a Judgment of Solomon, which Lanzi ascerts to be his best fresco. During his stay at Genoa his churches and palaces with works fit to compete with the best of the century. We mention further among
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his paintings The Martyrdom of St. Simon, at the Pinacothek of Munich, and a Virgin shedding Tears over the Body of her Son, at the Museum of Madrid. His life was a remarkable one, and he is considered one of the greatest painters of the Roman, now of the Florentine school; sometimes it comes near to the Venetian school. His colors are

brighter and more brilliant in his frescoes than in his oil-paintings. He likes to adorn his subjects with beautiful landscapes of great effect. Unfortunately, however, little is known of his life and works; he was too often assisted by his pupils; hence some weak parts in his works. He is charged also with some errors of perspective. He died at Rome in 1626. See Lanzi, Hist. of Painters (see Index); Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, s. v.; Nonnelli.

Pomarancio is also a surname by which Niccolò Circignani is generally known. He was a painter of the Florentine school of the 16th century, and was born at Pomarancio, near Volterra. He was probably a disciple of Titian, whose assistant he was in his works in the great room of the Belvedere, in the Vatican. He arrived at Rome quite young, and painted there a number of frescoes, among which was the ceiling of the Sala di P. Stucchi, (the Lord surrounded by Angels (tribune of S. Giovanni Paolo), St. John the Baptist (church of the Consolazione), and thirty-two terrible Scenes of Martyrdom (San Stefano Rotondo), vigorous, but executed with little care. It is probable that Pomarancio spent the last years of his life in his native place, where he died after 1591; for the works which must be referred to his last period are all among numerous paintings of his preserved in Volterra. At S. Giusto a Desert from the Cross is signed "Niccolò Circignani di Rimparancio pinxit A.D. 1580;" and at the Battisterio, on an Ascension, one of his best works, we read, "Nicolaus de Ciricignani Voltraenarum pinxit anno 1591." In the cathedral of the same city there remains of the frescoes with which he had adorned the tribune a God-Father; at S. Pietro, in Selci, an Annunciation (oil-painting), and at San Francesco a Pietà. Pomarancio was frequently aided by his pupils, the best known of whom are Cristoforo Roncalli, called also Pomarancio, and his own son, Antonio Circignani, who remained in obscurity during his father's lifetime, and came suddenly into repute by the paintings with which he adorned a chapel of Santa Maria Traspontina at Rome: they exhibit some features successfully borrowed from Barocci. At Florence, under the portico of the hospital of S. Matteo, he painted some frescoes in 1612. He died in 1674. He is divided into two periods, the first of which was occupied by frescoes; the second by oil-paintings. His last book is a painting of St. Michael, in the church of Ognissanti, under the steps of the altar, the work of 1628. It is dedicated to the Duke of Mantua, by whom it was presented to the Duke of Mantua, by whom it was presented to the Duke of Mantua, by whom it was presented to the Duke of Mantua.

Pomegranate, the Punica granatum of Linneus, is by universal consent acknowledged to denote the Heb. rimonnim (תמר), also lera, so called, according to Gesenius, from an Arab. root signifying to cover; but according to Furst, from one signifying to cover. Sept. posa, posa, paralex. lera, Vulg. malum punicum, ma-

lum granatum, molo gramatum), a word which occurs frequently in the O.T., and is used to designate either the pomegranate-tree or its fruit. It is described in the works of Dioscorides by the name pomegranum. The pomegranate is a native of Asia; and we may trace it from Syria, through Persia, even to the mountains of Northern India. It is common in Northern Africa. The pomegranate is not likely to have been a native of Egypt; it must, however, have been cultivated there at a very early period, as the Israelites, when in the desert, lamed the loss of its fruit in the wilderness of Zin (Numb. xx, 5)—this is "no place of figs, or of vines, or of pomegranates." The tree, with its characteristic calyx-crowned fruit, is easily recognised on the Egyptian sculptures (Wilkinson, Ant. Egyptians, i, 36, ed. 1854). That it was produced in Palestine during the same early ages is evident from the spires bringing some back when sent into Canaan to see what kind of a land it was; for we are told that they "came unto the brook of Eshcol, and cut down from thence a branch with one cluster of grapes, etc., and they brought of the pomegranates and of the figs of (Numb. xiii, 50; comp. also Deut. viii, 8). The villages or towns of Rimmon (Jossh. xv, 92), Gath-rimmon (xxii, 25), En-rimmon (Neh. xi, 29), possibly derived their names from pomegranate-gardens. The tree grew in their vicinity; the tree suffered occasionally from the devastations of locusts (Joel i, 12; see also Hag. ii, 19). Mention is made of "an orchard of pomegranates" in Cant. iv, 13; and in iv, 8 the cheeks (A.V. "temples") of the Beloved are compared to "a pomegranation in a lattice." In Judg. xxviii, 34; xxxiv, 24. This is explained mystically by Philo (Iphilo, ii, 138, 236), and differently by Meyer (Blattfer, in hohere Wahrheit, x, 65; see also Bahr, Symbolik, i, 128 sq.). The pomegranate seems also to have been used as a holy symbol in heathen reli-

gions (see Bahr, Symbol, i, 128). Among the later Jews the pomegranate was used in some cases as a measure (Mishna, Chëm, xvii, 4). Mention is made of "spiced wine of the juice of the pomegranate" in Cant vii, 2; with the word used, compare the pomegranate-grapes (blush grapes) of which Dioscorides speaks (v, 44) speaks, and which is still used in the East. Chari-

then great quantities of it were made in Per-

sia, both for home consumption and for exportation, in his time (Script. Herb. p. 339; Harmer, Obs. i, 377). Being a native of Persia and having been so highly valued in the East, its growth attracted the attention of Eastern nations. In the present day it is highly valued, and travellers describe...
used in the manufacture of morocco leather, and, together with the bark, is sometimes used medico-magnetically to expel the tape-worm. Russell (New Shirt of Aleppo, i. 85, 2d ed.) states that "lemons have by no means superseded the pomegranate; the latter is more easily procured through the winter, and is often in cooking preferred to the lemon. The tree is much cultivated in the gardens and orchards of Palestine and Syria. The fruit is seldom ripe earlier than the end of August, when most families lay in a stock for winter consumption. There are three varieties of the fruit— one sweet, another very acid, and a third, in which both qualities are agreeably blended. The juice of the sour fruit is often used as the basis of a vinegar, which is cut open when served up to table; or the grains, taken out and besprinkled with sugar or rose-water, are brought to table in saucers. The grains likewise, fresh as well as dried, make a considerable ingredient in cookery." He adds that the trees are apt to suffer much in severe winters from extraordinary cold. See Celsius, Hierobot, i. 271 sq.; Oken, Lehrbuch der Botanik, ii, 917 sq.; Geiger, Pharmaceutische Botanik, ii, 1417 sq.; Plenk, Plant. Med. Tab. p. 576; Layard, Nisrach, ii, 252. **Pomerania**, a province of Prussia, situated in the north-east, and bordering on the Baltic, was once the possession of the Slaves and Swedes, and has such a peculiar ecclesiastical record that we here take space to detail it. In the 6th century some Slavic tribes settled in Northern Germany, and calling themselves the Baltic Sea Pomorze, i.e. the sea-coast. The foremost deities of this Wendish people were Belbog, Czernibog, Radogost, Swantewit, Herovit, Gerovit, and Triglav.

I. Introduction of Christianity.—About the year 1000 the bishopric of Colberg was founded as a dependence of the archbishopric of Gnesen, and Reimborn appointed bishop; but Reimborn having gone to Kief to attend the celebration of the nuptials of the daughter of Boleslaus with the son of the czar Vladimir, and stopping at the Russian court, this commencement proved fruitless. The attempt of Bernhard, a Spanish monk, to introduce Christianity, which was made a century afterwards, was equally unsuccessful. But Boleslaus Krzyzouati, king of Poland, having subjected to his rule part of Pomerania, and wishing to make Christians of his new subjects, desired Otto, bishop of Bamberg, to bring those heathens the light of the Gospel. Otto, having obtained the agreement of pope Calixtus II, set on his way, April 19, 1124, over Prague, Breslau, Pozen, and Gnesen, where he stopped seven days and celebrated Whitensu-tide. Wratislaw, the Pomeranian chief, who, as a boy, had been christened at Helsinburg, called on the Amestour to give him two of his warriors to guide him to Pyritz. In this place the pagans were engaged in the celebration of one of their feasts. Otto preached to the 4000 men assembled at that solemnity, and a week had scarcely elapsed, during which he and his associates were busy instructing the daily increasing crowd in the Christian doctrines, when the bishop prescribed a three days' fasting, after which more than 7000 heathens were admitted to baptism. After erecting an altar, and leaving one of the priests, Otto went on sacrifices to Kammin, the residence of the prince. The wife of the latter received the apostle with great joy. He stopped fifty days, converted 8585 persons, laid the foundation of a church, and left a priest, for whose maintenance the prince had granted some lands. Julian, afterwards called Wolin, mostly inhabited by piratical, was not so favorably disposed towards the new religion; but, after more or less persecution, the Christians were permitted to leave the town unscathed and cross the Divenow. Here Otto, after resting a few days, entered upon negotiations with the inhabitants and obtained from the chiefs of the city that they would direct themselves by the example of Stettin, the oldest and noblest city of Pomerania. Thither Otto repaired, crossing the Haff, in company with Redamir, a citizen...
Christian prince, was in 1184 murdered by a heathen at Stolpe, near Anelam. On the spot where the deed had been committed a little church was built, and in 1158 the first monastery was founded there, and occupied by Dominitz, near Magdeburg, near Magdeburg. We mention some other notable monasteries of this time: 1. Kloster Leubnitz, 1165; Belbeuk, 1170; Eldena, 1207; Brudow and Neucamp, 1231; Hiddensee, 1299; Pudagla, 1308; all of which stood under "abates baculati." The following places of pilgrimage were distinguished: 1. The Gollenberg, near Cöslin, celebrated throughout Europe, where the altar was consecrated to the Virgin, the spire of which served as a light-house; 2. The Rekefeld, near Schmelin (circle of Stolpe), a mountain on which a church had been founded in honor of St. Nicholas, the patron of mariners; 3. The Holy Mountain, south of the city of Parnawa, from 1290; 4. Brunswic; 5. Wustrau, near Cöslin, from 1395; 6. Kers, near Barth, from 1405; 7. Werben, from 1474. While the largest part of the duchy of Pomerania, with part of the Uckermark, the Neumark, and of what is now called Western Prussia, was a dependency of the bishopric of Kammin, the western part of the country belonged to the diocese of Schwerin, and the island of Rügen, connected with Pomerania in 1325, was assigned to the Danish bishopric of Røskilde. The names of the bishops of Kammin are as follows: 1. Alblert, 1180-1185; 2. Frankmar, patriarch for four years (1190-1192); 3. Herman, 1192-1196. The seat of the bishops was transferred to Kammin, because Julian was destroyed by the Danes in 1175. 3. Siegfried (1186-1202). Under his administration there was a considerable immigration of Germans, who founded a number of cities. Jacob Beringer, a knight from Bamberg, who settled in Stettin, built in 1187 for the Germans the church of St. Jacob, with 30 altars. 4. Sigwin (1202-1217) preached himself. While he was bishop Stralsund was built, in 1209; and in 1214 the Templars arrived in Pomerania, and, owing to the great expenses of the church, and the ravages of the army, the government. In November, 1216, Christian, the apostle and bishop of Prussia, visited Pomerania, his native country, and dwelt a few days with the old, sickly Sigwin at Kammin. Duke Casimir, in company with a number of Templars, undertook a pilgrimage to Holzseepulcher, where he died, in 1217. 5. Conrad II (1218-1298). Anastasia, the pious widow of Bogislaw I, founded in 1228 the nunnery of the Virgins at Trepow, endowed it, and was buried in it. 6. Conrad III, count of Gútzko (1283-1284). The abbots of Eldena, Wigard, and of others, founded the monastery of the Poor Clares in Parnawa, and the Cistercian settled at Stettin, and in 1244 a nunnery was founded in the same city. 7. Dr. Wilhelm, resigned in the following year. Under his administration the monastery of Marienfels was built by Wratislaw III, whose daughter Barbara was the first abbess. 8. Hermann, count of Gleichen (1249-1298), a relation of the margraves of Brandenburg, promoted German civilization, and preserved a predilection for Brandenburg. In 1268 a chapter composed of twelve canons was erected in the church of St. Mary at Stettin, and confirmed by Urban IV. In 1270 the monks of Stettin found the Benedictine monastery of the black Oder; they were baptized, and promised to protect the Christian faith in their dominions. Otto longed to gain also to Christianity the inhabitants of the island of Rügen, but insuperable obstacles lay in his way. In Stettin, where a very few had remained, the notables had threatened Otto's death; he at once repaired to the church of Paul and Peter, and while the song of hymns filled the vaults of the church, the sound of arms was heard outside. The crowd calmed down by and by, and dispersed; a sermon in the market-place, whither the clergy repaired in procession under the protection of Wirtaka, retained the scattered flock. Julin followed again the example of Stettin. The saint now visited again all the places of Pomerania where he had worked, and, journeying through Poland, reached Bamberg Dec. 20. Though he was unable to save the monasteries he had converted and watched from afar over these young Christian communities to the time of his death, which occurred June 30, 1189. The conversion of Pomerania, and its accession to the German empire in 1181, induced a number of monks from the northern countries to settle in the district of the Wends, depopulated by long wars. Wratialav, the first
was intrusted with diplomatic negotiations. 14. John, duke of Saxe-Lauenburg, grandson of Writsahofen IV (1543-1557). In 1546 the collegiate church of St. Otto, with a fair and abundant revenue, was given by the Reformers to the Free Imperial City of Prague. The prince was to accomplish the ecclesiastical revolution, convoked a diet at Treptow Dec. 13, 1584, and invited the chapters thereto, with the threatening remark that, whether they attended or not, the resolutions should be law for them in any case. The bishop, the abbots, prelates, and a considerable part of the nobility, protested against the resolutions of the diet, and retired before its close. The remainder of the assembly declared for the Reformations. Bugenhagen composed a liturgy, and Erasmus was offered, if he would renounce the episcopal dignity and become the chief of the new Church, and to preserve his dignity and the possessions connected with it; but he declined. Only a tenth of the monasteries was spared: the nunneries of Marienfließ, Stolpe, Bergen, Kammin, and Colberg—and these also had to undergo great modifications. Almost all the monks left the country. Care was taken, however, of those whom old age kept back; the younger monks were sent to Wittenberg, to study there at public expense, and those who were willing to marry were similarly assisted. After Erasmus's death, the two dukes did not fail to interdict the game of dice and the sport to his clergy. In 1543 the Hussites, attracted by Bogislaw IX, penetrated as far as Stettin, and plundered Kolbätz. In 1540 the Putzkäßer set afoot near Barth, and subsisted during thirty years. 21. Henning Jven, a very benevolent priest, who obtruded on the independence of Charles V, and obtained, in 1549, in hidden seclusion. Bartholomew in this distress sent a prelate, Martin Weiper, to pope Paul III, in order to obtain the papal confirmation. The bishop's legate came back with letters from the apostolic legate and from the emperor, by means of which the chapter was empowered to elect Martin himself. Weiper was elected, and Julius III confirmed his election by a brief of Oct. 18, 1561. But Oct. 24, 1562, he was inaugurated again, this time according to the Protestant rite. After Martin's death, the princes, to avoid the difficulties resulting from further elections, determined to establish in the episcopal see only members of the ducal house. This noble family (it was five centuries old) was condemned to early extinction: in a period of a few years six princes died without posterity. Bogislaw XIV, the last of them, by his alliance with Gustavus Adolphus, who succeeded in making himself the master of Pomerania, had so exhausted all his resources that his funeral ceremonies could be celebrated only seventeen years after his death, which occurred in 1637. His nephew, son of his sister, Ernst Bogislaw, duke of Lauenburg, had sold the bishopric to William, elector of Brandenburg (1650). But, if we except the episcopal election, everything remained unchanged. See Milman, Mitikus, or the Conversion of Pomerania (1854). The history of Pomerania after this time is clearly Protestant, and will be treated in the art. 

POMERANIA See BUKHENAGEN.

Pomerius, Julianus, a noted Spanish prelate, flourished in the latter part of the 7th century as archbishop of Toledo, about A.D. 690-700, while Spain was still under the dominion of the Goths, before the Saracen invasion. That he was of Jewish extraction may be seen from what Mariana (vi, 18) says of him: "Bart Julianus eruditissima laude sae state celebratus, ut ejus libri testantur. Fuit ex Judaeorum sanguine proges tus in natione, Eugenii heri discipulis, Quintii Toledo in Pansulis successor, ingenios facult, copiosa, suavi, probatissimopinione singulari." Great praise is awarded to him by the historians of that period, especially for his writings and labors as a bishop. He took part in the great council of Toledo, about A.D. 589, at which time the bishops of Christ—a question on which this bishop, or rather the Council of Toledo, at which he presided, declared quite independently of the bishop of Rome: "Nobilis
POMERoy, Swan Lyman, D.D., a Congregational minister, and a man of more than ordinary scholarship, was born at Meredith, N. H., Jan. 5, 1799. He was a graduate of Bowdoin College, and of Andover Theological Seminary, where he completed his course in 1824. He was settled for some years as a pastor in Bangor, Me., and was called thence to a secretariery of the American Board of Commissioners of Foreign Missions. He displayed great ability and energy in this position for a number of years, but terminated his connection with it about 1860. He did not after that, we believe, have any pastoral charge. He died at Sunderland, Mass., March 17, 1869. See Appleton's Annual Cyclopaedia, ix, 568.

POMFRET, Jonas, an English clergyman, more noted as a poet than as a divine, was the son of Richard Pomfret, who held at the time of John's birth the rectory of Lutton, in Bedfordshire. He was born about 1667, and was educated at a grammar school in the country, and thence sent to Cambridge, but to what college is uncertain. He devoted himself especially to the study of polite literature, and wrote most of his poetical pieces, and took both the degrees in arts. After that he took holy orders, and was presented to the living of Malden, in Bedfordshire. About 1708 he went to London for institution to a larger and very considerable living; but was stopped March 17, 1739. He was a graduate of both University of, and of Andover Theological Seminary, where he completed his course in 1824. He was settled for some years as a pastor in Bangor, Me., and was called thence to a secretariery of the American Board of Commissioners of Foreign Missions. He displayed great ability and energy in this position for a number of years, but terminated his connection with it about 1860. He did not after that, we believe, have any pastoral charge. He died at Sunderland, Mass., March 17, 1869. See Appleton's Annual Cyclopaedia, ix, 568.

Pomis, David de, a Jewish savant of note, was born in 1525 at Spoleto, of the celebrated family called in Hebrew פּוֹם פֶּסֶל, which, like the families פּוֹם פֶּסֶל and פּוֹמִי וּפּוֹמִי, traced their origin to those Jews who were led into captivity after the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus and Vespasian. His father gave him his first instruction, initiating him in all the cycle of Biblical and Talmudic lore in Meccina. After his father's death De Pomis studied medicine, and greatly distinguished himself in that department. In 1540 he went to Paris, where he remained till 1558, prosecuting his studies in medicine, philosophy, and a little in physiognomy. In 1575 he entered into official service at Magus in Sabionetta till 1558; became physician to count Nicolaus Ursinus (1555-1600); and to prince Sforza (1560-1568); went to Rome, and then to Venice, where he died. Of De Pomis we have the following works: ד' פּוֹמִי, i.e. The Offspring of David, a Hebrew and Talmudic Lexicon in Hebrew, Latin, and Italian (Ven. 1587), dedicated to Sixtus V.; ד' פּוֹמִי, an Italian commentary on Ecclesiastes (ibid. 1571) — ד' פּוֹמִי, be a supplement to the commentary on Ecclesiastes (ibid. 1572) — a commentary on Job and a commentary on Daniel, which is still in MS. See First, Bibl. Jud. iii, 111 sqq.; Hassane, Hist. des Juifs (Engl. trans. by Taylor), p. 724; Kist, Cyclop. s. v.; Jahrbuch der Gesch. d. Juden, ii, 859; De Rossi, Dizionario storico degli Autori Ebrei (Ger. transl. by Hamberger), p. 266 sqq.; Aosta, Israel and the Gentiles, p. 487; Ethelburg, Hebrew Literature, p. 454. (B. P.)

Pommeil [an old English term, derived from the French pomme, an apple, and signifying anything round, but not necessarily spherical, is applied in English to pulule, a globular or round thing, a bowl, which is signified in Eccles. xii, 6; Zech. iv, 3, the bowl or round ornament on the capital of a column (2 Chron. iv, 12, 13; bowle," 1 Kings vii, 41, 42). See COLUMN.

Pommeraye, Jean-François, a French Benedictine monk, was born in 1617 at Rouen. He entered in 1637 the Congregation of Saint-Maur, made his profession at Tumblou, and renounced voluntarily all charges of his order to devote himself to study. He died at Rouen Oct. 28, 1687. He left several works, more remarkable for erudition than sound criticism. We mention, Hist. de l'Abbaye de Saint-Ouen de Rouen, de Saint-Aumand, et de Sainte-Catherine de la même Ville (Rouen, 1662, fol.) — Hist. des Archevêques de Rouen (ibid. 1667, fol.), the best of his works: — Hist. de la Cathédrale de Rouen (ibid. 1866, 4to). Pommeraye published after the demise of Dom Jean Anger Godin, its true author, a Recueil des Conciles et des Synodes de Rouen (1667, 4to); but this collection was put into the shade by the excellent work Conciles de Normandie, published by Dom Besnin (1717, fol.).—Hoefler, Nouv. Biog. Générale, s. v. Pomona, a female deity among the ancient Romans, who presided over fruit-trees. Her worship was under the supervision of a special priest. Pomorâni. See Pomôryans.

Pomoryans are a small body of Russian Dissenters, so called from their proximity to the Lake Ladoga and the White Sea, or from Pomor, a village in the government of Ononets, where they appear to have originated. They believe that Antichrist has already come; reigned in the world unseen, that is, spiritually; and has put an end in the Church to everything that is holy. This belief they founded upon the assertion by John (1st Epist. iv, 8), "This is that spirit of Antichrist whereby he that is abominable and even now already is in the world." It is probable that Russian Dissenters, as well as others, consider the secular spirit of their Church establishment as the very spirit of Antichrist, blaspheming everything that is truly spiritual and holy. They are zealous in opposing the innovations of Nikon with regard to the Church houola; prefer a life of celibacy and solitude, and rebaptize their converts from other sects. See Pinkerton, Greek Church, p. 580; Platon, Greek Church (see Index).

Pomp, Nicholas, one of the earliest and most prominent ministers of the German Reformed Church in this country, was native of Germany, where he was born Jan. 20, 1734. He prosecuted his studies, classical and theological, in the University of Halle; came to America under the auspices of the Church of Holland in 1769, and took charge of the German Reformed Church at Schneckemump, Montgomery County, Pa., where he labored with much success. In 1782 he received a call to Baltimore, Md., where he exercised his ministry for six years, when he returned again, in 1789, to the scene of his first labors; but in the following year he removed to Indianafield, in Bucks County, Pa., where he continued to discharge the faithful discharge of his pastoral duties up to the close of the last century, when failing health compelled him to retire from the active duties of his office. From that time onwards he resided with his son, the Rev. Thomas Pomp, pastor of the German Reformed Church in Easton, Pa., where he died, Sept. 1, 1819. In the early part of his ministry he published an able little work in reply to a "mischievous book on Universalism" which was circulated among the Germans, entitled The Everlasting Gospel. Father Pomp occupied a prominent position in the Reformed Church of this country. See Harbaugh, Fathers of the Ref. Church, i, 131-138. (D. Y. H.)

Pomp, Thomas, an amiable and eminent minister of the German Reformed Church, son of the former, was born in Montgomery County, Pa., Feb. 4, 1778. "His literary and theological studies he pursued principally, if not exclusively, under the supervision of his devoted and accomplished father." He entered the ministry when only twenty years of age. For a short time he was pastor of some congregations in his native county. In 1796, three years after being licensed, he accepted a call from the Reformed Church in Easton, Pa., Here, in connection with some country churches, he labored earnestly and with singular fidelity for considerably more than half a century, up to near the close of his quiet and beautiful life, April 22, 1852, when he was transferred from the Church militant on earth to the blessed "inhabitation in light." Mr. Pomp was naturally gifted; but he was principally distinguished for his singular amiability, gentleness, meekness, and peaceful relations with all mankind. He retained to the last moment of his life the unbeated confidence of his people and the warmest esteem of all who knew him. See Heikeiser, Fathers of the Ref. Church, iv, 15-25. (D. Y. H.)

Pompas, a solemn procession among the ancient heathens, on the occasion of a sacred festival, a funeral, a triumph, or for any special reasons.

Pompas Circonis, the sacred procession with which the Circenian games were introduced. On this occasion the statue of the gods, placed on wooden platoforms, were borne upon the shoulders of men, and when very heavy they were drawn along upon carriage.
POMPÆI (Pompeii), certain gods among the ancient Greeks, who received this name as being conductors by the way; but what gods are specially referred to is uncertain, unless Mercury be meant, whose office it was to conduct souls to Hades. On certain days, called Apoempes, sacrifices were offered to the Pompei.

Pompignan, Jean-Georges le Franc de, a French prelate, brother of the poet Pompignan, was born at Montauban Feb. 22, 1715. After finishing his studies at the College Louis le Grand and at the Seminary of St. Sulpice, he was made canon in his native diocese, but he had scarcely taken his license when he was appointed bishop of La Baume (25 Dec., 1722). In 1745, he obtained in commendam the abbey of St. Chaffre in his diocese, and was sent as a deputy to the assembly of the clergy held in 1755. He sided, in the strife which divided at that time the Church of France, with the party of the Fossierats, so called because they adopted the principles of the cardinal de la Rochefoucauld, the new minister of the portfolio of the prebendaries, in opposition to the party of the Théatins, who sided with the Théatine Boyer, previously bishop of Mirepoix. Pompignan was sent by the assembly to address the pope on the articles drawn up in the letters publics. He was one of the presidents of the assembly of 1760, and the author of the remonstrances to the king in favor of the members of the clergy banished by Parliament. He was uniriting in writing against the vices and incredulity of his epoch—vices which made him many enemies, among whom was Vaugelas. In 1774 Louis XVI appointed him archbishop of Vienne. In 1788 he sided with the tiers-état in the states of the Dauphiné, and this conduct caused him to be deputed to the États Généraux. He was true there to the same line of conduct, and was conspicuous at the head of the members of the clergy, who, June 22, 1789, joined the tiers-état. The consequence was that he became one of the first presidents of the National Assembly. On Aug. 4 of the ensuing year the king intrusted him with the roll of the prebendary, and the following day he was appointed minister of state, and took his seat in the council. Being aware that he could not reside in his diocese, he resigned the episcopal see, and received in exchange the abbey of Buzay. The suspension of the nomination to the prebendaries, Nov. 9, 1789, left him minister without portfolio, and was followed by considerable changes. He was introduced into the Church of France by the decree of July 12, 1790, on the civil constitution of the clergy. Pius VI addressed to Pompignan a bull, in which he condemned the new decrees, and exhorted him to bring his influence into play for the purpose of preventing the law from giving him sanction. This bull was useless, as the king sanctioned the decrees on Aug. 24. Pompignan had nothing to do with this decision of Louis XVI, insomuch as he had not attended the meetings of the council since Aug. 17, suffering already of the disease which sealed at Paris, Dec. 80, 1790. Besides a number of Mandements, pastoral letters, and reports to the assembly of the clergy, he left Questions diverses sur l'incredulité (Paris, 1753, 12mo);—La véritable Causes de l'Assemblé séculaire dans les Matières qui concernent l'Incredulité (1754, 8vo);—L'incredulité concussoire par les Prophètes (1759, 3 vols. 8vo);—La Religion vengé de l'incredulité par l'incredulité même (1772, 12mo);—L'Oraison funèbre de la Dauphine (1747, 4to);—L'Oraison funèbre de la Reine Marie Leszczyńska (1768, 4to);—Lettres à un Évêque sur plusieurs Points de Morale et de Discipline (1809, 3 vols. 8vo). See biographical sketch in his posthumous publications; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, s. v.; Jervis, Hist. of the Church of France, ii, 371; Van Laun, Hist. of French Lit. (N. Y. 1867, 3 vols. 8vo).

Pomponiatu, Petre. See PONPONAZEL.

Pomponazzu, Pietro, a famous Italian philosopher, was born at Mantua in 1462, and after studying at the University of Padua became a professor of philosophy in his alma mater. He also taught and wrote at Bologna with the highest distinction. Although small in stature—for he was almost a dwarf—he yet astonished his contemporaries by his remarkable intellectual power, and became one of the most eminent men of his time. He had frequent dealings with the famous Achilleini, whose puzzling objections would have confounded him had it not been for his skill in parrying them by his keen wit as well as by a sharp-cutting logic. He used to apply himself to the solution of difficulties so very intensely that he frequently forgot to eat, drink, sleep, and perform the ordinary functions of nature; nay, it made him almost distracted, and a laughing-stock to every one, as he himself tells us. He died in 1525. He wrote De Immortalitate Animae (1516), in which he maintains that the immortality of the soul cannot be proved by philosophical (or natural) proofs, but depends solely on revelation, which he accepts. This precaution, however, did not save him from attacks, and many adversaries rose up against him who did not scruple to treat him as an atheist; and the monks caused his book, although he wrote several apologies for it, to be burned at Venice. Another work of his on Incantations was also regarded as dangerous. He shows in this that he does not believe in magic and sorcery, and lays a prodigious stress on occult virtues in certain men by which they produced miraculous effects. He gives many examples of the Infractions of his adversaries do not admit them to be true, or free from magic. See Bayle, Dict. Hist. s. v.; Niceron, Mémoires, vol. xxv; Olearis, De Pomponasto (Jena, 1708, 4to); Buhle, Geschichte der neueren Philosophie, vol. ii; Ueberweg, Hist. of Philos. (see Index); Neander, Kirchengeschish (see Index); Lecky, Hist. of Rationalism, i, 870; Fishcr, Hist. of the Reformation, p. 542; Alzog, Kirchen- gesch., ii, 222; Morell, Hist. of Philosophy (see Index); Ranke, Hist. of the Popacy, i, 65, 64, 377.

Pomponia, Grecina, the wife of Plautus, a Roman general who commanded in England in the year 45, is thought, from a sentence in the Annales of Tacitus (xiii, 92), to have been a Christian, and the first in Britain. Tacitus says: "Also Pomponia Grecina, an illustrious woman, married to Plautus (who on his return from Britain entered the city with the pomp of an ovation), but accused of foreign superstition, was left to the decision of her husband." She was tried, according to custom, for her abandonment of the national worship, by her own husband, Plautus, in the presence of her kindred, and was acquitted. She lived to a great age, apparently in sorrow, and wearing "no habit but that of a peasant" in order to prevent asceticism from the fate of Julia, the daughter of Drusus, who was put to death by Messalina fourteen years before the accusation was brought against Pomponia. But this alone would not account for the charge of forsaking the Roman religion; and the supposition that she was a Christian, and that her mode of life grew out of her religious faith, is certainly quite probable. The wife of Plautius and Claudia Ruffina are supposed to be of the saints that were in Cesar's household, mentioned by Paul (Phil. iv, 22). Claudia is celebrated by Martial for her admirable beauty and learning in the following epigram:

"From painted Britons how was Claudia born! The fair barbarian! how do arts adorn!
When Roman charms a Greekian, and commend, Athens and Rome may for the dame contend." Speed, a very ancient British author, says that "Claudia sent Paul's writings, which she calls spiritual manna, unto her children, to feed the Britons, to feed the land of their bread of life; and also the writings of Martial, to instruct their minds with those lessons best fitting to produce moral virtues"—which Speed thinks was the occasion of this line in Martial's works.

"And Britons now, they say, our verses learn to sing." Gildas, the most ancient and authentic British historian, who wrote about A.D. 544, in his book called De Vic. 
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PONCE, Pedro, a Spanish Benedictine monk in the convent of Oña, in Old Castile, was born about 1530. He is considered the inventor of the art of teaching the dumb to speak, which he carried to considerable perfection. According to Ambrosio Morales (Antiquedades de España [Alcala, 1572], fol. 50), Ponce had to instruct two brothers and one sister of the constable of Castile, and a son of the grand justicia of Aragon, all of whom were born deaf and dumb. These pupils made such progress that, after some time, they not only were able to write correctly, but also to answer any questions put to them. One of them, Don Pedro de Velsaco, who lived to be only twenty years of age, spoke and wrote Latin as well as his mother tongue, and was at the time of his death making considerable progress in the Greek language. Another pupil of Ponce was a publican, a political monk, and was able to mock and confound and explain his creed by word of mouth. These facts are attested by the best Spanish writers of the time, as well as by Sir Kenelm Digby, who, in his Two Treatises concerning theBody and Soul of Man (Paris, 1644, cap. xxviii, note 8), says, "This priest taught the young lord to speak as distinctly as any man whatsoever; and I have often discoursed with him whiles Iwayt upon the prince"
de la Fuente, Constantino, a Spanish martyr to the Protestant cause, was a native of San Clemente de la Mancha, in the diocese of Cuenca. Possessing a good taste and a love of genuine knowledge, he evinced an early disgust for the barbarous pedantry of the schools, and an attachment to such of his countrymen as sought to revive the study of polite letters. Being intended for the Church, he made himself master of Greek and Hebrew, but at the same time learned to write and speak his native language with uncommon purity and elegance. Like Erasmus, with whose writings he was early captivated, he was distinguished for his sobriety and temperance; he took great care in indulging at the expense of foolish preachers and hypocritical monks. But he was endowed with greater firmness and decision of character than the philosopher of Rotterdam. During his attendance at the University Ponce's youthful spirit was roused by the irregularities, which his enemies afterwards took an ungenerous advantage of; but these were succeeded by the utmost decorum and correctness of manners, though he always retained his gay temper, and could never deny himself his jest. Notwithstanding the opportunities he had of enriching himself, he was so exempt from avarice that he left his library, which he valued above all his property, never large, his eloquence caused his services in the pulpit to be much sought after; but he was free from vanity, the besetting sin of orators, and seemed to prostitute his talents at the shrine of popularity. He declined the situation of preacher in the cathedral of Cuenca, which was offered him by the unanimous vote of the chapter. When the more honorable and lucrative office of preacher to the metropolitan church of Toledo was afterwards tendered to him, after thanking the chapter for their good opinion of him, he declined it, alleging as a reason "that he would not disturb the bones of his ancestors," alluding to a dispute between them and the archbishop Siliceo, who had insisted that his clergy should prove the purity of their descent. Whether it was the love of learning or the desire of doing great things that induced him at first to fix his residence at Seville is uncertain, but once there we find him co-operating with Egidius in his plans for disseminating scriptural knowledge. The emperor, having heard him preach during a visit to that city, was so much pleased with the sermon that he immediately named Ponce one of his chaplains, to which he added the office of almoner; and he soon after appointed him to accompany his son Philip to Flanders, "to let the Fleming see that Spain was not destitute of polite scholars and orators." Constantino made it a point of honor to obey the orders of his sovereign, and reluctantly quit his residence in Seville, for which he had hitherto rejected the most tempting offers. His journey gave him the opportunity of becoming personally acquainted with some of the Reformers. Among these was Jacob Schopper, a learned man of Biberach, in Swabia, by whose conversation his views of evangelical doctrine were greatly enlarged and confirmed. In 1555 Ponce returned to Seville, and his presence imparted a new impulse to the Protestant cause in that city. A benedict and enlightened individual having founded a pious society in the College of Doctrin, Ponce was appointed to the chair; and by means of the lectures which he read on the Scriptures, together with the instruction of Fernando de San Juan, proved of the institution, the minds of many of the young were opened to the truth. On the first Lent after his return to Seville he was, besides, chosen by the chapter to preach every alternate day in the cathedral church. So great was his popularity that, though the public service did not begin till eight o'clock in the morning, yet, when he was announced to preach the church would be filled by four, and even by three o'clock. Being newly recovered from a severe attack of the flux, it was thought weak that it was necessary for him repeatedly to pause during the sermon, on which account he was allowed to recruit his strength by taking a draught of wine in the pulpit, a permission which had never been granted to any other preacher.

While Constantino was pursuing this career of honor and usefulness, he involved himself in difficulties by coming forward as a candidate for the place of canon magistral in the cathedral of Seville, which had become vacant by the death of Egidius. Ponce did not want the office, but his friends pressed him to lay aside his scruples; and an individual who had great influence over his mind represented so strongly the services which he would be able to render to the cause of truth in so influential a situation, and the hurtful effects which such a recluse, who was so difficult to manage, noisy and ignorant declaimer, that he consented at last to offer himself a candidate. In spite of all manner of accusations and opposition he carried his election, was installed in his new office, and commenced his duty as preacher. But the popular faction, who had opposed his visit abroad Ponce, like many other preachers whom the Spanish Romanists sent to the Netherlands "to give light to others, returned home blind, having followed the example of the heretics" (Juseos, Historia Pontifical, ii, 597, b). In 1555 he had embraced the Protestant faith. Now that he had dared to assume the responsibilities of the Seville cathedral canonate, the envious priests, disappointed in their own seekings, boldly confronted Ponce with his heretical opinions, and loudly urged the Inquisition to take its aim at this new-made cathedral dignitary; and when, in 1555, the familiar were let upon him, the Protestants of Seville, Ponce was among the first who were apprehended. Among his books was found a treatise, in his own handwriting, on the points of controversy between the Church of Rome and the Protestants, and as Ponce had chosen to take sides with Luther and Calvin, and, when shown the work, not only acknowledged its authorship, but added, "you have there a full and candid confession of my belief: I am in your hands—do with me as seemeth to you good," his doom was sealed. Though put to the torture to reveal his associates and fellow-sinners, he maintained the most obstinate resolutions on this subject. He was afterwards condemned, and his books were burnt upon one any else. After two years of imprisonment, oppressed and worn out by a mode of living so different from what he had been used to, he died before his enemies could bring him to public execution. It was slanderingly reported that he had committed suicide and fellow-prisoner denied the calumny. Dec. 22, 1560, his effigy and bones were brought out in the public auto-da-fe, but the people, who had always greatly revered Ponce, rose up in rebellion, and the services were continued in private. In the character of Ponce the emperor was sovereign, and the indications of the excellence of his heart. They were of that kind which were adapted to the spiritual wants of his countrymen, and not calculated to display his own talents, or to acquire for himself a name in the learned world. They were composed in a native spirit, and in a style level to the lowest capacity. Abstract speculations and rhetorical ornaments, in which he was qualified both by nature and education to excel, were rigidly sacrificed to the one object of being understood by all, and useful to all. Among his works were a Collection, in the College of Doctrin, of the tenets of the infantine simplicity; a small treatise on The Doctrine of Christianity, drawn up in the familiar form of a dialogue between a master and his pupil, which, without being deficient in simplicity, is more calculated to interest persons of learning and advanced knowledge; an
Exposition of the First Psalm, in four sermons, which show that his pulpit eloquence, exempt from the common extremes, was neither degraded by vulgarity nor rendered disgusting by affectation and effort at display; and the Confession of a Sinner, in which the doctrines of the Gospel, poured from a contrite and humbled spirit, assume the form of the most edifying and devotional piety. See Antonius, Bibl. Hisp. Nov. i, 266. Also Ref. in Speina, p. 154-156, 207 sqq. 262 sq. (J. H. W.)

Poncet, MAURICE, a French prelate of the 16th century, flourished as curate of St. Pierre des Arcis. He was a divine of great eloquence and considerable learning, though not remarkable for refinement of taste or diction. He was a Gallican, and when Henry III. pursued that imbecile policy which finally cost France the loss of her best citizens for conscience sake, Poncet ridiculed the Leaguers [see LEAGUE], and especially visited with the full power of his sarcasm the grotesque proclamations of the Confréries des Pénitents. He made the walls of his church ring with denunciations of these hypocritical devotees, who, after parading the streets, barefoot, arrayed in sackcloth, and displaying ostentatiously the outward signs of austere asceticism, were accustomed to pass the night in riotous feasting and gross debauchery. Henry, resenting the exposure, banished the cardinal to his estates at St. Pére-at-Melun; but he was released after a brief confinement, and returned to Paris by the king's permission, his majesty remarking that "he had always believed the good doctor to have a zeal for God, but not according to knowledge; and that there was much excuse for him, since he was not quick enough of apprehension to see through the artifices of those by whom he was instigated. He had plenty of scholarship, but was grievously deficient in judgment." Poncet, unabated by the king's leniency, resumed his attacks in the same incisive style of spirit and sarcasm, and persevered in it till his death, which happened in 1580. See Jervis, Hist. Church of France, i, 181 sq. (J. H. W.)

Poncher, ÉTIENNE, a French prelate, noted also as a diplomatist, was born at Tours in 1446. He was the son of a magistrate, studied law, and while yet a youth was provided with several canonicles. In 1486 he obtained the charge of conciliator-clerk at the Parliament of Paris, and in 1498 he became President aux Enquêtes. He was elected bishop of Paris Feb. 25, 1503, in compliance with the request of king Louis XII, whom he was at that time accompanying to Milan. The same prince intrusted him in 1506 with several diplomatic missions to Germany; and Poncher, in the following year, being again in Italy with the king, was alone bold enough to speak in contradiction to the angry feelings of the king against the Venetians, and to oppose the confederation of Cambrai. Louis XII, who had already appointed Poncher chancellor of the duchy of Milan, bestowed on him in 1509 the abbey of Fleuri, and in 1512 made him the guardian of the seal of France, which office he kept till the death of the king, Jan. 1, 1515. Francis I appointed him, with Arthur Gouffer, one of the plenipotentiaries who signed, Aug. 16, 1517, the treaty of Nancy between Francis and Charles V. The same year Poncher went to Spain as ambassador of France, and in 1518 he was sent to Henry VIII of England, with whom he signed a new treaty of alliance. In virtue of the concordat he was transferred, March 14, 1519, to the archiepiscopal see of Sens. He died at Lyons, Feb. 24, 1524. Poncher published Constitutiones synodo, which are still held in great esteem, especially in regard to the sacraments. See Pofer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, iv.

Poncher, FRANÇOIS, a French prelate, nephew of the preceding; was born at Tours about 1480. His father, Pierre Poncher, a Commissioner of the general of the finances, was hung for embezzlement. Made counsellor at the Parliament of Paris (1510). François Poncher obtained soon afterwards the curacy of Issy, a canonicate at Notre Dame of Paris, the abbey of St. Maur-les-Fossés, and March 14, 1519, became bishop of Paris. So far from treading in the steps of his uncle, he was a misanthropic and scandalous prelate. He forged documents to get possession of the abbey of Fleury-sur-Loire, but was balked in his design. While the king was a prisoner at Madrid, Poncher fell out with the queen-regent, the duchess of Angoulême, Francis's mother, plotted to deprive her of the regency, and by treacherous negotiations with the Spanish court tried to prolong the captivity of his sovereign. As soon as Francis was free again Poncher was arrested and accused of high treason. While his process was in abeyance he died in the dungeon of Vincennes, Sept. 1, 1522. He wrote some poems on civil and ecclesiastical subjects to his uncle, Étiennes Poncher—Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, iv.

Pond is the rendering in the A. V. of δφερα, ἀδέλφη (literally a collection of water), in Exodus vii, 19; viii, 15, where it probably denotes the patercent reservoirs or swampy pools left by the inundation of the Nile (Sept. διαφωτισθης, Vulg. paludes). Again, in Isaiah xix, 10, δελφινος, which the A. V. translates as 'ponds for fish,' following the Vulgate. Its meaning at capensis piscibus, see De Dati et Luther, is rendered by the Sept. ρηχνος in vasionam. This rendering is supported by the author of Gesenius, Vatutbus, and Ewald, ale Lohnarbeiter, saying δελφινος = 'they that earn wages,' and כנות, ל回來ה (Job xxx, 25), 'to be fed.' Many interpreters, however, think that it designates fish ponds. We have abundant evidence from the paintings in the tombs that the Egyptians were very fond of fish for their food, and it appears that almost every villa possessed one, where the master of the house occasionally amused himself in fishing. The Jews, it seems, likewise constructed similar ponds, as in describing his bride in the Canticles (vii, 4) Solomon says, 'Thine eyes are like the fish-ponds in Heshbon.' See Frit. The word occurs several times of marshy pools, in contradistinction to the dry sands of the desert (Psa. cvii, 35; cxxvi, 8); 'standing water' (Isa. xxxvii, 7; xii, 18), 'a pool.' Such pools being commonly reedy, it is rendered 'reed' (Jer. ii, 32). See Pool.

Pond, EXODUS, D.D., a noted Congregational minister and writer, was born at Wrentham, Mass., July 29, 1791, and was educated at Brown University, where he graduated in 1813. He then decided to enter the ministry, and began a course in theology with the celebrated Dr. Emmons. June 14, 1814, young Pond was licensed to preach, and in the spring of the following year was ordained pastor of the Congregational Church at Auburnden, Mass. He left this charge in 1828 to become the conductor of the Spirit of the Pilgrims, a monthly publication in Boston. He was made professor of theology in the theological seminary at Bangor in September, 1832, and continued in that responsible position until 1856, when he became president, and changed to the professorship of ecclesiastical history, and lectured on pastoral duties. He died Jan. 21, 1882. Dr. Pond published reviews of such as The Beginnings of Lectures (1824)—Memoir of President Davids (1837)—Memoir of Susanna Anthony (1827)—Memoir of Count Zinzendorf (1839)—Memoir of John Wickliffe (1841)—Morning of the Reformation (1842, 12mo) No Fellowship with Romanism (1843)—The Young Pastor's Guide (Portland, 1844, 12mo) The Mother Family (1844, 12mo) The World's Salvation (1845)—Pope and Pagan, or Middletown's Celebrated Letters (Portland, 1846, 16mo) [see MIDDLETON, COTTER]—Swedenborgianism Reviewed (new ed. 1846)—Swedenborgianism Examined (N. Y. 1861)—Mumford—Plato—Mumford's Life, Opinions, and Influence (1846)—Review of Rushbull's God in Christ (1849)—The Ancient Church (1851)—Memoir of John Knox (1856)—Bampton Lectures on

Pone luctum, Magdalena. This is the beginning of a famous Easter hymn of uncertain date. Undoubtedly it belongs to the Middle Ages, for in this hymn, as well as in the Dies Irae (q. v.) and other Latin hymns, the same identification of Mary Magdalene with "the woman that was a sinner" (Luke vii, 57), which runs through the theology of the Middle Ages, is expressed. This hymn may be found in almost all collections of Latin hymns, and the first verse runs thus:

* Pone luctum, Magdalena,
* bit serena lycernas;
* Non est iam Simonis cura,
* Non cur sectum exprimis;
* Cause miles sunt iacendi,
* Cause miles exilantur;
* Alleluja resonat.

For the original, see Daniel, Theaetnurus Hymnol. ii, 365; Trench, Sacred Latin Poetry, p. 159; Blasser, Aussehlic christlich. Einl. bis zum X. Jhd., p. 166; Königsgeld, Hymnen u. Gedichte, i, 299. English translations are given in Schiff's Christ in Song, p. 256. For German translations, see Blasser, L., p. 185; Simrock, Königsgeld, and Forlage, Gesänge christl. Volser, p. 142. (B. P.)

Poneat. See POINET.

Pongilus, Hermannus, an Italian monkish, flourished near the middle of the 13th century at Ferrara. He practised great austerity as one of the Consolators, and died in 1209. Several years after his death (1300) charges of heresy were brought against him, and a judicial process having been declared, his bones were exhumed and burned, and his tomb demolished by order of pope Boniface VIII. His tomb, in the principal church at Ferrara, had been the object of great veneration, and many miracles were said to have been wrought there. Some think that the process was instituted and the tomb demolished to put an end to the extravagant devotion paid to his memory. The Franciscans attribute to Pongilus the origin of the Fraetrucidii (q. v.), but Moesheim considers this an error, and believes him to have been one of the Bogomils. Natalia Alexander (Hist. Eccles. viii, 87) speaks of Pongilus as reviving several vile practices of the Bogomils. See Wadding, Mon. Fratrir, vi, 279; Milman, Hist. of Latin Christianity, vii, 37 sq. (J. H. W.)

Pongol, a Hindu festival in honor of the sun, which is celebrated annually on Jan. 9. The high-caste Brahmins look upon this as a lucky and propitious day, but the Sudras hold it as sacred, and visit one another with presents. They boil rice on this day with milk outside the house, in some place exposed to the sun's rays, and when that luminary withdraws they cry out "Pongol!" and repeat it four times. The rice thus boiled is regarded as very holy, and kept as long as possible. The day after the Pongol the cows and buffaloes are led out early into the country, having their heads adorned with crowns and cakes. 

Poniatawa, Christine, a German female visionary, was born in 1610 at Lessen, Western Prussia. Her father, Julian Poniatawa, was a Polish gentleman, who, having escaped from a monastery and embraced the Protestant communion, was at first minister at Dachnick, in Lusatia, then librarian of a nobleman. He probably brought up his daughter in mystical ideas, for he is said to himself the author of a Latin dissertation on the knowledge which the angels may have of God. Christine had been intrusted to the care of the banished Jesuit, who had a strong liking for her, and when, Nov. 12, 1627, after severe pains, she fell into a trance, attended with visions and prophetic utterances relating to the future of the Reformed Church. This strange state returned at regular intervals for a whole year, always attended with the same phenomena, and a number of people testified to its genuineness. Jan. 27, 1628, the young visionary fell into so heavy a lethargy that she passed for dead, but when she finally recovered her senses she declared that her mission was fulfilled, and that she should thenceforth have no more visions. In 1632 she was married to a Moravian minister, Daniel Vetter, and died Dec. 5, 1644, at Lessen, near Posen. Her revelations, written by herself, were translated into Latin, and published by Amos Comenius and Christopher Kotter and Nicolas Drabicki, under the title Luz in Tentoris (1657, 1659, 1665, 4to). They were retranslated into German by Benedict Balsam (Amsterdam, 1664, 8vo). See Feucht, Gymn. fonat. Konst. p. 228 sq.; Witsius, Mystic. Sacra, pt. iii, ch. xxii; Arnold, Kirchen- u. Ketzhistorie; Moehl, Eccles. Hist. iii, 391, 392. (J. H. W.)

Poniatsows, Julian. See PONIATOWA, CHRISTINE.

Pons, Jean, a French Protestant writer, was born at Nismes May 15, 1747. He was brother-in-law to Rabaut-Dupuis. Intimately connected with Rabaut St. Etienne, he was the first to escape from the frightful fate he owed his life to the 9th Thermidor. He was afterwards justice of the peace at Nismes, and then director of the post department in the same city. He published Réflexions philosophiques et politiques sur la Fondation de l'empire du monde (Paris, 1808, 8vo), besides Notice biographique sur Paul Rabaut and Notices biographiques sur Rabaut-Dupuis. Pons died at Nismes Jan. 15, 1816. —Hoefcr, Now. Biog. Générale, a.v.

Ponsard de Gisi of Pates, a Crusader of the Order of the Knight Templars, flourished near the opening of the 14th century. He was a most earnest advocate of the Templars, and when, in 1307, they were brought to trial, and the papacy was questioning the feasibility of suffering its existence, Ponsard boldly declared himself ready to undertake its defence. All the enormous charges against the order were utterly, absolutely false; false were all the confessions, extorted by terror and pain, from himself and other brethren before the bishop of Paris. Those tortures had been applied by the swarm and deadly enemies and accusers of the order, by the prior of Montefalcon and William Roberts the monk. He put in another form: "These are the traitors who have falsely and dishonourably accused the religion of the Temple—William Roberts the monk, who had them put to the torture; Esquin de Florian of Beziers, prior of Montefalcon; Bernard Pelet, prior of Maso, Philip's envoy to England; and Gervais Boyol, knight of Gisors." Had Ponsard himself been tortured? He had been tortured before the bishop of Paris three months ere he made confession. He had stood thus in a pit for the space of an hour. He protested that in that state of agony he should confess or deny whatever they would. He was prepared to endure beheading, the stake, or the caldron for the honor of the order; but these slow, excruciating torments he could not bear besides the horrors of his two years' imprisonment. He was asked if he had anything to allege wherefore the court should not proceed. He hoped that the cause would be decided by good men and true. The provost of Poitiers interposed: he produced a schedule of charges advanced by Ponsard himself against the order. "Truth," answered Ponsard, "requires no concealment. I own that in a fit of passion, on account of some centumulc words with the treasurer of the Temple, I did draw up the schedule." Those charges, however, dark as were some of them, were totally unlike those now brought against the brotherhood. Before he left the court, Ponsard expressed the hope that the severity of his imprisonment might have the effect of making those who had undertaken the defence of the order. The court gave instructions to the provost of Poitiers and De Janville
that he should not be more harshly treated; but he was
finally condemned to death, and was burned at the
stake. See Milman, Hist. of Latin Christianity, vi, 429 sq.; Porter, Hist. of the Knights of Malta (see
INDEX, J. H. W.).

PONTANO, GIOVANNI-GIOVANO (Lat. Pontanna), a
celebrated Italian statesman, noted as a writer on mor-
als, was born December, 1426, in the environs of Cer-
reto, Umbria. His father having perished in a riot,
his mother fled with him to Bologna, where he rec-
ceived a careful education. Having in vain asserted his claim to the heritage of his parents, he entered the army of
Alfonso, king of Naples, then at war with the Floren-
tines (1447), and followed that king to Naples, where he became acquainted with the celebrated Panormita,
who took him along in his embassy to Florence, and
had him appointed royal secretary. Pontano's verses,
highly esteemed by all competent judges, seemed to
entitle him sufficiently to a seat in the academy which
Panormita, unter the king's auspices, established at
Naples. Ferdinand I, successor of Alfonso (1457), main-
tained him in his office of secretary, and appointed him
tutor of his son Alfonso, duke of Calabria. He followed
Ferdinand in his campaign against the duke of Anjou,
and distinguished himself by his bravery. Taken
captive on different occasions, he was often treated
without ransom to the camp of Ferdinand, out of respect
for his genius. On his return to Naples the king lav-
ished his favors upon him, bestowed upon him riches
dignities, and intrusted him with the conduct of the most
important matters of state, as chevalier of a war,
which bade fair to become general, having broken out
between the Venetians and the duke of Ferrara. Ponto-
ano brought about a reconciliation of the belligerents.
He was equally successful incompounding the diffi-
culties that had arisen between Ferdinand and pope
Innocent VIII. But his success was so great in the negotiation of the pope exclaimed, "I treat with Pontano: is it meet
that truth and good faith should abandon him who
never abandoned them?" He became at that time
first minister, and remained in high position under
Alfonso II (who erected to him a statue) and Ferdinand
II. When Charles VIII of France approached Naples at
the head of a French army, Pontano sent him forthwith
the keys of the city, harbaged the king at his coronation,
and disdained himself by the insults and asper-
sions which he heard in this speech as the neophyte
factors. When Ferdinand returned, he contented himself
with depriving Pontano of his offices. The fallen min-
ister found in his retreat more happiness than he had
enjoyed in the tumult of public business, and when
Louis XII, after the conquest of the kingdom of Naples,
offered to give him again at the head of an armament,
this new Doliocletian preferred his hermitage to royal
grandeur. It was in his retreat that he wrote most of
the works he has left. He died at Naples in August,
1468. Most of his works deal with moral subjects, and
abound in sound precepts and judicious reflections.
His history of the Neapolitan war is a masterpiece, suffi-
cient alone to immortalize his author. His Latinity is
pure and elegant, his style noble and harmonious.
His poetic works excited envy and conquered it. He an-
nounced himself, like Horace, the only Greek in the
Roman school, "The remotest posterity," he said, "will speak of
Pontano, and celebrate his name." Erasmus, though a par-
simonious distributor of praise to the Italians, has ac-
nowledged Pontano's merit in his Cereriom. It must be
recorded also that Pontano had the merit of correcting
the manuscript, then the only one, of Catullus; that we owe to him the discovery of Donat's com-
mentaries on Virgil, and of Rhemnus Palenom's Gram-
mar. In his physical treatises he first signalled the law of
continuity, and seems to have been the first among
the moderns to have acquainted himself, after Democritus,
declared the milk, the way to be composed of an infinity of small stars.
His poems, some of which unfortunately are spoiled by ob-
scenities, were published at Venice (1505-8, 2 vol. 8vo)
and at Florence (1514, 2 vol. 8vo). His prose writings
were published at Venice (1518-19, 8 vol. 4to) and at
Florence (1520, 4 vol. 8vo). His Works were edited at
Naples (1600-12, 6 vol. fol.), and more completely at
Basle (1584, 4 vol. 8vo). His prose writings are the
following works: De Obediencia: De Fortitudine: De
Principis: De Liberalitate: De Benscencia: De Magmfaestitia: De
Spendore: De Conveniencia: De Prudencia: De
Magnaanimitate: De Fortuna: De
Immaculata: De dogmatum: De
Religione: De speciebus: De
Deus: De amore: De<br>

Pontanus, GEOXO-BARTHOLD VON BRAYKENBERG, a
learned Bohemian philosopher, was born about
the middle of the 16th century. He had scarce-ly
taken orders when he achieved a reputation by his eloquence
in the pulpit, as well as for his remarkable Latin verses,
for which last-named attainment he was in 1588 crowned
with the poetical laurels by the emperor Rudolph. Ap-
pointed canon of the cathedral of Prague in 1589, he
afterwards became provost and vicar-general in the
same city. He exercised a great and happy influence
on the important questions then under debate in Boh-
emia. He died in 1616. His works are, Der Triumph
des Podgrosa (Frankf. 1604, 4to): De certis Podemor
in eum, De hominum et nymum (Cologne,
h. 8.; 8. 1608, fol.): Das vonrume Bohenem (Frankf.,
hol.; 8. 1608, fol.); a selection of some of the most remarkable acts of piety
the princes and prelates of Bohemia: Scandbergers, seu
ratus Georgii Castriacii (Hunan, 1609, 8vo): a number of Latin poems; a good edition of the treatise De ge-
mia rerrum proprioitatem of Bartholomaeus Anglicus

Pontard, PIERRE, a French prelate, was born at
Mussidan Sept. 23, 1749. He was curate of Sarlat when
the Revolution broke out. He then embraced the new
enlightened spirit which was sweeping over France, and
took his appointment as constitutional bishop of the Dordogne
in 1791. A few months later he was elected deputy of this
department to the Legislative Assembly. He spoke in favor of divorce, attacked the dogmas of the
Catholic Church, authorized the marriage of priests, and
finally took a wife himself. It was this same Pontard who
induced the visionary Suzanne Labrousse to go to Paris.
Under the consulate he kept a boarding-school at Paris,
but his institution waned after a few years. He was
intimate with Pignaut-Lebrun, and aided him, if the
report be true, in the composition of some of his novels.
After the Restoration, the duchess-dowager of Orleans,
to whom he had rendered some services during the
Reign of Terror, on hearing of his precarious situation,
bestowed on him a life-rent, which enabled him to enter
the institution founded at Château-Craon, without
apparent contrivance, Jan. 22, 1832. He left,
Recueil des Ouvrages de la celebre Mlle. Labrousse (Borde-
daux, 1797, 8vo) — Grammaire Mecanique elementaire de l'Orthographe Francaise (Paris, 1815, 8vo).
He is also the author of the Journal prophétique, which was
Galerie, n. v.

Pontas, JEAN, a French prelate, was born Dec. 31,
1838, at Saint-Hilaire-du-Harcouet, (diocese of Avran-
ches). Brought up by his maternal uncle, M. d'Arque-
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ville, he studied successively under his eyes in his native city, then at the Jesuits’ College of Rennes, finally in Paris at the College de Navarre. In 1668 he received, for reasons unknown, in the space of ten days, all the orders, inclusive of that of priesthood, from the bishop of Toul, with the consent of the bishop of Avranches, at scarcely twenty-four years old. In 1669 he obtained the titles of doctor of canon and of civil law. The archbishop of Paris, Pérégrine, appointed him vicar of the parish of Sainte-Geneviève-des-Ar- dents, an easy place, which left him time enough for his learned pursuits. He next became sub-penitentiary of Nantes, returned to Paris, and retired to the Petit-Augustines of the faubourg Saint-Germain, where he died, April 27, 1728. His principal work is the *Dictionnaire des Cas de Con- science* (Paris, 1741, 8 vols. fol.). It is the completest on this subject, in the treatment of which Ponsot displays uncommon sagacity and great caution. His decisions, founded on imposing authorities, are equally distant from loose morality and narrow rigorism—a twofold danger which works of this description seldom avoid altogether.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Pont-Audemer, Council of (Concilium Pont- audemarensis), an ecclesiastical council, was held in 1279 by William de Flavescourt, archbishop of Rouen, who presided; twenty-four canons were published. Among these:

5. Recommends the observance of the canons of Lent ("omnes vindiciae sexus") upon confession and communion.

20. Forbids Christians to dwell with Jews.

21. Forbids the keeping of vigils and assemblies, and all dancing, in churches and churchyards.

22. Forbids rural means to deliver any sentence of excommunication or suspension, unless in writing.

23. Forbids all those of the clergy who have taken the crozier and the privileges granted to them. See Labbé, *Concil. xi*, 1144.

Pontbriant, Henri-Guillaume-Marie, Du BREIL DE, brother of the two following, was born at Rennes in 1709. He was a canon, grand chantor of the cathedral of Rennes, and abbé of Lanvaux, in the diocese of Vannes. He died at Rennes in 1767. He left, *Poème sur l’Abus de la Poésie*, crowned at the Jeux Floraux in 1722:—"Sermón sur le Sacre du Roy" (Toulouse, 1722, 4to) — *Essais de Grammaire Francaise* (1784, 8vo) — *Projet d’une Histoire de Bretagne depuis 1561 jusqu’à notre Temps* (Rennes, 1784, fol.)— *Histoire, Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Pontbriant, Henri-Marie, Du BREIL DE, brother of the preceding, was born at Vannes in 1711. He was canon of Rennes. He early entered ecclesiastical life, and after several promotions was made bishop of Quebec in April 1741. He set out for Quebec shortly after, and arrived there Aug. 17. He died at Montreal (Canada) June 29, 1760. A pastoral letter which he issued on the approach of the English to Quebec in 1759 is in Smith’s *Hist. of Canada*.

Pontbriant, René-François, Du BREIL DE, a French priest, was born at Rennes near the opening in the 18th century. Appointed abbé of Saint-Marien-d’Auxerre, he was one of the most zealous promoters of the institution of the Petits-Savoyards. The first idea of that institution is due to the abbé Joly, canon of Dijon, who founded at Paris, towards 1655, in the immediate vicinity of poor children, an establishment which, taken up by Claude Hélyot, could not support itself after his death in 1686. The abbé of Pontbriant, touched with pity at the sight of those misery of poor little Savoyards, came to their help towards 1737, and devoted to them during the remainder of his life his time, his energies, and his fortune. The abbé de Fénelon, who died on the revolutionary scaffold in 1794, succeeded him in this task. Pontbriant died in 1760. He left, *Projet d’Établissement déjà commencé pouresser dans la Piété les Petits Savoyards qui sont dans Paris*, with several appendices (Paris, 1780-89, 4 pars, 8vo).— *Pilgrimage du Calcaire sur la Mont Valérien* (ibid. 1745, 12mo; 1751, 16mo; 1816, 12mo) — *L’Incendie détruit et le Christ afirma dans la Foi* (1792, 8vo), a work which met with uncommon favor.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Ponte, Luis DE, a Spanish Jesuit, noted as an ascetic writer, was born at Valladolid Nov. 11, 1554. He belonged to a noble family, but renounced all the advantages the world offered him, and at the age of twenty entered the Society of Jesus. He was during many years a teacher of philosophy and theology, but his failing health compelled him at last to monastical observance. He became sub-penitentiary, and divided his time between prayer, good works, and the composition of pious writings, by which he obtained throughout Europe the reputation of an excellent master of spiritual life. He died Feb. 17, 1624. Most of his numerous writings were translated into Latin by Melchior Trespinus. We mention *Meditationes de los Mysterios de nuestra Santa Fe* (Valladolid, 1605, 1613, 1618, 2 vols. 4to). This work was translated into several languages: into Arabic by F. Fromaye, and into French by F. Brignon (1618, 3 vols. 4to) — *Guida Espiritual de la Oracion, Meditacion y Contemplacion* (Mexico, 1622, 4 vols. fol. ; Paris, 1646, fol.) — *Directorio Espiritual* (Madrid, 1625, 8vo). He also wrote the first part of *Vida Moral* (Madrid, 1605, fol.) — *La Orden de los Jesuitas* (ibid. 1665, fol.), which was finished and published by a member of his order, Miguel Orefía.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v. See Antonio, *Bibliotheca Hispanica Nova*, s. v.

Pontius, Sr., a pope of the 3d century, was a native of Rome, and descended from the gens Calpurnia, if we may believe the ancient writers. Under Urban I he was elected in the pontificate in 230. Plautina and others assert that he introduced the singing of psalms into the Church, but this custom must be older. The first years of his pontificate under Alexander Severus were quiet, but the persecutions commenced again under Maximinus, and Pontius, together with a presbyter by the name of Hippolytus, suffered sentence of deportation to the usual place of exile, the island of Tavulato, near Sardinia, where he died from want and exposure, Sept. 28, 255. His body was carried to Rome by order of pope Callistus I, who succeeded him. Two epitaphs are said to have been erected to him. St. Anterus was his successor. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.; Plautina, *Vita Pontificum*, s. v.; Montor, *Hist. des Popes* (see Index); Milman, *Hist. of Latin Christendom*, i, 80.

Pontier, Grégoire, a French theologian, was born near Dijon, in 1727. For the 18th century. Though brought up in the Protestant communion, he embraced Roman Catholicism, entered the ecclesiastical state, and obtained the title of apostolic protonotary. He died at Paris in 1709, at an advanced age. He left, *Le Cabinet, ou la Bibliothèque des Grands* (1680-89, 8 vols. 12mo); the last volume contains in addition, *Les Questions de la Princesse Henriette de la Guiche, Duchesse d’Angoulême et Comtesse d’Alais, sur toutes Sortes de Sujets, avec les Réponses* (1687, 12mo) — *Lettre de Sentes, Premier Étqué d’Alais* (1698, 12mo), etc. La Bruyère gives a portrait of him, with his "Caractères," under the name of Dioscurus, and makes very much of him.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Pontifex (1). a priest among the ancient Romans. The pontifices were formed into a college, and all matters of religion were placed under its exclusive superintendence. Their functions and duties were minutely detailed in the pontifical books, which were drawn up in the reign of Numa Pompilius, and contained the names of the gods and the various regulations for their worship, as well as a detailed description of the functions, rights, and privileges of the priests. The pontifices were not priests of any particular divinity, but of the
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worship of the gods generally. Their duties embraced the regulation of all the religious rites and ceremonies (both public and private) of a state—of the worship of the gods should be worshipped, how burials should be conducted, how the souls of the dead (mantes) should be appeased. To them was intrusted the care of the calendar, the proclamation of festival days, etc. They also saw that every religious and every judicial act was performed on the right day. “As they thus had,” says Dr. Mommsen, “an especial supervision of all religious observances, it was to them in case of need (as on occasion of marriage, testament, or arrogoatio) that the preliminary question was addressed, whether the matter proposed did not, in any respect, offend against divine law.” In matters of religion they were the supreme authorities; from their decisions there was no appeal, and they themselves were responsible neither to the senate nor the people; further, they had power to inflict punishment on such priests as dared to disobey their injunctions and deviate into schismatical courses. The words of Festus are: “Rerum quo ad sacra et religiones pertinent, judices et sacerdotum.”

The head of the college was called Pontifex Maximus. The pontiffs, according to Roman tradition, were instituted from the beginning, to whom the origin of nearly all the religious ceremonies of ancient Rome is ascribed. But as they appear in all the Latin communities, they are regarded by Mommsen as a “thoroughly national Italian institution,” and probably found a place in the earliest religious organization of the Latin race. Their number was ten, or perhaps, including the pontifex maximus, five, all of whom were taken from the patricians. In B.C. 300, the Oculinian Law raised the number to nine, four of whom were to be plebeians. The first plebeian, however, who attained the dignity of pontifex maximus was Tiberius Coruncanius, B.C. 254. Sulla, in B.C. 81, again increased the number to fifteen, and Julius Cesar to sixteen. During the empire, the functions of pontifex maximus were generally discharged by the emperors themselves; and when at length the emperors dropped the name, it was picked up by the Christian bishops of Rome; and now this title, borrowed from a pagan cult, forms one of the sacred designations of his holiness the pope.

Pontifex (2) is hence also the title in the Roman Catholic Church of the archbishop or bishop of a diocese. The pope himself is styled the sovereign pontifex, or pontif (q. v.). (J. H. W.)

Pontifex Maximus. Before the time of Constantine the clergy were not recognized as holding any distinct rank in the state; but when Christianity was made the religion of the state, its ministers were considered as occupying the place of those heathen priests whose superstitions had fallen into desuetude. According to Zosimus, Constantine himself, in the year 325, assumed the title of Pontifex Maximus, which the heathen emperors before him had appropriated, because it contributed to exalt at once the imperial and episcopal dignity, and served to justify the interference of the emperor in ecclesiastical councils and in the nomination of bishops. Constantine’s successors followed his example until the days of Gratian, who was the last emperor to whom the title was applied. Some scholars doubt Zosimus’s assertion, notwithstanding the fact that the medals of Constantine and his successors, down to Gratian, and the inscriptions relating to them, give them the title of Pontifex Maximus, on the ground that it may have been one of those additional titles which the power of habit preserved, without any meaning being connected with them. As to the use of the cassadorial garment, Zosimus may not be quite trustworthy in that respect. But even if the emperors had adopted the pontifical robes, brought to them by the pagan priests at their accession, and had not followed that they actually wore them, or even officiated as “Pontifices Maximini.” It has been supposed by some authors that the first Christian emperors adopted this pagan title only as a means of proclaiming themselves the guardians and protectors of the Christian religion. At an early period of his reign Constantine issued edicts in favor of the Christian clergy, by which they were put on a footing, with regard to civil rights, with the heathen priests: these edicts were soon followed by others, which gave to the clergy some special and peculiar privileges. See Bingham, Origines Eclesiae. (Index in vol. II.); Riddle, Christian Antiquities, p. 337; Elliot, Romans, p. 620; Alzog, Kirchengesch. I, 244, 261.

Pontiff, or High-Priest, a person who has the superintendence and direction of divine worship, as the offering of sacrifices, and other religious solemnities.

The Romans had a college of pontiffs, called by them “pontifex.” See Pontifex.

Pontifices Confraternitatis, or, were in the 12th century guilds of associated monks for the building of churches. They appeared first at Chartres, in France, and spread thence throughout that country and England, Switzerland, and Germany. When their Christian character died out they became lodges of Freemasons.

Pontifical (i.e. belonging to a pontiff or bishop) is a book of rites and ceremonies pertaining to the office of a high-priest, pope, or prelate of that grade. There is the name of a book used by a bishop at consecration of churches, etc. Thus the Roman Pontifical (Pontificale Romana) is the book giving directions as to those acts of worship which Roman Catholic bishops exclusively perform or at least are authorized to perform by the pope. Several medieval pontificials are extant, but they have merely a historical value. The edition published Feb. 10, 1596, by pope Clement VIII, has remained up to our day the rule of the Roman Catholic ceremonial. “Statutum” says the pope, “Pontificale praeeditum nullo unquam in toto vel in parte mutatum, vel ei aliquid addendum, aut omnino detrahendum esse, ac quoquoseque qui pontificia munia exerceret, vel alia, que in dicto Pontificale continetur, facere aut ex quibusque eorum regulis que in hoc Pontificale prescriptis et rationibus tenetur, ex eis... nias formulis, que hoc ipso Pontificiali continetur, servatis satisfacere posses.” It may be seen by this quotation how stringent the prescriptions of the Pontifical are. The Pontifical contains the services for ordinations, for religious professions and absolutions of monks and nuns, consecrations, benedictions, etc., as well as of the solemn administration by a bishop of those sacraments which are ordinarily administered by priests. Besides the prayers to be recited, the Pontifical also lays down the ceremonial to be observed. The rules of this ceremonial are of two kinds—prescriptive, the literal observance of which is obligatory; and directive, which admit of a certain interpretation. The ceremonies must be performed as described in the several services without any omission, addition, or modification, whether in the administration of sacraments or the performance of public worship, in which the bishop exclusively, or a priest delegated by the bishop, officiates.

Another of the service-books of bishops is called the Ceremoniale, but it is chiefly confined to a description of the peculiar ceremonial with which bishops are required to celebrate solemnly those offices, as of the mass, vespers, the funeral office, etc., which are common to them with priests. The most prized editions of both these service-books are those published by authority of the learned pope Benedict XIV.

In England the Pontifical is not by authority published separately from the Liturgy, so that it is never called by that name; though the offices of confirmation and ordination, in fact, compose the English Pontifical. For the consecration of churches and churchyards there is no office appointed by sufficiency to the same office as the pontifical and missal. See CONSECRATION OF CHURCHES.

Pontificalia, properly the ensigns of a pontiff’s or bishop’s office, is a term loosely used for any ecclesiasti-
Pontificate means the state or dignity of a pontiff, or high-priest; but is more particularly applied in modern times to the reign of a pope.

Pontius, Council of. See Ponton.

Pontius, a deacon of the African Church, the tried friend and constant companion of Cyprian, drew up a narrative of the life and sufferings of the martyred bishop, which is styled an excellent production (Eregium volumen) by Jerome. If the piece extant under the name of Pontius, entitled De Vita et Passione S. Cyriapi, be genuine, it certainly does not merit such high commendation, since it is composed in an ambitious declamatory style, full of affectation and rhetorical ornaments. Perhaps the original work may have formed the basis of what we now possess, which has probably been built up into its present form by the labor of various hands. It will be found attached to all the most important editions of Cyprian, and is contained also in the Acta Primorvm Martyrvm of Ruinart (Paris, 1690, 4to; Amsterdam, 1718, fol). The Acta Pontii are preserved in the Miscellanea of Baluzé (Paris, 1678, 8vo), ii, 124, and in the Acta Sanctorum under March 8, the day marked as his festival in the Roman Martyrology. See Jerome, De Viris Ill. p. 68; Schönebaum, Bibl. Patrum Lat. vol. i, c. iii, § 6.

Pontius, Paul, a celebrated Belgian engraver, was born at Antwerp in 1596, according to some accounts, according to others in 1600. He was the pupil of Vos- termann, and is chiefly distinguished for his excellent prints after Rubens, which he executed under that great painter's inspection. He engraved also a celebrated set of portraits after Vandyck, including those of many of the most distinguished Flemish painters. He appears to have been himself wonderfully devoted to whatever art he copied. The date of his death appears not to be known. The Sluagher of the Innocents, after Rubens, one of his principal works, is dated 1653.

Pontius (Pilate). See Pilate.

Pontoppidan, Erik Eriksson, also called Pontoppidan the Elder, a Norwegian prelate, was born in 1616 at Broby (town-bridge = poropippus), in Fyn, in Denmark, from which he took his Latin name. He was for many years minister in Kjöge, but afterwards became bishop of the Trondhjem diocese in Norway. For his many Latin poems he had the honor of being praised by the poet by the old Ethshoff, who had himself been crowned poet in Germany. Pontoppidan's funeral sermons are very famous. But what especially entitles him to an honorable name in history is his Danish Grammar, which was published in 1668, while he was still minister at Kjöge. It was the first Danish grammar ever published. He died in 1678. See Barfod, Fortalinger, p. 542. (R. B. A.)

Pontoppidan, Erik L., son of the nephew of the foregoing, also called Pontoppidan the Younger, was born Aug. 24, 1698, in Aarhus, in Denmark, where his father was dean. He became a student in 1716 at Fredericia, and afterwards at Copenhagen; after this he was tutor in the house of general Lützow, in Norway; travelled in foreign lands with a son of Iver Hvitfeldt, and then became tutor in the family of the last duke of Holstein-Plön. In 1728 he was appointed chaplain of the palace chapel at Nordborg; in 1734 chaplain of the palace chapel at Fredericksborg; and in 1735 he became court-chaplain in Copenhagen. In 1738 he was elected professor of theology in the Copenhagen University; was appointed bishop of Bergen in 1747; received the degree of doctor of theology in 1749; and in 1756 became chancellor of the Copenhagen University. He died Dec. 20, 1764. As a theologian he was semi-pietistic, but not at all fanatical. He was cheerful, and disposed the severe pietistic laws that were enforced by the Danish government in his time. During the reign of Christian VI he had the courage to write, "God never permits the laws of nature to be violated for the sake of advancing the cause of the Church. When the Church of Christ consisted exclusively of volunteers, it had living members." Some fault has been found with him, and perhaps justly, in his direction of the affairs of the university, but at the same time he did much to advance the cause of science, and he was ever on the alert to see that the several professors did not neglect any portion of their duty to the university. As a German, Danish, and Latin author he exercised a great influence, especially in theology, history, natural history, and political economy. Of his numerous works, the following are the ones most known: An Explanation of Luther's Catechism (1737), a book that was for a long time the text-book in Denmark and Norway in the religious education of the children, and is as such used very widely yet. — Marmora Danica (1739-41, 2 vols, fol.), in which he copies a number of inscriptions of various ages which elucidate the history of his country: — Gesta et Vestigia Dunorum extra Daniam (1740-41, 4 vols.) : — Amulet Ecclesiæ Danici (1741-52, 4 vols.), in German; a good history of the Danish church: — Meditations of a Pilgrim that has Traveled around the World in Search of Christians (1742-44, 3 vols.) is a philosophical work, written in Danish, and has been translated into Dutch, German, and other languages; it has recently been reprinted in Denmark by V. Birkedal: — The Power of a Single Word Conquering Infidels (1745): — Cologum Pastorale Pretium (1757): — Origines Hafnienses (1760) : — Danish Atlas (1763-1761, 4 vols.). The fourth volume was completed by his brother-in-law, Hans de Hofman. He also published a Hymn-book, and wrote several short treatises. His History of Norway (1752-54) was translated into English and German. He published Economical Balance in 1759, and a Magazine of Political Economy, from 1757 to 1764. See Barfod, Fortalinger, p. 542; Nordisk Conversations-Lexicon, s. v. (R. B. A.)

Pontormo, Jacopo Da (or Jacopo Carrucci), a distinguished Florentine painter, was born at Pontormo in 1495. He was a short time the pupil of Leonardo da Vinci, and studied under Albertinelli, Pietro di Cosimo, and Andrea del Sarto. He painted for some time in a similar style to Andrea, and was that painter's rival; but he frequently changed his manner, and three distinct styles are ascribed to him, the last imitated from the works of Albert Dürer. Towards the close of his life he spent ten years in painting some frescoes of the Deluge and the Last Judgment in the church of San Lorenzo, in the manner of the imitators of Michael Angelo, but they have long since been washed over. He died at Florence in 1557.

Pontus (Porrig. the sea), a large district in the north of Asia Minor, extending along the coast of the Pontus Euxinus, from which circumstance the name was derived. It is mentioned in the New Testament as furnishing a portion of that audience which listened to the apostles on the day of Pentecost (Acts ii, 9), as the birthplace of Aquila (xviii. 2), and as one of the districts through which "the strangers" addressed by Peter in his first epistle "were scattered abroad" (1 Pet. i, 1). All these passages agree in showing that there were many Jewish residents in the district. The term Pontus signifies the country of very different peoples at different times, and while the boundaries of all the provinces of Asia Minor were continually shifting, none were more affected by the changes of the times than those of Pontus. In the earlier period of its history it was merely a province of Cappadocia, which then extended from the Black Sea to the Euphrates; and it is clear from the older traditions that the petty kingdoms of which it was composed were subdued and consolidated by Ninus. It then fell under the alternate dominion of the Medes and Persians, the latter of whom divided it into satrapies; and in the reign of Darius Hystaspis the country of Pontus was
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besought by that prince on Artabazae, a member of his own family, who henceforth assumed the title of king of Pontus, and was the last of princes rescued from oblivion by the genius, the crimes, and the vicissitudes of Mithridates VII, sometimes called "the Great." The kingdom of Artabazae was comprised between 41° and 43° N. lat., and between 35° and 42° E. long.; and was bounded on the north by the Euxine, on the south by Armenia Minor, on the east by Colchis, and on the west by the river Halys. The inhabitants were a bold, active, and warlike race, and in the reign of Ariobarzanes they shook off the yoke of Persia, to whose sovereignty their own had from the time of Artabazae been transferred, and established the independence of their country. From this period the kingdom of Pontus prospered. Its monarchs gradually added to their dominions the whole of Cappadocia and Phrygia, and a large part of Bithynia, thus dividing Asia Minor with the Attalid dynasty, which ruled at Pergamos. Mithridates VI formed an alliance with the Romans, sent a fleet to aid them in their wars against Carthage, and when, on the death of Attalus, who left his kingdom of Pergamos to the Roman people, Aristocrates contested the legacy, and attempted to make himself king of Pergamos, Mithridates espoused the cause of Rome, and aided in driving the usurper out of Asia. The policy of this able prince was reversed by his son and successor. Mithridates VII ascended the throne at the age of eleven years, and early began a career of enmity and treachery, the ulterior object of which was the entire subjugation of the country over which he ruled, and his reduction to the condition of a Roman province. Mithridates did, however, succeed so far as to make himself master of all Lesser Asia and of many of the adjacent islands. At Cos he plundered the Jews of a large sum; but upon their being annexed Armenia to his kingdom, while his son Ariarathes overcame Macedon and Thrace. At this period of his reign he was the master of twenty-five nations; and so great were his accomplishments as a linguist, that he is said to have been able to converse with the natives of all without the aid of an interpreter. He determined utterly to root out the Roman dominion from Asia, and in order to compromise the inhabitants of the country beyond the possibility of return, he issued orders that on a certain day throughout his dominions each Roman citizen should put to death, not excepting even women and children. This atrocious decree, which has covered the name of Mithridates with infamy, was carried out, and the number of persons who perished in the massacre is variously estimated at from eighty to one hundred and sixty thousand. From this time, therefore, he began to decline; and after a romantic series of vicissitudes he was killed at his own request in the seventy-first year of his age, B.C. 64. After the death of Mithridates, his son Pharnaces submitted to the Romans. He was made king of Bithynia, and proclaimed the ally of Rome; but after the return of Pompey he regained his hereditary kingdom, and ventured to oppose the Romans with as much obstinacy as his father, but with less success. Julius Caesar marched against him, and reduced the country to the condition of a province. Marc Antony restored Darius, the son of Pharnaces; and a short line of princes, none of whom require any notice in this place, governed the country till the time of Nero. The last of these, Polio II., was the father of that Berenice who married Herod Agrippa II., before whom Paul pleaded his cause with so much eloquence. From this time Pontus ceased to be an independent state, constituting a province or dependency of the Roman empire. On the east it was bounded by Colchis, on the south by Cappadocia and part of Armenia, and on the west by Phrygia, Bithynia, and Asia Minor; Pontus (Greg. v. 5) and Phrygia (Hist. Nat. vi. 4) regard Pontus and Cappadocia as one province; but Strabo (Greg. xii. 541) rightly distinguishes them, seeing that each formed a distinct government with its own ruler or prince. Poom ery divides what may be called the true Pontus into three districts—Pontus Galaticus, Pontus Cappadocius, and Pontus Polemecus. This last was imagined to be the country of the Amazons.

The climate of Pontus is hot in summer, but severe in winter, especially along the shores of the Euxine. The soil is fertile, but less so than in the more southern parts of Asia Minor; yet it abounds with olives and cherry-trees, and the valleys produce considerable quantities of grain. These advantages it owes to its being watered by many small rivers, while the great river Halys flows far into the interior. The inhabitants are a hardy and industrious race; deriving their origin, according to tradition, from Tubal Cain. They were industrious as well as warlike, and addicted to commerce, and the inhabitants of Pontus Cappadocia were celebrated for their skill in the manufacture of arms, and for working in metal in general. They had many convenient harbors on the Euxine, and abundance of fine timber for ship-building, and of these they seem very early to have taken full advantage. They retained more of the Eastern elements in their language and religion than the inhabitants of Lydia and Pergamos, who were brought more entirely under the influence of Greek art, literature, and philosophy. They spoke a dialect of the Persian, largely corrupted with Greek; and their religion seems to have been a compound of Greek, Scythian, and Persian. Demeter, Zeus, and Poseidon were their chief deities; but this came to us on Greek authority, and is not generally adopted by theologists. The principal towns of Pontus were Amasia, the ancient metropolis, and the birthplace of Strabo, Themiscyra, Cerasus, and Trappaeus; which last is still an important town under the name of Uzun Celbey. Themiscyra, Nisius, ii. 287; Mannert, vi. 350; Rosenmüller, Bibl. Greg. iii. 5-9; Encyclop. Methodeak, sect. Greg. Ancienne, s. v. Pontus; Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Greg. s. v. Pontus; Conway and Howson, Life and Epistles (N. Y. ed.), i. 247. See Asia Minor.

Potyoon. Council of (Concilium Postponiense), was held in June and July, 876, by the Caisalpine bishops, the emperor Charles and the Roman legates being present. The pretensions of Anesigius, metropolitan of Sens, whom pope John VIII. at the request of the emperor, had nominated primate vicar apostolic in Gaul and Germany, and who had appointed the princes of the church of Paris (the rights of the metropolitans), were brought before the council, and so resolutely opposed by the bishops that the affair, for the time, came to nothing; i.e., the pontifical rescript in favor of Anesigius remained practically null and void. The archbishop of Sens, however, from that time forward assumed the title of "Primate of Gaul and Germany," but it was a mere nominal distinction, unattended by jurisdiction or authority. The acts of the Synod of Pavia, in the beginning of the year, were confirmed by the Council of Potyoon. Fifty-two bishops and archbishops were subscribed the acts, together with five abbots. See Labbe, Concil. ix. 280; Hefele, Concilien-gesch, vol. i., iv., and v.; Sirmond, Concil. Ant. Gall. vol. iii.; Jervis, Hist. of the Church of France, i. 38 sq.

Pool is the rendering in the A. V. of the following Heb. and Greek words:

1. Usually "בּוּר, be'erlah (Sept. ερήμος or κωπώσσα), or בּוּר, be'erlah (Psa. xxxix. 6, see Behah)

2. "to fall on the knees" (see Judg. vii. 5, 6). This word is akin to the Arabic Bi't, and its Spanish form de Abierro. In the Old Test. it stands for the larger reservoirs of rain or spring water; while bir, "cistern," is used for the smaller domestic tanks, of which every house had one or more. Some are supplied by springs, and some are merely receptacles for rain-water (Burkhardt, Syria, p. 314). It is thus ap-
plied to the large public reservoirs, corresponding to the tanks of India, belonging to the towns of Gibeon (2 Sam. ii, 13), Hebron (iv, 12), Samaria (1 Kings xxiii, 28), and Jerusalem; "the upper pool," 2 Kings xviii, 17; Isa. vii, 8; xxxiv, 2 (now the "Birket el-Mamilla"); the lower pool," Isa. xxii, 9, 11 ("Birket es-Sultan"); "Hezekiah's pool," 2 Kings xx, 20 ("Birket el-Hammam"); the king's pool," Neh. ii, 14 ("the fountain of the Virgin"); "the pool of Siloam," Neh. iii, 15 ("Birket Silwan"); and the old pool," Isa. xxii, 11. We read also (Ecc. ii, 6) of the "pools" or cisterns made by Solomon to irrigate his gardens. The importance of these reservoirs in a country possessing scarcely more than one perennial stream, and where wells are few and inconsiderable, can hardly be estimated by those accustomed to an unfailing abundance of the precious fluid. In Jer. xiv, 3 we have a powerful description of the disappointment caused by the failure of the water in the cisterns (םינב; A. V. "pits"; comp. Isa. xiii, 15; Jer. ii, 13). In modern Palestine they are often very filthy, although in constant use (Thomson, Land and Book, i, 316). See Water.

2. ʿAgdām, אֲגָדָּם (Isa. xiv, 28; xxxv, 7; xli, 18; xlii, 15); elsewhere "pond" (q. v.).

3. ʿMikrā, מִקְר (Exod. vii, 19), a gathering together (i. e. of water), as rendered Gen. i, 10.

4. In the New Test. κολυμβησθαι, only in John v, 2; ix, 7.

The following are the principal reservoirs mentioned in the Bible:

a. A pool of Hezekiah, 2 Kings xx, 20 (comp. Sirach, xlviii, 17 [19]). It was a basin which that king had opened in the city, and fed by a watercourse (בְּפָון, "conduit"). In 2 Chron. xxxiii, 30 it is said more definitely that Hezekiah conducted the water from the upper pool of Gibbon in the west of the city. This pool of Hezekiah, called by the Arabs Birket el-Hammam, is pointed out by tradition in the north-western part of the modern city, not far east of the Jaffa gate (Robinson, ii, 134 sq.). And there is no doubt that this is the true location, since the waters of the upper pool of Gibbon (Birket el-Mamilla) flow through small, roughly built aqueducts in the vicinity of the Jaffa gate, and thus reach the Birket el-Hammam (Robinson, i, 396). See Hezekiah's Pool.

b. The upper pool (בְּפָון), and the lower pool (בְּפָון), the former lying near the fuller's field, and on the road to it, outside of the city (Isa. vii, 3; xxxvi, 2; 2 Kings xviii, 17), and connecting with a watercourse. The lower pool is named in Isa. xxii, 9. There still remain in the west of the city two water-basins, an upper and a lower; the one called Birket el-Mamilla, at the head of the valley of Gibon, and the other Birket es-Sultan, somewhat farther down the valley southward, almost in a line with the south wall of the city (Robinson, ii, 129 sq.). They are generally known as the upper and the lower pool of Gibon. It supports the identification of these with "the upper and lower pools" that there are no other similar or corresponding reservoirs in the neighborhood; and the western position of the upper pool suits well the circumstances mentioned in Scripture (see Isa. xxxvi, 2; 2 Kings xviii, 17; comp. Knobel, Int. p. 155, 257). It may be added that a trustworthy tradition places the fuller's field westward of the city (Robinson, op. cit. p. 128). See Gibon.

c. The old pool (.StatusBadRequest), not far from the double wall (בְּפָון, "two walls"), Isa. xxii, 11. This double wall was near the royal garden (2 Kings xxv, 4; Jer. xxxix, 4), which must be sought in the south-east of the city, near the fountain of Siloam (Neh. iii, 15). Near the mouth of the Tyropoeon there are still two reservoirs or cisterns (Robinson, i, 384; ii, 146), a smaller one hollowed out in the rock, and the other, a little larger, lying a short distance to the south of the former, and receiving its water. The water flows from an opening in the rock a few feet north of the lesser basin; i. e. from the fountain of Siloam. The larger of these basins is doubtless the pool of Siloam, and the smaller is possibly the "old pool," and the same with the artificial pool named in Neh. iii, 16 as in this vicinity (Robinson, ii, 146; comp. Thenius, in Illg's Zeit. 1844, i, 22 sq.). Perhaps, however, we may rather understand the passage in Isaiah as referring to
a mere demaking up of the Tyropeon itself between the two parallel parts of the old wall lining the sides of the valley, for the purpose of containing (temporarily during the siege) the waters of the then "old" (i.e. superseded) pool of Gihon outside the city, thus diverted into a new channel. See JERUSALEM.

d. The king's pool ( 관한 [ma'nahə], Neh. ii, 14) is probably the basin in the foundation of the Virgin Mary, on the east side of Ophel (Robinson, ii, 109, 149), and is perhaps the same with the pool of Solomon (כֹּלוּמְבַּצְרָה כָּלְוַעֲרָא [kolombarah kolouwar]) mentioned by Josephus as on this side of the city (War, v, 4, 2; comp. Thenius, op. cit. p. 25). With less probability Schultze (Jerus. p. 56) takes the pool which lies south of Siloam, and which is now half choked with earth, for the king's pool. See JERUSALEM.

In Josephus, besides the foregoing, we find the sparoe's pool (רֹעָמִי תָּרְפָּדָו), which may have a different meaning: see Beckman, Jerus. iv, 19, opposite the Castle of Antonia, in the north of the city (War, v, 11, 4), now Birket Islah, or perhaps Birket el-Hajjeh; the pool of almonds (אָפְרָדָדָו), on the east side, at some distance from the city (War, ut sup.; the pool of serpents (כֹּלוּמְבַּצְרָה רּוּמְבַּדְרָה [kolombarah rummardar]), near Herod's monument (Josephus, Ant. xiv, 10, 1), between Susias (a hill seven stadia, or a mile, from the city, Joseph. War, i, 19, 4) and the city, and hence to the north, perhaps near the road to Shechem (Robinson, ii, 400; iii, 45, 189 sqq.). This must, then, be different from the dragon well (כַּפְרַדְרָדָדָו [kapardar]; see Neh. ii, 18, which lay between the dung-gate and the south-eastern side of the valley (comp. Thenius, op. cit. p. 17). There is no trace of it now to be found, for Birket el-Mimilla is to be identified with the upper pool, as above (Schultze, p. 67). See JERUSALEM.

For the pools of Gideon, Hebron, Samaria, Solomon, Bethuel, and Siloam, see those words respectively. See also FOUNTAIN.

Poole, Matthew, an eminent English Nonconformist minister, was born in York in 1824. He received his education and took his degree at Emmanuel College, Cambridge. Having attached himself to the Presbyterian, he entered the ministry, and about the year 1648 became pastor of St. Michael's, Querne, in London. In 1657, when Richard Cromwell succeeded his father in the chancellorship at Oxford, Mr. Poole was incorporated master of arts in that university. He soon became famous and of influence among his brethren, especially after 1658, when he published A Model for the Management of a Dissenters' School. Thirteen Scophs (a word meaning the university, and principally in order to the Ministry, which was accompanied with a recommendation from the university, signed by several Cambridge professors and savants, among whom were Cadwworth, Withcott, Withington, Dillingham, etc.) In 1659, after the restoration of Charles II, he published a sermon upon John iv, 23, 24, preached before the mayor of London, against re-establishing the Liturgy of the Church of England; and refusing to comply with the Act of Uniformity, in 1662, he was ejected from his rectory. He published on this occasion For clamantia in desertos, but submitted to the law with a commendable resignation, and retired to his studies at his paternal estate, resolving to employ his pen in the service of religion in general, regardless of the particular disputes among Protestants. He now devoted himself to a laborious and useful work entitled Synopsis Criticorum Bibliicum, which was published in 1669 and the following years. The design was nothing less than to bring into one view whatever had been written by critics of all ages and nations on the books of Holy Scripture. The work when finally brought out was probably as good as any of the kind can be, and few will deny that it is a very valuable and useful abridgment; but synopses and abridgements are rather for the multitude than for scholars, who are rarely satisfied with the opinions of any author which are thus presented to them at second-hand, without the
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fulness of illustration which the author himself had given; yet being written in Latin, it is manifest that the compiler contemplated a work adapted to the necessities and tastes of Biblical scholars. Its chief use is as a convenient body of exegetical criticism for Biblical students who are placed in situations which cut them off from convenient access to large libraries, and for them it has been rendered to a great extent obsolete by the important results of recent research. But in its day it was a great work. In the midst of this employment he testified his zeal against popery in a number of works, the principal of which is entitled The True and Certain Differences between the Romish Faith concerning the Church's Infallibility (1666, 8vo). When Oates's depositions concerning the Popish plot were printed in 1679, Poole found his name in the list of those that were to be cut off; and an incident befell him soon after which gave him the greatest apprehensions of his danger. Having passed an evening at the house of his friend, alderman Ahurst, he took one Mr. Chorley to bear him company home. When they came to the narrow passage which leads from Clerkenwell to St. John's Court, there were two men standing at the entrance; one of whom, as Poole came along, cried out to the other, "Here he is!" upon which the other replied, "Let him alone, for there is somebody with him." As soon as they had passed, Poole asked his friend if he had heard what those men said; and upon his answering that he had, "I shall be murdered to-night, if you had not been with me." It is said that before this incident, he gave not the least credit to what was said in Oates's deposition; but he soon thought proper to retire to Holland, where he died, in October, 1679, not without a suspicion of being poisoned, as Abington relates. He published several small pieces, besides what has been mentioned; and he also wrote a volume of English Annotations upon the Holy Scriptures, but was prevented by death from going farther than the 56th chapter of Isaiah. That work was completed by others, and published (1688) in two vols. Poole is spoken of as profound in learning, strict in piety, and universal in his charity. He was more especially distinguished as a commentator. Mr. Cecil observes, "Commentators are excellent where there are but few difficulties; but they lose the harder knots still untied; but after all, if we must have commentators, as we certainly must, Poole is incomparable, and I had almost said, abundant of himself." Wood observes that "he left behind him the character of a very celebrated critic and casuist," and Calamy tells us that "he very frequently chanced to be true to his friend, very strict in his piety, and universal in his charity." See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth. s. v.; Middleton, Evangel. Biogr. vol. iii; Gen. Biogr. Dict. s. v.

POOR. This word, in the Scriptures, often denotes not so much a man destitute of the good things of this world, as a man sensible of his spiritual wants. In this sense the greatest and richest men of the world are on a level with the poorest in the eyes of God. In the following treatment of the subject we combine the Scriptural and the Talmudic information.

I. Hebrew and Greek terms so rendered in the A. V. These are: 1. עֲרוֹבָּד (ערובד) [e'robd] (Sept. παρακάτων; Vulg. pauper); 2. בָּלָד (בלש) [balash]; 3. בָּשָּׁב (בשׁב) [bashav]; 4. נִבְאָה (ניבאה) [nivah]; 5. מִשְׁבָּה (משובה) [misbah]; 6. מְשָׁבָה (משובה) [misbah]; 7. נִבְאָה (ניבאה) [nivah]; 8. פָּרָה (פרה) [parah]; 9. פָּרָה (פרה) [parah]. In 2 Sam. xii. 1, בָּשָׁב (בָּשָׁב) [bashav], נִבְאָה (ניבאה) [nivah], נִבְאָה (ניבאה) [nivah], נִבְאָה (ניבאה) [nivah], נִבְאָה (ניבאה) [nivah], נִבְאָה (ניבאה) [nivah].
used in the sense of "afflicted," "humble," etc., e. g. Matt. vi, 3.

11. Jesekh Excitations.—The general kindly spirit of the poor towards the poor is sufficiently shown by such passages as Deut. xv, 7, for the reason that (ver. 11) "the poor shall never cease out of the land;" and a remarkable agreement with some of its directions is expressed in Job xxv, 19; xxiv, 8 sq., where among acts of oppression are particularly mentioned "taking away (a) pledge," and withholding the sheath from the poor (vers. 9, 10; xxi, 12, 16; xxxi, 17), "eating with" the poor (comp. Deut. xxvi, 12, etc.). See also such passages as Ezek. xviii, 12, 16, 17; xxix, 29; Jer. v, 20; xii, 13, 15; Lev. xix, 13, 15; Exod. ii, 24; Zech. vii, 10, and Exod. xxv, 1, 4; xxii, 28; Tobit viii, 29, 8. See ALMS.

Among the special enactments in their favor the following must be mentioned:

1. The right of gleaning. The "corners of the field" were not to be reaped, nor all the grapes of the vineyard to be gathered, the olive-trees not to be beaten a second time, but the stranger, fatherless, and widow to be allowed to gather what was left. So, too, if a sheaf forgotten was left in the field, the owner was not to return for it, but leave it for them (Lev. xix, 9, 10; Deut. xxiv, 19-22). In the times of the Judges the story of Ruth is a striking illustration (Ruth ii, 2, etc.). See CORNER; GLEANING.

2. From the produce of the land in sabbatical years the poor and the stranger were to have their portion (Exod. xxiii, 11; Lev. xxv, 6).

3. The poor in the jubilee year, with the limitation as to town homes (Lev. xxv, 35-38). See JUBILEE.

4. Prohibition of usury, and of retention of pledges, i.e. loans without interest enjoined (Lev. xxv, 33, 37; Exod. xxiii, 23-27; Deut. xxiii, 19-20; xxiv, 10-18). See Loans.

5. Permanent bondage forbidden, and manumission of Hebrew bondmen or bondswomen enjoined in the sabbatical and jubilee years, even when bound to a foreigner, and redemption of such previous to those years (Deut. xv, 12-15; Lev. xxv, 39-47; 43-44). See SLAVERY.

6. Portions from the tithes to be shared by the poor after the Levites (Deut. xiv, 28; xxvi, 12, 13). See TITHES.

7. The poor to partake in entertainments at the feasts of Weeks and Tabernacles (Deut. xvi, 11; 14; see Neh. viii, 10).

8. Daily payment of wages (Lev. xix, 13).

On the other hand, while equal justice was commanded to be done to the poor man, he was not allowed to make himself a judge over his neighbor, or to administer justice (Exod. xix, 11; Lev. xix, 15).

On the law of gleaming the Rabbinical writers founded a variety of definitions and refinements, which, notwithstanding their minute and frivolous character, were on the whole strongly in favor of the poor. They are collected in the treatise of Maimonides' Mishneh Jotim, translated by Prideaux (Ugolino, viii, 721), and specimens of their character will appear in the following titles: There are, he says, thirteen precepts, seven affirmative and six negative, gathered from Lev. xix, 13-19; xxiv, 19; Deut. xiv, xv, xxiv. On these the following questions are raised and answered: What is a "corner," a "handful?" What is to "forget" a sheaf? What is a "stranger?" What is to be done when a field or a single tree belongs to two persons; and further, when one of them is a gentile, or when it is divided by a road or by water; when insects or enemies destroy the crop? How much grain must a man give way by way of alms? Among prohibitions is one forbidding any proprietor to frighten away the poor by a savage beast. An Israelite is forbidden to take alms openly from a gentile. Unwise was it to take an oath to redeem a pledge, expressed in Job xxx, 25. Those who gave less than their due proportion were to be punished. Mendicants are divided into two classes, settled poor and vagrants. The former were to be relieved by the authorized collectors, but all are enjoined to maintain themselves if possible. Lastly, the claim of the poor to the portions prescribed is laid down as a positive right.

Principles similar to those laid down by Moses are inculcated in the N. T., as Luke iii, 11; iv, 18; Acts vi, 1; Gal. ii, 10; Jas. ii, 15. In later times mendicancy, which does not appear to have been contemplated by Moses, became frequent. Instances actual or hypothetical may be seen in the following passages: Mark x, 46; Luke xvi, 20, 21; xviii, 35; John ix, 8; Acts i, 2. See BEGGAR.

But notwithstanding this, the prophets often complain of the profusion of the rich, while the poor are left to perish, and especially of judicial oppression practiced upon them (Isa. x, 2; Amos ii, 7; Jer. v, 28; Ezek. xxii, 29; Zech. vii, 10). Among the later Jewish kindness to the poor was regarded as a prominent virtue (Job xxix, 16; xxx, 25; xxxi, 19 sq.; Tobit ii, 15, iv, 11; xii, 9; Luke xix, 8), and charitable self-denial often took this form (comp. Matt. vi, 2; Otho, Lex. Robb, p. 512). See ALMS. Beggars, in the proper sense, are unknown in the Mosaic economy (Deut. xv, 4; comp. Michaelis, M. Rech. ii, 458 sq.), yet such extremity of want was known in the Psa. of Solomons, and the procedure in such cases is referred to in Ps. cvi, 18. See PLEASMENT from God. In the New Testament, however, they are mentioned, as Mark x, 46; Luke xviii, 35; John ix, 8; Acts iii, 2, but only in the case of infirm persons.

On the whole subject, besides the treatise above named, see Mishna, Peuk. i, 2-8; ii, 7; Peshach. iv, 8; Selden, De jure Hebr. et Rom. ii, 6, p. 273; Archäol. d. Hebr. ii, 256; Michaelis, vol. ii, § 142, p. 248; Otho, Lex. Robb, p. 808. See POVERTY.

POOR, CHRISTIAN CARE OF THE. In the early Church great regard was had for those in want. As early as the Lord's day alms were distributed among the poor, and as soon as they had brought their sacred duties to a close, the lists of orphans, widows, aged, and poor were produced for consideration, and with a donation was ordered out of the funds of the Church. No heart-stirring appeal was necessary to touch the sympathies of the people of God, and no cold calculations of prudence regulated the distribution of alms: wherever there was an object of misery, or a proved necessity, there the treasures of the Church were expended. When the poor in any place were numerous, and the brethren in that place were unable to afford them adequate support, application was made to some richer Church in the neighborhood; and never was it known that the application was fruitlessly received. After the more complete organization of the Church, the poor had one fourth part in the distribution of the funds. They were distributed respectively to the bishop, the clergy, and the maintenance of the edifice. In Antioch, in the time of Chrysostom, three thousand poor people were thus provided for, and half that number were similarly supported at Rome in the days of Cornelius. In times of famine the plate of the church was sometimes melted down to support the poor. How pointedly Ambrose replies to the charge of sacrilege brought against him on this account by the Arians: "Is it not better that the bishop should melt the plate to sustain the poor, when other sustenance cannot be had, than that some sacrilegious enemy should carry it off by spoil and plunder? Will not our Lord expostulate with us on this account? Why did you suffer so many helpless persons to die with famine when you had gold to provide them sustenance? Why were so many captives orphans and widows? Why so many were suffered to be slain by the enemy? It had been better to have preserved the vessels of living men than lifeless metals." What answer can be returned to this? For what shall a man say? I was afraid lest the temple of God should want its ornaments. But Christ will answer, "My sacraments, which are not bought with gold, do not require gold, nor please me the more for being ministered in gold; the ornament of my sacraments is the redemption of believers.
of captives; and those are truly precious vessels which redeem souls from death. The very poor were often placed in the portico of the church to ask alms. Severe censure was also directed against those who permitted the poor to starve, or defrauded the Church of those dues which were set apart to maintain them. Many instances are recorded where churches in the early ages of their existence for the support of the poor, gave them to neighboring and foreign churches in distant parts.

On intelligence of any pressing necessity, ministers and people would hasten with their treasures to the relief of those whom they had never seen, but with whom they were united by the ties of the same faith and hope. Thus when a multitude of Christian men and women in Numidia had been taken captive by a horde of neighboring barbarians, and when the churches to which they belonged were unable to raise the sum demanded for their ransom, they sent deputies to the Church in the metropolis of North Africa, and no sooner had Cyprian, who was at the head of it, heard the statement of distress than he commenced a collection in behalf of the unfortunate slaves, and never relaxed his exertions till he had obtained a sum equivalent to about 20,000. Even the strong cities among the Nomad tribes in the desert contributed to the same end. And thus the Church in Africa, sending deputies all over the world, and meeting together with a letter full of Christian sympathy and tenderness.

"In the Roman Catholic states of Europe at the present day, the Church still remains, to a great extent, the public almoner. In Rome, a Commission of Aid has the general direction and administration of the general charities of the papal public charities. It is composed of a cardinal-president and fifteen members, among whom is the pope's chaplain. The city is divided into twelve districts, over each of which a member of the central council presides. Each parish is represented by its curé and two deputies—a layman and a dame de charité, named for three years—and has a secretary and a steward or treasurer, who are paid. The alms are given in money, tools, and clothes. Requests for assistance are addressed to the parochial body, from which they are sent to the district, and thence to the central council. The more urgent cases are referred to the cardinal-president, or the curé of the parish. Three brotherhoods search out cases of hidden poverty; and not only do all the religious associations, convents, and monasteries distribute relief, but there is hardly a noble or wealthy house which does not take a regular part in the assistance of the poor.

"In Spain, the state supports several asylums for lunatics, the blind, and the deaf-and-dumb. It also distributes a large sum annually among the provinces for the relief of the poor. An amount being bound purport to raise double the amount received from the state. The state also steps in for the relief of great calamities, and devotes a certain sum annually for the assistance of unfortunate Spaniards abroad. A general directory of the charitable and sanitary services superintends the parochial bodies charged with the distribution of assistance to the poor.

"In Austria, each commune is charged with the relief of its poor. All who have legal domicile, or, being unable to prove their domicile, are resident in the commune, are entitled to relief out of the general assessment. There is no special rate, and the administration is strictly municipal. In many provinces private charity is associated with public assistance, administered by the curé, a few chosen inhabitants, who are called 'Fathers of the Poor,' and an officer accountable to the commune. This system is called the 'Poor's Institutes;' and their funds are principally derived from private sources; but they receive a third part of the property of ecclesiastics who die intestate, and certain fines, etc. Applicants are subjected to minute inquiry as to the cause of their poverty, and by the curé. The poor are thus scaled according to age and necessity. The infirm poor, who have no relatives to reside with, are taken into hospitals established in almost every commune, where they receive, besides lodging, fire and light, clothing, medical care, and a small allowance in money to provide for their food and other wants. Children are either provided for in the homes of their parents, put into asylums, or boarded with people of probity, who receive a monthly payment, as in Scotland. The welfare of these children is superintended by the curé, the mayors, and the sanitary officers of the commune. Foundlings, lunatics, the blind, and the deaf-and-dumb are provided for by the commune. Vagrants are punished, and parents permitting children under fourteen to beg are liable to three months' imprisonment. Able-bodied vagrants are sent to houses of correction, and kept to work. Pawnbroking is a charitable institution in Austria, under government control; and many pawnbrokers established on the rest on endowments, and lend without interest. The trade is forbidden to private persons.

"In France, the relief of the poor is not compulsory, in so far as its distributors may, after making inquiry, refuse relief, except in the case of foundlings and lunatics. The minister of the interior has a general superintendence of the machinery of relief, as well as the immediate administration of many large hospitals and asylums. He also assists a great number of private charities. The administration of these charities is placed on the occurrence of great calamities. The departmental funds are called upon for the compulsory relief, but the commune is the main source of public assistance. Its duty is to see that no real suffering remains unrelieved, and that the nature of the relief is such as can most easily be given in the general community. The commune encourages and stimulates voluntary charities, and receives gifts for the benefit of the poor's funds. Except in Paris, the administration of the hospitals, and of the relief given at the houses of the poor, are under different management, the communes only interfering to supplement the funds of the hospitals, when these are insufficient. The mayor is president both of the administration of the hospitals and of the body for giving out-door relief (the bureau de bienfaisance). During industrial calamities the poor are sometimes employed in workshops supported by the public, and in public works. In Paris, since 1849, there has been a responsible director set over all the charities of the city. He manages the out-door relief through the medium of the committees of assistance, formerly called bureaux de bienfaisance, in each arrondissement. He is under the inspection of a council, composed as follows: the prefect of the Seine (president), the prefect of police, two members of the Municipal Council, two maires or deputy-maires, two members of the committees of the religious assistance, the general director of the first chamber, two requests, one physician and one surgeon practising at the hospitals, one professor of medicine, one member of the Chamber of Commerce, one member of the Council of Public, and five members taken from other classes than those above mentioned. Begging is forbidden, and punished, wherever there are establishments for the relief of the poor.

The poor-law of England, and recently of Scotland, too, is a civil enactment. Formerly, in Scotland, many shifts were tried. Beggary was often resorted to, and as often condemned by statute. In Scotland, at the end of the 17th century, Fletcher says, there were 200,000 beggars—more on account of national distress at that time than at other times—but never less, he affirms, than 100,000. Various severe acts had been passed from time to time, and cruel punishments—in such as scourging and branding with a hot iron. The famous act of 1579, in enumerating the various classes of beggars condemned, has the following: "All minstrels, sanguets, and tale-tellers, not avowed in special service, by some of the lords of Parliament or great burrowers; all those who are of the mixed blood, or of a sable race; all those who live by their common minstrelsy; all common labourers, being persons skilled in body, living idle, and fleeing labour; all counterfairets of licences to beg, or using the same, knowing them to be counterfeit; all vagabonds,
bound scholars of the universities of Saint Andrews, Glasgow, and Abirdene, not licensed by the rector and deane of facultie of the universities to ask almes; all schollers engaged in their studies to be schipbrokent, without they have sufficient testimonies."

The fines levied for ecclesiastical offences were often given to the poor, as may be seen in the notes to principal Lee's second volume of Church History. In 1645, 1644, and 1646, the general session of Edinburgh gives the following to the poor:

"1645.
Feb. 16.—Penalties and gifts for the use of the poor.
Given by Mr. Robert Smeaton as a voluntary gift... 100 marks. Penalty for Nell Turner and her partie... 16 marks.
Feb. 15.—Given by Geo. Stuart, advocate, for his marriage... 90 marks.
Given by Col. Hume's lady for private marriage with young Craigie... 90 marks.
Given by Sir John Smyth as a yeartie voluntary gift... 100 marks.
Given by Mr. Robt. Smyth for his private marriage... 90 marks.

"1644.
The six sessions ordain the ordinall poor enrolled to be threatened if they learn not the grounds of religion, and to be deprived of their weekly pensions if they cannot answer to the Catholique.
May 9.—By Mr. Lus Stuart and Isbel Allen, for ordination... 81 li. 6s. 6d.
By Robert Martin, for his private marriage... 90 marks.
March 13.—Given for Wm. Salmond, relief in ordination... 35 li. 6s. 6d."

See Farrar.

In the United States, the poor who are members of any ecclesiastical organization are usually provided for by that body. Besides, the churches voluntarily assume very frequently the care of non-believers. In the Protestant Episcopal and in the Methodist Episcopal churches collections for the poor are taken on communion Sundays. Many churches make it the practice to take the poor collection every first Sabbath in the month.

POOR DANIEL, D.D., a Congregational minister and missionary to India, was born June 27, 1789, in Danvers, Mass. He graduated at Dartmouth College in 1812; was ordained June 21, 1816, with the intention of becoming a missionary, and sailed Oct. 23 for Ceylon, which he reached March 22, 1816. He commenced to labor at Tillipally, Jaffna, and returned after July, 1827. When he went to Batticaloa, to superintend the missionary work in that country. In 1839 he returned to Madras, the mainland, and returned to Ceylon in 1841. He came home in 1848, and spent about two years in the service of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, visiting various parts of the country, delivering addresses, and otherwise aiding the existing missionary enterprise. He sailed again to Ceylon in 1850, and took his station at Mampy, where he died of cholera, Feb. 2, 1855. He is the author of various publications in the Tamil and English languages. See Sprague, Annales of the Amer. Pulpit, ii, 107.

POOR CATHOLICS. See WALDENSERS.

POORES is the name of the little town situated near the temples where the Juggernaut worship is performed by the Hindus. It is situated in the province of Orissa (q. v.), in the south-eastern part of India, and is a dirty little town, with a district of about ten miles of like name, within which the temples are located. It constitutes a part of the endowment of the temple, nobody being allowed to enter the territory without paying a prescribed fee. The population of the town is about seventy-five thousand, there being among the number about four thousand priests, who attend daily upon the temple. Here is found probably one of the greatest stores of gold in India, and it might be called the greatest seat of Brahminical power. The stone wall enclosing the great temples is about thirty feet high, and the area forms a rectangle of six hundred and fifty feet by six hundred and sixty. Within this wall are a number of smaller temples. A visit to these temples is enjoined upon a Hindu as one of the most important acts in the ritual of his religion, and year after year the Mussulman is reported to represent his name from every section of the country. See the literature quoted under the article JAGGERNAUT.

POOR MEN'S BOX is a chest put up usually at the church entrance for the deposit of alms (q. v.). It is found on the continent of Europe not only in the churches, but also in the synagogues. The "Poor Men's Box (unamens, porsa or oblationes fiaciens)" is a box affixed near the high-altar, and was introduced there by archbishop Cramner, to serve in lieu of pilgrimage. In 1559 it was enjoined in every church in England. As architectural specimens, many of these "boxes" are a curiosity. Thus there is a curious alms-box in St. Helen's, Bishopsgate, supported by the figure of a mendicant, and another at Outwell, with a grinning mouth. The idea for the style of these boxes was probably derived from such objects as the bracket of the 15th century adjoining the tomb of Edward II at Gloucester, and the oaken box with a slit for alms used at St. Richard's shrine at Chichester, which is of the 16th century, although the iron-work dates back three hundred years earlier. There is a wooden alms-box of the 14th century at Évreux, the town of St. David, at Bridlington. A flasket or box of wood for collecting alms is mentioned in England in the 17th century. At Selby there is a chest made out of the bole of a single tree. In 1292 such hutchs were forbidden at Chichester, as the oblations hitherto made at the altar were placed in them. At St. David's, two centuries ago, old people could remember having seen basins of oblations made by seamen and passengers.

POOR OF LYONS. See WALDENSERS.

POOR PILGRIMS, an order that started up in the year 1500. They came out of Italy into Germany bare-footed and bare-headed, feeding all the week, except on Sundays, upon herbs and roots sprinkled with salt. They remained not above twenty-four hours in a place. They went by couples, begging from door to door. This penance they undertook voluntarily—some for three, others for five or seven years, as they pleased, and then returned home to their callings. See WALDENSERS.

POOR PRIESTS were those of the Lollards who in the 14th and 15th centuries wandered about the country holding what are called in modern times "missions" wherever they pleased, without any cure of souls being given to them, or license by the bishop of the diocese. The name poor seems to show an association of idea with the Pythecrae Catholici (q. v.), or the Poor of Lyons.

POPE. Having treated in the article PAPACY of the rise and development of the papal dignity and power, we shall speak in the present article of the personal attributes of the incumbent of the Roman see.

I. The Title.—The word pope is derived from the Latin papas, Greek πάπας, and means father. While the Greek word was used in the Greek Church to designate both bishops and priests, and has gradually come to be reserved for the priests exclusively, the Latin term was for several centuries a title applied to all bishops, and was finally reserved for the bishops of Rome. As far as is known, bishop Siricius, in the 4th century, was the first who was accorded the title. After the 5th century it came into more general use, and after the 7th it gradually disappeared from ecclesiastical language for every ecclesiastical dignity except that of the bishop of Rome. It was expressly made the exclusive prerogative of that dignitary by Gregory VII. In a like manner several other titles, which at first were applied to the bishops of the principal sees, such as apostolicus, dominus apostolicus, sedes apostolica, were gradually monopolized by the bishops of Rome. The designation
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servus servorum Dei was first used by Gregory I, and though occasionally also bishops, priests, and emperors adopted it, it likewise remained in the course of time the prerogative of the popes. During the 8th and the following centuries it was common to call the bishop of Rome vicarius Petri. The expression occurs in the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals, in the oath which was taken in 722 by Boniface to Gregory II, in the oath taken by Gregory VII to the king of Germany, in the conclusion of peace between Alexander III and the emperor Frederick Barbarossa; but from the time of Innocent III, when the power of the popes had become more absolute, the vicarius Petri gave way to the vicarius Christi. The title Sanctitas tua or Beatiudu tua, which came into use in the 9th or 4th century, the pope shares even now with the bishops of the Eastern Church. It is accorded to him even by Protestant governments. (See Brit. and For. Rev. Jan. 1866, p. 48 eq.)

II. Rights and Functions.—1. Personal Prerogatives.—The rights claimed by the popes within the Roman Catholic Church, and accorded to them by the bishops, priests, and laity of the Church, have of course greatly varied according to the degrees of power which the incumbents of the Roman see attained in various periods of Church history. For a long time they claimed and received as bishops of Rome and patriarchs of the West only those rights and honors which also belonged to other bishops and patriarchs. See Bishop; Patriarch. When their superiority over other bishops and patriarchs came finally to be recognised and established, the popes were by no means regarded as absolute rulers of the Church, but their rights were limited and circumscribed by general councils and secular princes. While the popes were with an unyielding consistency endeavoring to develop the extreme papal system which now prevails, many of the greatest scholars of the Church defended an episcopal system which assigned to the pope a position similar to that of a constitutional monarch, and, in particular, maintained the superiority of a general council over the pope. At the general councils of Constance and Basel the friends of this view had an undisputed majority; and in the following centuries the history of Gallicanism, of Febriorius, of Joseph II, are some of many proofs that in several countries the episcopal system had numerous adherents, even among bishops. After having been long on the decline, the episcopal system in the Roman Catholic Church was totally extinguished by the Vatican Council, and the extensive rights which the pope, in the course of many centuries, had claimed as their exclusive monopoly, were recognised by the entire Church. A common division of the papal rights is that into jurisdiction and intrinsecum and praesidium et praestigium. The former comprises the sovereign law of legislation, the supreme administration and the final decision on all subjects relating to ecclesiastical offices, especially the right of confirming, consecrating, transferring, and deposing bishops; the regulation of all religious institutions, especially of the religious orders; the supreme ecclesiastical jurisdiction, the supreme right of supervision, and the supreme management of ecclesiastical finances and property; the highest authority in all doctrinal questions. In the decision of doctrinal questions the popes have long claimed infallibility (q.v.), and the Vatican Council has recognised this claim as a doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church. The pope has also the supreme right of regulating the divine worship, of granting indulgences (q.v.), and the sole right of beatifying and canonising deceased members of the Church. See Beatification; Canonization. The primatus honoris comprises the following distinctions: 1. The tiara, also called mitra turbinata cum corona, triregnum, regnum, diadema, phrygium, consisting of the bishop's cap (mitra) ornamented with a triple golden crown. It is for the first time mentioned in the forged donation of Constantine (8th century), and was for the first time used at the coronation of Nicholas II (858). The third crown was added to the mitra by Urban V (1362-1370). The pope receives it on the day of coronation in the loggia of St. Peter's Church from two cardinal deacons, who place it upon his head with the words, "Acipe tiaram tribus coronis ornatum et scias, patrem te esse principum et regum, rectorem orbis in terra, vicarium salvatoris nostri Jesu Christi, cui est honor in secula seculorum. The pope only wears the tiara at great ecclesiastical festivities and processions, but not during the performance of ecclesiastical functions. 2. The so-called pedum rectum, the straight bishop's staff ornamented with a cross, but not the crooked episcopal pastoral staff. 3. The pallium, a vestment having the form of a scarf, composed of white wool, and embroidered with six black silk crosses. The pope sends it as a mark of honor to patriarchs, primates, metropolitanans, and sometimes to bishops, all of whom are only allowed to wear it within their own dioceses and on certain occasions, while the pope wears it always and everywhere on saying mass. 4. The so-called adovaria, a hommage which in the old Oriental Church was shown to bishops and priests generally. It consists in kneeling down and kissing the pope's foot. Gregory VII still demanded it from princes, the Dictatus Gregorii saying on this subject, "Quod solius papae pedes omnes principes deoculcent." The kiss upon the cross on the pope's shoes is still demanded from clergymen and laymen, but an exception is made with princes and personae of higher rank. Sovereign princes only kiss the hand, cardinals the foot and the hand, after which they are admitted to an embrace; archbishops and bishops the foot and the knee. 5. During the Middle Ages the popes received from the princes the officium stippe, the princes holding the stirrups when the pope mounted the horse, and leading the horse for a while. Among the princes who are recorded to have rendered this homage were Louis II, Henry VI, Henry VII, Frederick III, Charles V, and Philip IV of France. Of Frederick Barbarossa, pope Adrian IV complained that he held the left, instead of the right stirrup. 2. Inves, etc.—At home the pope's habit is a white silk cassock, rochet, and scarlet mantle. In winter he wears a fur cap; in summer a satin one. When he celebrates mass, the color of his habit varies according to the so-
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The solemnity of the festival. At Whitsuntide, and all festivals of the martyrs, he officiates in red; at Easter, and all festivals of virgins, in white; Lent, Advent, and eves of fasting-days, in violet; and on Easter-eve, and at all masses for the dead, in black. All these colors are said to be typical: the red expresses the clemency of the festival, the blood of the martyrs; the white, the joy caused by our Saviour's resurrection, and the chastity of virgins; the violet, the pale aspect of those who fast; and the black, grief and mourning. The tiara is a cincture, with three coronets, rising one above another, and adorned with jewels. Paul II was the first who added the ornaments of precious stones to his crown. The jewels of Clement VIII's crown were valued, they say, at 500,000 pieces of gold. That of Martin V had five pounds and a half weight of pearls in it. "Nor is there anything unreasonable in this (says Father Bonani), since the pope governs the kingdom of Christ in quality of his vicar: now this kingdom is infinitely superior to all the kingdoms of the universe. The high-priest of the Jews wore on his head and breast the riches which were to represent the majesty of the Supreme God. The pope represents that of the Saviour of the world, and nothing better expresses it than riches." We must not omit that the two strings of the tiara are said to represent the two different manners of interpreting the Scriptures, the mystical and the literal. The pope has two seals. One is called "the fisherman's ring," and is the impression of Peter holding a line with a bait to it in the water. It is used for briefs sealed with wax. The other seal bears the figures of Peter and Paul, with a cross on one side; and on the other an effigy, with the name of the reigning pope. This is used for the bulls, which are sealed with lead. On the decease of a pope these seals are defaced and broken by the cardinal-chamberlain in the presence of three others. When the pope goes in procession to St. Peter's, the cross is carried before him on the end of a pike about ten palms long. "Many reasons," says Father Bonani, "authorize this custom. It is a monument of the sufferings of Jesus Christ, and of the pope's adherence to the Saviour of the world. It is the true mark of the pontifical dignity, and represents the authority of the Church, as the Roman faces did that of the consuls." At the same time two grooms bear two fans on each side of his holiness's chair, to drive away the flies. This (according to the above-cited author) represents the scapulium covering the face of God with their wings.

3. Officers. — The pope has a Vicar who is always a cardinal. He who manages that charge has jurisdiction over the priests and regulars, over the lay-communities, hospitals, places of piety, and Jews. His place may be worth to him two hundred ducats per month. He has two lieutenants, one for civil and the other for criminal affairs, and a vicegerent, who is a bishop, for the exercise of episcopal functions.

The Penitentiary has jurisdiction in cases referred to the pope; and gives to approved confessors power to absolve. At solemn feasts he goes into one of the churches of Rome, where, sitting in a high chair, he has a switch in his hand, and bears the confession of particular cases. This place is worth eight thousand crowns a year.

The Chancellor was properly secretary to the pope, ab initio. This charge is now bestowed upon none but a cardinal, and it may be worth to him fifteen or sixteen thousand crowns a year. His business is to despatch the apostolic letters, except those signed by the pope, which are despatched by a brief ex aequo et consilio episcopiorum. He has under him a regent, and twelve abbreviators di parco maggiore, who are all prelates. The regent has power to commit all causes of appeal to the rota and referendaries. The abbreviators di parco maggiore draw the bulls, and send them when they are written. Besides these, there are abbreviators di parco minor, who are curators, and other officers of the chancery, appointed to receive and sign bulls. The vice-chancellor keeps a register of the collection of titles given to cardinals, and of promotions to bishoprics and consistorial abbey.

The Chamberlain is always a cardinal, and has for substitutes the clerks of the apostolic chamber, a treasurer, and a president. This office is worth to him fourteen thousand crowns a year. He takes cognizance of all causes within the verge of the apostolic chamber, and, besides, judges of appeals from the masters of the streets, bridges, and edifices. When the see is vacant, the chamberlain remains in the palace, in the pope's apartment, goes through the streets with the Swiss guards attending him, coins money with his own arms thereon, and holds a consistory. He is one of the three chief treasurers of the Castle of St. Angelo, whereof the dean is another, and the pope the third.

The Prefect of the signature of justice is also one of the cardinals, and has two hundred ducats in gold per month. His office is to make records of all the petitions and the commissions of causes which are delegated by the court. Every Thursday the signature of justice is held in the palace of the cardinal-prefect, where assist twelve prelates-referendaries, that have votes, and all the other referendaries, with power to propose each two causes; as also an auditor of the rota, and the civil auditor of the cardinal-vicar, having no vote, but only to maintain their jurisdiction in what relates to them. The prefect of the signature of grace signs all the petitions and grants which the pope bestows in the congregations held in his own presence once a week. The prefect of the briefs is always a cardinal; he revises and signs the copies of the briefs.

The General of the Holy Church is created by a brief of the pope, who gives him the staff himself in his chamber, and takes his oath. In time of peace he allowed him a thousand crowns per month, and three thousand in time of war. He commands all the troops and all the governors in the places and fortresses of the ecclesiastical estate. His lieutenant has three thousand crowns a year, and is made also by a brief from the pope, as is the general of the artillery, who has twelve hundred crowns per annum.

The governor of the Castle of St. Angelo has six thousand crowns per annum.
The pope has four Masters of Ceremonies, who are always clad in purple, and have great authority in public affairs. Besides these, there are other masters of the ceremonies, which are in the congregations of privileges invested with the office of secretary, and the other despatches orders.

The Master of the Sacred Palace is always a Dominican. He reviews and approves all the books that are printed, being assisted by two priests of the same order. The palace, besides a table, allows him a coach.

The Chancellor for the commissary and household of the pope, is always a prelate. The chamberlains of honor are persons of quality, who come to the palace when they please.

The Master of the Stables is a gentleman who has the office of master of the horse, without the title of it; for the pope bestows no such upon any person. He is sword-bearer, and sometimes one of the greatest lords in Rome, as was Pompey Frangipani under Leo II.

The Vestry-keeper is an Augustine monk, who has the same allowance as the master of the palace. He takes care of all the riches in the pope's vestry. He goes like a prelate; and if he be a titular bishop, takes place among the assistant bishops.

The pope's Secretary is always a cardinal, and very often his nephew. This place is united to that of superior of the cardinal house in several envoys who write and subscribe all the letters sent to the princes and nuncios. All ambassadors and all ministers at Rome, after having negotiated with the pope, are obliged to give him an account of their negotiations. The secretaries of state are subject to the secretary superintendent, or cardinal-patron, whose orders they receive, and to whom they sent their letters to be subscribed. They live in the palace, and are prelates clad in purple.

There are twenty-four Secretaries of Briefs, the chief of whose lives in the palace. Their business is to subscribe and dispatch the briefs that the cardinal-prefect of the briefs. The secretary of the secret briefs takes care to prepare them when the cardinal-patron or some one of the secretaries of state commands him. These briefs are shown to nobody, nor signed by the prefect of the briefs, except when they are sealed sub anno piscesaria, and accompanied with a letter from the cardinal-patron. The copies of these briefs are carefully kept; and, when the pope is dead, they are carried to the Castle of St. Angelo.

The pope of Rome has from two civil judges, one of whom is called the first collateral judge, and the other the second collateral, a judge for criminal affairs. He, together with these judges, takes cognizance of matters between the citizens and inhabitants of Rome. He is always a foreigner, and lives in the palace, while in the disbursements in his office he appears clad like an old senator, having a robe of cloth of gold that hangs down to the earth, with large sleeves to it lined with red taffeta.

A. Official Power.——As we have seen above, the pope of Rome is now the supreme head of what is known as the Roman Catholic world. Held to be the successor of the apostle Peter, the pope is claimed to be Christ's vicar on earth. The Council of Florence, 1439, says: —"Definition, Sanctum apostolicam Sedem et Romanum Pontificem in universum orbem tenere primatum, et ipsum Pontificem Romanum successorum esse Petri principis apostolorum, et verum Christi vicariam, totiusque Ecclesiae caput et omnium Christianorum patrem ac doctorem existere, et ipsi in B. Petro passendi, regendi ac gubernandi universalem Ecclesiam a Domino Dominum necesse habere potestato postea tradere tra

Romanam Ecclesiam omnium Ecclesiarum matrem et magistram agnoscere; Romanoque Pontifici, beati Petri apostolorum principis successoris ac Jesu Christi vicario, veram omniesiam spondendo ac juro." As such he is to invest with the benefices invested by the law necessary for the government of the Universal Church. This embraces authority to examine and decide authoritatively all controversies, to convolve councils, to revise and confirm their decrees, to issue general decrees, whether upon discipline and morals or upon doctrine, to appoint bishops in all parts of the Church; and upon the confirmation of the pope, by the clergy or by the civil authorities, no matter how it may have been made; he can also depose bishops, and set others in their place, and even, in cases of great emergency, suppress bishoprics, and change their ecclesiastical limits according to his judgment of the existing requirements of the Church; he is also to judge of the doctrines taught in particular books or by particular individuals, and to pronounce infallibly as to their conformity with the Catholic faith, or the contrary. In addition to these powers, it is still further claimed for him by the Ultramontanes, as we have seen above and in the article Infallibility, that he is endowed by God with infallibility; so that what he says ex cathedra, i.e. officially and as pope, is of divine authority, and cannot be questioned or denied; and that also, as the representative of God, he has the right by virtue of his office to exercise over the civil rulers and civil jurisdiction, the allegiance of all the faithful to him being superior to that which is due to their respective governments. See PRIMACY.

The principal scriptural authority for the papacy relied upon by Catholics is Isaiah xi. 2. (The sceptre shall not depart from the house of David, nor the throne of Jacob, and from his feet, until he come and be anointed with the oil of gladness.) Again, vii. 18, 19. Without entering into a discussion of the meaning of this famous passage, we may here quote from Abbott's Commentary on the New Testament, a statement of the Roman Catholic interpretation, and the ground on which that view is rejected by all Protestants:

"The ordinary rule of the Roman Catholic Church is that Christ declared his purpose to found a great ecclesiastical organization; that this organization was to be built upon Peter and his successors as its true foundation; that they were to represent to all time the authority of God upon the earth, being clothed in the authority of their office, with a continuous inspiration, and authorized by the Word, and fitted by the indwelling Spirit of God, to guide, direct, illumine, and command; and that the chief officers of Christ, with the same force and effect as Christ himself (see Phillips, Kirchenrecht, i. 146). See art. Peter. This view is supported by the following remarks of the Roman Catholic commentator, who does not, as we have seen, refer to a definite ecclesiastical organization by the word church, and would not be so understood by the Ultramontanes. 2. Peter is to be a rock-like; he was, on the contrary, characteristically imitative and human; also, he was of little importance save for other distinguishing words (see 'Thou art a rock' which the Roman Catholic interpretation bases. 3. Neither he nor the other apostles understood that they were invested him with any such authority and position. He did not occupy any such place in the Church while he lived. In the first council at Jerusalem (Acts xv. 7-11) he was simply an adviser, the office of chief or president being apparently held by James; Paul withstood Peter to his face, as no disciple ever withstood Christ, or would have withstood his acknowledged representative (Gal. ii. 11-14); and throughout the N.T. the apostles are all treated as co-equals (Matt. xviii. 1; xix. 8, 9; xxiii. 8; John xv. 1-5; Rev. xxi. 14). 4. There is neither here nor anywhere else in the N.T. any mention of a successor to Peter's authority in him to appoint a successor, or of any such authority vested in any of the apostles, or supposed to be assumed to be exercised, by any of them. 5. The N.T. throughout, and the O.T. in all its prophecies, recognizes Christ as the chief corner-stone, the foundation on which the kingdom of God can alone be built. 6. Mark and Luke omit from their account this utterance of Christ; if it really existed, as it is the foundation of the Roman Catholic Church, and was thus essential and not incidental to the right understanding of the whole incident, it would not be omitted from their accounts." See ROOS.

Few Christian governments have ever been willing to recognise to their full extent the rights claimed by and for the Roman popes. The placet (q.v.) was introduced in the Middle Ages by most of the states, and without its consent, it is stated, no treaty by the pope. It was found necessary to consent to the conclusion of special concordats (q.v.) or conventions, which, in
the way of compromise, regulated the papal rights which a state government bound itself to recognise.

Many popes in the Middle Ages also claimed the power of deposing kings, of abolishing the subjects of certain princes, and of taking away their allegiance, and, in general, an unlimited power over temporal as well as spiritual affairs. That a number of popes assumed this right is a fact admitted on all sides; but it is quite common among Roman Catholics to deny that this is a right in the sense in which the papacy, and also that they were claimed by the popes as a right belonging to them in virtue of their office. A few samples of pontifical arrogance may suffice for illustration here:

 Pope Pachom I., In 1096, deposed Henry IV., and excited enemies to persecute him; telling them that they could not offer a more acceptable sacrifice to God than by impounding him who endeavored to take the kingdom from God's Church. "For thy
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Fealty and defence of God's holy Church, in the name of Almighty God, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, I depose from imperial and papal administration king Henry, son of Henry sometime emperor, who too boldly and rashly hath laid hands on thy Church; and I assign unto me the empire from that city whereunto they were wont to plight their faith unto true kings; for it is right and seemly that they doth en

deer to diminish the majesty of the Church. Go to, therefore, most holy princes of the apostles, and what I say is to thee, so far is thy authority, that all may now at length understand, if ye can blind and lose in heaven, that ye also can upon earth take away and give, enfeoff and enfeoff, and whatsoever ye will, and whatsoever ye have; for ye can judge things belonging unto God, what is to be done or omitted, and that ye have the power of life and death, 7 and to sentence, and to sentence, and to sentence, is to be done and done. For it is thy part to judge angels, who govern proud princes, what becometh it you to do towards their service. All secular now, and all secular powers, learn from this man's example what ye can do in heaven, and in what esteem ye are with God; and let them henceforth fear to slight commandments, because they cannot do as suddenly he judged, that all men may understand that not caste, but by your means, this son of iniquity deth fallen from his kingdom." Pope Boniface VIII., in 1305, has a decree extant in the canon law running thus: "We declare, say, define, pronounce it to be the duty and obligation of every human creature to be subject to the Roman pontiff. One soul must be under another, and the temporal authority must be subject to the spiritual power, whence, if the earthly power doth so straitly, it must be judged by the spiritual power." Before him, pope Innocent III. affirmed "the pontifical authority so much to exceed the royal power, as the sun doth the moon; and supplies to the former the words of the prophet Jeremiah, Boon, constitui super gentes et regnas. See, I have set thee over the nations and kingdoms, to pull down, and to tread with the heel under mischief; to destroy and to throw down." Of this power that pope made especial use by deposing the emperor Richelieu, and compelling him to abdicate. "As he believed to the apostolical see, he first did strike with an anathema; then him persevering in his obstinacy, did, in a second edict, Rome's temporal power depose from empire." This monstrous authority was avowed by that great council under this pope; according to the council, he did represent or constitute the Church, when it was ordained that if a "temporal lord, being re

olled and admonished by the Church, should neglect to purge his territory from heretical thity, he should, by the metropolitan and the other comprovincial bishops, be removed in the band of excommunication; and that if he should slight to make satisfaction within a year, it should be signified to the pope, that he might from that time, pronounce the subjects absolved from their fealty to him, and expose the territory to be seized on by Catholics." Pope Urban II., in his time, begins his homily on Queen Elizabeth in these words: "He that reigneth on high, to whom is given all power in heaven and in earth, hath committed the keys of the kingdom of heaven to the Church, and of whom there is no satiation, to one alone, on earth, namely, to Peter, prince of the apostles, and to his successors, the Roman pontiff, appointed to be an apostolic successor of Peter to be governed with a plenteous power. This one he hath constituted prince over all nations, king over all Rome, that he may, as the chief to all dominion, dignity, and privilege whatsoever; and absolves all the nobles, subjects, and people, of the earth, and wheresoever they live, from their oath, and all duty whatsoever, in regard of dominion, fidelity, and obedience." The pope who had to take the crown of君, king of Navarre, and the prince of Condé, begins thus: "The au
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thority given to St. Peter and his successors, by the imperial power of the Eternal King, is the power of earthly kings and princes. It passes uncontrollable sentence upon them all; and if it find any of them resisting God's ordinance, it takes more severe vengeance of them, casting them down from their thrones, though never so pleasant, and trembling them down to the lowest parts of the earth, and by degrees doth then proceed to thunder against them. "We deprive them and their posterity forever of the dominion and kingdom." And accordingly he deprives those princes of their kingdoms and dominions, absoles their subjects from their allegiance, and obliges all to pay any obedience to them. "By the authority of these presents, we do absole and set free all persons, as well jointly as severally, every one of them, and all their natal family, and all their kin that are whatsoever in regard of dominion, fidelity, and obedience; and do charge and forbid all and every of them that they do not dare to act, or, any of their ordinances, laws, and commands." For a full review of this question, see GALICIAN CHURCH; INVESTITURE; TEMPORAL POWER.

III. The Election of the Pope.—In the 2d and 3d centuries the bishops of Rome were, like all the bishops of the ancient Church, elected by the clergy and the people. When Christianity was declared to be the state religion, the emperors claimed a share in the election of the pope. The clergy of Rome greatly disliked the interference of the emperors in the election of their bishops, and, after the destruction of the Western Roman empire in 476, they endeavored to deprive the emperor of the right to elect the bishop. This machiavellian indication to the Roman clergy the exclusive right of electing the bishop. Three years later, 502, the Roman synod declared a decree issued by Odoacer, who as successor of the Roman emperor demanded that no bishop of Rome should be elected "nine months after the death of an emperor," as a violation of the rights of the Church. That Odoacer paid no attention to these resolutions is proved by the fact that in 514 he had a share in the election of Felix III. The Gothic kings Theodoric and his successors, as well as Justinian I and the Byzantine emperors, likewise disregarded the rights of the Church. They are known to have appointed or confirmed several popes—as Vigilius, Pelagius I., and Pelagius II. The so-called Liber diurnus, a collection of formulas of the councils of Carthage, which relates to the time from the 6th to the 8th century, and received its present shape in the 8th century, expressly mentions that the Roman bishops elected by the clergy and the people were confirmed by the Greek emperor, or his representative, the exarch of Ravenna. The weak rule of the last Longobardian kings, and the imposition of the emperors in Constantinople, greatly favored the endeavors of the popes to exclude altogether the influence of princes from the papal elections. During the reign of Pepin the Short and Charlemagne the elections were entirely free, and the report that a Roman synod held at Rome in 774, had no influence upon Charlemagne in the right of confirming the elected pope is a forgery. The popes of this time only notified Pepin and Charles of the result of the elections. The beneficent influence which was soon after obtained by the Roman nobility upon the elections of the popes induced again an interference of the temporal power, and in 824 Lothair, the son of Louis le Debonnaire, entered into an agreement with Eugenius II., according to which the consecration of a newly elected pope was not to take place without the concurrence of an imperial delegate. This agreement remained in force throughout the following century. In the 10th century Otto the Great rescued the Church from the most disgraceful condition in which it had yet found itself, and rid it of some of the most wicked popes which have ever disgraced the see of Rome. It was quite common in those days to look upon the emperor as the chief pillar of reform, and it is therefore not to be wondered at that a greater influence was accorded to him than had been possessed by any of his predecessors. When he entered the city of Rome, the people, according to Luitprand, answered, "O God, give the emperor a substitute, motordoc praetor consensum atque electionem domini imperatoris Ottomis Cesaribus Augusti filiique regis Otto

Ottokar." After the Synod of Sutri had, in 1046, deposed
all the three popes, the Roman people conferred upon Henry III, for himself and his successors, the right "in electione semper ordinandi pontificis principatum." Henry III, as the successor of the German popes Clement II, Leo IX, and Victor II, for which he consulted only his German advisers, as if it had been an affair of the German empire. After the death of Henry III, the influence of Hildebrand upon the popes of that time soon brought on the beginning of a new era in the history of the papacy. One of the events which mark the beginning of this new era is the radical change which was made in the papal elections by the famous decree of Nicholas II and the Lateran Synod in 1059. The essential point of the decree was the substitution of the papal election to the cardinal-bishops, the total abolition of the former concurrence of the Roman people and nobility, and the virtual abolition of the former imperial right; for the words "salvo debo honore et reverentia" do not appear to imply more than the right of the emperor to demand a notification of the result of the election. The emperors were to possess the insignificant rights which were left to them only as a personal privilege, for the conferring of which every new emperor had to make an application. The decree of Nicholas II was confirmed by that of Alexander III and the Lateran Synod of 1178, which made the validity of the papal election contingent upon a two-thirds vote of the cardinals. The defeat of the emperor Frederick Barbarossa in his struggle with the papacy put an end forever to even the nominal rights of the imperial right. The first provisions concerning the conclave were made by Gregory X and the Council of Lyons in 1274. The town for holding the conclave (c. v.) was not to be exclusively Rome, but the city in which the pope died; and in case he stayed under an adjacent city, the place for the conclave was the episcopal palace. The provisions of the decree of Gregory X were somewhat, though not essentially, modified by Clement V (1305-1314) and Clement VI (1352-1355). The councils of Pisa, Constance, and Baele elected new popes, without binding themselves to the papal provisions concerning the conclave; but in this as in many other respects their proceedings were of an exceptional character, and were without abiding consequences in the law of the Church. In 1621 Gregory XV issued the constitution *Etsur Petri filiis*, which contained all the principal provisions in regard to the conclave that are now in use. In a few points only it was supplemented by bulls of Urban VIII (1625) and Clement XII (1732).

The present mode of electing a pope has been fully described in the article CONCLAVE. The right of voting is limited to the cardinals who have been ordained deacons. The lack of this ordination may, however, be supplied by a special privilege of the pope. The cardinals do not lose their right of voting even by excommunication, but they can cast their votes only if they are personally present in the conclave. Those who live outside of the city of Rome are not specially invited. Since Boniface IX (1389) all the popes have been taken from the College of Cardinals, but in a legal point of view the eligibility of the pope is not conditioned by his being a cardinal. The decree of Nicholas II abolished a former provision by a Roman synod which demanded it, and since then a number of popes have been elected who were not cardinals. Urban III, elected in 1185, was only archbishop of Milan; Urban IV (1261) was patriarch of Jerusalem; Clement V (1305), archbishop of Bordeaux; Urban VI, with whose election in 1378 the papal schism began, was archbishop of Bari. Celestine V (1294) was an eremite, who after a long conclave was agreed upon by two contending parties as a mere figurehead. Urban V (1366) was elected at the third transon of pope Pius IX, the empire of Germany will claim this right, in order to prevent the election of the candidate of the Jesuits. Long usage causes the selection of the candidate from the Italian cardinals. Several popes, like Celestine V, have been elected on a very small number, in the course of the Middle Ages, have been deposed by the emperors; and in the 15th century the councils of Pisa, Constance, and Baele claimed and exercised the right of deposing the pope. The principle, first enounced by the Council of Trent, that the Pseudo-Lawrence Declaratory, the act obtained by the advocates of the extreme papal system, that the apostolic see is not judged by any one ("apostolica sedes a nemine judicatur"), has more and more been accepted by the Church; and after the Vatican Council it would appear to be impossible that the Catholic world would again recognize the right of the papal see except those caused by the voluntary resignation or the death of the incumbent.

The coronation and consecration ceremonies attending the inauguration of the pope are of a very solemn and impressive character, and it is necessary to give a description in the words of an eye-witness:

"About eleven o'clock the procession began to arrive from the Quirinal Palace. It was immensely long. The cardinals were in their state carriages, and each was accompanied by several carriages full of attendants. The senator and governor of Rome formed part of the train. The pope was in a state coach drawn by six black horses, and preceded by a procession on foot, consisting of a large cross. The procession went round by the back of St. Peter's, and the pope went up to the Sixtine Chapel, where various ceremonies were performed which I did not see. In about half an hour the procession entered the central portion of the church, and on its arrival the lowest orders of the clergy came first, then bishops, archbishops, cardinals, and, lastly, the pope. He was borne aloft on a throne, carried by six or eight men. The choir singing, *Ecce suus esperans*—"Behold the great priest!" At the chapel of the Salvatoris he stopped and addressed the host assembled, and then borne forward to the area of the altar, and, passing by the side of it, alighted in a space enclosed by the space of the pope was set on the east side. He walked up to the altar, prayed at the foot of it, ascended the steps, and seated himself on the middle of the altar, on the very spot where the chas- trium or pyx, containing the host, usually stands. The cardinals in succession went through the ceremony of adoration. This ceremony is performed after quitting the conclave, *secundus*, in the Sixtine Chapel before the procession comes into St. Peter's; and now, for the third time, each cardinal prostrated himself before the pope, then kissed his toe, or rather his slipper, next kissed his hand, which was not bare, but enveloped in the robe of his robes; and, lastly, the pope embraced each twice, and when all had gone through this ceremony, the pope rose and blessed his blessing on his head. He then sat down, and retired in a sedan chair, on the back of which there is embroidered in gold a dove, to represent the Holy Spirit." On the Sabbath after his solemn installation his holiness performs mass at an altar of the richest decoration, the pontifical mantle and tiara adorned with the greatest cardinal-deacon, who addresses him thus: "Receive the holy mantle, the plenitude of the pontifical office, to the honor of Almighty God, and of the blessed Virgin Mary, his mother, and of the blessed apostles Peter and Paul, and of all the holy patriarchs and of the holy church in general. Receive the public coronation on the balcony above the great door of St. Peter's. His mantle as a priest is taken off, and the tiara is placed on his head. The words: "Receive the tiara adorned with three crowns, and know that thou art the father of princes and kings, the shepherd, on the throne of the fourth of the great year of our Lord, the son of the everlasting God, Christ, to whom is honor and glory for ever and ever."
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Amen." His holiness then pronounces this prayer: "May the great Paul, in whose power and authority we confide, intercede for us with the Lord. By the prayers and merits of the blessed Mary, always a virgin, Michael, Archangel, and of the holy souls of the faithful departed, John the Baptist, and the holy apostles Peter and Paul, and all the saints: may Almighty God have mercy upon you, and may the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost, grant you according to the abatement of all your sins, space for true and fruitful repentance, a heart always penitent, and amendment of life, that you may be found fitting for the Kingdom of the Holy Spirit, and Napes, and the rest of your good works." Two keys are also given him in the church of St. Peter Lateran.

(See also: Vehiligum Mag. 1851.)

IV. List of the Popes of Rome. To the above article, we have referred the uncertainty prevailing in regard to the first bishops of Rome. Roman Catholic writers themselves quite generally admit that the statements of ancient Church-writers on the subject are entirely irreconcilable; but it has been impossible to establish with any degree of certainty the order in which they followed each other, the years of their accession to the see of Rome, and the year of their death. The following table is given from the Roman laminate entitled Gerruchus Cattaneo (with the original names of the popes and not of antipopes, from other sources), and although it is so uncertain in its first part that even the Roman historians do not adopt it, it is of some value, as presenting the claims of the Church of Rome:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Term of Reign</th>
<th>Place of Birth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>St. Peter, M.</td>
<td>42-47</td>
<td>Bethsaida in Galilee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>St. Linus, M.</td>
<td>66-69</td>
<td>Volterra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>St. Sylvest, M.</td>
<td>271-276</td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>St. Clement I, M.</td>
<td>92-100</td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>St. Anacletus, M.</td>
<td>110-112</td>
<td>Athens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>St. Evaristus, M.</td>
<td>141-143</td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>St. Alexander I, M.</td>
<td>12-12</td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>St. Sixtus I, M.</td>
<td>117-118</td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>St. Telesphorus, M.</td>
<td>142-145</td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>St. Hyginus, M.</td>
<td>130-135</td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>St. Anicetus, M.</td>
<td>167-175</td>
<td>Syria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>St. Soter, M.</td>
<td>175-182</td>
<td>Campania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>St. Victor I, M.</td>
<td>259-263</td>
<td>Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>St. Sylvestre, M.</td>
<td>366-371</td>
<td>Galatia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>St. Sixtus II, M.</td>
<td>590-593</td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>St. Marcellus, M.</td>
<td>590-593</td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>St. Marcellus I, M.</td>
<td>590-593</td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>St. Cornelius, M.</td>
<td>590-593</td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Revistan, first antipope.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Term of Reign</th>
<th>Place of Birth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>St. Luuis, M.</td>
<td>256-257</td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>St. Sixtus I, M.</td>
<td>296-301</td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>St. Eutychianus, M.</td>
<td>315-353</td>
<td>Tuscany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>St. Dalmatianus, M.</td>
<td>350-354</td>
<td>Dalmatia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>St. Marcellus, M.</td>
<td>384-390</td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>St. Marcellus I, M.</td>
<td>384-390</td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>St. Hilary, M.</td>
<td>355-367</td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>St. Ambrose, M.</td>
<td>397-401</td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>St. Stephen I, M.</td>
<td>399-410</td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>St. Julius I, M.</td>
<td>432-440</td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>St. Felix II, M.</td>
<td>483-506</td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>St. Damasus, M.</td>
<td>553-556</td>
<td>Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>St. Sylvestre, M.</td>
<td>496-503</td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>St. Basil I, M.</td>
<td>557-587</td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>St. Gregory I, M.</td>
<td>590-604</td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>St. Hilarius, M.</td>
<td>654-655</td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>St. Hilarius II, M.</td>
<td>654-655</td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>St. Symmachus, M.</td>
<td>590-593</td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>St. Hormisdas, M.</td>
<td>655-655</td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>St. Felix III, M.</td>
<td>452-459</td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>St. Gelasius I, M.</td>
<td>496-499</td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>St. Leo, M.</td>
<td>440-448</td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>St. Symmachus II, M.</td>
<td>590-593</td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>St. Boniface I, M.</td>
<td>506-530</td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>St. John II, M.</td>
<td>527-528</td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>St. Agapetus I, M.</td>
<td>535-536</td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The first pope who changed his name on ascending the papal throne.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Place of Birth</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Clement XIX</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>1294-1314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>John XXI</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>1316-1317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Benedict XI</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>1303-1304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Nicholas I</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>1276-1277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Alexander II</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>1277-1278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Honorius III</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>1216-1217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Alexander III</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>1254-1261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Urban IV</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>1264-1265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Clement IV</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>1265-1266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Gregory X</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>1271-1276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Innocent V</td>
<td>Savoy</td>
<td>1276-1276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Adrian V</td>
<td>Genoa</td>
<td>1276-1276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>John XXII</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>1278-1277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Nicholas II</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>1277-1280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Martin IV</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>1281-1285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Honorius IV</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>1285-1287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Nicholas III</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>1288-1289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Celestine V</td>
<td>Isernia</td>
<td>1294-1294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Boniface VIII</td>
<td>Anagni</td>
<td>1139-1143</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*From 1791 to 1870 occurs the great Western Schism, during which a rival line of popes was set up in the papal see. A rival line of popes occurred in the papal see, in conflict with each other. The Council of Pisa, 1128, deposed both rival popes; but Benedict XIII remained in schism till his death in 1417.*
the clergy and laity in opposition to Cornelius; the last, Felix V, who was elected in opposition to Eugenius IV. Sometimes the whole Church was for a number of years divided by the rival claims of two popes, and in one instance this division continued for thirty-nine years (1578-1617), under a papal antipope.

The story that at one time, in the 9th century, the papal chair was filled by a woman, the popess Joan, was quite generally credited from the latter part of the 11th until the opening of the 16th century, but it is now admitted by nearly all writers to be a false statement.

On the several Latin titles given to the popes, see Ducas, Glossarium. On the rights and functions of the popes, see the manuals of ecclesiastical laws, especially those by Richter, Lehrbuch des Kirchenrechts (7th ed., by Dover, Leipziger, 1874); Menzel, Lehrbuch des Kirchenrechts (3d ed. Gotting, 1869); Sultzer, Lehrbuch des lateinischen Kirchenwesens (3d ed. Giessen, 1873); Phillips, Kirchenrecht (Ratisbon, 1845-69, 7 vols.). The principal work on the papal elections is by Zopf, Die Papstwahlen (1872). See also Cambra, Synagoga constitutionum apostolici, cum ceremoniis Gregorii de partibus ecclesiae, adm. electorum Papa (1792); Menachem, Ceremonialis electionis et coronationis Pontific. Rom. (Frankfort, 1792); Adler, Ceremonien und Feierlichkeiten bei der Wahl und Krönung eines Papstes (Vienna, 1844); Pipping, De privilegiis conuerationis Pontif. Rom. (Leipzig, 1671); Hafner, De cor. triplex, Pontif. Rom. (Uspala, 1786); Krebs, De mutatione nominum Pontif. Rom. (Leipzig, 1719); Mayer, De osculo pedum Pontif. Rom. (Wittenberg, 1667); Poulk, Dieses von Christendom, ii, 556; Thompson, Popacy und der Civil Protestantism (N. Y. 1677, 1292); Strowman's Rev. July and Oct. 1855; North Brit. Rev. vol. xii; Cath. World, Aug., 1870, art. xi; Lond. Quart. Rev. April, 1871; Oct. 1876, art. iii; Princeton Rev. Jan., 1871, art. i; Bibl. Sac. Jan., 1871, art. iv; Edinb. Rev. July, 1871, art. v; July, 1872, art. iv. (A. J. S.)

POPE The term pope is derived from the Greek word bishop (papax), a title given in the early Church to the secular clergy, and corresponds in import to the Latin curate used in the English Church. We find full information about Russian curates or popes in the earliest times. A passage of Nikon (i, 198) shows plainly that about the year 1094, when the Bulgars, there were priests in Russia. They formed, with the deacons, subdeacons, and the persons belonging to an inferior degree of the ecclesiastical order, what was called the secular clergy, the highest office of it being that of archpriest or protopope. The verger, the bell-ringer, those who were not counted in the ecclesiastical order, and formed together a special class, distinguished from the regular and secular clergy as well by their cloth as by their peculiar privileges. The conditions required for admission into the ecclesiasticate had been set among others, by the metropolitan Cyril (1774) at the Synod of Vladimir on the Kietama, celebrated in Russian history. It was decreed there: "If the bishops wish to ordain a pope, let them first examine his life from his childhood; only he who has lived temperately and chastely, who has married a virgins, who is proficient in the art of reading and writing, who is neither a gambler nor a cheat, who is not addicted to drinking, swearing, or cursing, who is not quarrelsome, shall receive the consecration." The right to appoint a pope belonged to the bishop in his diocese, and the community seem to have had originally no share whatever in the choice of their pastor. But it was one of the directions of the Stoglownik (of the year 1551) that the parishioners should elect their pastors and deacons themselves. As the revenue of the popes accrued either from special properties or from the voluntary contributions of the parishioners, it is natural to see that in the first case the right of nomination was exercised by the bishop, and in the other case by the people. The pope was chosen from the deacons, the deacons from the subdeacons, and the latter were taken from among the secular clergy. The pope was endowed by the bishop, who received as a compensa-
tion the so-called ordination money. This practice was opposed in Novgorod and Pakow, and occasioned the formation of the sect called Strigolniks (q. v.). At the present time the priests are appointed by the bishop, archbishop, or metropolitan to whose eparchy they belong. Yet the right of the bishop is not of a quite unlimited description: he has to make sure of the consent of the church patron, i.e., the proprietor of the ground on which the church stands, or of the colonel, the preacher, who presides in the officium in a regiment. The lower servants of the Church are appointed by the priest or the patron, seldom by the higher dignitaries.

The official duties of the Greek popes are the following: Every Sunday and holyday, and at least three times in the week, they officiate mechanically and distribute the Eucharist; they give their blessing to confined wives, christen new-born children, administer confession, marry betrothed couples, recite their prayers in uninterrupted series before the bodies of the deceased until they are under ground, and visit from time to time their parishioners in their houses for the purpose of bestowing their benediction, etc. Extemporaneous preaching is severely prohibited. Once in a while they read for the assembled people after worship a homily of the father which is printed and sent to the priests. Many liturgical acts cannot be done by the pope alone without the assistance of the deacon. Every pope must have married already as subdeacon, and the reputation of his bride must have been unblemished. If his wife dies, his usefulness as a pastor comes to an end, and, as a rule, he retires to some monastery, where, as a priest-monk, he enjoys special honors. But, according to more modern rules, popes of good repute are allowed to remain in office after the death of their wives; but a second marriage is entirely out of the question. If the widowed priest marries again, he renounces popes for bishops of the ecclesiastical state, for one marriage only is allowed and prescribed to him.

The honors paid to the secular priests do not follow them into private life. Their religious duties performed, the borrowed nimbus falls, and the boyar who devoutly kissed their hand at the altar ignores them in the street. The cause thereof is mostly to be found in their licentious conduct, their coarseness, their ignorance of worldly and spiritual things—in short, in their vices, against which the metropolitan, bishops, and even the council, are powerless in vain. The council prohibited prohibitory measures. Witnesses relate that the ignorance of the Greek clergy is indescribable; that out of a thousand priests, scarcely ten are able to sign their names, and that he who can do it can pass himself off for a scholar: it is impossible for him to lay claim to a much higher degree of consideration. Most of those who are destined to the Church belong to the lowest class of the population—they are generally the sons of the lower clergy. The sad predicament of the district schools and colleges allows of an inference as to the studies preparatory to the priesthood. The financial aspect of a pope belongs by law to the clerical career; and if the necessities of the Church require it, two of his children receive orders. The embryo pastor gets his first education in the church, where he performs the lower church duties, and in the ecclesiastical schools of the district. Then he spends two years in a clerical seminary, where he learns reading, writing, elementary arithmetic, and the ritual: at this stage of his development the black cloak is thrown on his shoulders, and the priest is made. Now he has to marry; if he does not cherish the idea of retiring to a monastery. He has not the least smattering of Latin or Greek, nor indeed any kind of knowledge. The sum of his acquirements is the ability to read and write the liturgy of the Church. Even the little he has learned in school is slowly obliterated by the frequent mistakes in the ceremonies and the toils of agriculture, to which he must devote his spare time to avoid starvation.

The income of the pope and inferior ecclesiastics is very scanty. As a rule they dwell in a house belonging to the parish, till with their own hands the land conceded to them for their maintenance, and have mostly to depend on their casual income. It follows that everything—baptism, blessings, exorcisms, visits to the sick, celebration of the Eucharist, even confessions—must be paid for according to the rank and wealth of the parishians, else the pope could not maintain himself and his family. If the pope comes to a place, where his family lives, he is expected to officiate in a church. The lower servants of the Church are appointed by the priest or the patron, seldom by the higher dignitaries.

The ordination of popes (hierys, presbyters, priests) is observed in the following way: The bishop makes the sign of the cross over the head of the candidate, while the latter kisses the bishop's knees. He then, with the other ecclesiastics, walks three times processionally around the altar, kneels down before the same, and lays his forehead between his hands, which he rests on the altar. The bishop places his right hand on the head of the young priest, and says, "The divine grace promotes the most pious deacon to the order of priesthood." Then the ordained youth receives the benediction, and kisses the hand of the bishop. As to priestly garments, he receives, instead of the crenion, a similar strip, four inches wide and four feet long, around the neck: this ornament is called epibrachelion; further, a belt and a round cloak, the great phelonion (the casula of the Latins), which reaches to his feet.

The secular clergy stand under the control of the diocesan bishop, but are in many respects also amenable to the worldly authorities. See for literature the art. RUSSIA.

Pope, Alexander, the celebrated English poet of the 18th century, deserves a place here as the writer of poems of a decidedly religious cast, for the speculative character of some of his productions, and their peculiar philosophical tendency. Pope was born May 21, 1688, in London, of rather humble parentage, of the Romish communion. A sickly child, Alexander's early educational advantages were limited, and his pecuniary deficiencies his poetic talent was manifest at a most tender age, though it is true that his celebrity is chiefly due to his satirical power, which was displayed in the writings of his mature years. We would not, however, be understood as underrating the poet's qualifications; for, although he confined himself to the didactic style—leaving untouched the two higher orders of poetry, the epic and dramatic—he was yet in this department the master unsurpassed. No other English poet, not even Cowper, has combined such powers of reasoning with such peep-hole decorations of fancy; and Pope's works have been more frequently edited than those of any other British poet except Shakespeare. When but fifteen years old, Pope prepared poetical translations of several Latin poets, and thereby proved his attainments in the classical languages. From the age of twelve he had himself formed a plan of study, to which he rigidly adhered, and completed with little other incitement than the desire of excellence. His general reading, too, was uncommonly extensive and various, and at twenty-five he was one of the best-informed men of his generation. When only eighteen years old he produced his Messiah, a sacred eclogue in imitation of Virgil's Dido. Pollio was a Roman senator in the time of Augustus, and celebrated not only as a general, but as a patron of letters and the fine arts. Virgil, it is said, used to till his vineyard at Civitavecchia (B.C. 40) when Augustus and Antony had ratified a league of peace, and thus, as it was thought, ca-
established the tranquillity of the empire, as in the times of the "golden age." In this eclogue Virgil is most eloquent in the praise of peace, and in some of his figures and similes, words to which Steevens thought he might be imitated in the prophecies of Isaiah, which he had possibly read in the Greek Septuagint. But, however this may be as regards Virgil, Roscoe well remarks of this production of Pope, that "the idea of uniting the sacred prophecies and grand imagery of Isaiah with the mysterious veiled and pomp of imagery used in the Pollio, thereby combining both sacred and heathen mythology in predicting the coming of the Messiah, is one of the happiest subjects for producing emotions of sublimity that ever occurred to the mind of a poet. Pope's poetic workable was his Essay on Criticism (written in 1709), which displays such extent of comprehension, such nicety of distinction, such acquaintance with mankind, and such knowledge both of ancient and modern learning, as are not often attained by the mature age and longest experience. About 1713 he set about a translation of Homer's Iliad and Odyssey, which he published from 1715 to 1720, and secured by it a world-wide renown. It was received with admiration, and well deserved the praises of his contemporaries. But the work which gives him special interest in our line of study is his Essay on Criticism (1713), a philosophical didactic poem in vindication of the ways of Providence, in which the poet proposes to prove that, of all possible systems, Infinite Wisdom has formed the best; that in such a system coherences, union, subordinates it necessary; that it is a strange thing that we should not be able to discover perfection and order in every instance; because, in an infinity of things mutually relative, a mind which sees not infinitely can see nothing fully. Thus we see Pope setting forth, after Bolingbroke, a theory of optimism (q.v.), the consequences of which he probably did not fully understand. The Essay aspires to be, like Leibnitz's celebrated work, a theology, and is really a poetical version of the religious creed of Pope's age—of that system which took various shapes with Clarke, Tindal, and Shaftesbury, and which Bolingbroke seems to have more or less put into shape to be celebrated in poetry by his friends. The poem is didactic, and not only didactic, butratioinative. The emotion is always checked by the sense that the Deity whose ways are indicated is after all but a barren abstraction, in no particular relation to our race or its history. He never touches the circle of human interests. Considered as a whole, this production, though Pope's most ambitious, remains radically unsatisfactory; yet there are, it must be granted, many brief passages marked by Pope's special felicities of language; many in which the moral sentiment is true and tender; many in which he forgets for a moment the danger of open heterodoxy, and utters with genuine force some of the deeper sentiments that haunt us in this mysterious universe. Of his other works, none interest us here. One of the most admirable of Pope's religious poems is "The Universal Prayer," beginning with

"Father of all! In every age,
In every clime adored."
The bread in the Eucharist has been worshipped as it were the eternal God. From the doctrine of purgatory has sprung that of indulgences, and the practice of persons paying sums of money to the Romish bishop and clergy to release the souls of their friends from the fabulous fire of purgatory.

We append a list of these principal heresies of the Church of Rome, and the time at which they were introduced:

**Injunction of saints first taught with authority by a Council of Constantinople, A.D. 784.**

A *time of innocence* is a religious worship first publicly affirmed and sanctioned in the Council of Nicaea, A.D. 321.

**Sacramental efficacy of the clergy first enjoined publicly at the first Council of Lateran, A.D. 1123.**

Papal supremacy first publicly asserted by the fourth Council of Lateran, A.D. 1215.

**Arbitrary confession first enjoined by Innocent III, at the fourth Council of Lateran, A.D. 1215.**

**Prayers in a foreign tongue first deliberately sanctioned by the Council of Trent, A.D. 1562.**

**Premunire of the seculars first publicly insulata on by the fourth Council of Lateran, A.D. 1215.**

**Purgatory and indulgences first set forth by the Council of Florence, A.D. 1439.**

**Institution of benefices as a canonical at the Council of Trent, A.D. 1547.**

**Communion in one kind only, first authoritatively sanctioned by the Council of Constance, A.D. 1414.**

**The formula of the sacraments first settled by the Council of Trent, A.D. 1548.**

This system of doctrine will be best understood by a reading of the creed of popery as adopted by pope Pius IV (q.v.), and published in 1564. See also PROFESSIO FIDIC.

It embodies the decisions of the Council of Trent. Every Roman Catholic is bound by it, and Romish officials swear to it. After repeating the Apostles' Creed, the form of the oath goes on:

"I most firmly admit and embrace apostolical and ecclesiastical traditions, and all other constitutions and observances of the Church. I subscribe to, confess, and profess the Holy Scriptures according to the sense which the holy mother Church has held and does hold, to whom it belongs to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Holy Scriptures; nor will I ever take and interpret them otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the fathers.

I profess, also, that there are truly and properly seven sacraments of the new law, instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord, and for the salvation of men. The number of seven is not imposed on me by compulsion, but is a very powerful testimony for a Jew to make of an apostate. See Jewish Inteligener, 1870; Missionblatt für Israel, 1870; Döbrich Emeth (Breslaus, 1870). (B. P.)"
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demned and anathematised by the Church. This true
catholic faith, in which we believe, which now freely profess and truly hold, I. N. N., promise, vow, and swear most constantly to hold and profess the same whole and undivided, with God's assistance, to the end of my life. Amen.

For literature, see Romanism.

Poppish Plot, the name given to an imaginary plot on the part of the Roman Catholics in England during the reign of Charles II, the object of which was believed to be a general massacre of the Protestants. See OATH, TRUE.

Popeish View of Christianity. The supporters of this view regard the Church as the mediator between God and the individual: the Church (by which some of them seem to mean "the clergy") is a sort of chartered corporation, by belonging to or by being attached to which any given individual acquires certain privileges. The opponents of such a view regard it as a priesthood, because it lays the stress not on the relations of a man's heart towards God and Christ, as the Gospel does, but on something wholly artificial and formal—his belonging to a certain so-called Society; and thus, whether the Society be alive or dead, whether it really exists or not, the man is ipso facto himself and team itself, as the channel of grace and salvation, when it certainly is not the channel of salvation, because it is visibly and notoriously no sure channel of grace. The opponents of the popish views acknowledge the Pope as the head of the Church; but it is so great a means of grace that its benefits are of the highest value; yet they regard relation to any Church as a thing quite subordinate and secondary; the salvation of a man's soul being effected by the change in his heart and life wrought by Christ's Spirit; and because all who go straight to Christ (their known communion of the Church being assumed) do "manifestly and visibly receive grace, and have the seal of his Spirit, and therefore are certainly heirs of salvation." They adopt this view of Christianity because it seems "simple and scriptural," while any other is complex in its character and human in its source. According to this view, all seems plain: "we are not to derive our salvation through or from the Church, but to be kept or strengthened in the way of salvation by the aid or example of our fellow-Christians, who are formed into societies for this very reason that they might help one another, and not leave each man to fight his own fight alone; the Scripture notion of the Church being that religious society should help a man to become better and holier, just as civil society helps us in civilization.

Popkin, John Smelling, D.D., a Congregational minister, was born June 19, 1771, in Boston, Mass. He graduated at Harvard College in 1792, and held the office of tutor of Greek from 1795 to 1798. Having entered the ministry, he was ordained pastor of the Federal Street Church, Boston, July 16, 1799, which charge he resigned in 1802, and became pastor of the First Parish in Newbury Sept. 19, 1804. In 1815 he was elected professor of Greek in Harvard College, and served until 1826, when he accepted the professorship of Greek literature. He resigned in 1838, and lived in entire retirement, and died, March 2, 1852. Dr. Popkin published Three Lectures on Liberal Education (1836), and a number of occasional sermons. Some of his lectures and sermons, with a Life by Prof. Felton, were published in 1852. See Sprague, Amasa, ii, 454; North Amer. Rev. 1875, p. 470; Christian Examiner, vol. iii.

Poplar (πάπυρος, Papyrus), Sept. σπώραξ, in Gen. xxx, 27; λάστιγος, in Hos. iv. 18; Vulg. populus, the rendering of the above-named Hebrew Hebrew, which occurs only in the two places cited. Peeled rods of the πάπυρος were put by Jacob before Laban's ring-streaked sheep. This tree is mentioned with the oak and the terebinth, by Hosea, as one under which idolatrous Israel used to sacrifice. Several ancient writers, Celsius among the number (Hierok. i. 292), are in favor of the rendering of the A. V., and think the "white poplar," (Populus alba) is the tree denoted. The Hebrew name lāmēc, being supposed to be derived from לָמֶךְ (to white), has been considered identical with the Greek λάμης, which both signifies "white" and also the "white poplar." This poplar is said to be called white, not on account of the whiteness of its bark, but of that of the under surface of its leaves. It may perhaps be so designated from the whiteness of its inner branches, which has a remarkable appearance when the seed-covering first bursts. The poplar is certainly common in the countries where the scenes are laid of the transactions related in the above passages of Scripture (comp. Belon, Obs. ii, 106). Rauwolf also mentions the white poplar as abundant about Aleppo and Tripoli, and still called by the ancient Arabic name ḥawr or ḥor, which is the word used in the Arabic translation of Hosea.

Others, however, have been of opinion that lāmēc denotes the storax-tree rather than the white poplar. Thus, in Galat. iv. 1, the time of Christ's ascension is referred to the Populus, on which occurs the word στέφανος, a rod of storax; and the Greek translation of the Pentateuch, according to Rosenmuller, is more ancient and of far greater authority than that of Hosea. So R. Jonah, as translated by Celsius, says of lāmēc, "Dictor Idummæae, et ait hic inquit Horeum, quod nomen is lāmēc, "a rod of storax;" and the Greek translation of Genesis lubën is employed as the representative of the Hebrew lāmēc. Lubën, both in Arabic and in Persian, is the name of a tree, and of the fragrant resin employed for fumigating, which exudes from it, which is commonly known by the name of storax. This resin was well known in the ancients, and is mentioned by Hippocrates and Theophrastus. Dioscorides, (i, 79) and Pliny (Nat. Hist. xii, 17 and 25) both speak of the storax. Pliny says, "That part of Syria which adjoins Judea above Phenicia produces storax, which is found in the neighborhood of Gabala (Jebel) and Marathus, as also of Casius, a mountain of Seleucia. . . . That which comes from the mountain of Amanus, in Syria, is highly esteemed for medicinal purposes, and even more so by the perfumers." Dioscorides describes several kinds, all of which were obtained from Asia Minor; and all that is now imported is believed to be the produce of that country. But the tree is cultivated in the south of Europe, though it does not there yield any storax. It is found in Greece, and is supposed to be a native of Asia Minor, whence it extends into Syria, and probably from thence to Egypt. It is therefore the country which was the scene of the transaction related in the above passage of Genesis. From the description of Dioscorides, and his comparing the leaves of the storax to those of the quince, there is no doubt of the same tree being intended: especially as in early times, as at the present day, it yielded a highly fragrant balsamic substance which was esteemed as a medicine, and employed in fumigation. From the similarity of the Hebrew name lāmēc to the Arabic lab₂n, and from the Sept., having in Genesis translated the former by storax, it seems most probable that this was the tree intended. It is capable of yielding white wands as well as the poplar; and it also well qualified to afford complete shade under its ample foliage, as in the passage of Hose. iv. 13. We may also suppose it to have been more particularly alluded to from its being a tree yielding incense. "They sacrifice upon the tops of the mountains, and burn incense upon the hills, under the terebinth and the storax trees, because the shadow thereof is good." Storax (στράξ) is mentioned in Ecelus, xxiv, 15, together with other aromatic substances. The modern Greek name of the tree, as we learn from Sibthorpe (Flor. Græc.). It is στράξ, and is a common wild shrub in Greece and in most parts of the Levant. The
resin exudes either spontaneously or after incision. This property, however, it would seem, is only for the most part possessed by trees which grow in a warm country; for English specimens, though they flower profusely, do not produce the drug. Mr. Daniel Hanbury, who has discussed the whole subject of the storax planta with much care (see the Pharmaceutical Journal and Transactions for Feb., 1857), tells us that a friend of his quite failed to obtain any exudation from *Styrax officinalis*, by incisions made in the hottest part of the summer of 1856, on specimens growing in the botanic garden at Montpellier. "The experiment was quite unsuccessful; neither aqueous sap nor resinous juice flowed from the incisions." Still Mr. Hanbury quotes two authorities to show that under certain favorable circumstances the tree may exude a fragrant resin even in France and Italy. The *Styrax officinalis* is a shrub from nine to twelve feet high, with ovate leaves, which are white underneath; the flowers are in racemes, and are white or cream-colored. The white appearance agrees with the etymology of the Hebrew *libnah*. The liquid *storax* of commerce is the product of the *Liquidambar Orientalis*, Mill. (see a fig. in Mr. Hanbury's communication), an entirely different plant, whose resin was probably unknown to the ancients. See *Stacte*.

*Styrax Officinalis.*

**Poplicani,** a name applied to the *Algibeenses* (q.v.).

**Poppiæ.** See *Sabina*.

**Popotchis,* or Popovačchins,* a name given to the different sects of Russian dissenters who recognize the validity of ordination as given in the Established Church, and receive most of their *popes* (q.v.), i.e., priests, from that communion. The Popotchis are divided into five principal sects: the Starobertz, or Old Ceremonialists, the Diaconoffitchis, the Peremayanoffitchis, the Epiffanoffitchis, and the Tschernabalti. Those who have no priests at all, or who do not acknowledge the validity of Church ordination, are termed *Bez-Popotchitchis,* or No-Priesters. See *Mosheim, Eccles. History,* vol. iii.; *Plato, Greek Church* (see Index).

**Popogano** is the name by which the primitive inhabitants of Virginia designated hell, which they imagined floating in the air between heaven and earth.

**Popple, Poppy,** **Poppy-head** (from Fr. *poupple* = a doll, or Lat. *puppis* = the "poop" of a ship), an architectural term designating an elevated ornament often used on the tops of the upright ends, or elbows, which terminate seats, etc., in churches; they are sometimes merely cut into plain *feur de lis* or other simple forms, with the edges chamfered or slightly hollowed, but are frequently carved with leaves, like finials, and in rich work are sculptured into animals and figures, and are often extremely elaborate. No examples are known to exist of earlier date than the Decorated style, and but few so early; of Perpendicular date specimens are to be found in very many churches, especially in the cathedrals and old abbey churches. See *Stall; Standard*.

Ordinary Popple. Kiddleston, c. 1450.

**Poppy-head.** See *Poppit*.

**Populonis,* a surname of *Juno* (q.v.) among the ancient Romans, as being the protectress of the whole Roman people.


**Porch** is the rendering in the A. V. of the following words:

1. לֶ֔דּוֹן or לֱדוֹן, *udam* (from לָדוֹן, before), a vestibule or hall (Sept. *aôla*; Vulg. *porticus* [1 Chron. xxviii. 11]; *vncos*; *porticus*). It is used of the entrance-hall of a building (Ezek. xli. 7, 48); of the place where the throne was placed, and where judgment was administered (1 Kings vii. 7 [see *Palace*]); and of the veranda surrounding a court (Ezek. xli. 10). It is especially applied to the vestibule of the Temple (1 Kings vii. 17; Joel ii. 17). See *Temple*. "The porch of the Lord" (2 Chron. xv. 8; xxix. 17) seems to stand for the Temple itself.

2. בֵּן־פְּרֵיָד, *miserdon,* a sort of colonnade or balcony with pillars (Jugd. iii. 28); probably a corridor connecting the principal rooms of the house (Wilkinson, *Ancient Egyptians,* i. 11). It may have been a sort of veranda chamber in the works of Solomon, open in front and at the sides, but capable of being enclosed with awnings or curtains, like that of the royal palace at *Isphahan* described by Chardin (vii, 386, and pl. 39). The word is used in the Talmud (*Middeoth,* iii. 7).

3. Πύληος (Matt. xxvi. 71), probably the passage from the street into the first court of the house, in which, in Eastern houses, is the *maastibah,* or stone bench for the porter or persons waiting, and where also the master of the house often receives visitors and transacts business (Lam. *Mod. Ep.* i. 82; Shaw, *Tyr. p.* 207). The word rendered "porch" in the parallel passage (Mark xiv. 68) is *proaspelion,* the outer court. The scene therefore of the denial of our Lord took place either in that court or in the passage from it to the house-door. See *House*.

4. The term *eroys* is used for the colonnade or portico
of Bethesda, and also for that of the Temple called Solomon's porch (John v, 2; x, 23; Acts iii, 11; v, 19). Josephus describes the poricci or porticoes which surrounded the Temple of Solomon, and also the royal porch (4 Macc. 2, 3; 9. 4). These poricci are described by Tacitus as forming an important line of defence during the siege (Hist. v, 12). See Solomon's Porch.

PORCH (Lat. porticus) is the term applied in ecclesiastical architecture to the adjunctive erection placed over the doorway of a church. In the early ecclesiastical structures, raised after infant baptism became prevalent in the West, and the discipline of the catechumens (q.v.) had fallen into desuetude, the narthex (q.v.) was given the form of a vestibule, frequently closed, and sufficiently capacious to contain a large number of persons and permit the celebration of different ceremonies. This was really what we now understand by porch. Few churches, cathedrals, conventual or parochial, were, until the middle of the 12th century, unprovided with a central porch in front of the principal entrance; but after the 13th century they were not so common.

The earliest porches in the West, dating from the 8th to the 11th century, are shallow, and extended across the church front, as at Clermont. One of the earliest is at St. Poix, Périgord. In some cases they were recessed under the tower, as at St. Germain-des-Prés (Paris), Limoges, Poissy, of the 9th or 10th century, St. Benet-sur-Loire, Alençon, and St. Savin. During the 11th century this became the rule; in the 13th it was rare, but at a later date it reappeared at Caen, Fribourg, and Cranbrook. At St. Savin the porch is defended and protected by a ditch, just as the castellated palaces stood in front of the western entrance of Canterbury Cathedral. The giant porch of Aachen, imposing as it is, is far exceeded by the three magnificent Early English porches of Peterborough, which accord with the entire work, those of many of the great French cathedrals are mere afterthoughts, noble but accidental additions. At Fribourg, Rheims, and Chartres (1200–80) the porches are covered with statuary.

Towards the close of the 12th century the ceremonies performed within them fell into desuetude, and they in consequence dwindled into a mere appendage of the main structure; and from that cause their use was restricted to western doors; large lateral porches, usually in cathedrals, as at Chartres, Sens, Bayeux, Puy-en-Velay, Chalon-sur-Marne, Wells, Salisbury, Lincoln, and Hereford, were built for the convenience of worshippers when entering or leaving the church, for benefactions, and the preliminaries of baptism; and in cathedrals and in the cathedrals of minor sees. The monastic churches in towns imitated the arrangement. These porches were usually closed at the sides, as in the Norman examples of Kelso, Selby, Southwell, Sherborne, and Malmsbury, although that of Alençon is open. At Hereford the great porch (cir. 1513) is open, but the inner Decorated porch is closed. Until the close of the 14th century porches, generally of open form, were commonly built. The lateral porch fronted the side which faced the more populous portion of the city—at Gloucester, Canterbury, Malmsbury, Chester, and St. David's, on the south; at Durham, Hereford, Exeter, Christchurch (Hants), and Selby, on the north. At Chichester it is on the south side, opening on the cloister to admit procession to the shrine; at Westminster (called from its beauty Solomon's Porch) it stood in advance of the north front of the transept; at Lincoln the bishop's porch is in the presbytery. There are Early English porches at St. Alban's and Barnack, the latter, like All Saints', Stamford, Albury, and St. Mary's, Nottingham, having external and internal stone roofs. From the 14th century onwards we have a large number of examples in England, France, and Germany. In the 15th and 16th centuries the arcing were used as channels, fenced in with an iron screen; and at Chichester there are still lateral examples.
Great Addington, c. 1150.

tombs. Gradually incense was used and litanies were chanted in porches. Fonts and basins for the ablutions of the faithful before entering the church were erected, and exhibitions of relics and sacred images were made. Markets were permitted, just as objects of piety are still sold in foreign porches on festival days. Feudal and other courts were held. At Sandwich a school was taught and books sold, and even, in 1519, peddlers hawked their wares at Riccall. Chapters and religious bodies appealed to the civil power to put an end to such irregularities, and the great abbeys of Clugny, Maulbronn, and Citeaux, about the beginning of the 12th century, began to erect large enclosed porches in front of their churches. The Clugnians built large ante-churches of two stories, as at Lewes; at Tours, near the close of the 11th century. At the latter place they consisted of a nave and aisles of thirteen bays, with an upper chapel of St. Michael, in which the altar was used for a mass attended by penitents. At Clugny in the 13th century an altar and pulpit adjoined the church door. Their influence is perceptible in the large upper chapel over the porch at Puy-en-Velay and Autun, and the tribune for an altar at Chartres, etc.

The Cistercians built western porches deep and longitudinal, in imitation of the narthex, according to the desire of St. Bernard, at Toury, Moissac, Chartres, and Beaujeu. At Vezelay, in the 13th century, the porch, of two bays in length, forms a nave with aisles, lateral galleries, and a tribune for an altar over the minister door. In many French parish churches this plan was followed in order to accommodate mourners at funerals. In England an upper chamber sometimes occurs over porches, as at Southwell, Christchurch (Hants), and in parish churches used as a school-room or a chapel's or watchers' dormitory. Placentia, Farma, and Modena have porches of two stories.

In the foreign examples pilgrims or penitents were marshalled on the ground-floor in order to hear an address from the pulpit, or mass said at the upper altar, while those who came from a distance found shelter in these vaulted porches, just as the country people on the eves of great festivals pass the night under the porticoes of St. Peter's at Rome. At Paulinville, cir. 1150, there is, and at Sherborne there was, a large parochial ante-church. At Glastonbury and Durham the Lady-chapel was placed in a similar position.

It is possible that these outer buildings served the same purpose of a place of previous assembly, just as the great western transept of Ely or Lincoln church. Sometimes it was occupied on occasions when large multitudes flocked to the church. In some monastic churches it served as the fore- 
sic parlor for conversation with persons inadmissible within the inner portions. The children of the abbey serfs were baptized and the office at which their domestic servants and laborers attended was said. In all large churches the processions were arranged in the porch on Palm-Sunday, on Holy-cross Day, and in Rogation. Sometimes it formed a sanctuary, containing a ring in the door to which the fugitive clung, as at Durham, and at Cologne there was an inscription to this effect, "Here sits the great criminal."—Walpole, Sacred Architecture, a. v.; Parker, Glossary of Architecture, a. v.

Porchat. Joseph, a converted Jew, flourished in the 14th century in Spain, and by his learning rendered great service to the Church of Christ in that day. He was associated with Martini (q. v.), the author of Pugio Fidei, and transcribed a great part of it into a work which he himself composed under the title of Victoria adversus Hebreos (1520), and which is one of the ablest polemics of the Christian Church against Judaism. See McCrie, Hist. of the Reformation in Spain, p. 56.

Porcias Festus. See Festus.

Porcq, Jean Le, a French Oratorian, was born near Bologna-sur-Mer in 1536. Professor of theology for fifty years at the school founded at Sauzon by the Oratorians, he was one of the most active adversaries of the Jansenists, and published against them Les Sentiments de Saint-Augustine sur la Grâce (Lyons, 1682, 1706, 4to). Although he abstains from all personalities, his adversaries spoke of it with the utmost contempt. Abbé Goujet acknowledges Porcq's piety, and says that he always carefully avoided anything that was akin to sectarianism, but that he wrote against Jansenism because he considered it wrong. He wrote as a true polemic against doctrinal and not persons. See Dupin, Bibl. des Aut. Ecclés., du 18ème Siècle, i, 365.

Porcupine. See Bittern.

Porridge. John, an English mystic, who, with Jane Lead and Thomas Bromley, founded the so-called "Philadelphia" society, was born in London in 1698. He studied theology and medicine at Oxford, and became a curate at Reading; but, after a short pastorate, was settled at Bradford, in Berkshire. From the works of Böhme, which Charles I had caused to be published in English, Porridge derived the germs of his strange and incoherent mysticism. A time of such sudden veering from the extreme of churchliness to the mildest independentism as was the case under Charles I and Cromwell is very favorable to sporadic outbursts of fanaticism. Hence, as Porridge was very susceptible in this direction, it was not long until he found himself the centre of a group of disciples. The effect of association was to intensify his delusion and to brighten his imagination. This culminated in a series of the wildest ostensibly supernatural visions. In the night of Jan. 3, 1651, he assumed to have had three of these. The first was that of a being with clothes, beard, and hat, who drew back his bed-curtains, and then mysteriously vanished. Hardly had Porridge fallen asleep again when he saw a giant with an uprooted tree on his shoulder and a sword in his hand, seeing the tree to the earth, and then began to wrestle with Porridge, but was successfully resisted by the latter with
spiritual weapons. The third vision was that of an immense dragon, which vomited fire upon him, and left him exclaiming in the terms of the "Vision of Saint Malachy," a session of the "Philadelphians" was held. Those in attendance also now fell into a state of ecstasy, and had visions of the heavenly and of the infernal world. As these visions continued for a period of three weeks, day and night, Pordage affirmed that they could not be mere fanciful imaginations, but were a heavenly admonition to them to break off from the world, and to enter upon a life of complete devotion to God. But their meetings called for the intervention of the police. The matter was investigated, but led to no other serious results. Finally, in a human manner, he is not by any means to be confused with Titian, from whom he is to be separated by a whole lifetime. Certainly the saints and virgins of Pordenone, which hang in the gallery of Venice beside the works of Titian, do not look as if they had the latter much trouble to distance his competitor. As Pordenone principally painted frescos in North or Upper Italy, he was known in Lower Italy only by his fine oil-paintings. His most splendid work in oil is the altar-piece of Santa Maria dell'Orto at Venice, representing a San Lorenzo Giustini, a landscape on the grandest scale. There are St. John the Baptist and St. Augustine. The frescos of Pordenone are spread over the towns and castles of Friuli; some are at Genoa, Mantua, and Venice, but the best-preserved are on N.-T. the towns of Piacenza, and especially in the cathedral of Cremona. He was highly esteemed by the Emperor Charles V., who enabled him to paint Hercules II., duke of Mantua, called him to Mantua to paint cartoons for tapestry to be made in Flanders, but he soon afterwards died (1539), as it was suspected, of poison. We have very few exact copies of Pordenone, and of his works which have been preserved. Moreover, his frescos are oftentimes proved not to be his, or are under so much doubt that it is unsafe to risk a list of them. The Glory of S. Lorenzo Giustini, in the Academy of Venice, is one of his finest works. Much has been said of The Woman taken in Adultery, in the Berlin Museum, but it is so repainted (the heads of the Saviour and the woman being almost new) that it can do little honor to any artist of the 16th century. Several of Pordenone's pictures are in England. In the National Gallery is a colossal figure of An Apostle. See Mrs. Clement, "Handbook of Painters, Sculptors, etc., s. v.;" Radcliffe, "Schools and Masters of Painting," p. 209 sq.; and Vassari, "Lives of the Painters;" Lanzi, "History of Painting in Italy;" Spooner, "Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts," s. v. (J. H. W.)

Porrée, Charles, a noted French Jesuit, was born in 1673. He became a member of the Society of Jesus in 1692, and flourished as a trainer of youth all his life, and it is presumed that no man ever exceeded him in this work. Vutale says of him that "he was eloquent after the style and taste of Seneca, a very beautiful poet; but that his greatest merit consisted in inspiring his pupils with the love of learning as to virtue." He died in 1741. His writings are of a secular character.

Porodakhta is a personage of the Persian mythology, the father of the famous hero Ahemard. He is to be one of the assistants of Siosiah, son of Zoroaster, in his great work, the resurrection of the dead.

Porphyrians was the name given to the Arians in an edict of the emperor Constantine issued in the year 325, the reason stated being that, as they had emulated the impiety of the Nestorians, they were to be named after him (Socrat. Hist. Eccles., i, 6). This decree was afterwards quoted as a precedent by Theodosius the Younger, who ordered that the Nestorians should, in a similar manner, be called Simionians. It may be doubted whether either name extended much beyond the four corners of the edicts in which they were given. See Baronius, "Annales," ad ann. 325, vol. lxxxiv, lxxxv.
Porphyry (Πορφύριος), a celebrated heathen philosopher, the oldest expounder and defender of Neo-Platonism as taught by Plotinus (q. v.), and one of the most sagacious and learned antagonists of Christianity under the Roman empire, flourished in the second half of the 3d century.

Porphyry was born A.D. 233. Eunapius and Suidas (following, no doubt, Porphyry himself, Vitr. Plot. viii., 107) in their biographies call him a Tyrian; but both St. Jerome (Prof. Epist. ad Gal.) and St. Chrysostom (Homil. vi. in ad Corinth. p. 58) term him Baraswòry, a word on the fancied correction of which a good deal of ingenuity has been unnecessarily expended; some imagining that it is a corruption of some term of reproach (such as βαρασιωρς, herb-eater, βοδαρανωρς, or βαρανατωρ). The more reasonable view is that the word is correct enough, and describes more accurately the birthplace of Porphyry—Bataanes, the Bashan of Scripture. To account for his being called a Tyrian some have supposed that he was originally of Jewish origin, and having first embraced, and afterwards renounced Christianity, called himself a Tyrian to mislead those who were looking for a slighter alteration in the text of Chrysostom, supposed that Porphyry falsely assumed the epithet Baraswòry, to induce the belief that he was of Jewish origin, so that his statements with regard to the Jewish Scriptures might have the more weight. None of these conjectures secures any definite results. The least inoffensive view is that of Jounis, who is followed by Fabricius, Brucker, and others, that there was a Tyrian settlement in the district of Bataanes, and that Porphyry was born there, but, from the neighborhood of the more important place, called himself, and was called by others, a Tyrian (Brucker, Hist. Crit. Phil. ii., 240; Harless, Ad Fabricius Bibli. Gr. vi., 725).

The original name of Porphyry was Malæirus (Μαλαρίως, the Greek form of the Syro-Phoenician Melék), a word, as he himself tells us, which signifies King. His father bore the same name, and was a man of distinguished family (Porph. Vitr. Plot. c. xvi). Aurelius, in dedicating a work to him, styled him Basileia. The more euphonic name Πορφύριος (in allusion to the usual color of royal robes) was subsequently devised for him by his preceptor, Longinus (Eunapius, Porph. p. 121; Suidas, s. v.). Suidas states that he lived in the reign of Aurelian, and died in that of Diocletian. Eunapius says, more explicitly, that he lived in the reigns of Galienus, Claudius, Tacitus, Aurelian, and Probus. Porphyry states that he was born when he first became the pupil of Plotinus, which was in the tenth year of the reign of Gallienus (Vitr. Plot. iv., 99); the date of his birth was, therefore, A.D. 233.

Exhibiting in his earliest youth a thirst for knowledge, a quickness of mental perception, combined with indications of intellectual vigor, his father provided the very best instruction for him, especially in philosophy and literature. From Porphyry himself, as quoted by Eusebius (Hist. iii., 19; comp. Proclus, in Tim. i., p. 20), it appears that when very young he was placed under the instruction of Theon. This could not have been, as some have imagined, at Alexandria, for about the time of the birth of Porphyry Origen quitted Alexandria, and did not return to it. It was most likely at Cæsarea that Porphyry attended the instructions of Origen. Eunapius has been charged with a gross blunder in making Origen the fellow-student of Porphyry; but it does not seem necessary to suppose that he meant the celebrated Church father of that name. Porphyry next removed to Athens, and became the pupil of Apollonius (Porph. Quest. Hum. 25), and of the much-celebrated Longinus (q. v.). For reputation for wisdom and skill in instruction brought him scholars from all parts of the then civilized world. Under his tuition he received that early moulding which subsequently secured such vigor of thought and elegance of style, and the tutor was so much pleased with his scholar that he not only warmly commended him, but applied the name to him by which alone posterity has known him. At the age of twenty he went to Rome to study under Plotinus (q. v.), but as that philosopher was not then teaching, Porphyry returned to the care of his former preceptor. At the age of thirty he again went to Rome, this time in the company of Ammonius Saccas, and he studied with the great exponent of Neo-Platonism, and with Plotinus's oldest disciple, Amelius (Vitr. Plot. c. iv.).

Porphyry remained six years, and became thoroughly attached to his master—a man endowed with an extraordinary understanding and vigorous imagination, who as a teacher of the eclectic philosophy capable of felicitously unfolding the sublime ideas of Plato had obtained a great reputation. Under such guidance the pupil, by nature well endowed for study, and led on by his zeal for distinction and acquirements, very soon came to be regarded as one of the chief ornaments of the school. He wrote and disputed with great freedom and masterly ability. Thus, e. g., when having some doubts respecting a dogma which Plotinus had inculcated, Porphyry hesitated not to call the philosopher's dicta in question, and a long and sharp dispute ensued in reply to those who disputed with him, hoping to get a rejoinder, which Amelius wrote by request of Plotinus. Porphyry, still unsatisfied, again wrote, and was once more replied to by Amelius, who this time succeeded in pacifying the inquisitive pupil. Porphyry now evidently saw this man of the Papriques was mistaken in his erroneous criticisms. This generous action gained so thoroughly the approval and confidence of Plotinus that he was admitted by him to terms of close intimacy, and frequently had assigned to him the task of refuting opponents, and was besides intrusted with the still more difficult and delicate duty of correcting and arranging the writings of Plotinus (Vitr. Plot. vii., 107; xiii., 115; xv., 117; xxiv., 189).

So closely did Porphyry apply himself to these studies that his health became impaired, and, naturally of hypochondriacal disposition, a cloud, settling into confirmed melancholy, was cast over his mind. While in this state he formed a resolution of putting an end to his life, hoping by this method, according to the Platonic teaching, to release the soul from the prison of the body. From this mad design, however, he was dissuaded by his master, who advised a voyage to Sicily. Complying with this advice, Porphyry recovered his bodily vigor and serenity of mind, and devoted himself to authorship. He then wrote, according to Eusebius (Hist. vi. 19) and St. Jerome (Chron. 153), six years of age, about the time of the death of Constantian, his Christian teacher; according to Christian legend, he retired to a monastery at Athens after the death of Plotinus has been inferred (by Holstenius) from a passage quoted by Eusebius, where, as the text stands, Porphyry is made to speak of celebrating the birthday of Plotinus at Athens with Longinus. There can be little doubt whatever the reading should be, as Brucker (l. c. p. 148) suggests, πανανατωρ, and that the incident refers to the earlier part of the life of Porphyry, otherwise the allusion will not accord with the history either of Porphyry or Longinus.

Of the remainder of the life of Porphyry we know very little. According to Eunapius he returned to Rome, where he taught, and gave frequent public exhibitions of his acquirements and talents as a speaker, and was held in high honor by the senate and people till he died. But his mind again lost its balance, for he
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pretended to be not only a philosopher "endued with superior wisdom, but a divine person, favored with supernatural communications from heaven." He avers that in the sixty-eighth year of his age (Vit. Plot. c. xxiii) he had a vision of the Supreme Intelligence, the (Vit. Plot. c. xxvi), and Augustine thought, of the agency of evil spirits, but more probably an entire fiction, employed to offset the supernatural elements of Christianity, or a mere phan-tasm of an overwrought brain. When probably at a somewhat advanced period of his life, he married Mar-cella, the widow of one of his friends, and the mother of seven children (Ad Marc. 1), with the view, as he avowed, of superintending their education. About ten months after his marriage he had occasion to leave her and go on a journey; and to console her for his absence he wrote to her an epistle, which is still extant. The date of his death cannot be fixed with any exact-ness; it was probably about A.D. 305 or 306.

His Philosophy.—It appears from the testimony even of antagonists, and from what we have left of Porphyry's writings, that he was a man of great abilities and very extensive learning. Eusebius speaks of him as one τῶν μᾶλλα ἐξισορροπητῶν καὶ πάσιν γνωριμῶν, κλητὸς τοῦ συμμονήμερος πρὸς Ἑλληνίδας ἀντιπροσώπους (Prop. Ep. iii. 9); and Augustine styles him "hominem non fictum, sed verum, quem scribitur in saeculum putant " (De nat. rerum iv. 30, c. xix, 22). The philosophical doctrines of Porphyry were in all essential respects the same as those of his master, Plotinus. To that system he was ardently attached, and proved himself one of its most ener-getic defenders. His writings were all designed directly or indirectly to illustrate, commend, or establish it. His rhetorical training, extensive learning, and comparative clearness of style, no doubt did good service in the cause of his school. Thus Eunapius (Vita Porph. p. 8, Bois) ascribes to Porphyry as his principal merit that by his writings, by his disputations, he brought within the range of the understanding of all men the doctrine of Plotinus, which in the language of its author had seemed difficult and obscure. Indeed, Porphyry lays himself less claim to originality than to the merit of an expositor and defender of the doctrine of Plotinus, which he regarded as identical with that of Plato, and sub-stantially also with that of Aristotle. Porphyry is, nevertheless, charged with inconsistencies and contra-dictions; his later views being frequently at variance with his earlier ones (Eunapius, Vit. Porph. fin.; Rose-lanx, Echat. I, 233.). The reason of this may probably be found in the vacillation of his views with respect to theurgy and philosoph-ogy—a vacillation which would doubtless attract the greater attention, as it was in opposition to the general tenor of his master's school, that he ranked philosop-hy higher than theurgical superstitions which were connected with the popular polytheism. With the latter, some features of his doctrine had considerable affinity. He insisted strongly on the contrast between the corporeal and the incorporeal, and the power of the latter over the former. This may have been, as in his view, unrestricted by the limits of space, and independent of the accident of contiguity. When free from intermixture with matter, it is omnipresent, and its power unlimited. His doctrine with regard to da-mons, pointed in the same direction. Over both them and the souls of the dead power could be obtained by enchantments (De Abst. ii. 38, 39, 41, 43, 47). Yet these notions seem to have been taken up by him rather in deference to the prevalent opinion of his times than as forming an essential part of his philosophy. Though at first he considered the incorporeal as the true method of safety consisted in the purification of the soul and the contemplation of the eternal Deity. The increasing value set upon theurgy, and the endeavors to raise it to the philosophy it was, perhaps produced something like a reaction in his mind, and strengthened the doubts which he entertained with regard to the popular superstition. These doubts he set forth in a letter to the Egyptian prophet Anoebo, in a series of questions. The distrust there expressed respecting the popular notions of the gods, divinations, incarnations, and other theurgic arts. "Ut videamus intro vitium sacrilegium curiositatem et philosophiae professionem fluctuassit, et nunc hanc artem tamquam failaceam, et in ipsa actione periculosam, et legibus prohibitam, carentiam monere, nunc autem velut ejus laudatorius cedemem, ut eum dicere easque souterissime partam animae, non quidem intellec-tualis qua rerum intelligibilium perciptioni veritas, vel habentium similitudines corporum, sed spiritualis, qua rerum corporalium capiantur imagines." The letter to Anoebo called forth a reply, which is still extant, and known under the title Pari Mortuarius, and is the production probably of Lamiulhus (q.v.).

So many are the variations of Porphyry in his philo-sophic views from those of Plotinus, that Porphyry must really be assigned to a class of his own rather than called an exponent of Plotinus. Not only did Porphyry popu-lize the teaching of Plotinus, which he had learned, by popularizing it by the more practical and religious charac-ter which he gave to the system. Understanding the power of the Christian religion, which was fast superstitioning the national credos, he felt the necessity for anta-gonizing it. He therefore undertook to spiritualize the old creeds, and to harmonize them with philosophy by treating them as symbolic. He perceived the national craving for a theology (Farrar, p. 57) which rested on some divine authority, or revelation from the world invisible (comp. Augustine's criticism on him in De Cret. xxx. x. 1, 9, 93). He even so far effaced the character of his master as to pretend that he claimed the title of Pope. He also identified the Deity with the manifested or the real or pretended oracles in his περὶ τῆς λειτουργίας, of which fragments exist in Eusebius and Augustine (Fabricius, Bibl. Gr. v. 744). Heathens, it would seem, had consulted oracles on this very subject of Christianity; and it is these, the genuineness of which may be doubted, that he uses.

The end of philosophizing, according to Porphyry, is the salvation of the soul (ἡ τῆς ψυχῆς σωτηρία). The cause of evil is to be found in the soul, in its desires after the low and base, and not in the body as such (Ad Marc. 29). The man who considers that the soul is immortal (καταμωμισθείσα) through asceticism and the philos-ophical contemplation of God. To divination and theurgic initiations Porphyry conceded only a subordinate signif-icance; in his later years, especially, he was in danger of sinking into a kind of paganism. In particular, his epistle to Anoebo, the Egyptian priest. He acknowledged one absolute, supreme Deity, who is to be worshipped with pure words and thoughts (Ad Marc. 18). He also, however, distinguished two classes of visible and invisible gods, the former being composed of body and soul, and the latter, neither eternal nor immutable (De Abst. ii. 34, 36, 37-39). He also distin-guished between good and evil demons, and held that the latter ought to be appeased, but that it should be the object of the philosopher to free himself as much as possible from everything placed under the power of evil demons. For that reason, among others, he rejected all animal sacrifices (De Abst. ii. 38, 39, 48). The ascetic tendency of his philosophy, as connected with his ex-alted ideas of the power of reason, which is superior to nature and the influence of demons, conduced to raise him above the superstitions and tendencies of his age and the spirit of the philosopher being, in his view, superior to all impressions from without. The object of the philos-opher should be to free himself as much as possible from all desires or of dependence on that which is exterior, such appetites being to him the principal tares, from which we should be glad to be set free, or with
the loss of the whole body (Ad Marc. 84). We should, therefore, restrain our sensual desires as much as possible. It was mainly in this point of view that he rejected all six books of Platonism in the second world of Socr. über Freiheit, mit krit. u. erw. Bermerk. zu Porphy. Socr. über Enthaltsamkeit, p. 4-38). Though bad genii have some power over us, yet through abstinence and the steady resistance of all disturbing influences we can pursue the good in spite of them. If we could abstain from vegetable as well as animal food, he thought we should become still more like the gods (De Ast. iii, 27). It is by means of reason only that we are exalted to the supreme God, to whom nothing material should be offered, for everything material is unclean (De Ast. i, 39, 57; ii, 94, Ad Marc. 84). He distinguishes four degrees of virtues, the lowest being political virtue, the virtue of a good man who moderates his passions. Superior to this is purging virtue, which completely sets the soul free from affections. Its object is to make us resemble God, and by it we become domestic men or good demons. In the higher grade, when entirely given up to knowledge and the soul, man becomes a god, till at last he lives only for reason, and so becomes the father of gods, one with the one Supreme Being (Serm. 94).

Porphyry appears to be more distinct from Plotinus than Plotinus's doctrine of the emanation of matter from the super-sensible, and proximately from the soul (Proc. in Tim. p. 109, 188, 189). The doctrine that the world is without beginning in time was defended by Porphyry against the objections of Aviceus and Plutarch (Proc. in Tim. p. 119).

His Attacks against Christianity.—Porphyry has especial interest for us, however, not so much as a philosopher of the New-Platonic school, great as he was so much, but as the constructor of a new philosophy, the aim of which was not merely speculation and the enchantment of reason, but its acceptance as a national creed, and its dethronement of Christianity. When made aware that his system could not of itself accomplish all that he desired, he left the apologetic domain, and became the most determined of heathen polonies the world ever beheld or Christianity ever encountered. Lucian and Celsus, a hundred years earlier, had vainly striven to stay the rising fortunes of the Gospel. He now came forward to attempt the death-grapple, and it must be confessed that he made a most vigorous effort to retrieve a sinking cause, to turn back the tide of new ideas, and to re-instate in the minds of the people of the Roman empire the principles of an ineffable religious system, of a waning and insufficient philosophy. As already indicated above, Porphyry was a man of remarkable learning. He wrote books both in prose and verse, as well as works on the vulgar greeks and ribald remarks of Thomas Paine. In his attacks on the Gospel, often reminds us of the vulgar gibes of ribald remarks of Thomas Paine.

Speaking in the name of philosophy, he assumes a dignity, an elevation of tone, an apparent candor in the treatment of his subject, akin to that of the judge, who is supposed impartially to survey the whole field of evidence, and to give weight to no doubtful statements, to no suspicious arguments. Undoubtedly his honesty in his convictions and in his attack to his philosophy of his master, he brought the resources of a great, a cultured mind to bear against the more vulnerable points of the Christian system, testing it by weapons of the highest temper. Porphyry certainly enjoyed a vantage-ground in the school of philosophy to which he belonged. Platonism, as already suggested, approximated more nearly than any of the other philosophical systems of antiquity to the elevated teachings of the Gospel. But during the period which, while spreading through the Roman world, this philosophy, under the teachings of Plotinus, had been drawing nearer to the doctrines of the New Testament, inso-
of the Jewish Church. It is traceable to a more limited extent in the inspired writers of the New Testament, and in most of the fathers; but in the school of Alexandria it was as a system of interpretation. It is this allegorical system which Porphyry attacked. He assassinated the writings of those who had fanatically allegorized the Old Testament in the pious desire of finding Christianity in every part of it, in spite of historic conditions; and he hastily drew the inference, with a transparent disregard of doubt which rash interpretations of prophecy are in danger of producing at this day, that no consistent sense can be put upon the Old Testament. His fourth book was a criticism on the Mosaic history, and on Jewish antiquities. But the most important books in his work were the twelfth and thirteenth, which were devoted to an examination of the prophecies of Daniel; and in these he detected some of those peculiarities on which modern criticism has employed itself, and arrived at the conclusions in reference to their date revived by the English deists Collins in the last century, and by many German critics in the present. It is well known that half of the book of Daniel is historic, half prophetic. Each of these parts is distinguished from similar portions of the Old Testament by some peculiarities. Porphyry is not right in regarding it as a historic part, unless we may conjecture, from his theory of the book being originally written in Greek, that he detected the presence of those Greek words in Nebuchadnezzar's edicts which many modern critics have connected, and thus decreed into the prophetic part, and consequently into the Macedonian conquest. The peculiarity alleged to belong to the prophetic part is its apocalyptic tone. It looks, it has been said, historical rather than prophetic. Definite events, and these in a distinct chain, are predicted with the precision of historical narrative; whereas most prophecy is a moral sermon, in which general moral predictions are given, with specific historic ones interspersed. Nor is it, which is shared in a less degree by occasional prophecies elsewhere, the only peculiarity alleged, but it is affirmed also that the definite character ceases at a particular period of the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes, down to which the very campaigns of the Seleucid and Ptolemaic dynasties are noted, but subsequently to which the prophetic tone becomes more vague and indefinite. Hence the conjecture has been hazarded that it was written during the time of Palestine. A Jewish, who gathered up the traditions of Daniel's life and wrote the recent history of his country in eloquent language in an apocalyptic form, which, after the literary fashion of his age, he imitated to an ancient seer, Daedalus, predicted a comet as composed of it, indefinite as he gazed on the future. It was this peculiarity, the supposed ceasing of the prophecies in the book of Daniel at a definite date, which was noticed by Porphyry, and led him to suggest the theory of his authorship just named. He seems also to have entered into some examination of the specific prophecies, for he attacks objects to the application of the words "the abomination of desolation" to other objects than that to which he considers its original meaning (see Jerome on Matt. xxiv. 15). These remarks will give an idea of the critical acuteness of Porphyry. A few other traces of Porphyry's views remain, which are of less importance, and are levelled against parts of the New Testament: e.g. the change of purpose in our blessed Lord (John vii), [Jerome, vol. iv, pt. ii, p. 521 (Hist. adscr. Pelagius); Ep. (184) in Pli.], several of which are given by Holsten. (Vid. Porphyry, p. 86), the reason given by the Old E overlooks was abrogated if divine [August. Epist. (102, olm 49, Benedict. ed. 1689), ii, 274, where six questions are named, some of which come from Porphyry]; the question what became of the generations which lived before the destruction of Jerusalem was the only way of salvation; objections to the severity of Peter in the death of Ananias; and the inscrutable mystery of an infinite punishment in retribution for finite sin (August. Retract. bk. ii, c. 31, vol. i, p. 58, concerning Matt. vii, 2). His objections are not, it will be observed, founded on quibbles like those of Celsius, but on inductive literary characteristics, many of which are greatly exaggerated or grossly misrepresented, but still are real, and suggest difficulties or inquiries which the best modern theological critics have honorably felt to demand candid examination and explanation. It was by no means an easy matter to reply to such a critique as Porphyry adopted, and it may be said that he never was answered as he should have been. The reply which Origen made to Celsius set aside all the objections of the heathen disputant, but the thirty separate replies to Porphyry, among which he used, were the same, but elaborated by Methodius, Eusebius, and Apollinarius, very insufficiently solve the intricate and deep problems proposed by the most successful exponent of Neo-Platonism. That he made a profound impression on the Church is seen in the fact that to all Christians his name became hateful, odious, the synonym for all pernicious systems or dangerous in unbelief, like that of Turk or Moslem or Papist in later ages. When Constantine wished to blacken the reputation of the Arians, he only had to add to them the epithet of Porphyrian. That name was carried in it again to the new heresy, invoked to sink irretrievable infamy on any individual or sect who bore it. A great deal of discussion has taken place respecting the assertion of Socrates (H. E. iii, 29), that in his earlier years Porphyry was a Christian, and that, when he had been instructed by Origen, he was converted to the Gnostics, and this is referred to as the evidence of Manetho, he apostatized, and revenged himself by writing against them. The authority is so slight, and the improbability of the story so great (for it does not appear that any of his antagonists charged him with apostasy, unless it was Eusebius), while it may so easily have arisen from the fact that in his early youth Porphyry was instructed by Origen, that it may confidently be rejected. Anable summary of the arguments on both sides is given by Brucker (ii, 251, etc.). A doubt has been raised as to the identity of the assailant of Christianity with the Neo-Platonic philosopher, but it is totally without foundation.

Other Works.—Of the very numerous writings of Porphyry the following are extant: 1. Πίστις καὶ ζωή; supposing by many to be a fragment of his larger history of philosophers. 2. Περὶ Πλωτινοῦ οἰκείου καὶ τῶν τάξεων τῶν Βιβλίων. 3. Περὶ μηθύσεως τῶν ιεροτρόπων, in four books, dedicated to his friend and fellow-disciple Firmus Caecilius. 4. Fragmenta of his epistle Πρὸς Ανδρόνικον τῶν Ἀγάσιτων. Large quotations from this work are made by Eusebius in his Prae. 5. Περὶ τὴν τὸν ὄμερον ἔνδοξην τοῦ ὁμολογητοῦ, addressed to Anatolius. 7. Περὶ τοῦ Τύσιθαμα τῶν ἄνωθεν ἐπτροπῆς, a fanciful allegorical interpretation of the description of the cave of the nympha in the Odyssey, showing both the ingenuity and the recklessness with which Porphyry and other writers of his stamp pressed writers and authorities of all kinds into their service, as holders of the doctrines of their school. 8. A fragment from a treatise Περὶ ζωής, preserved by Stobæus. 9. Βιογραφία, or Περὶ τῶν κυρίων φιλοσόφων, addressed to Chrysasorus, and written by Porphyry while in Sicily. It is commonly prefixed to the Organon of Aristotle. 10. A commentary on the Categories of Aristotle, in questions and answers. 11. Some fragments of a commentary on Aristotle's books Περὶ φυσικῆς ἀρχῶν. 12. A commentary on the Harmonica of Porphyry, coming off at the seventh chapter of the writing of the Catholic bishops: see Williamson, Anecd. Graec., ii, 108-118). 14. Scholia on the Iliad, preserved at Leyden among the books and papers of I. Vossius. A portion of them was published by Valckenier, in an appendix to Urrinius's Virgil, with a copious appendix by the learned Clemens Chersius, of the Iliad, preserved in the Vatican library, were published by Villoison (Anecd. Graec., ii, 266, etc.), and
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Porreà, Gilbert De la. See Porreàni.

Porreàni, Margarétta, one of the numerous victims of religious persecution in the Middle Ages, was born in Hainault, and published at Paris a book which, according to the decision of the theologians who examined it, contained a number of errors and heresies, "et inter cetera (hæreses) quod anima annihilata in amore condicio sine reprehensione conscientiae vel remorum poeset et defert naturam, quasi aquae appetit et desiderat ponent." These errors the foolish woman refused to retract, and as she also scorned the excommunication visited upon her by the Inquisition, the Church delivered her up to the secular arm for execution. At the stake she is said to have confessed to her error, and to have given all the signs of repentance; but for this we have only the testimony of the priests who attended her in her last hours as her persecutors.

Porreàni, a name for the followers of GILBERT DE LA PORREÀ, bishop of Poitiers, a metaphysical divinity of the 12th century, who held opinions respecting the personality and the essence of the Holy Trinity analogical to those of the Lutrelians or Damasitans of the 6th century. Porreànius attempted to distinguish the divine essence from the Deity, and the properties of the three divine Persons from the Persons themselves, not in reality, but in distinction. In contradiction to certain defects of the Lutrelians, he denied the incarnation of the divine nature, respecting which he ventured to set forth the proposition, "Quod Divina natura non esse incarnata." Porreànius was accused by two of his clergy of teaching bisphathy, and at their instigation St. Bernard brought the matter before Eugenius III, the successor, who was then in France. The case was discussed first in the Council of Paris in A.D. 1147, and then in the Council of Rheims, which was held in the following year. To put an end to the contest, Porreànius yielded his own judgment to that of the council and the papacy. It does not appear that any large party was formed by Porreànius, but some are spoken of under his name as his followers. See Gallus Christianus, ii. 1175; Harduin, Concili. VI, ii. 1297; Mansi, Concili. XXI, 712.

Porst, Johann, a Lutheran minister, was born Dec. 11, 1668, at Oberkrotzau, not far from Hof. In 1691 he went to Leipzig to study theology (30th of June, 1698, he was appointed pastor at Malchow, near Berlin: in 1704 he was called to Berlin as preacher at Friedrichswerder and Dorotheenstadt; in 1709 he was made court-preacher, and in 1712 provost of St. Nicola, pastor pri¬mary, and inspector of the time. He occupied since 1717 the position as councilor of consistory. Of his many writings, none is so well known as his hymn-book, published in 1718, and which is still in
use in some churches at Berlin. See Jöcher, Gelehrten-
Lexikon, s. v.; Winer, Handbuch der theolog. Literatur, p. 115 and index; Koch, Gesch. des deutschen
(7th ed.) § 166, 2; Staudt, in göttliche Führung (Stuttgart:
1850); Bachmann, Zur Geschichte der Berliner Gemälde-
bücher (Berlin 1856); id. Die Gemäldebücher Berlin's (ibid.
1857). (B. P.)
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The rendering in Neh. ii, 13 of the Heb.
sha'ar, "גֶּשֶׁר," elsewhere rendered "gate" (q. v.), as
twice in the same verse. These gates of the cities,
and the unoccupied spaces on which they opened,
served as a typical Hebrew antiquity for places of public assembling of the
citizens (comp. the forum, ayōp, of the Greeks and
Romans). In the East this is still the custom, the gates
taking the place of the coffee-houses and other places of
resort among the Western nations (Gen. xix, 1; 1 Sam.
v, 16); ix, 18; Job xxi, 7; Jer. xxxvi, 7). There the people
came together in great numbers when any public
 calamity occurred (2 Macc. iii, 19), there the judges
heard causes and complaints (Deut. xxvi, 19 sq.;
xxii, 13 sq.; Isa. xxii, 21; Job xxxi, 21; Ps. cxviii, 5; Amos
v, 15; Zechar. viii, 16; Jer. xxxii, 22), and
there deeds which required legal sanction, especially
important contracts, were performed (Gen. xxiii, 10, 18;
Deut. xxx, 7; Ruth iv, 11; comp. the early German,
Griam, Deutsche Rechtsverhältnisse, p. 104 sq.; and see Host,
Maroko, p. 239). These gates had no doors to receive
honorable visitors (2 Kings ii, 11, 8; but see below), or for
discussion of public important affairs (1 Kings xxii, 10), and
markets were held in the vicinity (2 Kings vii, 1; Ar-
vieux, Nachr. v, 186; Rosenmüller, Morgenl. vi, 273;
Jacobi, De foro in porto [Leips. 1714], in Ugelino, Thes.
vol. xxv). At the gate public announcements were
made (Jer. xvii, 19; Prov. i, 21; viii, 3). Idolatries,
too, were sometimes practiced here (2 Kings xxii, 8),
just as in Catholic cities altars are placed at the gates.
On the whole, we must consider the gate, not as a mere
port or entrance, but as a strong offence, and as
connected with an open place within; perhaps even with
beneath (Host, Maroko, ut sup.). They were barred
with strong bolts and posts [see Citt.], and often built
over (2 Sam. xviii, 33) with watch-towers (ver. 24 sq.).
Gate-keepers are mentioned, at least in Jerusalem, with
some political duties and powers (Jer. xxivv, 15; Neh.
xxii, 19). On the other hand, in 2 Sam. xv, 2 (and per-
haps in xix, 8), the allusion is not to a city gate, but
to that of a palace in the royal city; and in Esth. iii, 2;
Dan. ii, 49, the word is used, according to a usage still
current in Persia; for the king's gate (ašu regaṇa) in Latin,
is a similar synonyme; comp. also the Arabic
Gate of Raskid for court, in Elmacin, Hist. Sasan. p. 120; see Lüdeke, Türk. Reich, i, 281). To sit at
the palace door or gate (Esth. ii, 19, 21; iv, 2; v, 9, 13 sq.;
vi, 10), among the Persians, was to wait in the hall or
vestibule of the king. Not only courtiers and attend-
ants, but even high officers of the government were
found there (Herod. iii, 20). See Door.
PORTA, Baccio della, more generally known as
Fra Bartolomeo, an Italian monastic of the Dominican
order, distinguished as a painter of the Florentine school,
and to be noted for his intimate relations with Raffaello
and the other Umbrian painters of his time, was born at Sa-
vignano, not far from Florence, in 1469. He was a pu-
pill of Cosimo Roselli in Florence, and lived near the gate of
St. Piero, from which circumstance his name of "Della
Porta" was derived. We have no detailed narrative of
his life, except that he was early brought under
Roselli's tuition, where he formed a close friendship with
Mariotta Albertinelli, his associate student, and showed
such natural and artistic propenencies towards "sweetness
and light" that the beauty of his Madonna faces and the
sublime force of his colorings won the approbation even of
the critical Florentines. He acquired such great
fame that he was commissioned to execute a fresco of
The Last Judgment in the convent of S. Marco, about
VIII. 14-14*

the time when Savonarola went to Florence to preach
against the sinfulness of the city. Bartolomeo became
the earnest preacher, and left his unfinished pictures to be completed by Albertinelli.
During four years he led a most austere life, never
touching his pencil. His superior finally commanded
his practice of the art, and he resumed it with language
and energy unprecedented in his lifetime. About 1509 he
arrived in Florence. He was then but twenty-one years
old, yet was already noted as a great painter. He vis-
ted the friar's cell, and the consequence was a deep
friendship between the two, to which the world owes
the afterworks of Fra Bartolomeo. Raffaello instructed his
monastic friend in perspective, and his turn gave new
ideas of drapery to Raffaello. Fra Bartolomeo was the
first to employ lay figures in the study of drapery; he
also imparted to Raffaello his mode of coloring. The
examination of the works of these painters will prove
that from the works of both of these masters we have more exa-
lent pictures than they had done before; the friar has
caught an intellectual grace from his young friend, and
Raffaello had advanced in color and drapery. About
1508 Fra Bartolomeo was allowed to go to Venice,
where his coloring was greatly admired. There he
finished his masterpiece (1510). This visit was doubtless a deep joy
to him, but the beauties of what he saw so far exceeded
his imagination that he seemed to have been stupefied;
he made no attempt to equal or excel the artists about
him, and only commenced two figures of SS. Peter and
Paul, which Raffaello finished after his return to Flo-
rence. When once more in his convent, Bartolomeo
showed the benefit he had received, and executed some
of his most important works, among which are a Mu-
riage of St. Catharina, now hanging in the Louvre, and
the unfinished Concepcion of the Valti. But it is in his
later days, when his mind had broadened and strength-
ened and his touch grown firm, that we find such mas-
terpieces as the Pitti of the Piti— the most purely
beautiful Pietà ever painted; The Presentation in the
Temple, at Vienna; and The Madonna della Minervi-
cordia, most famous of them, and considered by many as
his most important work. It had been said that he could
do nothing grand; he now painted the St. Mark, which
is in the Pitti Palace, and is so simply grand as to be
comparable to the remains of Greekian art. He lived only
four years after going to Rome, and during that short
time with a shrinking of his powers, but not a failing
in energy. His character was impressed on all his works.
When Savonarola was seized, Porta hid himself, and vowed that if he escaped
he would become a monk. This want of courage and
energy in his nature we must admit; but he was en-
thusiastic, devout, and loving. His sainls and virgins are
tender, mild, and full of sweet dignity, and if we char-
acterized his pictures in one word, holiness is what we
should use, for it is that which they most express. His
boy-angels were beautifully painted, and his representa-
tions of architecture were rich and grand. His works
are rare. The Louvre has two of his pictures, and the
Berlin Museum one; but he is best studied in Florence,
where the larger number of his works remain. See Mrs.
Clement, Handbook of Painters, Sculptors, etc., s. v.;
Meehan, Lives of the Most Eminent Painters, etc., of the
Order of S. Dominic (Dublin 1862, 2 vols. 12mo.), vol.
ii, ch. i-vii; Radcliffe, Schools and Masters of Painting
(N. Y. 1867), p. 120 sq.; et al.; Schlegel, Ästhetische
and Miscellaneous Notes, p. 7 sq.; Taine, Travels in Italy
(Florence and Venice), p. 156 sq. (J. H. W.)
Porta, Paolo, a Jesuit, born 1520 at Osterwick, near Halleuberg. Having completed
his studies, he was called in 1566 as rector to Osterwick.
In 1567 he went as conrector to Eisleben; in 1569 he
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drafted as deacon of St. Nicolai; in 1578, pastor of SS. Peter and Paul and assessor of the consistory, at the same time serving the spiritual wants of the Church of the Holy Ghost and lecturing at the Gymnasium. When in 1572 the Flaeck controversy took place, he sided with the Eisleben theologians against Spaenberg. Porta died in 1585. He wrote, Pastorale Luth. r. (1565); Orationes, etc. (1585); — Regensburger lectiones, operum Lutheri (ibid., etc. See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Literatur, ii, 29; Jocher, Gelehrten-Lexikon, s. v. (B. P.)

Porta, Sigismondo di, a Roman Catholic monastic, flourished in the period of the great Reformation movement of the 16th century. He had early taken the black cloak of the Augustinians; his chief work was the monument to Paul III in the tribune of St. Peter's. Two statues, of Peace and Abundance, which formerly made a part of this work, are now in the Farnese Palace.

Porta, Simon, an Italian philosopher of the first half of the 16th century, was a pupil of Pomponazzi, and is celebrated especially as the author of Magia Naturalis (Naples, 1586, and since). In 1512 the Lateran Council condemned both those who taught that the human soul was not immortal and those who asserted that the soul is one and identical in all men. It condemned also the scholastics who affirmed these opinions, although contrary to faith, were philosophically true. It enjoined professors of philosophy to refute all heretical doctrines to which they might allude, and prohibited the clergy from studying philosophy for a course longer than five years. Indeed, Averroism as early as the 13th century had become hostile to the doctrines of the Church, and in 1271, and again in 1277, it was condemned by Stephen Tempier, archbishop of Paris, who caused its principles to be embodied in distinct propositions. Among these were the following: "Quod sermone theologice sunt fundati in falsis, quod nihil plus scire theologice. Quod fabulae et falsa sunt in leges Christianas, sicut et in aliis. Quod lex Christiana impedit addiscere. Quod sapientes mundi sunt philosophico tantum. Notwithstanding the condemnation of the Church, these ideas seemed to have taken hold of the philosophical mind of the age, and long continued to find favor among teachers and students. Like his preceptor, Pomponazzi, Porta wrote, in agreement with the Alexandrians on the question of immortality, a work entitled De rerum naturalibvs principiis, de anima et mente humana (Flo. 1551). Among other works of Porta, we mention De humana mente disputatio (1551): — De dolore: — An homo bonus vel malus vel naturalis (1551). He died in 1555. See Uebert, Hist. der Philos., ii, 14, 467.

Porta-Leonc (πορταλέονκι), Abraham, also called Arjé Abraham, a Jewish savant, was born in the year 1612, the son of a family who excelled in medical science to such a degree that one of the members of the family was employed as physician in the service of king Ferdinand I of Naples and duke Galeazzo Maria Sforza of Mailand. Abraham received an excellent education, and attended the lectures at the University of Padua, where he espoused the philosophy of Aristotle and submitted himself to the study of Aristotle, Hippocrates, Galenus, and the Arabic writers. In the year 1653 he received the doctorate and became a member of the medical college at Mantua. He died in the year 1612. Porta-Leone takes a prominent place in Jewish literature, as he is the author of the ΠορταΛήΟνκι, an extensive work on Jewish antiquities, in which he minutely treats of the Temple and its structures, the structure of the altar, the candlestick, table, music, etc. The whole is divided into ninety sections, to which is appended a list of ninety-eight works, which he perused for his work, and an essay on the use of the Hebrew language, etc. This excellent work, which is now very scarce, was first published in the year 1612. A Latin translation, which Wagenseil pronounced "is in the highest degree interesting," was published by Uglione in his Thesaurus antiquitatum sacrarum (vol. i. iii. xiii. xxxii.), 1664. Iken used Leone's work in his antiquities to a great extent, and he promised a translation of the whole, which never appeared. See Furt, Bibl. Jud. et. iii. 114 sq., De Rossi, Dizionario storico de' Autori Ebrei (German transl.), p. 268 sq.; Wolf, Bibl. Heb., i. iii., iv. 68; Jahrbuch für Geschichte der Juden u. des Judenthums, ii. 946 sq.; Wolf, Studien zur Jüdischen Geschichte der Wiener Universität, 1866, p. 172; Delitsch and Zunz, Addit. ad Cod. Bibl. Sem. (Lips., xxxvii. (B. P.)

Portable Altars (creticae, gestatorum, itineraria). During the Crusades the bishops and ecclesiastics who took part in them carried an "itinerant altar." The portable altar was a table used for consecrating altars in private chapels. Bede mentions a consecrated table in lieu of an altar. The monks of St. Denis carried a table of wood, covered with a linen cloth, in Charlemagne's campaign against the Saxons. There were examples also of stone, metal, and terra-cotta. The repository is used in the street to rest the Sacrament on in the procession of the Fête Dieu in France. One is preserved at Santa Maria, in the portico d'Campitelli; and another, of carved porphyry, at Conques, cir. 1106. See Altar.

Portable Bells. Hand-bells were of Celtic origin, and were used in Britain, in St. Patrick's time in Ireland, and in that of St. Bello in Wales. Unlike the small altar-bells, which were square, these were hexagonal or oval, without clappers, like the original cloch, usually of bronze, and sometimes jewelled, being regarded as specially sacred, and possessed of miraculous powers, as St. Hilya's, the bell of Armagh of the close of the 11th century, the golden bell of St. Senanus, St. Ewin's at Monasteren, which was tied with a chain to prevent its automatic flight, and used as an ordeal for swearing criminals by the justices of Munster. The clocis was cylindrical, and in the 8th, 9th, and 10th centuries often gemmed. At Carlowdon, in Wales, the hangi was used at a funeral recently. Hand-bells are preserved at Perton, Guirc and St. Symphorian's, Côtes-du-Nord. See Bell.

Portail, Antoine, a French priest noted for his relation to the "Congregation of Priests of the Mission," which body he joined immediately after their institution by Vincent de Paul, flourished in the first half of the 17th century. Nothing is known of his personal history, but he is reputed to have been not only Paul's first companion, but also his most devoted coadjutor. See Jervis, Hist. of the Church of France, i. 320 sq.

Portail (πορταλί), an architectural term, designates an external porch, that is, the principal doors of a church by way of shelter, whereas a porch is a projecting outwork independent of the door. See Porton. There are fine examples of portals in the cathedrals of Rheims, Paris, St. Ouen's, and Rouen, Amiens, Sens, Senlis, and Bourges, Westminster, etc. In medieval Italy, of smaller dimensions, he appears richly decorated, with cornice, field, and Verona and other Italian towns. "Pennisile porch," the resort of beggars, was the local name of the cemetery-gate of Wells.
Portas vestrās aeternałēs. This is the beginning of one of the few Ascension hymns which we have in the Latin language. "Nothing is poorer," says Trench, "throughout the whole Christian Church than the hymnology of the Ascension. It is bowed to the ground. Even the best man in any Protestant hymn-book, so incomparably rich in Passion and Resurrection and Pentecost hymns, is singularly ill-furnished with these. ... The Latin forms no exception; it does not possess a single first-rate hymn on the Ascension." This hymn, which strangely enough has never found its way into any of the more modern collections of Latin hymns, runs thus:

"Portas vestrās aeternałēs, Triumphales, principałēs, Angēllā, satillitā, Fās, tollite acutum, Vеuít Dominus virtutām, Flux aeterna gloria."

An English translation is given by Benedict in The Hymns of Hildibrand, etc., p. 81 (N. Y. 1867); for the original, see Trench, Sacred Latin Poetry, p. 172 sq.

Portatīlē Altāre is the name of a square portable stone framed in wood, at the angles and in the middle of which there is a cross, and the cavity of which receives some pomegranate stands by a mark impressed by the bishop, and can be used after this ceremony for the purpose of saying mass in private chapels. See Portable Altars.

Portatives is the technical term applied to candlesticks used in churches and carried by hand.

Porteaus Mōb. This tragic incident is introduced here from its connection with the ecclesiastical history of Scotland. Some new customs were felt to be odious and galling in Scotland, and revenue-officers were specially obnoxious in some of the seaports. Two men, named Wilson and Robertson, who had robbed the collector of Pittenweem, in Fife, were apprehended and brought to the court. Attempts were made to break out of jail after sentence had been passed upon them, had proved abortive. On the Sabbath before the execution the criminals, as usual, were taken to church, under custody of four soldiers of the city guard, when, as the congregation was dismissing, Wilson, laying hold of two of the soldiers, one in each hand, and seizing the third with his teeth, called on Robertson to run. The latter at once knocked down the remaining guard and fled, without any one trying to arrest him. The romantic pity of Wilson for his junior accomplice, and his successful delusion of the interpreter, were great assets for him. At his execution, April 14, 1736, the mob became unruly, rushed to the scaffold, and cut down the dead man. Captain Porteous, of the city guard, who was at that time surly and excited, ordered his men to fire—saw, fired a musket-shot of each man, and seven persons were killed by the first volley, and more by the second. Some respectable citizens were shot as they were looking out from their windows. Captain Porteous was tried before the High Court of Justiciary, and condemned to death. Queen Caroline, in the absence of George II. on the Continent, sent down a reprieve. The populace were filled with terrible indignation, and resolved to take the law into their own hands. On Sept. 7 a crowd assembled under some unknown command, secured all the military posts, locked the gates, opened the prison, took out captain Porteous, entered a shop, brought away a halter, leaving a guinea on the counter to pay for it, and hung him on a dyer's pole. The mob dispersed with perfect order, and did no other violence. The riot is enveloped in mystery—no one of the parties ever apprehended. But a bill of great and vitriolic personal abuse, which was prepared by some of the original agents in passing through Parliament it contained the enactment that every minister in the Church of Scotland was to read a proclamation against the rioters from the pulpit, during public worship, on the second Saturday of each month during a whole year. If any minister refused, he was, for the first offence, to be declared incapable of sitting and voting in any Church court, and, for the second, he was pronounced incapable of "taking, holding, or enjoying any ecclesiastical benefit in Scotland." The majority of the ministers complied with the edict. Some, however, refused. Some, with the enactment ratified commotion in many parishes, and aided the spread of the first Secession. The seceders were accused of disloyalty, because they unanimously, and without hesitation, refused to read the edict. In Carlyle's History of Schism will be found a graphic account. Carlyle saw the rescue and witnessed the execution.—Scott, Heart of Mid-Lothian.

Porter. This word, when used in the A. V., does not bear its modern signification of a carrier of burdens, but denotes in every case a gate-keeper, from the Latin portaritis, the man who attended to the porta. In the original the word is מֶשְׁכָּה or מָשְׁכָה, shōr, from מָשָׁךְ, shār, a gate or postern, is guarded by a porter. This is the same (Sept. φύλακας and πύλος; Vulg. porta- rius and janitor). This meaning is evidently implied in 1 Chron. ix. 21; 2 Chron. xxiii, 13; xxxv, 15; John x, 8. It is generally employed in reference to the Levites who had charge of the entrances to the sanctuary, but is used also in other connections in 2 Sam. viii, 16; 2 Kings vii, 10, 11; Mark xiii, 84; John x, 8; xviii, 16, 17. In two passages (1 Chron. xxv, 23, 24) the Hebrew word is rendered "doorkeeper," and in John xviii, 16, 17, θύραμας is "a she that kept the door." Thus, in 2 Kings vii, 10, 11, and 2 Sam. viii, 26, we meet with the porter at the gates of a town. In the palace of the high-priest (John xviii, 17) the porter was a female, θυραρία, θύρωρας. See also Acts xxii, 13. A porter seems to have been usually stationed at the doors of sheepfolds (John x, 5). According to Stier and others, this θύραμας corresponds to the Holy Spirit, who opens the way for the true Ministers of Christ. See Door.

The porters of the Temple, who were guards as well as porters, were very numerous in David's time; for in 1 Chron. xxxii, 5 no less than 4000 are mentioned. They were divided into courses (1 Chron. xxvi, 1-19), and had their keepers appointed to them by David. Besides attending to the gates and keeping order there, they seem, as Lightfoot says, to have had charge of certain treasures (ver. 15, comp. with 2 Chron. xxv, 24, and Lightfoot's Prospect of the Temple, c. v, § 6). Properly speaking, their office was in some respects that of a heri- son. They were the soldiers of Jehovah, and the guards of his Temple. The stations that were guarded were not all occupied by the same number—some being guarded by six, some by four, and others by two persons only. They were relieved every Sabbath-day by others who took their places (2 Kings xi, 5; 1 Chron. ix, 17-29; xvi, 42; 2 Chron. vii, 14; xxxii, 4; xxxiv, 14; xxxv, 15). Their service was required by night as well as by day, and a man called "the Man of the Mountain of the House" went round every night to see that all were in their places, and that none of them slept. If he found any one asleep he struck him, and had liberty to burn his clothes. To this Lightfoot thinks there is a reference in Rev. xv, 16: "Blessed is he that watcheth and keepeth his garments" (Temple Service, c. vii, § 1). See Temple.

Porter, David, D.D., a Congregational minister of some note, was a native of Hebron, Conn., where he was born May 27, 1761. He was educated at Dartmouth College, class of 1784, and, having been duly ordained, became pastor of the Congregational Church at Springfield, N. Y., in 1787. In 1803 he removed to Catskill, N. Y., as pastor of the Presbyterian church, and founded his relation to the Church until 1831. He died in that
place Jan. 7, 1851. He served nearly a year in the Revolutionary army. He published *Dissertation on Baptism* (1809), and some *Sermons*. He was, after his discharge, agent of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, and, though eccentric, a man of great influence. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, iii, 496-506.

Porter, Ebenezer, D.D., an eminent Congregational minister, was born Oct. 5, 1772, in Cornwall, Conn. After graduating at Dartmouth College in 1792, he taught school some months; then studied divinity, and entered the ministry in 1794, and was ordained pastor at Washington, Conn., Sept. 6, 1796, where he remained until April 1, 1812, when, his health becoming impaired, he removed to Andover to take the Pasteur professorship of pulpit eloquence in the theological seminary. In 1817 he was chosen professor of divinity in Yale College, but did not accept, and during the same year refused successively the presidency of Hamilton College, of Middlebury College, and of the University of Georgia. In 1827 he was made president of the seminary, and held that office until his death, April 8, 1834. As a theological instructor, Dr. Porter had few equals. He was remarkably well endowed for the training of young men intended for the holy ministry. Thus Dr. Dewey writes: "A friend of mine attended service in the (Andover) seminary one morning some years after I left it, and heard one of Dr. Porter's grand discourses; and, as the audience was leaving the chapel, professor Stuart in his deep tone said, 'This is the majesty of the Gospel.' It was indeed the majesty of the Gospel." Dr. Porter published, *The Young Preacher's Manual* (1819; 2d ed. 1829); *A Lecture on the Analysis of Vocal Injections* (1824); *An Analysis of the Principles of Rhetorical Delivery as applied in Reading and Speaking* (1827); *The Rhetorical Reader* (1831); *Lectures on Revivals of Religion* (1822); *A Lecture on the Cultivation of Spiritual Habits and Progress in Study* (1838); *Lectures on Homiletics, Preaching, and Public Prayer* (1834); and a large number of occasional *Sermons*. Since his death the *Biblical Reader* and Lectures on Eloquence and Style have also been published. Dr. Porter was a contributor to the *Quarterly Register*, and the translator of many sacred German poems. See notices of this excellent man and eloquent preacher in Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, ii, 851; Rev. Lyman Matthews, *Memoir of E. Porter, D.D.* (Boston, 1835); D. C. Glass, *W. H. Moore, Poly., Spec. I, 79; Id. and Theol. Rev. iv, 401 (by W. Long); Meth. Rev. liii, 191; Ware, *Biogr. of Unitarians*, vol. i. (J. H. W.)

Porter, Eliphalet, D.D., a Congregational minister of Unitarian tendency, was born at North Bridgewater, Mass., June 11, 1758. He was educated at Harvard University, class of 1779, and, after studying theology with his father, Rev. John Porter, minister of North Bridgewater from 1740 till 1802, he was ordained Oct. 2, 1782, over the Congregational Society of Roxbury, and there continued fifty-one years. In 1802 he was chosen as colleague. He died in that place Dec. 7, 1833. He was a member of the Academy of Arts and Sciences. He published *A Eulogy of Washington* (1800), and nine single *Sermons*. See Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, viii, 157.

Porter, George D., a Presbyterian minister, was born at Newbury, Me., Mar. 1, 1803. He was educated for the medical profession, but subsequently fill called to the ministry. He graduated at the Western Theological Seminary at Alleghany, Pa., was licensed in 1832, and for a time preached in Monongahela City, Pa., but afterwards removed to Newburg and Rockport, Pa., and was ordained by Huntington Presbytery in Nov., 1833. When the questions which led to the disruption of the Church came up, he took a lively inter-
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annual Conference, from which time till his death, in 1832, he labored in that and other fields, chiefly in the Middle States. For two years of this time he was principal of the academy at Cazenovia, giving great satisfaction. Mr. Porter was an excellent preacher, and a zealous and consistent Christian. See Minutes of Conferences, ii, 161.

Porter, Samuel, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Ireland in 1760, came to this country in 1790, and accepted a pastorate in Hone Rite, in 1796, and in 1798, at College, Pennsylvania. He published several Sermons (1798, 1803, 1811), which were reprinted with two Dialogues in 1858, with a biographical sketch of the author by Rev. David Elliott, D.D. He was also contributor to several periodicals. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, iii, 539–550.

Porter, Thomas, an English dissenting divine, flourished in the second half of the last century. Scarcely anything is known of his personal history. He published, A Defence of Unitarianism; intended as an Answer to Dr. Haeker on his Reply (1738, 8vo):—Serious Thoughts on the Birth of a Child (1805).

Porter, Walter, an English musician of some note, flourished in the first half of the 18th century as gentleman of the Chapel Royal of Charles I. He was one of the choristers of Westminster. He was killed during the civil war. He published, Musurgia and Aires (Lond. 1632):—Aires and Madrigals (1689).

Porter, William Henry, an American divine of some note, was born at Rye, New Hampshire, in 1817, and was educated at Yale College, class of 1841. After having studied theology he became pastor of the Presbyterian Church at Litchfield, N. J., in 1845. In 1851 he united with the Swedenborgians, and took a pastorate at Boston, Mass. He died at Roxbury, Mass., in 1861. He published, Common and Scriptural Providence Compared (Bost. 1845, 12mo):—The Jesuitic Union, or, New Jerusalem on Earth (1850, 12mo).

Portasce, Portasce, Portoeus, or Portorium, are technical terms applied to the brewery, or a portable book of prayer used in the Church of Rome, and containing the mass and the other parts of the Church service to be said through the year at canonical hours, with the exception of the marriage service. The terms are derived from the Latin portorium (a portando forae), through the French portier-hors, hence portasce, portoeus. The foreign breviaries were divided according to the four seasons, but in England into winter and summer parts.

Porteus, Bekly, an eminent English prelate, was born at York in 1731. He passed several years at a small school in his native city, and at the age of thirteen he was sent to a school at Ripon, and entered at an earlier age than usual Cambridge University, where he was admitted a sizar of Christ's College. His personal worth, united with his superior attainments, both classical and mathematical, soon procured for him a fellowship in his college, and by the exertions of his friends he was made esquire-beadle of the university. This office he did not long retain, but chose rather to give his undivided attention to private pupils. In 1757, at the age of twenty-six, he was ordained deacon, and soon after priest; and only a little while later was appointed lecturer at Whitbale. He first became known as a writer by obtaining Seaton's prize for the best English poem on a sacred subject. On the occasion this topic was "Death," and the production of Mr. Porteus was universally regarded as one of great merit. In 1761 his fame was still further increased by a sermon which he preached before his alma mater on the character of David, king of Israel. Archbishop Secker was so much pleased with Porteus that he made him in 1763 his chaplain. Porteus's first preferences were two small livings in Kent, which he held a while and then took the rectory of Hunton in the same county. Hunton was his favorite residence. He delighted in the quiet of that rural retirement, and still more in exercising the duties of the ministry among its simple and attached people. He was most indefatigable in performing all the services of pastoral satisfaction. In some district of it daily; and by his pastoral visits to the poor, as well as to the rich, secured the affections and esteem of all his parishioners. His high character for propriety and talents brought him into general notice, and he was soon appointed prebendary of Peterborough, and not long afterwards, in 1767, he became rector of Lambeth. In the same year he took the degree of D.D. at Cambridge, and in 1769 was made chaplain to king George III, and master of the hospital of St. Cross, near Winchester. In 1773 Dr. Porteus, with a few other clergymen, joined in an unauspicious application to the bishops, requesting that they would review the Liturgy and Articles for the purpose of making some slight alterations. In 1776 Dr. Porteus, without any solicitation on his part, was made bishop of Chester; and in 1776, on the death of bishop Lewish, he was promoted to the diocese of London, over which he presided till his death. This appointment, with the new duties to which it called his attention, put a temporary stop to the immediate prosecution of several important undertakings he had contemplated; but they were resumed shortly after. The bishop immediately published an excellent Summary of the Principal Events of the Truth and Divine Origin of the Christian Revelation, designed chiefly for the instruction of young persons. Besides, as a member of the Legislature, he pursued a long-formed plan for improving the condition of the negro slaves in the West Indian islands, and particularly for their instruction in religious knowledge. He was for many years one of the vice-presidents of the British and Foreign Bible Society, and took a lively interest, as well as an active part, in the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. In short, his public influence, as well as private patronage, were constantly exerted in devising or supporting measures for the diffusion of pure and undefiled religion. In 1798 he began a course of lectures on St. Matthew's Gospel, which he delivered at St. James's Church on the Fridays in Lent. Those lectures, which he afterwards published, have been among the most popular of all his works. He died May 14, 1808. Though bishop Porteus cannot be called a profound scholar or divine, he was a man of considerable learning and ability; and he pursued through life a steady course of useful exertion for the benefit of his fellow-creatures, which procured him a high reputation among men of all parties. He was a prelate of liberal and enlarged views, one proof of which may be adduced in the fact that when a bill was introduced into Parliament for the abolition of the existing miseries of the negroes, he pronounced it "a measure no less consonant to the principles of sound policy than to the genuine spirit of the Gospel." He was in private life distinguished by a cheerful disposition, affable manners, great benevolence, and deep and unaffected piety. As a preacher, few in his day surpassed him in eloquence or pathos. He is conscious for sound judgment, solid argument, great knowledge of the human heart, accurate observation of the world, an unshrinking reproof of vice, the most persuasive exhortations to piety, and an unqualified avowal of all the essential, fundamental truths and doctrines of the Gospel. His works, consisting of sermons and tracts, with a Life of Archbishop Secker, and the poems and lectures already mentioned, were collected and published, with his Life, making another volume, by his nephew, the Rev. Robert Hodgson, who died dean of Christchurch in 1805 (8vo, and often). There are a few letters, sermons, etc., not included in this collection (see Darling, Cyclop. Bibliogr. i, 2425). Besides Hodgson's Life of Bishop Porteus (also published separately, 1810, 8vo), see Churchman's Magazine, iv. No. 203, 231, 319; Bicknell, Lamps of the Church, p. 69 sq.; Chambers, Cyclop. Engl.
in the ensuing year elected provincial of his order. In 1594 he was theological instructor at Poitiers. He mixed in the disorders of the League, which conducted he expiated subsequendy by public penance. After the rendition of Paris he went to Saumur, solicited from Duplessis-Mornay the pardon of his past errors, and obtained permission to celebrate in the church of St. Peter the virtues of the king against whom he had uttered such violent imprecations. He left Les Catholiques, Démonstrations sur certains Discours de la Doctrine ecclésiastique (Paris, 1567, 8vo)—De Verba Dominii: "Hor faciile in meum commemorationem" (Antwerp, 1567, 8vo), a pamphlet on the Lord's Supper—Christiënne Déclaration de l'Eglise et de l'Eucharistie (ibid. 1567, 8vo)—De la Limiti et l'Évêché de la vraie et foussée Astronomie contre les Abusseurs de notre Siécle (Poitiers, 1578)—Défense à la Réponse faite aux Intérêts de Bernard de Parvieu par les Ministres de la Religion prétendue reformée (ibid. 8vo)—De l'Illusion de l'Eucharistie (ibid. 1602, 8vo)—Parafrase générale à l'Exact Examen de l'Institution de l'Eucharistie (ibid. 1602, 8vo)—Traité de l'Usage et de l'Idole (ibid. 1608). See Wadding, Script. ord. Minorum; Salachrona (2d ed.), p. 192; Liron, Singularitates Hist. et litter. iii, 84; Desportes, Biblio. du Maine; Haureau, Hist. lit. du Maine, i, 306.—Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, s. v.

Portico is an architectural term designating a range of columns in the front of a building. When of four columns it is called tetra styie; when of six, hexa styie; of eight, octa styie; of ten, deca styie. The Latin porticus, however, from which the Italian portico and the French portique are derived, has a more extended significance in medieval writers; comprehending, in fact, every kind of covered ambulatory of which one or more sides are opened to the air, by rows of columns or arches, whether it be attached to the front of a building or to its sides, or to the inner sides of an area, so as to form a cloister in the strict sense of the word. In an ancient church the porticoes were the cloisters about the area, otherwise called the exterior northex (q. v.), and the place of the mourners. See PORCH.

Portier, Michael, D.D., an American Roman Catholic prelate, was born near the opening of our century, and was of French descent. He was educated in this country and at the Propaganda at Rome, and was consecrated to the priesthood Nov. 5, 1826. After holding various ecclesiastical appointments, he was made bishop of Mobile. He died May 14, 1859. As an ecclesiastic he was greatly beloved by his own denomination, and as a citizen he was highly respected by all classes. He was more solicitous towards those who differed from him in religious belief than is apt to be the case among Romanists.

Portiforium, otherwise called the Fic (q. v.), is a

Tomb of Bishop Porteous, at Tunbridge, Kent.

Temple of Vesta, Tivoli.
book of rubrical directions to instruct the clergy as to the due performance of divine service and the administration of the sacraments. Sometimes, however, the word "Portion" has been used in reference to the financial support of religious institutions, including monasteries, convents, and the clergy. The Portion of a religious community was often a significant source of income, providing support for the maintenance of the community and the performance of their religious duties.

Portia, the name given in the canon law to the suitable salary which was anciently allotted to the priest or minister of a parish. The term "Portion" (Italian: "Portione") refers to a fixed salary or stipend provided to a priest or minister, which was a significant part of their income and a basic requirement for their professional role. The amount and type of portion could vary depending on the jurisdiction and the status of the parish.

Portion (Porsele, chelch). In addition to the sense of dividing or allotting, this word is used in reference to a part of the flock going to pasture. Portioning was an important aspect of pastoral care, ensuring that the sheep or cattle were distributed evenly and provided with adequate grazing.

Portion (Parochial). The mediety of a parish was divided into several vicarages or parishes. The Portion (Parochial) was essentially a fraction of the territory of a parish that was assigned to a particular priest or minister. This division was important for the administration of the sacraments and the distribution of religious services. The size and number of portions could vary, depending on the needs and size of the parish.

Portion (Parochial) is the mediety of a parish which was divided into several vicarages or parishes. The Portion (Parochial) was essentially a fraction of the territory of a parish that was assigned to a particular priest or minister. This division was important for the administration of the sacraments and the distribution of religious services. The size and number of portions could vary, depending on the needs and size of the parish.
mother, five of her sisters, and six nieces became her spiritual children. Mère Angélique's change of such pious devotion was said to have been occasioned by a sudden and mysterious offering made by a wandering Capuchin friar, father Basil, who had learned the truth of the Gospel of Christ, and had resolved formally to quit the communion of Rome, and, in passing the convent of Port-Royal while on his journey to the Protestant countries of the North, had secured permission to address the nuns. With love and kindness, but with unyielding firmness and great wisdom, the converted young woman restored the rule of the order in all its severity—as the strict observance of religious poverty, abstinence from meat, complete seclusion, and the daily attendance in the choir. The abbey of Port-Royal des Champs had been erected for but a small number of nuns; in consequence, however, of the celebrity which it attained through the reforms and guidance of Mère Angélique, the number increased greatly, so that, instead of twelve, there were more than eighty; and thus the buildings of the abbey became overcrowded and unhealthy. In 1626 it was found necessary to make additional provisions. A house was purchased in Paris in the Faubourg St. Jacques (in great part at the expense of the Arnauld family), to which the nuns were removed. This they were able to do by permission of the Port-Royal des Champs. In 1633 more spacious quarters were secured in the Rue de Bouloi, near the Rue Coquillière, where they also owned a church, which was dedicated with great solemnity by the archbishop of Paris.

In 1629 the nuns had exercised the right of affording an asylum to such lay penitents as the world disdained, with being their own masters, should wish to live in monastic seclusion without binding themselves by permanent monastic vows. This privilege has not withdrawn the Port-Royalists much until now. But the gradual transformation of Mère Angélique, under the influence of St. Francis de Sales, whom she had been brought in contact, and who led her to accept the doctrine of perfection in the form of the possibilities of a complete transformation of the human heart in the years before death, had so benefitted her that in her influence over her nuns and the severity they reached, that, inspired by this example, a number of learned and pious men, desirous of living in religious retirement, sought in 1638 the privilege of occupying the desecrated establishment of the Port-Royal des Champs. The leading minister of this new movement was the indefatigable St. Cyprian, who had been first an examiner and later the spiritual director of the nuns of Port-Royal. See Du Verger de Hachane. He was a Jansenist, and a most intimate friend of the founder of these doctrines, and as the head of this new group, he established, in 1639, the Port-Royal des Champs, the home of Jansenism in France.

A whole colony of illustrious penitents joined him: the three brothers of La Mère Angélique; her nephew, the celebrated advocate La Maitre, and her brothers Serinourt and De Sève; Pierre Nicole; Claude Lancelot, the grammarian; Tillemont, the historian; Pascal, the philosopher; Racine, the poet, and Antoine Arnauld (q. v.), the great Arnauld, the youngest brother of the abbess, the learned and impetuous Doctor of the Sorbonne, whose condemnation by that body occasioned Pascals' Proverbes.

This religious movement of the 17th century in France is as remarkable as the philosophical for which that era is noted. Jansenists and Jesuits undertook the re-establishment of that spiritual power which had been lost since the Reformation, and which the Jesuits had neglected. With this major work, the Jesuits had taken hold of—the social and political side of Catholicism—they clung to its personal, mystical, and ascetic side. They did not quarrel with the Church; they desired to remain Catholic in spite of the pope, believing in the priesthood and the sacraments. They arrived at a metaphorical separation from Rome, in the same way that St. Paul and St. Augustine were their inspirers. The Jesuits adopted directly antagonistic views on grace and predestination, and proclaimed the opinions of the Spanish Molina, who had undertaken, in his De Concordia Gratiae et Libertatis in Dre Domini, to reconcile free-will and predestination. The solitaires of Port-Royal now became the Jansenists of France, insisted upon predestination, and taught that good works were without merit; that grace alone, arbitrarily given or refused, made saints—a Christianity as terrible as the Fates of the ancients. They pursued human nature, interpreted the actions of the abbey, implacably hatred, and the logical conclusion of such a doctrine was the salvation of the few—i.e. the Church of Jansenism became an aristocracy of grace. See Jansenism. However much we may find in Jansenism to take exception to, the men who espoused its tenets were actuated by the noblest of motives, and deserved success in their undertaking, which aimed principally at the freedom of France from the trammels of the papal devotions—the Jesuits—and the spread of practical piety among the French people.

The Jesuits moved to a more prominent at this time in the Church of France, and effectively controlled the court, obtained under the ministry of Richelieu, and especially of Mazarin, repeated condemnatory acts against the teachings of the Jansenists in general, and of Port-Royal in particular. This persecution, however, only stimulated the growth of the new opinions. Duverger, a Port-Royalist, was thrown into prison, and kept there until the death of Richelieu, in 1642.

But the very time of his liberation was marked by a most noteworthy production. Antoine Arnauld, better known as St. Grand Arnauld, then wrote his Frequent Communion, the first work of that scientific school of religious philosophy of which Port-Royal was the focus and Pascal the principal exponent. Indeed, the best claim which the community of Port-Royal has upon our notice is this literary war which it waged against the scholastic theology, and against the Jesuits in particular. The Society of Jesus had, ever be it said to its credit, devoted itself to the education of youth; but whatever danger there was in their general teaching was mitigated by the discerning eye of the Jesuits of Anti-Jesuits, the confessional; for the integrity and piety which characterized the Port-Royalists caused them to be much sought after as confessors. They discovered and maintained the famous distinction of god and devil in respect to papal infallibility. As more and more of the Jesuits came to be convinced of the truth of this doctrine, the pope could not err: as to facts he might. See Gallicanism; Infallibility. When required, they were willing to condemn, as doctrines, the five propositions which were said to comprise the Jansenistic heresy; but they denied that these conclusions were to be found in or inferred from Jansen's Augustines. No papal bulls or persecution could make them recede from this position. In their maintenance of Jansen's real doctrines, in their refusal to acknowledge papal infallibility as to facts, in their continual warfare against the Jesuits, they were exposed to constant persecution. For the Jesuits were not inert in the face of this opposition and defiance. They plotted incessantly at Rome, in order to bring the thunders of the Holy See to bear upon the over-bold Jansenists.

The persecution thrived about a result the Jesuits hardly anticipated. Blaise Pascal was induced to step into the arena in defence of the Port-Royalists. One of the most independent minds of his age, Pascal had
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never yet up to this point submitted himself to the actual guidance of Jansen, any more than he had frankly accepted the logical consequences of the discoveries of Descartes. He had felt the force of both these powerful influences; but a third feeling had asserted authority over his unwilling mind: he had been swayed by the sceptical influence of Montaigne. As a sort of refuge from the yawning abyss which had thus threatened to drown him, this staunch and devoted spirit threw him, as by a sudden and irresistible impulse, into the arms of the Jansenists, and he became a recluse at Port-Royal, and its champion against the world. See PASCAL.

In the meantime the number of nuns and novices of Port-Royal de Paris having greatly increased, the abbess Angélique Arnaudt determined in 1648 to transfer part of them to Port-Royal des Champs. The school of Port-Royal was therefore removed from the latter place to Paris, Rue St. Dominique, Faubourg St. Jacques, but after three years the teachers were restored to Port-Royal des Champs, where they no longer occupied the monastic building, but a farm-house, called Les Granges, on the neighboring hill. In 1658, pope Innocent X having condemned five propositions in the book of Jansenius, Arnaudt wrote to prove that these propositions did not exist in the book of Jansenius, at least not in the sense attributed to him by Arnaudt, was accused of Jansenism. The nuns of Port-Royal, with their abbess Angélique, having refused to sign the formulary acknowledging that the five alleged heretical propositions were contained in the work of Jansenius, preparations were begun by the Jesuits for scattering the community of Port-Royal, and placing them in close captivity, so as to bring them to submission. It seemed a strange spectacle that a body of women, and a few others who agreed with them in sentiment, should withstand the power of the decrees of Home and all the pertinacity of the Jesuit in carrying out those decrees. On March 80, 1656, two months after the condemnation of Dr. Arnaudt, the civil authorities proceeded to carry out an order in council that every scholar, postulant, and novice should be removed from Port-Royal. But, for some unknown reasons, the execution was suddenly interrupted and delayed several years. It is said that Mazarin's unpleasant relations with the papacy were the principal cause of this sudden suspension of procedure against the recluses. In 1660 the king himself ordered the school to be broken up. The nuns still continuing refusatory, Péreixac, archbishop of Paris, sent a party of police-officers in 1664, who arrested the abbess, her niece Angélique Arnaudt the Younger, or Angélique de St. Jean, the mistress of the novices, and other nuns, and distributed them among several monasteries, but they were kept in a state of confinement. See ARNAUDT, ANGÉLIQUE.

Previously some of the nuns who had remained at Port-Royal de Paris intrigued with the government in order to become independent of Port-Royal des Champs, and Louis XIV appointed a separate abbess to Port-Royal de Paris. In 1669 a compromise was made between the pope and the defenders of Jansenius, which was called "the Peace of Clement IX." The nuns of Port-Royal des Champs with their own abbess were then restored to their convent, but Port-Royal de Paris was not restored to them; a division of property was effected between the two communities, by order of the king, which was confirmed by a bull of Clement X dated 1671. Each convent retained its own abbess. Several disputes took place between the two communities, in which the adherents of the Jesuits and the Jansenists were active parties. At last, in March, 1708, a bull of pope Clement XI suppressed the convent of Port-Royal des Champs, and gave the property to Port-Royal de Paris. In 1708 Le Tellier had obtained from king Louis XIV a decree for the execution of the papal bull, and D'Argenson, the lieutenant-general of police, put an end to the meeting of Port-Royal des Champs, and he removed from thence the nuns, who were distributed among several convents. The convent and church of Port-Royal des Champs were stripped of all their valuables, which were transferred to Port-Royal de Paris, and the former building was levelled with the ground, by order of Louis XIV, as a nest of Jansenists and heretics. The sacred relics of the Church were borne from the altar, the bodies disinterred from the cemetery, and every trace of the establishment destroyed, the very soil being abandoned to the plough.

Literature.—Besoin, Racine (1767, 2 vols.), Clemencet, Du Fosse, Fontaine (Col. 1788, 2 vols.), and others have written of Port-Royal. Dr. Reuchlin has published one of the most elaborate treatises, entitled Geschichte von Port-Royal (Hamb. 1689-44, 2 vols.); and other and more recent works to be consulted are: Saint-Duver, Hist. de Port-Royal (Paris, 1840-58, 4 vols.); Beurd, Port-Royal (Lond. 1868, 2 vols.); Schimmelpenning, Memoiren von Port-Royal (Ibid. 1855). On Reuchlin's work, see Sir James Stephen, Essays, vol. i.; Wilken, Port-Royal oder der Jansenismus in Frankreich, in the Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie, 1859; Meth. Quarterly, 1856. See also Jervis, Hist. Ch. of France (Lond. 1872), vol. i. and ii., and his History of France (Student's Edition), p. 469-472; Ranke, Hist. of the Papacy, ii, 251, 259; Trequilles, Hist. of the Jansenists, p. 11, etc.; Martyn, Hist. of France (age of Louis XIV); Bridges, France under Richelieu and Colbert, lect. iv.; Villemain, Discours et Mélanges Littéraires; Voltaire, Vie de Louis XIV, ch. xxxvi.; Bridge, Hist. of French Literature, p. 172 sq.; Van Laun, Hist. of French Literature (see Index); Lundl. Quart. Rev. Oct. 1871, p. 178; Brit. Quar. Rev. April, 1878, p. 294; Edinb. Rev. April, 1841; Amer. Theol. Rev. April, 1860, p. 162, 565.

PORTUGAL, the most westerly kingdom of Europe, a part of the great Spanish peninsula, lies in 36° 55'-42° 8' N. lat. and 6° 15'-30° W. long. Its greatest length from north to south is 988 miles, and its average breadth from east to west is about 100 miles. The kingdom of Portugal proper is bounded by the Atlantic on the S. and W., and by Spain on the N. and E. Its distinctive subdivisions, with their several areas and populations, are given in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Area in Sq. Miles</th>
<th>Pop. 1871.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MINHO</td>
<td>Viana</td>
<td>2907</td>
<td>911,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Braga</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAS OS MONTES</td>
<td>Braganza</td>
<td>4298</td>
<td>365,688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Villa-real</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEIRA</td>
<td>Aveiro</td>
<td>9945</td>
<td>1,984,923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coimbra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Viseu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guarda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Castelo-Branco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTREMADURA</td>
<td>Leiria</td>
<td>6573</td>
<td>829,691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Santarem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lisbon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALENTEJO</td>
<td>Portalegre</td>
<td>9418</td>
<td>331,841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evora</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALGARVE</td>
<td>Faro</td>
<td>1878</td>
<td>188,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>84,509</td>
<td>3,900,570</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The insular appendages of Portugal are—the Azores, 1996 square miles, pop. (1871) 208,983; Madeira, etc., 815 square miles, pop. (1871) 118,575. Total home territories, 36,818, and the population (1871), 4,367,882. The colonial possessions of Portugal are—in Africa: Cape Verde Islands, 1650.02 square miles; pop. (1871), 57,147. Senegambu, 33,487.58 square miles; pop. (1868) 98,428. Islands of San-Thome and Principe, off Gwinea, 448.56 square miles; pop. (1868) 19,295. Angola, Bequela, 200,602.50
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square miles; pop. 2,000,000. Mozambique and dependencias, 283,500 square miles; pop. 300,000. In Asia: Goa, Salsette, 1440.5 square miles; pop. 474,284. Damascus, 84.4 square miles; pop. 76,000. In the Archipelago, 2,877 square miles; pop. 850,000. In China: Macao, 11.76 square miles; pop. (1866) 100,000. Total of colonies, 529,041.48 square miles; pop. 3,872,959.

Christianity was established in this country at the same time as in Spain, from which it is only politically separated: it therefore had its share of the misfortunes which, at the time of the great barbarian invasions, under the Alani, Suevos, Westgoths, and afterwards under the Arabs, came over the Christian Church. The weight of these calamities was made lighter for Portugal by the circumstance that, partly through the influence of the Roman bishops Anaelicus and Anicetus, partly through the decrees of Constantine, which made metropolitan seats of the chief cities of the provinces, the diocesan system had been developed at an early period. In the country now called Portugal, in the province of Galicia, Bracara, now Braga, was the metropolis. We learn from Garcia Louisa, in his remarks on the Council of Luco, that the bishops of Astorica, Portucal (Porto), Colmbrinia (Coimbra), Egitania (Idania), Eminium (Ermesinde), Lamego, and other bishops on the Douro, Loco (Lugo, on the sources of the Minho), Trias (El Padrón, in Galicia), Veso (Viseu), Auria (Orense), Tude (Tuy), Magneto or Britonia (Mondoeiro), and Dimio, near Braga, were suffragans of Bracara. At the Council of Luco, A.D. 305, a second council was established at Loco, but it remained dependent on Bracara. Veso, Colmbrinia, Egitania, Lamego, and Magneto were then suffragan seats of Bracara, and Trias, Auria, Tude, Astorica, and Britonia formed the ecclesiastical province of Luco: it ceased to exist when the domination of the Suevos, in 615, was overthrown by the Westgoths. In Lusitania, Merida, on the Guadiana, was the metropolis; the ecclesiastical province included Numanzia, Pax Tullia, Ososoma, Olyaequa, Cauro, Avila, and Elbora. Calixtus II transferred the metropolis of the bishop of Compostella. In the 7th century some changes appear to have taken place. The beginning of the 8th century saw the downfall of the Westgothic empire, and the invasion of the Arabs, invited by the sons of the expelled king, and by their uncle, Oppas, archbishop of Hispalis, for the purpose of driving from the throne their king, Rechcal. The land between the Douro and the Pyrenees, a small portion of the peninsula, remained under Christian rule. Ferdinand II (1038-65) wrenched from the Arabs Lamego, Veso, Coimbra, etc. Though the Arabs had allowed the inhabitants of these places to maintain their churches, many of them passed over to Mohammedanism, and thus, by degrees, bishoprics and monasteries disappeared. Even Bracara lost her metropolitan dignity; and when, in 1083, Alphonso VI took Toledo, which under the Arabian rule had continued still during two centuries to be the residence of an archbishop, there was scarcely a Christian to be found in the city. In the consideration of these circumstances, and with the consent of pope John VIII, Ovetum, in Galicia, was made a metropolis, including the bishoprics Anca, Legio, Astorica, Salmantiva, Cauro, Coimbra, Lamego, Veso, Portucal, Bracara, Tude, Auria, Trias, Loco, Britonia, and Cesar Augusta. Oviedo was the city of the bishops in partibus infidelium; but the former suffragans of Tarragona did not acknowledge the archbishop of Ovetum, but that of Narbonne as their metropolis. The dignity of the bishop of Ovetum expired in 1088. Alphonse VI took Toledo and Castile, the old ecclesiastical provinces of Toledo, Braga, and Tarragona being then established anew by Gregory VII and Urban II. The long time during which the Spanish peninsula had been reduced to unity being obliterated everywhere, justified, in the ideas of these times, the measures taken by the Church for the purpose of securing the rule and purity of the Roman Catholic religion. The complete expulsion of Mohammedans and Jews seemed commanded by the circumstances, and it was executed without delay. In the year 1249 an inquisition was established in Lisbon, and special severity was displayed against the Jews accused of practicing their old worship under the garb of Christianity. They formed, under the name of New-Christians (q.v.), a suspicious class, and many of them, in 1506, had been victims to the severe decrees of the council of Trent. The power of the Church increased rapidly, and with it the pride of some of the bishops, for there soon arose between the crown and the clergy difficulties greatly detrimental to the influence of the latter, as it gave occasion to the people to get an insight into and speak freely of its sad condition, as well as of that of the Roman court. By the laws of 1822-28 every naturalized foreigner was granted civil and political rights regardless of his religion; they authorized every kind of private worship, and prohibited every religious persecution. The Catholic clergy were treated with the greatest distinction, and their incomes were seized upon to fill the treasury of the state. It was not until 1848 that the government was reconciled with the pope, and the wounds of the Roman Church were long in healing even after that. The Pope through his nuncios in Portugal declared the inquisition a diocesan patriarch, who is always a cardinal, and who is, to some extent, independent of Rome. Portugal is divided into three dioceses, which are presided over by the cardinal-patriarch of Lisbon. His suffragan sees are Castelo-Branco, Guarda, Lamego, Leiria, and Portoalegre. There are several colonial bishoprics in Madeira, the Azores, and other islands. Besides the patriarchate or archbishopric of Lisbon, there is the archbishopric of Braga, who is primate of the kingdom, and whose suffragan sees are Porto, Viseu, Coimbra, Bragança-Miranda, Aveiro, and Vila Velha; and the archbishopric of Evora, with the bishoprics Elvas, Beja, and Algarve. The archbishops have the rank of a marquis, the bishops of a count. They all belong to the grandezza, or higher nobility. The bishops are appointed by the king, and confirmed by the pope. No bull can be published without the agreement of the king. The number of clergy holding cure is given at 18,000. The total number of parishes is 4086. The monasteries were dissolved in 1834, but a few religious establishments still exist. At the time of the dissolution Portugal was possessed of 90,000 monasteries, with 7500 monks, and 129 nunneries, with 2725 nuns.

There are six orders of knighthood, viz., the Order of Christ, founded in 1119; St. Benedit of Avis; the Tower and Sword, founded in 1438, and reorganized in 1888; Our Lady of Mount Carmel, founded in 1819; and the Order of St. John of Jerusalem, which was separated in 1802 from that of Malta. In addition to these, there is one civil-service order, founded in 1288. Portugal stands below the other countries of Europe in regard to education. There is one university at Coimbra; there are military, naval, trade, and navigation schools, and many classical and higher schools; and in 1861 there were 1788 public schools, with 79,172 pupils, uncontrolled by the Church. There is an Academy of Sciences and a School of Arts at Lisbon, the former of which has a library of 56,000 volumes. The other public libraries are the Central Library, with 300,000 volumes; various royal libraries, as that of Lisbon, with 86,000 badly preserved volumes and 8000 MSS.; that at the Neocesidales Palace, with 28,000 volumes; and that at the Ajuda Palace, with 20,000 volumes; and the University Library of Coimbra, with 70,000 volumes. The administration of the management of general education is conducted by a superior council of education at Coimbra, under the supervision of the ministry of the Home Department. See Schäfer, Gesch. von Portugal (1198); Haberland, Geschichte der Staatenkunde von Europa, i. 8 sq.; Busk, Hist. of Portugal (1811); Dunham, Hist. of Portugal (1882); Ander-
PORTUGUESE VERSION

The oldest known Portuguese version is that of the Psalms, which was published at Oxford in 1655, together with a translation of the English liturgy, under the title, O Lívro da Oratóriacomum administrado aos Sacramentos e outros Ritos e Ceremonias da Igreja, conforme o uso da Igreja de Inglaterra, compilado com o Salario ou Salmo de David (Oxford, na estampa do Teatro, anno de Christo, 1655).

This translation is said to be very defective. Next in chronological order is the New Testament, or O Novo Testamento, 1702, todos os sacros Santos Lírios e Exércitos espirituais e apostólicos do novo Concilio de Nice Fam. Senhor Redentor e Redemptor Jesus Christo traduzido em Portuguez pelo Padre Joam Ferreira a d'Almeida, Ministro Preceptor da Santo Evangelho. Com todas as Licenças necessarias (em Amsterdam, por Joam Crelina, 1712, 8vo). Seven years later, the first part of the Old Testament, or the Pentateuch, was published under the title, Os cinco livros de Moyses, chamados: 1. Genesis; 2. Exodo; 3. Levítico; 4. Números; 5. Deuteronomio (com privilegio real; Translueber, em India Oriental, na costa do Coromandel, em uma estampa da Real Mission de Denemark, anno de 1719, 4to). Um ano depois, O Livro da Oratória de Davi, com toda diligentia traduzido de Texto original na Lingua Portuguez, segundo o uso da tradução com muitos passos dedicado pelo Padre Benjamin Schultz, Missionário do Rey de Dinamarca e Ministro da Palavra de Deus (Trangambar, em India Oriental, na costa de Coromandel, em uma estampa da Real Mission, anno de 1721, 12mo); Os doce Prophetas Menores, comem a semana, Hoseas, Joel, Amos, Obadias, Jonas, Micah, Nahum, Habacuc, Sophonias, Haggo, Zacharias, Malachias (com toda diligentia traduzido na lingua Portuguez com os Padres Missionarios de Trangambar). O Livro dos Profetas, comem a semana, O Livro de Jozef, O Livro dos Juizes, O livro de Ruth, o primeiro Livro dos Reis, o segundo Livro dos Reis, o primeiro Livro dos Cronicaes, o segundo Livro dos Cronicaes, o Livro de Ezequiel, o Livro de Neemias, o Livro de Ester, traduzido na Lingua Portuguez, pelo Reverendo Padre Joam Ferreira d'Almeida, Ministro Preceptor do Santo Evangelho na Cidade de D. Março, conforme o texto original em que os Padres Missionarios de Trangambar, na officina da Real Mission de Dinamarca, anno de 1728, 4to); and Os Livros historicos do Velho Testamento, comem a semana, O Livro de Josue, o Livro dos Juizes, o Livro de Ruth, o primeiro Livro dos Reis, o segundo Livro dos Reis, o primeiro Livro dos Cronicaes, o segundo Livro dos Cronicaes, o Livro de Ezequiel, o Livro de Neemias, e o Livro de Ester, traduzido na Lingua Portuguez, pelo Reverendo Padre Joam Ferreira d'Almeida, Ministro Preceptor do Santo Evangelho na Cidade de D. Março, conforme o texto original em que os Padres Missionarios de Trangambar, na officina da Real Mission de Dinamarca, anno de 1738, 4to). In the preface to these historical books, which is dated April 21, 1738, we are told that the ministers of Batavia sent this translation of Job. For some years, when the Dutch naturalized to mysticism. When, in 1809, Brauana passed from Austria to Bavaria, Pischel was placed under the dependency of the bishop of Salzburg; and in 1815, when the city became Austrian again, he returned to the diocese of Linz. Soon afterwards, he was sent to China to transmit the doctrine of the Dutch government, and to preach his "new revelation." Christ, he says, dwells in the hearts of such as are pure, and directs all their actions. To them appear God and the Virgin, and make them the recipients of their revelation. He who does not get purified incurs damnation, and deserves death, which alone can purify him. This doctrine must be obeyed even if it should exact the sacrifice of life itself, if the fruit of the new revelation is not to be lost and given to the Jews. God has determined that the Jews shall be converted. Judaism and Christianity melted together into one general, catholic religion, the millennial kingdom is to commence when these events have taken place. The new doctrine found proselytes not only in Ambrosianism and other sects. The editorship of R. Holten and the Rev. R.C. Bridger was issued in 1876 (see the "784 Report of the British and Foreign Bible Society" [Lond. 1877], p. 89 sq.). Complete editions of the Bible in the Portuguese language were published by the American and British and Foreign Bible Societies, the German Gesellschaft für die Erforschung der Mediävistik (Handbuch der biblischen Literatur, iv, 298 sq. [1876]).
bead confessions and gave absolution. They are said to have committed most indecencies in their assemblies. The ceremony of purification preceded the admission of new members: a kind of oil or a powder which the proselyte was made to swallow produced dreadful convulsions, while a crowd of maddened females performed a savage dance around the sufferer, to eject the devil from his body. This was the initiation of the new member. The escape of Napoleon from Elba strengthened the belief that he was the Antichrist, and that, as a consequence, the millennium was at hand. Disorderly tramps roamed about, prophesying and preaching, and themselves for chosen members of the kingdom of God, and resisted both the ecclesiastical and civil authorities. At last government took the matter in hand, nightly raids were made upon their assemblies, their doings were investigated, and Pöschel was put into custody at Salzburg. This intervention of the police did not appease the fanaticism of the sectarians, who were misled several times even to sanguinary excesses. A mother tried to torture her child to death, to honor the Lord; a father to kill his child in prison. The insanity of these people reached its pitch in the House of the Holy Shitt. In the night the then Emperor Paul I. Sunday it was resolved, in a meeting held near Ampelwang, to offer a sacrifice to the Lord. A peasant, of the name of Haas, was to be the victim. His mother and an old man were dragged to the scene of the holocaust. The beast was killed and eaten. While the peasant lived only a few days afterwards of his wound, the ceremony becoming by this postponement devoid of effect. Haas prevailed on his adopted daughter, a girl of nineteen years, to give her life for him. The monster killed her most cruelly, and are even said to have drunk her blood, as being the blood of Christ. The scene of these horrors was on the ensuing day occupied by the militia and the actors arrested, but only six of the leaders were kept in custody. The sect, which did not count over 125 members, thereafter disappeared rapidly. Pöschel, who had always condemned the horrors committed by his disciples, was transferred to Vienna, where, his insanity being clearly demonstrated, he was placed under severe ecclesiastical custody. He died in 1837. In a wider sense, the name of Pöschelians was for some time used to designate fanatics of Pöschel's and the Pöschelians' description. See Althof, Kirchengesch. ii, 689; Giesebrecht, Kirchengesch. der neuesten Zeit (Bonn, 1855), p. 338 sq. (J. H. W.)

Pöschelians. See Pöschel.

Poseidon, the god who was considered among the ancient Greeks as presiding over the sea. He was the son of Cronos and Rhea, and had his palace at the bottom of the sea, where the monsters of the deep play around his dwelling. This deity was believed to be the author of storms, and to shake the earth with his trident or the son of Poseidon. His wife was Amphitrite. When the universe was divided between the brothers, the sea was given to Poseidon. He was equal to Zeus in dignity, but not in power. He once conspired with Hera (Juno) and Athena (Minerva) to put Zeus in chains but the more powerful god. He rides over the waves in a chariot drawn by horses with brazen hoofs and golden manes, and the sea becomes smooth at his appearance, while the monsters of the deep gambol and play around him. Herodotus affirms that the Greeks derived the worship of Poseidon from Libya; but, from whatever quarter it was received, it spread all over Greece and Southern Italy. It prevailed more especially in the Peloponnesus. The usual sacrifices offered to this god were black and white bulls, and also wild bears and rams. At Corinth his image was held in his honor. The Pantheon, or festival of all the Ionians, was celebrated also in honor of Poseidon. The Romans identified him with their own sea-god Neptune. Troy was called Neptunia Pergina, because Poseidon assisted Apollo to surround it with walls for king Laomedon, who refused to give them the promise of reward. Poseidon sent a sea-monster to ravage the country, which was killed by Hercules. He always hated the Trojans, and assisted the Greeks against them. He prevented the return of Ulysses, in revenge for his having blinded Polyphemus, the son of Poseidon. In art he is easily recognized by his trident and his chariot with which are the trident, horses, and dolphins. See Neptune.

Poseidonia, a festival celebrated annually among the ancient Greeks in honor of Poseidon. It was kept chiefly in the island of Aegina.

Poseidonius. See Poseidonius.

Posen, a Polish province, that portion of ancient Poland which fell to Prussia in the partition of the kingdom, has an area of 11,260 square miles, and a population (close of 1871) of 1,568,684. The territory is divided into two departments, that of Posen and Bromberg, and its principal cities are, besides the respective capitals named after the departments, Gnesen, Liess, and Inowroclaw. The principal river is the Wartha, which is navigable, but the commerce of the province is very light. For education little has been done as yet. The Prussian government is determined to force German culture. There are six gymnasia, several normal and training schools, a seminary for the training of priests, and about two-thirds of the burgher of the province. Nearly half the population belong to the Roman Catholic Church, which is under the spiritual jurisdiction of the archbishop of Gnesen and Posen, while 74,000 of the remainder are Jews. The inhabitants may still be said to be Poles, more than 800,000 persons employing Polish as their mother-tongue.

Posen formed an integral part of Poland till 1772, when, at the first partition of the Polish territory, the districts north of the Netze were given to Prussia. At the second and third partitions, which were made twenty years later, the remainder was incorporated in the Prussian kingdom under the name of South Prussia. In 1807 Posen was included in the duchy of Warsaw; but by the act of the Congress of Vienna it was separated in 1815 from Poland and reassigned to Prussia under the title of the Grand Duchy of Posen. In 1848 the Poles, who had never amalgamated with their new German compatriots, took advantage of the general political excitement of that period to organize an open rebellion, which gave the Prussian government considerable trouble, and was put down with much cruelty that has been spilled on both sides. On the cessation of disturbances, the German citizens of the province demanded the incorporation of Posen with those Prussian states which were members of the German Confederation, and the Berlin Chambers gave their approval of the proposed measure in 1851. But on the subsidence of revolutionary sentiment in Germany the subject was dropped, and Posen returned to its former condition of an extra-German province of the Prussian monarchy. For the ecclesiastical history, see Poland; see also Prussia.

Poser, the term applied to the bishop's examining chaplain. The annual examiner at Winchester and Eton still bears this name.

Posey, Alexander, a colored minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born about the year 1814. He came from the Africola Methodist Episcopal Church March 29, 1834, at Winchester, Va., where the Western Conference was being in Winchester, Va. He was received into full connection, and the same year (1869) was appointed to Johnmann Street Chapel, Winchester, Va. He was reappointed to 1870 to Winchester, Va.; in 1871 to Harrisonburgh, Va., and in 1872-73 to Lexington, Va. In 1874 he was appointed to Abingdon, Va., but did not reach his work, he being sick at the time he received his appointment. He never recovered, but died Aug. 1, 1874. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1875, p. 14.
POSEY 457  POSITIVISM

Posey, John Henderson, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born Sept. 17, 1819, in Breckinridge County, Ky.; emigrated with his parents in early life to Illinois, and settled in Morgan County, Ill. He was licensed to preach July 16, 1858, and retained the local relation for some time. In 1866 he joined the Illinois Conference, and was appointed to Barry Circuit. In 1878 he was appointed to Lima Circuit. Shortly after the next year's Conference his health failed, and he died Nov. 18, 1869. He ever regarded the ministry as the most sacred vocation on earth. His high appreciation of its sacredness and responsibility was such at times as almost to overpower his own spirit. He was a true itinerant in heart and practice. See Minutes of the Annual Conferences, 1870, p. 518, 519.

Posidonius (Ποσιδώνιος), an envoy of the Syrian general Nicoran to Judas Maccabaeus (2 Macc. xiv, 19).

Posidonius (Ποσιδώνιος), a distinguished Greek Stoic philosopher, was a native of Apameia in Syria, but a citizen of Rhodes, where he resided the greater part of his life (A.D. 70-120). The dates of his birth and death are unknown; but he must have been born during the latter half of the 2nd century before the Christian era, as he was a disciple of Panetius, who probably died about B.C. 100, and whom he succeeded as the head of the Stoic school. He removed to Rome in the consulship of Marcus Murelius (Suidas, Posidon.), B.C. 51, and probably died soon after. He lived, according to Lucian (Macrob. c. 20), to the age of eighty-four, and was one of the most celebrated philosophers of his day. Cicero, who had received instruction from him (Cic. Decr. 3; De Fis. i, 2), frequently speaks of him in the highest terms. Pompey also appears to have had a very high opinion of him, as we read of his visiting him at Rhodes shortly before the war against the pirates, B.C. 67 (Strabo, xi, 492), and again in B.C. 62, after the termination of the Mithridatic war (Plutarch, Pompe. c. 42; Pliny, Hist. Nat., vii, 80). He must have been a man of very extensive and varied information in almost all the departments of human knowledge. Strabo calls him, ὁδιω τῶν καὶ ἢμοις φιλοσοφός πολυσμηνικός. Besides his philosophy, he was an excellent orator, a master of history, and astronomy; but none of them have come down to us, with the exception of their titles, and a few sentences quoted by Cicero, Diogenes Laertius, Strabo, and others. He seems to have travelled in different parts of the world for the purpose of collecting information. We learn incidentally from Strabo (xii, 614; iii, 163: iv, 197) that he had been in Spain, Liguria, and Gaul. Plutarch was also indebted to Posidonius, among others, for the materials of several of his lives. This is the case in the Lives of Marcellus, Paulus Emilius, the Gracchi, and others; but particularly in the Life of Murius, with whom Posidonius had been personally acquainted (Plut. Marius, c. 45). Posidonius wrote Meteorologica. Cicero mentions (Nat. Deor. ii, 84) his artificial spheres, which represented the motions of the heavens. Posidonius was a much stricter Stoic than his master Panetius. He maintained that pain was not an evil, as we learn from an anecdote which Posidonius frequently related respecting his visit to the philosopher at Rhodes (Cic. Tuscul. Disput. ii, 25). As a physical investigator he was greatly superior to the Stoics generally, attaching himself in this respect rather to Aristotle. Indeed, although attached to the Stoic system, he was far less dogmatical and obstinate than the majority of that school, refusing to admit a dogma because it was one of the school if it did not commend itself to him for its own sake. His treatment of divination, the nature of the gods referred to by Cicero, who probably made use of them in his works on the same subject (Cic. De Div. i, 3, 30, 64; De Nat. Deor. i, 44). Strabo says (xi, 492) that Posidonius wrote an account of the wars of Pompey, but did not pay much attention to accounts of his later career at about the age of seventeen. When he attained to the years of manhood he came to Missouri, and there connected himself with the Methodist Church. He was licensed to preach July 16, 1858, and retained the local relation for some time. In 1866 he joined the Illinois Conference, and was appointed to Barry Circuit. In 1878 he was appointed to Lima Circuit. Shortly after the next year's Conference his health failed, and he died Nov. 18, 1869. He ever regarded the ministry as the most sacred vocation on earth. His high appreciation of its sacredness and responsibility was such at times as almost to overpower his own spirit. He was a true itinerant in heart and practice. See Minutes of the Annual Conferences, 1870, p. 518, 519.

Positive Philosophy, a recent scheme of philosophy, on the basis of materialism, founded by Auguste Comte de Paris. See Comte; Positivism.

Positivism, a distinct, scientific habit of mind, regulated by a characteristic principle, which was made the basis of an entirely new system of philosophy by Auguste Comte (see Comte), and which has matured, according to the intention of its author, into a sect, a creed, and a church, since the article on Comte was written. The term is applied to the intellectual habit, the characteristic principle, the philosophical procedure, and the consequent body of doctrine. The English Positivists, who have latterly been the most zealous propagators of the positive philosophy, and have very recently issued a complete translation of the Système de la Politique Positive, revolt from some of the conceptions of the later speculation of Comte, respecting his theological and ecclesiastical reconstructions, and all the sentimental mimicry of the papal organization, which was elaborated under the quasi influence of Mme. Chlotilde de Vaux. They adhere rigidly to the distinctive principle of the positive philosophy, which constitutes its sole rationale and determines its consistent developments and applications. It is the first duty, then, to ascertain what this principle is.

The epithet Positive has been employed in various significations in the history of philosophy, as will be shown at the time. The method of investigation which is employed by the school of the Positivists and by its founder to denote the strict confinement of speculation and the rigorous limitation of knowledge to observed facts, and to their habitual antecedences, concomitances, and sequences. It excludes all laws but those of recognized association. It involves the exclusion of causes and effects: of supernatural, spiritual, or metaphysical agencies; of hidden forces, latent qualities, and immaterial essences. It contracts the intelligible universe within the sphere of the phenomenal. It refrains from investigating the intrinsic constitution of things, and prohibits any expatiation beyond the reach of purely scientific analysis and construction. It does not deny, but it ignores, extrudes, and repudiates as inaccessible and imaginary whatever transcends the observed facts and the logical deductions therefrom. It is the pure method of inductive science, accepted as practically sufficient and complete, though without asserting that it is necessarily exhaustive. Whatever lies beyond this circle is not only unknown, but inconceivable and inapprehensible—not merely imperfect and uncertain, but impossibly palpable and determinate to human apprehension.

It is impossible to give a sharp, precise, and formal definition of Positivism, because it is chiefly discriminated from other philosophical schemes by what it excludes, by its limitations rather than by its comprehension. One of the most eminent and earnest of living Positivists has within the last few years given an ex-
plation of the character of the doctrine, which it may be
to cite as an authoritative testimony:

"Suffice it that we mean by the positivist method of thought the use of the senses (in a sense not limited to the social construction of Comte) that method which would base life and conduct, upon such evidence as can be referred to logical canons of proof, which would place all that occupies man in a ho-

mogeneous scheme of life. On this method this method turns aside from hypotheses, not to be tested by any known logical canon familiar to science, whether the hypothesis claimed be one of deduction, intuition, aspiration, or general plaus-

ibility. And again, this method turns aside from ideal standards which give themselves the lie, as by professedly to transform and control the field of law. We say, life and conduct shall stand for us wholly on a basis of law, and must prove the arch-structure of science (not physical, but moral and social science) where we are free to use our intelligence in the methods known to us as intelligible logic, methods which the intellect can analyze" (Frederic

Harrison, The Soul and Future Life, In The Nineteenth Cen-
tury, No. 4, June, 1877, art. vii, p. 624, 625).

Mr. Harrison's contemplation is here, as will be readily
conjectured, directed specially to the ethical develop-
ments of Positivism; but such language so applied reveals the severity with which everything but the pro-
cesses and products of scientific observation and logical conclusion is excluded from the arena of the Positivist.

This accords perfectly with the determination of the dogma itself. In this chapter he first formulated in the

Philosophie Positive ( tome i, p. 4, 5).

"In fine, in the Positive state the human mind, recog-

nizing the impossibility of obtaining absolute notions, re-

ounces the fiction of the absolute destination of the

universe, and inquiry into the intrinsic causes of phe-

nomena, and attaches itself instead solely to the discov-

ery, by judicious combination of reasoning and observa-

tion, of their effective laws—that is, to the discovery of their invariable relations of succession and resemblance. Thus, the idea of a final and revealed purpose of the universe, its all-inclusive facts that sooner or later and terms is, there is no more than the connection estab-

lished between diverse phenomena and certain general facts whose number tends to be constantly diminish-

ed by the progress of science."

This procedure has long been regarded as alone ap-
cerception in the domain of physical science, and as equi-

lively applicable, within the limits of its applicabil-

ity, in speculative science. It forms what is commonly

regarded as the Baconian philosophy or the Baconian

redintegration of philosophy. Positivism, however,

both in the conception of the father of the system and in

the doctrine and practice of his followers, extends its

range so as to embrace all the departments of knowledge and action, to profess itself the sole and ex-

clusive method, and to stigmatize and repudiate whatever

will not submit to its jurisdiction or remains be-

yond its reach. Indeed, in the elaboration of the sys-

tem by Comte all its applications to the exact sciences

were mere preliminary steps in social recon-

struction, and to the establishment of a comprehensive and diversified ethical doctrine for public and private

authority. In this light it is still viewed by the exist-

ing school of Positivists, notwithstanding their rejec-
tion of much of the theological reverence of Comte.

It will readily be recognized that Positivism, as so

understood, revives under strangely modernized aspects

the old dogma of Protagoras that man is the measure

of the universe. The ancient contrast and analogy of the

great and the microscopic have been reproduced in

quaint disguise and more plausible form by limiting the

intelligible universe (mundus intelligibilis) to its reflec-

tion from the mirror of the human mind so far, and

so far only, as an image of it can be formed through the

instrumentality of the bodily senses and of rea-

ning on the phenomena observed thereby. We will not

be tempted into the easy misrepresentation of

alleging that all is denied which is not so reflected, but

the practical effect is nearly the same; for it is ig-

nored, censured, and extruded from the field of specula-

tion. On the other hand all its absurdities, the mind

of man and its measureless potencies, the heart of man

with its boundless duties, its multidimensional aspirations

and its unfathomable mysteries, are shrivelled up into

the narrow dimensions of the science of the day. Sure-

ly we require a philosophy of the unknown as well as

of the known.

"Vere scire est scire per causas," said Aristotle, and

the schoolmen after him. The maxim was unquestion-

ably pressed by the latter to hazardous uses, and em-
ployed to authenticate hallucinations which obstructed

science for centuries. "Vere scire est scire apparentibus"—

true knowledge is the knowledge of appearances—is

the shibboleth of the Positivists, and is even more dan-

gerous than the misapprehension which it has under-
taken to dethrone. It results in pure phenomenism, and

renders man and the universe alike hollow, deceptive,

and empty, a mere shadow. The more universal and

the length to which it may be and has been carried, are

well illustrated by the remarkable and exquisitely writ-

ten article of Mr. Frederic Harrison on "The Soul and

Future Life," from which we have already made a cita-

tion, and by the very recent discussions provoked by

it. Mr. Harrison, like his Cerephus, still more severe

"thoughts that wander through eternity," except it be a

human eternity. He will not suffer them to travel

"extra flammantia memia mundi." He compresses

those flaming walls to the limits of the earth's horizon.

He does not imagine the existence of "the Po-

sitivist's heaven," but only stars it out and dissipates it into a technical ab-

traction. "The combined activity of the human pow-

ers," he says, "organized around the highest of them we

call the soul." Again, "the consensus of human facul-

ties, which we call the soul, comprises all sides of human

nature according to the homogenized theory."

"She, musing with the dull earth's moldering sod,

Tumult tenfold in solemn shame,

Lay there, exiled from eternal God,

Lest to her place some other be den-derer.

The future life is still more vacant, unreal, and inap-

prehensible than even the subdued soul. It is in

deed the shadow of a shade. Mr. Harrison does not

give such distinct utterance to his conception of the

post-mortem existence as to enable us to grasp it firmly.

He employs phrases which indicate his acceptance of the

Panhumanistic immortality, by absorption into the

aggregate humanity of subsequent generations, if he

refuses to adore with Comte le Nouveau Grand-Etre—

the New Supreme God—humanity itself. But the abstract

term—the unsubstantial and unessential conception of

humanity—is less a real being—a more capable receptacle of souls or extinct consciences of hu-

man powers—by being stripped of the tawdry trappings

and tinsel fringes with which Comte had decorated it,

to set it up as an idol in place of Jehovah. Strange

that the Positivist should reject as unphilosophical and

invalid all that religion teaches as true, and as true, and

should recur to such a factitious and ficti-

tious abstraction as this humanity must be! Waiving

the divine attributes of creation, ordination, and gov-

ernment, and regarding only the functions of the Divin-

ity as a moral influence exerted over men as "the

warder of them that diligently seek him"—it may well

be asked what restraint or encouragement could a de-

ified and posthumous humanity exercise retrospectively

on the conduct of men in society or as individuals.

The fancy is as futile as it is absurd. Roche Boyle's comic exclamations would recur to every transgressor—"What has posterity done for us!" It may be frankly conceded that the ideas of duty, of obligation, of justice, of temporal responsibility—per-

haps even of right and wrong, of righteousness and sin,
of beauty and of aesthetic emotion—may be translated

from the language of religious belief into the language

of Positivism. M. Comte made a travesty of the rites

and ceremonial of Catholic Christianity, and commended

it to his devotees as the Positive religion. This in-

vention has been accepted by his followers, and by a

few, but it is a similar procedure by which Mr. Har-

rison and the rest profess and hope to retain the esen-

tial characteristics of a divine creed, after excluding
from the universe all recognition of divinity. It is mistaking the shell for the organism, after the substance and life, which were enclosed by the shell, and which informed the shell, have perished out. We can see the very nice distinction demanded by Positivism between the universe of divinity and the universe of divinity and the supernatural and the mere declaration of its incoginitability, and of its consequent elimination from the domain of faith, as of knowledge. But the practical effect in both cases will be nearly the same. The discrimination is very refined and theoretical, and may be perfectly valid in almost all the cases. But it is only the purest art of most intellectual natures which can perceive it and act upon it, and even they will forget it or lose their hold upon it in moments of passion and temptation. It cannot be adequately apprehended by dull minds, coarse temperaments, and undisciplined characters, and will consequently be wholly inoperative where most required. The defect—the fatal defect—is the absence of any imperative and extrinsic authority to secure effective responsibility and obedience to right. The injury to humanity thus rendered is very evident; the advantage to be anticipated is indubitable.

This notice proceeds on the same plane with that adopted by the Positivists, and the discussion of their principles does not travel beyond the domain of the human understanding. The danger of Positivism springs from the recognition of divinity, of the danger of so many kinds of schemes of philosophy in our day—the disposition to regard a partial truth as the complete body of truth—to make one principle the sufficient explanation of all things, and to render human knowledge co-extensive with all knowledge, and, practically, with all truth. The unknown must always transcend the known: it must remain higher in dignity and influence, as well as incomprehensible in all dimensions. The necessary principle, however, is to humanize the universe—to restrict all valid knowledge to purely scientific knowledge, and to keep the realm of the altogether apprehensible within the narrow mould of the demonstrable. Positivism is true in its place and in its degree, as evolution is true under the like limitations, but it is not all-comprehending. It does not include all truth, and is far from embracing all reality. Its error and its pernicious consequences arise from the attempt to make it all-sufficient and exclusive. As a method of science it is true and valuable in all the applications of physical science, and of ethical science too, so far as the latter can appropriately employ observation and induction. But beyond this the difficulties and consequences of these unknown, including that which is known only by its effects; and we cannot wisely or safely leave this vast enclosing sphere out of our contemplation, for it is the main regulator of our conduct, by constant appeal to our highest sensibilities. If the hypothesis of the astronomer be true, that there is a mighty central sun in the unsounded depths of heaviness space, round which our sun, with all its attendant planets, revolves in a regular but measureless orbit, it would be neither logical nor prudent to deny the existence of such a centre of attraction, because it remains, and may forever remain, unattainable by human sense. It seems even more illogical and indirect to repudiate a moral centre of the universe, attracting and governing all things, and radiating its influences over the whole physical and rational world, because it lies beyond the limits of scientific observation, and cannot be measured, analyzed, or determined by the forms of science.

The factitious blindness or wilful shortsightedness of the Positive dogma is strangely illustrated by the history of the organism, and of the philosophy which has been employed to designate it. St. Thomas Aquinas (Summa Theol. ii, 67) employs Positive in accordance with its juridical usage as opposed to Natural—"jus naturale et jus positivum." Accordingly, he uses it to denote that which is commanded, assumed, laid down, posted, taken for granted; hence, arbitrary, not in the sense of wilful or fantastic, but of determined as a condition precedent. "Illud dictur esse positivum quod ex voluntate humana procedit," etc. This meaning is frequently given to it by others of the schoolmen, and is sufficiently accordant with its etymology, the word positi means to put or to place, and the superlative is ad adversum non negatur" (Cicero, Pro Cæc. xii). As in the scholastic reasoning the most absolutely determined principles—the starting-points of speculation—were the dogmas of revealed truth, the positions formulated and with the superlative was supposed to ensue ab adversario non negatur" (Cicero, Pro Cæc. xii). As in the scholastic reasoning the most absolutely determined principles—the starting-points of speculation—were the dogmas of revealed truth, the positions formulated and with the superlative was supposed to ensue ab adversario non negatur" (Cicero, Pro Cæc. xii). As in the scholastic reasoning the most absolutely determined principles—the starting-points of speculation—were the dogmas of revealed truth, the positions formulated and with the superlative was supposed to ensue ab adversario non negatur" (Cicero, Pro Cæc. xii). As in the scholastic reasoning the most absolutely determined principles—the starting-points of speculation—were the dogmas of revealed truth, the positions formulated and with the superlative was supposed to ensue ab adversario non negatur" (Cicero, Pro Cæc. xii). As in the scholastic reasoning the most absolutely determined principles—the starting-points of speculation—were the dogmas of revealed truth, the positions formulated and with the superlative was supposed to ensue ab adversario non negatur" (Cicero, Pro Cæc. xii). As in the scholastic reasoning the most absolutely determined principles—the starting-points of speculation—were the dogmas of revealed truth, the positions formulated and with the superlative was supposed to ensue ab adversario non negatur" (Cicero, Pro Cæc. xii). As in the scholastic reasoning the most absolutely determined principles—the starting-points of speculation—were the dogmas of revealed truth, the positions formulated and with the superlative was supposed to ensue ab adversario non negatur" (Cicero, Pro Cæc. xii). As in the scholastic reasoning the most absolutely determined principles—the starting-points of speculation—were the dogmas of revealed truth, the positions formulated and with the superlative was supposed to ensue ab adversario non negatur" (Cicero, Pro Cæc. xii). As in the scholastic reasoning the most absolutely determined principles—the starting-points of speculation—were the dogmas of revealed truth, the positions formulated and with the superlative was supposed to ensue ab adversario non negatur" (Cicero, Pro Cæc. xii). As in the scholastic reasoning the most absolutely determined principles—the starting-points of speculation—were the dogmas of revealed truth, the positions formulated and with the superlative was supposed to ensue ab adversario non negatur" (Cicero, Pro Cæc. xii). As in the scholastic reasoning the most absolutely determined principles—the starting-points of speculation—were the dogmas of revealed truth, the positions formulated and with the superlative was supposed to ensue ab adversario non negatur" (Cicero, Pro Cæc. xii). As in the scholastic reasoning the most absolutely determined principles—the starting-points of speculation—were the dogmas of revealed truth, the positions formulated and with the superlative was supposed to ensue ab adversario non negatur" (Cicero, Pro Cæc. xii). As in the scholastic reasoning the most absolutely determined principles—the starting-points of speculation—were the dogmas of revealed truth, the positions formulated and with the superlative was supposed to ensue ab adversario non negatur" (Cicero, Pro Cæc. xii). As in the scholastic reasoning the most absolutely determined principles—the starting-points of speculation—were the dogmas of revealed truth, the positions formulated and with the superlative was supposed to ensue ab adversario non negatur" (Cicero, Pro Cæc. xii). As in the scholastic reasoning the most absolutely determined principles—the starting-points of speculation—were the dogmas of revealed truth, the positions formulated and with the superlative was supposed to ensue ab adversario non negatur" (Cicero, Pro Cæc. xii). As in the scholastic reasoning the most absolutely determined principles—the starting-points of speculation—were the dogmas of revealed truth, the positions formulated and with the superlative was supposed to ensue ab adversario non negatur" (Cicero, Pro Cæc. xii). As in the scholastic reasoning the most absolutely determined principles—the starting-points of speculation—were the dogmas of revealed truth, the positions formulated and with the superlative was supposed to ensue ab adversario non negatur" (Cicero, Pro Cæc. xii). As in the scholastic reasoning the most absolutely determined principles—the starting-points of speculation—were the dogmas of revealed truth, the positions formulated and with the superlative was supposed to ensue ab adversario non negatur" (Cicero, Pro Cæc. xii). As in the scholastic reasoning the most absolutely determined principles—the starting-points of speculation—were the dogmas of revealed truth, the positions formulated and with the superlative was supposed to ensue ab adversario non negatur" (Cicero, Pro Cæc. xii). As in the scholastic reasoning the most absolutely determined principles—the starting-points of speculation—were the dogmas of revealed truth, the positions formulated and with the superlative was supposed to ensue ab adversario non negatur" (Cicero, Pro Cæc. xii). As in the scholastic reasoning the most absolutely determined principles—the starting-points of speculation—were the dogmas of revealed truth, the positions formulated and with the superlative was supposed to ensue ab adversario non negatur" (Cicero, Pro Cæc. xii). As in the scholastic reasoning the most absolutely determined principles—the starting-points of speculation—were the dogmas of revealed truth, the positions formulated and with the superlative was supposed to ensue ab adversario non negatur" (Cicero, Pro Cæc. xii). As in the scholastic reasoning the most absolutely determined principles—the starting-points of speculation—were the dogmas of revealed truth, the positions formulated and with the superlative was supposed to ensue ab adversario non negatur" (Cicero, Pro Cæc. xii). As in the scholastic reasoning the most absolutely determined principles—the starting-points of speculation—were the dogmas of revealed truth, the positions formulated and with the superlative was supposed to ensue ab adversario non negatur" (Cicero, Pro Cæc. xii). As in the scholastic reasoning the most absolutely determined principles—the starting-points of spec
impassable to human faculties, if duly prepared by familiarity with previous links, we are far from regarding the ultimate reality of phenomena and experiences, satisfactorily expressed by declaring it to consist in the discovery and generalization of laws” (Edinb. Rev. Jan. 1848, art. v, p. 180, 181).

Literature.—To the references given at the close of the article, Comenius may now be added: Come, Systema Politici Oration, translated, run upon by Bridges, Harrison, Beeley, Congreve, and Hulton (Lond. 1876, 4 vols. 8vo); Harrison, Order and Progress (1 vol. 8vo); Congreve, Essays, Political, Social, and Religious (1 vol. 8vo); Estané y Cortada, El Positivismo, o Sistema de las experimentaciones (Baeza, 1877, 8vo); Cordier, Exposé et Critique du positivisme prolongé (Var. 1877, 8vo); Adrian, Essai sur quelques Points de la Philosophie positive; The Nineteenth Century, No. 4, June, 1877, art. vii; No. 5, July, 1877; art. vi (The Soul and Future Life, by Frederic Harrison); ibid. No. 7, Sept. 1877, art. xi (A Modern Symposium, by R. H. Hutton, Prof. Huxley, Lord Blachford, Hon. Robert Noel; subj. “The Future Life”): ibid. No. 8, Oct. 1877, art. ix (A Modern Symposium, by Lord Selborne, Rev. Canon Bar- ry, W. R. Greg, Rev. Baldwin Brown, Dr. W. G. Ward, Frederic Harrison; subj. [concluded] “The Soul and Future Life”).

(G. F. H.)

POSER, AUGUSTUS SIGMUND (formerly Sinis, a German minister of the Lutheran Church, a convert from Judaism, was born May 19, 1805, at Auras, in Lower Silesia. His early education he received at the public schools of Breslau. When seventeen years of age, he went to Berlin to continue his studies. There he became acquainted with a Hebrew Christian, who received the first seed of the Gospel. In the year 1828 he re- ceived public baptism, assuming the name of Augustus Siegmund. He betook himself to the study of theology, and upon its completion filled several situations as tutor in private families. In the year 1830 he received a call to be Professor of Hebrew at the University of Halle, and set out for Berlin to prepare for his journey. On the road his intention became the subject of conversation with a fellow-traveller, a gentleman holding a high situation under government, and to his no small surprise he was informed by the latter that he must relinquish the intention of becoming a missionary, as he had just been appointed by the government chaplain of the Penitentiary at Sagan (in Silesia), and the necessary documents respecting it were nearly completed. In Sep- tember he received this new charge, which he did not disclaim as becoming a faithful disciple of Christ. In addition to the discharge of his heavy duties, Posner edited a monthly publication under the title The Prophet, Son, which became a great blessing to many readers. In the year 1840 he was formally ordained by the consistory. Seeing that his duties at Sagan were far be- yond his strength, the government made the offer to him of another ministerial charge at Lebenthal—adding, however, that if it were practicable his remaining at his present post would be regarded with great satisfaction. The expression of such a wish was sufficient to lead Pos- ner to consider it his duty to remain. Thus he labored and suffered on. In the beginning of the year 1846 Pos- ner was invited by the congregation of a newly erected church in Berlin to become their pastor; but the consistory refusing to comply with Posner’s wishes to adhere to the formula of the Lutheran Church instead of those of the Prussian National Church, Posner had to relinquish the appointment. Broke health, in connection with domestic afflictions, hastened his end, and on Monday, Jan. 22, 1849, he was called to his eternal rest, enquiring with a wonderful magical force the words “Bach, am ende, make an end, O Lord! Come, Lord Jesus!—come, come, come quickly! Lead my soul out of darkness.” See A.S. Posner, Der treue Zeuge Gottes, weiland Pastor an der königl. Strafanstalt zu Sagan; Von einem Freund (Schreibershaus, 1851, 2d ed.); and the biography prepared by a brother of the deceased in the Sonntags-Blu-}

Biothek, vol. iv, pt. iii (Bielefeld, 1850); Jewish Intelli- gencer (Lond. 1858); Zuchold, Bibliotheca Theologica, ii, 120. (B. P.)

POSELLE, AUGUSTUS, a German Lutheran theologian, was born Jan. 6, 1654, at Zittau, in the Oberlausitz. He studied at Wittenberg, Kiel, and Jena, and for a long time he preached at Hamburg. In 1688 he was appointed zum Pastoralzelle in Hamburg, where he remained for some time; in 1714 he was made archdeacon, and in 1718 pastor primarius of St. John, in which position he died, Nov. 23, 1728. He wrote, Richtige Erklärung der Fülle der St. Pauli an die Römer:—Nachricht von dem in Inhaber bestehenden biblischen Exemplaren. See Jocher, Gehrent- Lexikon, s. a.

Possessed with Devils, the usual rendering in the A. V. of the Greek ἐπανομοσύνης (but also ἐπανομοσύνης, Mark v, 18; ἐπέναμος ἤτοι, Luke viii, 27; ἐπέναμος ἢ τόκον ἐκάθισεν ἤτοι, iv, 33), Matt. iv, 24; ivii, 16; xx, 22; Acts vii, 7; Luke vii, 2. These were persons afflicted with disease, as epilepsy (Matt. xxi, 18; Luke ix, 22; Math. x, 16), dumbness (Matt. ix, 32; xii, 22), and especially with melancholy and insanity (Matt. viii, 28; Mark v, 2 sq.; Luke vii, 27 sq.; whence the healed are said to be of sound mind (σωφρόνων ἄνως, Mark v, 15; Luke viii, 35). It is not necessary to suppose that the epilepsy or the dumbness of these persons was the case, was complicated with peculiar physical disorders, although epilepsy is very commonly connected with something of the kind (see Farmer, Ferz. p. 89; Hippocra- tis, Visc. Morb. c. i; Esquier, Path. u. Thérap. d. Scle- rotèmes; Leips. 1857, p. 78; comp. p. 585). Indeed, while these special disabilities of men in other respects in sound and vigorous health were naturally referred to a supernatural cause, this would be especially the case with the sudden attacks of epilepsy, falling at irregular intervals and without premonition. Everything of this kind is called the Devil, in the Greeks and Romans, the evil spirits taking possession of men (see Acts x, 18; Luke xiii, 16; comp. Josephus, Ant. vi, 8, 2, in 1 Sam. xvi, 14, 23; see also Lightfoot, p. 388; Eisenmenger, Enzyklopädie Judenth. ii, 404; Maimonides, Schob. ii, 5; Erub. iii, 4; Crozier, Symbof. ii, 34 sq.). The case was the same among the ancients with those extraordinary events and achievements, accomplished by men, which seemed too great to proceed from the natural human powers—they were referred to the operation of a di- vine spirit. Not only hallucinations, which are the most frequent symptom of epilepsy (called by Herodotus the sacred disease, iii, 35), but also the ravings of Bechamites and Corybantes were viewed as proceeding from superhuman inspiration (Herod. iv, 79; Eurip. Medec. 298 sq.; Diod. Hal. De Demon. c. xxii; see also Herod. iii, 33; Heliod. Eld. iv, 10; Dos. Exercit. Phil. p. 62 sq.). Hence to demonize (ζα- μωσύνη) is the common Greek expression meaning to be insane (Euch. Chor. 564; Sept. c. Theb. 1008; Eurip. Phem. 899; Aristoph. Themorph. 1060; Plutarch, Marv. 20; Lucian, Philopater. c. xvi; and Wetst. i, 261; comp. Aretaeus, Saurous Med., dist. i, 4 sq.). These cases were generally viewed as the spirits of the deceased (Philostr. Apoll. iii, 38; Horace, Epod. v, 91; comp. Josephus, War, vii, 6, 3; and on exorcising them, see Plutarch, Sympos. vii, 5; Lucian, Philopater. c. xvi; on the Syriac and Arabic usage of speech, see John, Apskr. p. 173 sq.). The practice of exorcism upon such men, for the purpose of driving out the devils, was very common (comp. Lucian, Philopater. c. xvi; and see Matt. xii, 37; Luke ix, 49; Acts xiii, 18 sq.; comp. Justin Mart. Apol. ii, 7). The exorcists made use of certain magical formulae, which are preserved (Josephus, Ant. viii, 2, 5), in connection with certain roots, stones, etc. (id. War, vii, 6, 6; Mishna, Gitten, lxvii, 2; Plutarch, De Flur. vi, 2). Afterwards these men were found also in other countries (Lucian, Philopater. c. xvi). Many suppose that Jesus simply adopted the popular mode of speech in his age in speaking of ce-
moniac possession, and healed the unfortunate sufferers without sharing in the view commonly taken of their disease (F. von Hennert, Accomodat, in N. T. p. 81 sq.; Hase, Leben Jesu, p. 72 sq.; Juvenal, Sat. xiv. 179 sq.; Just, in the time of Orig. Gen. De spir. mal. III, 33 sq.; many of the physicians and of the people. Where prayer and fasting are recommended to the apostles as means of exorcism, Porphyry (Apob. ii. 204, 417 sq.) may be compared. It was very natural that the sufferers, when healed, wished to remain in the vicinity of the Physician (Luke viii, 58; comp. viii, 2); and it is supposed, as just the fancied enemies most safe against the return of the demons.

The symptoms recorded of individual demonsiacs agree with those which are noticed in diseases of the kinds mentioned above. (a) On Matt. xxvii. 10, comp. Paul. Epist. iii, 18, where he speaks of a morbus comitatus, in which the whole body is convulsed; which affects chiefly boys, sometimes young men; and in which the convulsion is accompanied with a sudden inarticulate cry. The chief distinguishing mark, however, is a foaming at the mouth (comp. Luke ix. 37; I. Mack. Chron. ii. 4). Cynicus (Mark. Chron. i, 4) speaks of a class of diseased persons, epileptics, who fell in public places (from which the disease is still sometimes called falling-sickness, and in German Fallsucht; comp. Rabb. יָפָּחָה or יָפָּחָה, an epileptic, or even into rivers or the sea. Aretaeus (De Morbo Epil. 5) speaks of some who fell in weakness into the river. It was early observed that this affliction seemed to have some connection with the changes of the moon (Doug. Ael. vii. 5; Bartholin, Morb. Bibl. c. xviii.; comp. Aret. Morb. Chron. i, 4; Origen, in Matt. iii. 577; Lucian, Tox. c. xxiv.; Isidor. Orig. iv. 7). Hence the use of the word σκυλατος in Matt. iv. 24; xvii. 15; comp. Suicer, Theatr. ii. 946. In Latin, too, epileptics were called lanuvici, or monstrostrum. Again, epilepsy, in connection with partial insanity, was the disease of the man mentioned in Mark i., 23 sq.; Luke iv. 33 sq.; comp. esp. Mark i., 26. (b) On Matt. viii, 28, comp. Wetstein, 153 sq. The proofs of vast strength, and of a violent rage against himself (Mark v. 4, 5; comp. Acts xix, 16), leave no doubt that this was a maniac. The fact that he avoided society, and wished to dwell alone among tombs, point to the peculiar mania which Sauvages calls Mania mecanthropica, or that which Keil (in the article Manie, in the Dictionary of the Hebrew and Greek, 2d ed., p. 508; and in the Hist. de l'espr. 1803, p. 365) calls Mania errabunda. Yet his mania was but temporary, though the delusion which it accompanied was permanent, showing itself in settled ideas (Mark v, 9; Luke viii, 39). Thus, according to the principles of Heinroth (Lehrbuch der Seelestörungen, i, 360 sq.), the case is one of delusion joined with melancholy, and sometimes heightened to mania. Mental as well as physical diseases are often thus complicated with each other (Esquirol, p. 78); comp. further, Tauryn. Jeros. Termin. xl, 2, where an insane man (παρθηκη) is thus described: "He goes forth and spends the night in the tombs and destroys whatever is offered him." The leaping down of the swine, a part of the fruit of the herd, was produced, as some think, by the violent running towards them of the demonsiacs, under the fixed impression that the demons could not leave them save by finding another dwelling-place in the unclean beasts (comp. Josephus, Ant. vii. 5, 5; comp. esp. Eichhorn, Bibl. vii, 855 sq.; Grimm, E. A. J. 132 sq.; Schmidt, Erzr. Brüü. ii. 88 sq.; Geiling, in Henke, Mus. i. 260 sq.; Friedl. S. r. einer literaturgesch. d. Pathol. u. Therapie d. psych. Dozse. in dem v. Dr. Cremer, 2d ed. 39 sq.; Friedl. J. Lehre v. d. A. d. tier., 3d ed., note 13, on Acts xxvi. 16). The view of the earlier theologians and physicians was that in the case of the demonsiac healed by Jesus there had been an actual bodily indwelling of evil spirits. From this view (set forth by J. Marcilhac, Textual Exeget. p. 257 sq.; Deyling, Observat. i, 571 sq.; Ernesti, N. Chr. Bibl. iv. 85 sq.; comp. viii, 86 sq.; Wetstein, i, 379 sq.; Bartholin, De morb. Bibl. c. xix.) it was formally combated by Mezulis, Bibelkomment., p. 63 sq. See Semler, Com. de Demoniacis quorum in N. T. tit. mentio (Halle, 1760); Umständliche Untersuchung der Dämonen-Liste (ibid. 1762); Gruner, De Demoniacis a Christo Receivatis (Jena, 1773); Lindenthal, in the Zeitschr. f. kath. Theol. 1817-1818; and himself, Rech. der Erw. vet. and himself, Erzr. ber. 1770; his Briefs ub. die Dämonischen in d. Evang., with additions by Semler (Halle, 1788); Zimmerman, Diat. de Demoniacis Evang. (Kintzheim, 1786); Medicina-hermeneut. Untersuch. p. 15 sq.; Comp. Carn. cycl. col. 398 sq.; Baur, Bibl. Theol. d. N. T., i. 213 sq.; Jarch, Arch. ii, 400 sq. (omitted in the 2d ed.; comp. Nachtr. zu Jaulin's Theol. Werke, p. 451 sq.). Additional literature is cited by Volbeding, Index Provenumarum Fisci (Cologne, 1686), c. xxvi. Cybercol. col. 830, 925, 926, 1672, 1882; Danz, Bibl. Theol. olog. p. 125. 204. See also Woodward, Demoniacal Possession (London, 1839, 1855); Mth. Quart. Rev. July, 1857; Free-will Bapt. Quart. April, 1858; Preb. Rev. Oct. 1865. Comp. DEMONIAC. Possessio, a terrastico, a celebrated Italian Jesuit, noted for the diplomatic services he rendered the Church of Rome, was born at Mantova in 1584. He belonged to a noble but poor family. Sent to Rome at the age of sixteen, he was in a short time proficient in the classical languages and literature, and cardinal Ercole di Gonzaga made him his amanuensis, and instructed to his hands the education of his nephews, Francis and Scipio di Gonzaga. Possessio followed his patron to Ferrara, then to Padua, and gained by his merit the esteem of Paolo Manucci, Bartolomeo Ricci, and Sigonio. Although he had been rewarded by the Gonzagas with the donation of the rich commandery of Possano, in Piedmont, he preferred to join the Jesuits. He had not finished his novitiate when he was sent on a very delicate errand to the duke of Savoy, Emanuel Philibert (1560), to be the object of this mission was to stop the progress of heresy, which, coming from France, threatened to invade Italy through Savoy and Piedmont. The Roman court, either to reward his services or to give full scope to his talents, employed him in several negotiations. The first of these missions was to Sweden. He was sent to Stockholm in the spring of 1628. The king received him with great favor, abjured severally all his heresies, made a general confession, and promised obedience to the apostolic see. The ensuing day, May 17, 1578, the mass was celebrated after the Roman rite in presence of the king. Possessio returned to Rome, and the queries and propositions of the king were examined by an ecclesiastical commission. The mass in the vulgar tongue, the chalice for the laymen, the marriage of priests, the omission of the invocation of saints and of the prayers for the dead, the suppression of holy water and other ceremonies were rejected; seven other proposals were accepted. On Possessio's return to Stockholm (July, 1579), the king, who was of a very fickle disposition, showed great dissatisfaction at the negative answer he had met with on the five points above mentioned, broke up all negotiations, and would not even consent to the establishment of a Church for Romanists. In February, 1580, the regnad of Wadstena, at which Possesino was present, took a threatening attitude, and King John was compelled to publish an edict against such Romanists. In summer, the king's depredations, and to promise to promote only Protestants to the professorships. In the same year Possesino returned to Rome. King John, having lost his wife Catharine in
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1588, married in 1585 Guinilla Bjelke, who became for the Lutherans what the former queen had been for the Catholics.

Soon afterwards Possévino was sent on a similar errand to Poland and Russia. The czar, Ivan Vassili-vitch II (1583–1584), called the Terrible, had vastly aggrandized his empire in all directions. In 1580 he had received the submission of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. In 1582 he met Stephen Bathori, king of Poland (1575–1586), who defeated him and compelled him to retreat. To stop the Polish invasion the czar invoked the mediation of pope Gregory XIII. Possévino was sent to the headquarters of the king of Poland at Wilna. Bathori consented to retract the order in which he had issued his edict on the Jesuits, but kept his conditions. Hereupon Possévino set on his way to the interior of Russia under an escort of Cossacks. The czar received him at Staciža, and gave him a solemn audience, Aug. 8. Ivan sat on his throne, surrounded with Oriental pomp, dressed in a long robe interwoven with golden threads and covered with pearls and jewels; he bore a kind of tiara on his head, and held a golden sceptre in his left hand. Senators, bojars, and army-officers filled the rooms; gold and precious stones glittered everywhere. The rest was in accordance. After five days' negotiation, during which the whole proceedings the czar gave frequent evidence of astuteness and duplicity. Possévino subordinated his intervention to the following conditions: free passage through Russia for the apostolic nuncios and representatives, the protection of the Catholic worship for foreign merchants, and admission of Catholic priests to administer to the sacred rites. Finally, as the czar himself had proposed an alliance against the Turks, the papal envoy hinted at the fusion of the two churches as being the best means to bring it to pass. Possévino was hopeful of hope, while the czar gave only evasive answers. Thus a month elapsed in fruitless debate, when the news of the siege of Pleskau (Pokov), the possession of which city would have opened Russia to the Poles, brought matters to a rapid conclusion. Ivan consented to the admission of Roman Catholic merchants, and Possévino repaired to the Polish camp. Through his exertions a congress of plenipotentiaries of both belligerents was held at Porchau, in which the mediator presided. Bathori demanded the cession of the whole of Wiliczi, and as Possévino knew that the king of Poland would not swerve from his purpose, he prevailed on the Russians to consent. But when the Poles demanded also the town of Weliki, and the life of the Russian envoy was at stake, the papal legate had to pledge his own life to obtain their signature. At last the treaty was signed, Jan. 15. 

Armored, Possévino, after a truly triumphal journey, reached Moscow, where he found the court in consternation and the czar beside himself: he had killed his son with a blow of his golden sceptre. Five weeks after the conclusion of the peace a conference was held in the Kremlin, when the czar declined the proposal of a fusion of the churches, but consented to the passage of the missionaries, and granted religious freedom to foreign merchants and priests. During these latter negotiations Ivan at one time had lifted his sceptre, still red with his son's blood, against the Jesuit. Failing to intimidate Possévino, he laid a snare for him, trying to prevail on him to kiss the hand of the patriarch: his purpose was to make believe that the pope had submitted to the patriarch. But the clerical diplomatist remained faithful to his task, and succeeded.

He was scarcely returned when he was sent to Livonia and Transylvania to combat Protestantism, which was fast gaining ground in those provinces. Possévino held a conference with the sectarians at Herrmannstadt. On the same occasion he increased the importance of the colleges of his order in those parts, and founded a seminary at Clausenburg. In 1588 he took his seat, in his quality of a papal nuncio, at the great Diet of Warsaw. As Possévino several times interposed his mediation between Poland and the German empire, he was, as could be expected, accused of partiality by both parties. The general inquirer, Albert, who had persisted on his being recalled, and Gregory XIII complied with the demand. Possévino was glad to leave his political toils. He journeyed about as a simple missionary in Livonia, Bohemia, Saxony, and Upper Hungary. In 1590 the nuncio of the pope's legation was sent to hold lectures: there he became acquainted with the young count of Sales, whom he prevailed upon to leave the law for the church, and who became St. Francis de Sales. After four years spent at Padua, he was called to Rome, where he took some pains in trying to reconcile Henry IV with the papal court; this displeased the Spanish party and his superior, and he was sent to Bologna as rector of the college. He was at Venice when Paul V put the city under interdict; and here was a new case of mediation for the old man. He died at Ferrara Feb. 26, 1611. Among his works are, Del Sacrifìcio dell' Altare (Lyons, 1585, 8vo); Il Soldato Cristiano (Rome, 1569, 12mo), written at Pius V's request, when this pontiff sent troops to Charles IX against the Huguenots; — Moscovita, seu de rebus Moscovitica (Wilna, 1586, 6to; Cologne, 1587–85, fol.; later trans. 1596, 4to; see selecta de ratione Studiorum (Rome, 1592, 12mo; Lyons, 1595, 8vo). The four authors are Le Noue, Jean Bodin, Duplessis-Mornay, and Machiavelli. Possévino was here misled by his zeal against the Protestants; and as to Machiavelli, he is referred to as a heretic. This papal envoy was the author of a vast and selecta de ratione Studiorum (Rome, 1592, 2 vols. fol.; new ed. with correct. and addit., Cologne, 1607, 2 vols. fol.— Apparatus auctor (Venice, 1603–6, 3 vols. fol.; Cologne, 1607, 2 vols. fol.); this is the greatest catalogue of ancient and modern authors that had been seen at that time. Although he had especially in view the interest of the Roman Catholic Church, yet he did not, like Bellarmin, Sixtus of Siena, and others, confine his task to the enumeration of ecclesiastical writers—his plan includes the profane too. He treats of nearly eight thousand writers—their lives, works, influence, editions: — Vita di Ludovico Gossaga, Duce di Nerro, di Eleonora, Duchessa di Mantova (1604, 4to). See Ranke, Hist. of the Popes, i. 434 sq.; ii. 21 sq.; Alzog, Kirchengesch., ii. 841, 425, 456; Mosheim, Eccles. Hist. vol. iii; Hefner, Néer. Bltg. Genev., a. v.

Possidius, Sr., a prelate of the early Eastern Church, flourished at the close of the 4th and the commencement of the 5th century. He was a disciple of St. Augustine, and lived on intimate terms with him all his life. On being raised in 397 to the episcopal see of Ocriculum, a town near Pula, when Possidius, after a truly triumphal journey, reached Moscow, he found the court in consternation and the czar beside himself: he had killed his son with a blow of his golden sceptre. Five weeks after the conclusion of the peace a conference was held in the Kremlin, when the czar declined the proposal of a fusion of the churches, but consented to the passage of the missionaries, and granted religious freedom to foreign merchants and priests. During these latter negotiations Ivan at one time had lifted his sceptre, still red with his son's blood, against the Jesuit. Failing to intimidate Possévino, he laid a snare for him, trying to prevail on him to kiss the hand of the patriarch: his purpose was to make believe that the pope had submitted to the patriarch. But the clerical diplomatist remained faithful to his task, and succeeded.

He was scarcely returned when he was sent to Livonia and Transylvania to combat Protestantism, which was fast gaining ground in those provinces. Possévino held a conference with the sectarians at Herrmannstadt. On the same occasion he increased the importance of the colleges of his order in those parts, and founded a seminary at Clausenburg. In 1588 he took his seat, in his quality of a papal nuncio, at the great Diet of Warsaw. As Possévino several times interposed his mediation between Poland and the German empire, he was, as could be expected, accused of partiality by both parties. The general inquirer, Albert, who had persisted on his being recalled, and Gregory XIII complied with the demand. Possévino was glad to leave his political toils. He journeyed about as a simple missionary in Livonia, Bohemia, Saxony, and Upper Hungary. In 1590 the nuncio of the pope's legation was sent to hold lectures: there he became acquainted with the young count of Sales, whom he prevailed upon to leave the law for the church, and who became St. Francis de Sales. After four years spent at Padua, he was called to Rome, where he took some pains in trying to reconcile Henry IV with the papal court; this displeased the Spanish party and his superior, and he was sent to Bologna as rector of the college. He was at Venice when Paul V put the city under interdict; and here was a new case of mediation for the old man. He died at Ferrara Feb. 26, 1611. Among his works are, Del Sacrifìcio dell' Altare (Lyons, 1585, 8vo); Il Soldato Cristiano (Rome, 1569, 12mo), written at Pius V's request, when this pontiff sent troops to Charles IX against the Huguenots; — Moscovita, seu de rebus Moscovitica (Wilna, 1586, 6to; Cologne, 1587–85, fol.; later trans. 1596, 4to; see selecta de ratione Studiorum (Rome, 1592, 12mo; Lyons, 1595, 8vo). The four authors are Le Noue, Jean Bodin, Duplessis-Mornay, and Machiavelli. Possévino was here misled by his zeal against the Protestants; and as to Machiavelli, he is referred to as a heretic. This papal envoy was the author of a vast and selecta de ratione Studiorum (Rome, 1592, 2 vols. fol.; new ed. with correct. and addit., Cologne, 1607, 2 vols. fol.— Apparatus auctor (Venice, 1603–6, 3 vols. fol.; Cologne, 1607, 2 vols. fol.); this is the greatest catalogue of ancient and modern authors that had been seen at that time. Although he had especially in view the interest of the Roman Catholic Church, yet he did not, like Bellarmin, Sixtus of Siena, and others, confine his task to the enumeration of ecclesiastical writers—his plan includes the profane too. He treats of nearly eight thousand writers—their lives, works, influence, editions: — Vita di Ludovico Gossaga, Duce di Nerro, di Eleonora, Duchessa di Mantova (1604, 4to). See Ranke, Hist. of the Popes, i. 434 sq.; ii. 21 sq.; Alzog, Kirchengesch., ii. 841, 425, 456; Mosheim, Eccles. Hist. vol. iii; Hefner, Néer. Bltg. Genev., a. v.
Post (courant) is the rendering of ἐφέλλω, σφάλας (Sept. ἐσπάρήλωρος, Vulg. cursor, 2 Chron. xxx, 6, 10; Ezech. iii, 13, 15; viii, 10, 14; Job ix, 25; Jer. ii, 31, a runner, or "guard," as elsewhere rendered; a courier or carrier of messages, such as is common in Oriental countries. See Angarevo. The term post is used to indicate primarily the person who conveyed with speed any message; and subsequently the means of regular postal communications. Some writers have thought that the use of posts as a system originated with the Persians. Diodoros Siculus observes that the kings of Persia, in order to have intelligence of what was passing through all the provinces of their vast dominions, placed sentinels at eminences at convenient distances, where towers were built. These sentinels gave notice of public occurrences from one to another, with a very loud and shrill voice, by which news was transmitted from one extremity of the kingdom to another with great expedition. But as this could not be practiced except in the case of general news, which it was expedient that the whole nation should be acquainted with, Cyrus, as Xenophon relates, appointed couriers and places for post-horses, building for the purpose on all the high-roads houses for the reception of the couriers, where they were to deliver their packets to the next, and so on. This they did night and day, so that no incontinency of weather was to stop them; and they are represented as moving with astonishing speed. Herodotus owns that nothing swifter was known for a journey by land. Xerxes, in his famous expedition against Greece, planted posts from the Ξγεαν Sea to Shushan or Susa, to send notice thither of what might happen to his army; he placed also messengers from station to station, to convey his packets, at such distances from each other as a horse might easily travel. The regularity and swiftness of the Roman posts were likewise admirable. Gibbon observes, "The advantage of receiving the earliest intelligence, and of conveying their orders with celerity, induced the emperors to establish throughout their extensive dominions the regular institution of posts. Houses were everywhere erected at the distance only of five or six miles; each of them was constantly provided with forty horses; and by the help of these relays it was easy to travel a hundred miles a day along the Roman roads. In the time of a theodotion or postmaster of a Roman road went by post from Antioch to Constantinople. He began his journey at night, was in Cappadocia (163 miles from Antioch) the ensuing evening, and arrived at Constantinople the sixth day about noon. The whole distance was 725 Roman, or 605 English miles. This service seems to have lasted very laxly performed till the time of Trajan, previous to whose reign the Roman messengers were in the habit of seizing for the public service any horses that came in their way. Some regularity was observed from this time forward, as in the Theodosian code mention is made of post-horses, and orders given for their regulation. Throughout all this period posts were only used on special occasions. Letters from private persons were conveyed by private hands, and were confined for the most part to business of sufficient urgency. Yet the correspondence of ancient times, if we may judge from the immense number of Egyptian, Babylonian, and Persian seals still in existence, must have been far from inconsiderable. The institution of posts disappeared from Europe with the breaking up of the Roman empire, and its re-establishment is generally attributed to Louis XI of France, in the middle of the 15th century.

Post (stationary) is the rendering in the A. V. of the following words:

1. ἄνω, ἄνω (Sept. τὸ ἄνωθεν, Vulg. from), properly a ram (as in Gen. xxv, 9, and often); hence perhaps a pillar or buttress (Ezek. xi, 9-49; xiii, 1, 3; "lintel," 1 Kings vi, 31). In the Sept. it is sometimes left untranslated (אֵל, אֵלָה, אֵלָד); and in the Chaldee version it is represented by a modification of itself. Throughout the passages of Ezekiel in which the Sept. renders the Vulg. uniformly renders it by from: which Gesenius quotes as favorable to his own view, provided that by from be understood the projections in front of the building. The A. V. of 1 Kings vi, 31, "lintel," is supported by the versions of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion of Ezek. xi, 21; while Kimchi explains it generally by "post." The Peshito-Syriac uniformly renders the word by a modification of the Greek παραστάτης, "pillars." Jarchi understands by ἀνω a round column like a large tree; Aquila (Ezek. xii, 1) has, having in view the meaning "ram," which the word elsewhere bears, renders it εἴρημα, apparently intending thereby to denote the volutes of columns curved like rams' horns. J. D. Michaelis (Stepp. ad Lev. s. v.) considers it to be the tympanum or triangular area of the entablature above a gate supported by columns. Gesenius himself, after reviewing the passages in which the word occurs, arrives at the conclusion that in the singular it denotes the whole projecting framework of a door or gateway, including the jambs on either side, the lintel, and architrave, with frieze and cornice. In the plural it is applied to denote the projections along the front of an edifice ornamented with columns or palm-trees, and with recesses or intercolumniations between them sometimes filled up by windows. Under the former head he places 1 Kings vi, 31; Ezek. xi, 9, 21, 24, 26, 29, 31, 33, 34, 36-41, 49; xii, 9, 10, 14, 16; xiii, 1. Another explanation still is that of Böttcher (quoted by Winer, Realbe. ii, 575), who says that αἰσθήσεως is the projecting entrance and passage-wall—which might appropriately be divided into compartments by pilasters: and this view is adopted by Frits (Handb. s. v.). Akin to this is ζύλων, καλλίτον, "an arch," only used in the plur. (Ezek. xi, 16, etc.), probably a portico, and so ren-
dery by Symmachus and Syriac versions (Gesen. Thesaur. p. 48). 2. μηδή, ammdh (Sept. ὠνίστροφον, Vulg. superliminare), literally, mother, or cubit, as the fundamental re- lance in the Temple worship (Isa. vi. 4). 3. μετά, metad (Sept. ἀπ' ἑλίαν, φιλα; Vulg. post- tio), the door-post (the usual term). See Mizuzah. The ceremony of boring the ear of a voluntary bond- man was performed by placing the ear against the door- post of the house (Exod. xxxi. 6); see Juven. Sat. i. 103, and Plaut. Pun. v. 2, 21). The posts of the doors of the Temple were of olive-wood (1 Kings vi. 28). 4. ραφθ, ῥαφθ (Sept. φιλα, πρωτολογος; Vulg. lineam, super- liminare), the threshold (2 Chron. iii. 7; Ezek. xlii. 16; Amos ix. 1; elsewhere "threshold," "door," or "gate"). See Door.

Post, Christian Frederick, a distinguished but somewhat erratic Moravian missionary, was born in 1710 at Conitz, in Polish Prussia. He immigrated to America in 1742. He preached, after his arrival in this country, among the Indians, with whom he was con- nected by marriage, his first wife, Rachel, having been a baptized Wompanoag, and his second wife, Agnes, a baptized Delaware. His earliest missionary labors ex- tended over parts of New England and New York. In 1748 he was one of the Mohawks, and he was arrested on the false charge of being a French spy, sent to New York, and there confined for seven weeks in the jail of the City Hall. His companion, David Zeisberger (q.v.), shared the same lot. The protest of Governor Thomas and other influential Pennsylvanians at last secured their release. After the death of his second Indian wife—his third wife was a white woman—he returned to Europe, and thence, in 1752, sailed to Lab- rador, attempting to bring the Gospel to the Equi- maux. Having come back to Pennsylvania in 1754, he established himself in the Wyo Valley, where he instructed the Indians and entertained travelling missionaries until the breaking out of the French and Indian War. In the course of this war, in the summer of 1758, at the instance of the government of Pennsyl- vania, he undertook a perilous journey through the Indian country as far as Ohio, inducing the Western tribes which were in league with France to bury the hatchet and send deputies to a congress at Easton. This congress resulted in a general pacification, which embraced all the nations except the Twightees. Un- dertaking the business of his first tour, he thereupon visited the Indian country a second time, and induced the Twightees also to conclude peace. Post thus conferred an incalculable benefit upon the colonies, and indirectly helped to bring the North American continent under the sway of the Anglo-Saxon race. The journal of his first tour, which caused a great sensation at the time, was published in London in 1759, in a work entitled An Enquiry into the Causes of the Alienation of the Delaware and Shawnee Indians from the British Interest, etc. It is also found in the Penn. Archives, iii. 520-544. After the war Post began (1761) an in- dependent mission on the Tuscarawas, Ohio. The breaking out of the Pontiac conspiracy compelled him to retire. He went to the South, and in the beginning of 1764 sailed from Charleston to Mosquitia, where he preached to the natives. In 1767 he visited the colo- nies, but returned again to Mosquitia. After that we lose sight of him until 1784, when he is found residing in Germantown, Pa. There he died, April 29, 1785, and was buried in the Lower Graveyard of that place by the Rev. William White (afterwards bishop White), rector of Christ Church, Philadelphia. (E. de S.)

Post, Henry Albertson, a Presbyterian minis- ter, was born in Browning, N. Y., Sept. 2, 1835. He received a careful parental training, enjoyed all the ad- vantages of the academies of New England, and gradu- ated at the New York Free Academy. He studied theology in the Union Seminary, New York, and sub- sequently in the Princeton Seminary, N. J., where he graduated in 1861, and was licensed as a minister of the Church in Warrensburgh, N. Y., Jan. 10, 1860: this was his only charge, for he died Nov. 12, 1861. Mr. Post died in the very midst of his active work; still his short ministry gave full proof of his calling, and many souls were added to the Church. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1865, p. 306. (J. L. S.)

Post, Reuben, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Lorneville, N. Y., in 1792. He received classical training, and graduated with honor at Middlebury College, Vt., in 1814, and at the Theological Seminary at Princeton, N. J., in 1818. On leaving the seminary, he spent some time as a missionary in Virginia, then accepted a call from the First Presbyterian Church, D. C., and was ordained in 1818. In 1836 he accepted a call from the Circular Church, Charleston, S. C., where he labored faithfully for twenty-three years, when he was taken ill, and died Sept. 24, 1858. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1860, p. 77. (J. L. S.)

Postel, Guillaume, one of the most learned Frenchmen of his time, is celebrated especially as one of the fathers of the modernius as the true architect of the scriptural chronology. He was born May 28, 1505 (according to some historians, 1510), at Dolerie, near Barenton, in Normandy. He lost his parents early, and poverty compelled him to leave his country. At the age of thirteen years he found at Sacy, near Pontoise, a modest situation in the library of a learned master. He saved his remnant. He went to Paris to pursue his studies. There he was the victim of a robbery, which reduced him to extreme mis- ery, and he was confined by sickness to a hospital for two years. When he was restored to health, his por- verty and the high price of living compelled him to leave Paris, and to support himself by cleaning in the Beauce. Afterwards he entered the College of Sainte-Barbe in the quality of a servant; there he became by private study one of the most learned Hebraists of his time. No less remarkable was his proficiency in the Greek language. He lived successively in Amiens and Rouen, and then went back to Paris to become a tutor. He accompanied La Forest to Constantinople to transact some political business. He went a second time to the capital of Turkey with the heir of a citizen of Tours, who had died leaving 200,000 ducats as a deposit in the hands of Ibrahim Pasha. Postel improved these occasions to study the Arabic language, and brought back with him a number of manuscripts in Arabic and Syriac. The New Testament in Syriac, which he was the first to translate into Latin, was presented by order of the emperor Ferdinand I. Shortly after this Postel published an alphabet in twelve languages, and some other writings. His learning was now acknowledged by king Francis I, and he was given in 1539 a professor- ship of mathematics and Oriental languages, with a salary of 200 ducats, which allowed him much leisure to devote himself to linguistic studies; but he lost his chair when chancellor Poyet, his benefactor, fell into disgrace. Postel thereupon repaired to Vienna, where he helped Job. Alb. Widmanstadt in the publica- tion of his Hebrew treatise in Syriac-Gyrycko. Compelled to leave that city for motives unknown, he was mistaken for a murderer who had some likeness to him, and arrested on the frontier of the Venetian terri- tory. He succeeded in escaping his captors, and went to Rome in 1544. He there made the acquaintance of Ignatius de Loyola and determined to enter the Order of the Jesuits. But the head of the neophyte was full of fantastic ideas, due to the study of the rabbins, and also to the study of the stars. After a two-years' novici- tiate he was expelled from the order, and Ignatius pro- hibited him to inturrupt his studies. Postel, himself, pos- sess in some writings his mystical ideas, he was im- prisoned. Escaping to Venice, he was denounced to the Inquisition, but was dismissed by that tribunal, being
POSTEL

considered more a fool than a heretic. He afterwards lived in Genoa and Baze. Beza asserts that Postel offered to abjure his errors and to enter one of the Protestant communities, which seems doubtful. It appears that in 1553 he was a teacher of mathematics at Dijon, when his opinions compelled him again to resign. He lived for some time at the court of the emperor Ferdinand I, whence, after a public abjuration of his opinions, he was recalled to his former situation at the College of France by Francis I, but soon lost it again, and spent the last eighteen years of his life in the monastery of Saint-Martin des Champs. In his old age, says a contemporary, "princes and men of science paid their visits to the venerable recluse at Saint-Martin des Champs, where he lived. He sat there in his chair, his white beard falling down to his girdle; and in his deportment was such a majesty, such gravity in everything he said, that no one ever left him without a wish to see him again, and without astonishment at what he had heard." He died Sept. 6, 1561. It was during his life at the monastery that Postel published in 1572 his ideas about the comet which appeared in them from the direction of the constellation of Orion. The end of the work, he says, was written "Postellus restitutus;" he also maintained that women shall have the dominion over men, and that his writings were revealed to him by Jesus Christ. He was therefore confident of being able to explain by reason and philosophy all Christian dogmas, inclusive of the mysteries, his personal reason having become so superior to that of other men that by its means he would convert all nations to the Christian faith. "Christ has given," he said, "the excellence of faith to the apostles; but faith being now almost extinct, he gave us, and especially to the Catholics, the faith of reason, so powerful and victorious, as never did the apostles have it. And thus innumerable things in the Scripture and in nature, which never were understood, by said victorious reason will be understood." He asserted that the human soul of Christ was created and united with the eternal Word before the creation of the world. He affirmed that everything that was in nature was described in the heavens in Hebrew characters, formed by the arrangement of the stars. The world was to subsist only for 6000 years, an opinion he had taken from the Hebrew sages. The end of the world will be preceded by the restoration of all things into the state they were in before the fall of Adam. He dreamed of the fusion of all religions into one creed; and in his desire to reconcile Christians, Jews, and Mohammedans, undertook to explain the most extravagant opinions. But, whatever judgment we may pronounce on his opinions, justice compels us to recognise that all historians commend the purity of his life, the wisdom of his conduct, and the benevolence of his character; he often neglected his own interests to take care of others. He left, Linguarum XI, libri, alphabetum introductio ac legendi methodos (Paris, 1588, 4to);—De originalibus seu de Hebraicis linguis et gentibus antiquatate aliqua variarum linguarum officiante (ibid. 1588, 4to);—Grammatica Arvica (ibid. 1588, 4to);—Syriae descriptio (ibid. 1540, 8vo);—De magnificatus Atheniensium (Baze. 1543, 8vo);—Leipsic, 1581, 12mo, with the notes of John Frederick Heikelsius:—Alcorami seu legis Mahometi et evangelistarum concordiae liber (Paris, 1548, 8vo);—Sacrorum apodeoron, seu Excidium Christiani libri ii (ibid. 1548);—IV librorum de orbis terrarum concordia prima (ibid. 1548);—Epistolarum Sacram (ibid. 1548, 8vo); in this work Postel endeavored to prove that there is nothing in religion that is not in accordance with nature and reason:—De orbis terrarum concordiae libri ii (Bazeil, 1544, 4vo), it is the best of Postel's works, and expounds with much talent his favorite ideas about the unity of all the nations of the world:—De nativitate Mediatoris ulimo, nunc futura et toti orbis terrarum in singulari ratione pridend manifestanda opus (ibid. 1547, 8vo);—Abecedariorum a constitutione mundi clarus, qua mens humana lata in divini quas in humana rectis ad interiorum eterna veritatis (ibid. 1610; and with appendix, Amat. 1641, 16mo);—Candelabrum typici in Mosis tabernaculo jusue divino expressi interpretatio (Venice, 1548—Hebrew, Latin, and French):—De Etrursa regnima, qua prima in orbe Europae habebat est, originibus, institutis, religionibus, et moribus, quae situ ad mediam Lituorum, ad Monarchiam, et quela Moyena sunt necessariae pro parte (Paris, 1551, 8vo):—Abrahami patriarcarum liber Jebrar, sive formaciones mundi, patribus quidem Abrahami tempora preecessionibus relinquit, etc. (ibid. 1552, 16mo):—De naturali sua orbe natura urbisque (ibid. 1552, 16mo):—Eclaresi futilorum Aristotelis dogmarum (ibid. 1552, 16mo):—L'Histoire mémorable des Expéditions depuis le Déluge, faites par les Gaulois ou Français depuis la France jusques en Asie, ou en Thessalie, et en orientale Partie de l'Europe (ibid. 1562, 16mo):—De Phænomeni liquei, seu de prisci Latini et Graeci liqueo charactere (ibid. 1562, 8vo):—Tabula in astronomiam, in arithmeticum theoriam et in musucum theoriam (ibid. 1552):—La Loi Saliq, lettre de la première humaine Vériq (ibid. 1552, 16mo);—Protophylacus in Atheniis et potissimum orbis Latinlo ad hunc diec incognita aut inconsiderata historia (ibid. 1553, 8vo):—Descriprio Domini (Bazeil, 1582, 8vo):—De Originalis, seu de varia des Gauda (Paris, 1558, fol.):—Signorum celestium vera configuratio et significacionum expositioni (ibid. 1558, 8vo):—La Doctrice du Sàcre dure, ou de l'Églajique or de Sauc Ces de Boros (ibid. 1561, 16mo). This book has become very rare and precious. Postel declares that he speaks in the name and by the inspiration of a certain mère Jeanne, whom he had known in Italy, and whose substance has been absorbed by his own.—Des Miracles des Indes et du Nouveau-Monde où est démétro le Lieu du Paradis terrestre (ibid. 1558, 16mo):—Description de la Terre-Sainte (ibid. 1558, 16mo):—Le prime nove dell' altro mondo, rivo immemoriali storia inizialita: La Vergine Veneta (1555, 12mo):—De la République des Turcs et des Maura della Sua storia (ibid. 1560, 4to):—Cosmographica disciplina Compendium, cum synopsi rerum toto orbe gestarum (Bazeil, 1561, 4to):—La Concession des quatre Épamines (Paris, 1562, 16mo):—Les premiers Elements d'Excidium Christiani in Vers (ibid. 1562, 8vo):—De universali sacra cosmographia (ibid. 1563, 4to; reprint several times):—De varia historiae et de admirandis rebus qua a quaquaginta annis comgeterem (1560–88, Paris, 1568, 4to). Postel is one of the authors to whom the celebrated work De tribus lapostolos has been attributed. Hœfer, Nouv. Désig. Général, n. 2, See Ireg, De Postello (Leips. 1704): Desbillons, Sur la Vie de Postel (Liége, 1773);—Sainte-Marthe, Études; Thevet, Hist. des Hommes illustres; Desbillons, Nouveaux Éclaircissements sur la Vie de Postel; Collomiens, Guilia Orientalia; De Thou, Études des Savants; Sallegre, Mémoires de la Lit-
Postil

Postil (Latin postilla) originally designated in the ecclesiastical language of mediaeval explanation remarks accompanying the text of the Bible, mostly in the form of words or homilies. The name sprang from the fact that these were usually delivered immediately after the reading of the Gospel, and were explanatory of it. Its etymology is to be found in the words "post illa verba textus" or "sacrum scriptum," the first two words being combined in one, which is used as noun and verb (postilla, postillare). Charlemagne ordered a homiliarium to be composed for the clergy of his empire, in which the pericopes or texts of the Sundays and holydays are followed by a homily from one of the celebrated ancient preachers. This collection was long in use in the German empire, and was often called "Postilla." But the meaning of the word became more comprehensive in the latter part of the Middle Ages, when a running commentary of Scripture was called "Postilla," because the text was first exhibited, and post illa verba textus of the text the comments of the writer. Thus we find "Postillavit evangelia, epistolae Pauli," etc. The most remarkable of these postillas is that of the celebrated exegete Nicolas de Lyra (q. v.), under the title "Postilla perpetua in Biblia," or "Postilla in universa Biblia." Luther, by his well-known "Postilla," introduced a word among the Protestant communions. It is still, but less frequently, employed, and only in the Church of Rome or of England, for collections of sermons connected with the pericopes of Sundays and holydays. See Siegel, Christliche Lehrbucher (see Index in vol. iv); Whedon, On the Book of Common Prayer, p. 272.

Post-Millenialists, the name applied to the large body of Christians belonging to all denominations who believe that the second coming of Christ will not precede, as the Pre-Millenialists allege, but follow after the Millennium (q. v.).

Post-Pride (or the Collectio Post Mysterium or Post Sancta, as it is called in the Gallican office) is the prayer of the Asaphorum (q. v.) of the Mozarab liturgy. Various opinions are entertained regarding the belief of the Eastern Church on the doctrine of the Invocation of the Holy Ghost (q. v.) in the consecration of the Hosts. These opinions are summarized in the following three: (1) That the Eastern Church gives it no effect in the act of consecration, believing that to take place solely, entirely, and properly in the words of institution. (2) That it believes both the words of institution and those of invocation to be coordinate and efficacious to the same end. (3) That the whole force of the consecration is vested in the invocation. (For the history of the controversy, see Neale, Introd. i, 493 sq.). Neale, than whom there is no better authority on the subject, believes "that the sense of the Eastern Church must be thus expressed: The bread and wine offered on the altar are transmuted into the body and blood of Christ by the words of institution, and by the invocation of the Holy Ghost by the Church; and if either of these things be wanting, the Eucharist, so far forth as the orthodox Eastern Church is concerned, is altogether wanton. If, however, the limitation because the Oriental Church has not condemned her Roman sister for the omission of the invocation" (Introd. i, 496).

The Post-Pride varies with the festival on which it is used. Thus, e.g., the prayer said on the first Sunday after Christmas is as follows: "Mindful, O Lord, of thy precepts, we earnestly pray thee that thou wouldst pour forth on these sacrifices the plenitude of thy Holy Ghost, that while we receive them blessed of thee, we may in all ways rejoice that we are filled with all the gifts of benediction, that we have freed from the bonds of our sins. Amen. Through thy gift, holy Lord, forthy word, and the like of all these that they may serve us, thy unworthy servants, sanctify them and quicken them, and bless them, and grant to us that they may be consecrated and offered to thee, the God, to ages of ages, and to God the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost, One God, for ever and ever. Amen."

Cardinal Bona, who calls the belief of the Greeks a de
terata error, though he denies it to be more than an opinion held by some members of the Eastern Church, is rather baffled by the Mozarabic office. He tries to prove that it is only to be taken relatively to the receiver, and quotes the Mass for the first Sunday after Christmas: "Be pleased to bless and sanctify to us the gifts," etc. By parity of reasoning it might be argued that the Roman Church only believes in a relative change, because the prayer in the canon runs, respecting the yet unconsecrated bread and wine, "that to us they may become the body and blood of Jesus Christ." The Post-Pride in the Gothic-Hispanic rite seems always to have contained this invocation; but in the mutilation and changes to which that office has been subjected comparatively few masses have retained it in direct terms. The Post-Pride for Easter-day, though not contained in the Hortulanus, has a most remarkable prayer for change: "Ut hic tibi panis cum hoc calice oblatus in Fili in tuus Corpus et Sanguinem, te beneficente, dicescat." This may be profitably compared with the Ximenesan Post-Pride for Corpus Christi: "Omnis tibi reverentia est autem transmutatus in Carmelo, et calix transformatus in, Sanguinium," etc. In some instances the prayer for the descent of the Holy Ghost is changed into a prayer for the descent of Christ; as, for example, in the first (= second) Sunday after Easter: "Christe ... his sacrificis propitiis illibare, bisque beneficentis descende." The corruption sometimes takes a curious turn: thus on July 25 the Post-Pride prays that by the intercession of St. Christopher the offerers may be filled with the Holy Ghost. We may gather on the whole that Ximenes, who (like Bona) must have considered the prayer for any change after the words of institution a detestable error, softened the expression in many cases, and omitted it in many others; though enough is still left to show us what the original design of the prayer was. See Litturgy. (J. H. W.)

Post-Sanctus. See Post-Pride.

Postulate (alrjna, postulatum, that which is asked or assumed to prove something else). "According to some, the difference between axioms and postulates is analogous to that between theorems and corollaries. The former expressing truths which are self-evident, and from which other propositions may be deduced; the latter, operations which may easily be performed, and by the help of which more difficult constructions may be effected." There is a difference between a postulate and a hypothesis. When you lay down something which may be, although you have not proved it, and which is admitted by the learner or the disputant, you make a hypothesis. The postulate, not being assented to, may be contested during the discussion, and is only established by its conformity with all other ideas on the subject.

Postulation (Lat. i. e. an asking) is a term in ecclesiastical law designating a presentation or recommendation addressed to the superior to whom the right of appointment to any dignity belongs, in favor of one who has not a strict title to the appointment. Thus, a chapter elect for bishop a person who was not one of the canonical requirements, or if there is a canonical impediment, the act of the chapter is not properly an election, but a request to the pope for dispensation and admission. It can only take place when the wanted requirements are of a trivial description. It is also used in the case of the presentation of candidates for the episcopacy as it exists in the Roman Catholic Church.
POSTURES are the bodily attitudes assumed in the various parts of divine worship, whether public or private. No act whatever can be performed without the body taking some posture. This is the case in divine worship as well as in matters of less consequence. The one question, therefore, in which all postures are equally appropriate in that worship and in its different departments, is whether all possible postures are equally consistent with the posture: not that the posture of the body be noted, but that the posture of the heart. It was necessary first to work the clay with the feet, to make it plastic (Isa. xi., 25), and then to shape it with the hand (Jer. xvii., 4, 6; Sirach xxxiii., 10; xxxviii., 80) and the Oriental potter’s wheel (חַנֵךְ, Jer. xviii.; see Gesenius, Thesaur., i., 16). The vessels were glazed (Sirach xxxviii., 31; Prov. xxvi., 23), and then burned in the oven (ἐρυθρός, Sirach, i. c.). Bähr (Symbolik, ii., 288) and Sommer (Bild. Abhandl., i., 210) assume, indeed, that the Hebrews were ignorant of glazing, and explain the passages (Lev. vi. 21; xi., 33; xv., 12) which command the breaking of earthen vessels made unclean by this want of glazing. There are, indeed, no pots extant from Egyptian antiquity, but earthen figures show a glazing upon them; and it would be unreasonable to suppose that the Egyptians had failed to apply the art to their vessels. There is nothing inexplicable in the command to break the defiled vessels, insasmuch as they were of little value; and any of them might easily have lost part of its glazing, and so taken in some of the vernacular substance; so that breaking was the safest method of disposing of them. Such a command would also produce more care in housekeeping to avoid uncleanness (comp. Descript. de l’Egypte, vol. ii., pl. 87 sq.; v., pl. 75; Wilkinson, i., 114). See Pottery.

The following are the words so rendered in the English Bible:

1. בִּשְׁנֵה, בֵּן (Sept. Ἰάγγειος), applied to holding oil (2 Kings iv., 2), probably was an earthen jar, deep and narrow, without handles, apparently like the Roman and Egyptian amphora, inserted in a stand of wood or stone (see Wilkinson, Anc. Egypt., i., 47; Sandys, Tract. p. 150). See Pitcher.

2. פַּחַת, פַּח (Sept. πότηραυς, Vulg. ephesyus, Jer. xxxx., 5; elsewhere “bowl” or “cup”), probably a bulging jar or bowl for liquids. See Bowl.

3. דַּד, דָּד (Sept. diophos, Job xlii., 20; Ps. li., 6; elsewhere “basket,” “caldron,” “kettle”), a vessel for culinary purposes, mentioned (1 Sam. ii., 14) in conjunction with “caldron” and “kettle,” and so perhaps of smaller size. See Kettle.

4. בֵּית, בֵּית ("potsherds," Job ii., 8; Ps. xxvi., 15; Prov. xxxvi., 23; Isa. xlv., 9; elsewhere “earthen,” etc.), an earthen vessel for stewing or scorching. Such a vessel was used for baking (Exek. iv., 9). It is contrasted in the same passage (Lev. vi., 28) with a metal vessel for the same purpose. See Pottery.

5. כָּלִים, כָּלִים (Sept. coxelos, Lev. vi., 28), a vessel of any kind (as usually elsewhere rendered). See Vessel.

6. כּוֹר, כּוֹר (only once and in the dual, Lev. xii., 35, “ranges for pots”). See Range.

7. מְדִים, מְדִים (Sept. χαλέπιον, Vulg. olea, the most usual and appropriate word, Exod. xxxviii., 3; 2 Kings iv., 38-41; xxv., 14; 2 Chron. iv., 11, 16; xxxvii., 13; Job xlii., 31; Ps. lvii., 9; Eccles. viii. 7; Jer. ii., 13; Ezek. xxiv., 3, 6; Min. iii., 3; Zech. xiv., 10, 21). It is also used, combined with other words, to denote special uses, as with מְדוֹן (Jer. i., 18), “a seething-pot;” with מְדִים, “flesh” (Exod. xvi., 5); מְדִים, “washing” (Ps. ix., 8); מְדִים, “fining-pot” (Prov. xxvii., 21). The blackness which such vessels would contract is added to Joel iii., 6. See Caldron.

8. לוֹעֵפָה, לוֹעֵפָה (Sept. χαλέπιον, Vulg. cocubes, Judg. vi., 19; Sam. ii., 14; “pan,” Numb. xi., 8), apparently an open flat vessel. See Pan.

POTAMIANA

10. Ἀρδή, Ἀρδή, Ἀρδή, Ἀρδή (Sept. Ἀρδής, Πα. lxi, 18; "hooks," Ezek. xi, 45), opposite rows, as of sheeps- folds.
11. Ἐστίας (Mark vii, 8, 9), properly a sextarius or sixteenth part of the medius or "bushel," nearly one pint English; hence a cup generally. See MEASUR. 12. στράγγα (Heb. ix, 4), an earthen jug or jar; = No. 9 above.
13. ἔσωτα (John ii, 6, 7; iv, 28), a "water-pot" for any liquid. The water-pots of Cana appear to have been large amphorae, such as are in use at the present day in Syria (Fischer, Poesis, p. 10; Jolliffe, i, 60). These were of stone or of earthenware but gold, silver, bronze, or copper was also used for vessels both for domestic and also, with marked preference, for ritual use (1 Kings vii, 45; x, 21; 2 Chron. iv, 16; ix, 20; Mark vii, 4; Michaelis, Lives of Moses, § 217, iii, 385, ed. Smith). The water-pot of the Samaritan woman may have been a leather bucket, such as Bedawin women use (Burckhardt, Notes, i, 45). See WATR-POT.

POT, "HOLY-WATER POT" or "HOLY-WATER VASE," and Sprinkle (= sprinkling-brush), are implements used in Roman Catholic churches for sprinkling the altar and priest and any other place with the holy water on Sunday. Holy-water pots, such as is represented in the cut, are from five and a quarter to seven and a half inches in diameter.

Potamiana, a Christian martyr in the time of Severus, in the beginning of the 3d century, was a slave of rare personal beauty; for not reciprocating the passion of her master she was given up as a Christian to the prefect of Egypt. She was scourged; and, unmoved by threats, was led to the fire and burned, together with her mother, Marcella. Scalding pitch was poured upon her body, which she bore with great patience. Balsam, her executioner, embraced Christianity, and suffered martyrdom. See Schaff, Church History, i, 169.

Potamias, an ecclesiastic of Spanish birth, flourished as bishop of Lisbon in the middle of the 4th century; and if the first of the pieces mentioned below be genuine, he must, in the early part of his career, have been a champion of the Catholic faith. Subsequently, however, he was a zealous Arius, and it is believed that he drew up the document known to ecclesiastical history as The Second Sirmian Creed. The writings usually ascribed to Potamias are, Epistola ad Athanasiam Episcopum Alexandrinum de Consolamentuille Filiis Dei, in some MSS. entitled Epistola Potamii ad Atha- nasiuni ab Artonio (impeptum?) posticum in Concilio Ariminensi subreipublici, composed in the year A.D. 355, while the opinions of the author were yet orthodox. The authenticity of this piece, however, which is char- acterized by great obscurity of thought and of expression, and often half barbarous in phraseology, is very doubtful. It was first published by the Benedicite D'Achery, in his Spicilegium rectorum aliquot Scripto- rum (Paris, 1661, 4to), ii, 366, or iii. 299 of the new edition by Baluze (1717, fol.), and will be found in its best form in Galland's Bibliotheca Patrum (Venice, 1769, fol.), v. 12, f. 339. Sermo de Martyrio Episco- Prophetarum. These are two discourses resembling in style the epistle to Athanasius, long attributed to Zeno, bishop of Verona, and published, without suspicion, among his works, until the brothers Belleriuni (S. Zeno- nius Sermones [ibid. 1739, fol.], p. 297). They proved that they must be assigned to Potamias, whom, however, they supposed to be a person altogether different from the bishop of Lisbon, and belonging to a different age. The arguments which they employ to demonstra- te this last position are founded upon the second title of the Epistola ad Athanasianum as given above, but this title is not Schleierm. and others to be the blunder of an ignorant transcriber. THe Sermones will be found in Galland, and the discussions with regard to the real author in the Prolegomena to the volume, ch. x, p. xvii. See Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol. s. v.; Umbelvsew, Hist. of Philosophy, vol. i; Hinsch, Gesch. der Philosophie, vol. i.

Potamo (Ποτάμω), a Greek philosopher of the Alexandrian school, lived in the 5th century of the Christian era, and was a native of Alexandria. According to Suidas, under Ποτάμως and Ποτάμων, he was a con- temporary of the emperor Augustus; but Porphyry, in his life of Plotinus, states positively that Plotinus del- ighted in listening to Potamo's exposition of a new philosophy, of which he was laying the foundations. What was the purport of this new philosophy? It was developed in two treatises, one of which was a commentary on Plato's Theaicus, the other a treatise on the first principles. See POTAMIANA. Both works are lost; but something is known of the second by a passage of Diogenes Laertius in the introduction to his book On the Life and Doctrines of Illustrious Philosophers. "Of late," says the biographer, "an eclectic school, οἱ εἰκετε- 

Ποταμίων, are required to discern the truth: that which judges, reason (τὸ γνῶσις), and that by the means of which we judge, i.e. the accurate representation of the objects of our judgments. As to the principles of things, he recognizes four of them- matter, quality, action, and place (ἐντὸς τοῦ ἐν, καὶ τὸ 

ποιημένον, ποιημένον τι, καὶ τὸ που). In other words, out of what, and by whom, how, and where a thing is done (ἐν τινὶ ποιημένον, ποιημένον τι, καὶ τὸ που, οὕτω τι, καὶ ποιημένον τι), towards which everything should tend, according to him, is a life perfect in virtues, without discarding, how- ever, the good of the body, nor general material inter- ests." It follows from this passage of Diogenes Laertius, combined with the testimony of Porphyry, i.e. that Potamo was the founder of the eclectic school at Rome; 2d, that he combined the doctrines of Plato with the Stoical and Aristotelian, and was not without original views of his own; 3d, that in ethics he attempted a kind of conciliation of Stoicism and Epicureism.—Hoe- fer. But it must be noted that the few followers he had under his rule were his pupils. They were supplanted by the school that endeavored to engratify Christianity upon the older sys- tem of philosophy. See Porphyry, Vita Plotini, e. g. in Fabricius, Bibl. Græc. ii, 109; Diogenes Laertius, Proem. § 21; but especially Brucker, Historia Christianæ Philosophiae, ii, 193 sq.; Glöckner, De Potamiana Acker. Philosophia Ecletica, recensitorum Platonicerum Disciplinæ admodum disiniuti. Disput. (Leips. 1745, 4to), an abstract of which is in Fabricius, iii, 184 sq. For the statement that there were two or three Potamos there is no ground. See the examination of this point in Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. ii, 513.

Potent. Cross, in heraldry, a cross crutch-shaped at each extremity. It is also called a Jerusalem cross, from its occurrence in the insignia of the Christian kingdom of Jerusalem, which are, Argent a cross potent between four crescents or. This coat is re- markable as being a departure from the usual heraldic rule which prohi- bits the placing of metal upon metal.

Potential. Opposed to actual. This antithesis is a fundamental doctrine of the Peripatetic philosophy. "Aristotle saith that divided they (i.e. bodies) be in infinitum potentially, but actually not" (Holland's Ple-
Potipherah (Heb. Potiph'rah, פֹּטִיפֶרָה, or Potiph'har, פֹּטִיפֶּרָה, "guardian of wine"; Sept. Ποτιφραθής), an officer of Pharaoh, probably the chief of his body-guard (Gen. xxxix. 1). B.C. c. 1800. Of the Midianitish merchant he purchased Joseph. The keeper of the prison into which the son of Jacob was eventually cast treated him with kindness and confidence in the management of the prison (Gen. xxvii, 36; xxxix, 1); and this confidence was afterwards sanctioned by the "captain of the guard" himself, as the officer responsible for the safe custody of prisoners of state (Gen. xi, 5, 4). It is sometimes denied, but more usually maintained, that this "captain of the guard" was the same with the Potipher who is before designated by the same title. It is possible that this "captain of the guard" and Joseph's master were the same person. It would be in accordance with Oriental usage that offenders against the court, and the third persons of officers of state, should be in custody of the captain of the guard; and that Potipher should have treated Joseph well after having cast him into prison is not irreconcilable with the facts of the case. After having imprisoned Joseph in the first transport of his choler, he might possibly discover circumstances which led him to doubt his guilt, if not to be convinced of his innocence. The mantle left in the hands of his mistress, and so triumphantly produced against him, would, when calmly considered, seem a stronger proof of guilt against her than against him; yet still, to avoid the dishonor of exposing the presence of the Antichrist. In 1802 he published in Latin an Explanation of the Psalms of David (Augsburg, 1860). Under the empire two of his pamphlets against the four articles of the Gallican Council were confiscated by the police. Pothier died at Rheims June 23, 1812.—Hoefer, Nouv. Biog., Générale, v.

Pothinus, Sr., a prelate of the Church in the 2nd century, who died a martyr, was probably born at Smyrna in A.D. 67. He was a disciple neither of Peter nor of John, as some writers have asserted, but of Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna. He went to Rome with the latter and was admitted into the company of Anicetus (whom he succeeded as bishop in 158) and was sent by that pontiff to evangelize the Gauls. Pothinus established himself at Lyons, and founded there a flourishing Church. He had presided over twenty years when, in the reign of Marcus Aurelius, the persecutions against the Christians broke out with renewed fury. His extreme age did not protect the bishop from persecution. He was brought before the governor, and was asked who was the God of the Christians. "If you are worthy," said the old bishop, "you will know him." He was severely beaten, and dragged, half dead, to a dismal dungeon, where he died two days afterwards, June 2, 177. At the same time with the apostle of Lyons, forty-seven faithful sealed their faith with their blood. These were the first martyrs of the Gauls: their remains were buried beneath the altar of a church built under the invocation of the holy apostles, now consecrated to St. Niixer. The Church celebrates on June 2 the memory of the martyrs of Lyons. Their history was written in Greek, in the name of the faithful of the churches of Lyons, and attributed to Irenæus, successor of Pothinus. It is one of the most precious monuments of the first centuries of Christianity. We owe its preservation to Eusebius, who inserted it partly in his Hist. Eccles. (lib. v, cap. i).—Hoefer, Nouv. Biog., Générale, s. v. See Longueville, Hist. de l'Église Gallicane, liv. i; Gallia Christiana, vol. v; Colon. Antiquités de Lyon, p. 38; Du Tert. Le Clergé de France, vol. iv; Schaff, Hist. of the Christian Church, i, 167; Mosheim, Commentaries, and Eccles. Hist. vol. i; Alot, Kirchengesch. i, 129, 138.

Pothos (Ποθός), a personification among the ancient Greeks of love or desire, and usually regarded as a companion of Aphrodite.
Potrimpos is the name of an important deity of the Lithuanian and ancient Prussians previous to the conquest of their country by the Teutonic Order; the second person in the Northern trial—Perkunas, Potrimpos, and Tautie—was he who granted the blessing of victory in war and fertility in time of peace; he also dispensed the biles of domestic happiness. His image stood in a cavity of the holy oak at Romowe; it looked smilingly at Perkunas, and represented, as far as the rough art of those times would allow, the features of a cheerful youth. It was the sight of this image of victory in stroying fire, Potrimpos was the god of the feeculating and devastating water. Corn and incense were the offerings he preferred; a wreath of ears adored his head. But he was not always content with these unlooby sacrifices: sometimes children had to be immolated in his honor, and reduced to ashes in burning wax. A snake was kept in his honor in an urn of clay, fed with milk, and always covered with ears of corn. For this reason the snake was a holy animal among the ancient Prussians. Warriors, marching to the bloody encounter, if they chanced to meet a serpent, fancying they beheld in it Potrimpos himself, were hopeful of his assistance, and thought themselves invincible. When a solemn sacrifice was to be offered to him, the priests remained three days stretched on the ground, fasting, and at intervals throwing little rice into the fire, the smoke of which did not appear that particular places, lakes and woods, were consecrated to him, nor can any trace of the expansion of his worship into other countries be ascertained, unless we admit with Mone that he is one person with the phallic field-god Priag worshipped at Upsala; but this is very doubtful. Some modern historians assert that it was a female deity, the wife of the thunder-god; they assimilate him with the mother of the gods mentioned by Tacitus as solemnly worshipped by the Eastians. See Anderson, Northern Mythology, a. v.

Potsherd (παρθήρδη, cheres, from the root παρθείνειν, to scrape or scratch; Sept. παρθείνειν; Vulg. testa, ras feriali; "sherd" in two places, once "stone," often "earth vessel"); a bit of potter's ware (Job li. 8), is figuratively used in Scripture to denote a thing worthless and insignificant (Psa. xxii, 15; Prov. xxvi, 23; Is. xlv, 9). It may illustrate some of these allusions to remind the reader of the fact that the sites of ancient towns are often covered at the same time with quantities of broken pottery, usually of coarse texture, but coated and protected with a strong and bright-colored glaze, mostly bluish-green, and sometimes yellow. These fragments give some to of the most venerable spots of the ancient world the appearance of a deserted pottery rather than of a town. The fact is, however, that they occur only upon the sites of towns which were built with crude brick; and this suggests that the heaps of ruin into which these had fallen being disintegrated, and worn at the surface by the action of the weather, bring to view and leave exposed the broken pottery, which is not liable to be thus dissolved and washed away. It is certainly remarkable that of the more mighty cities of old time, nothing but potsherds now remain visible at the surface of the ground. Towns built with kiln-burnt bricks do not exhibit this form of ruin, which is therefore not usually met with in Palestine. See Potsherd.

Pott, David Julius, D.D., a German theologian, was born at Embeckhausen, in Hanover, in 1760. In 1787 he was appointed professor of theology at Helmstedt, from which place he removed to occupy the same chair at Halle. Here he, with Ruperti, edited the Syllage Commentationum Theologicarum (8 vols. 1800-7), and afterwards at Gottingen undertook, as joint continuator with Heinrich, an edition of Koppe's Testamentum Novum, a commentary on the Catholic epistles (1810-10). He died about 1826. See Ilgen, Zeitschrift für historische Theologie, 1868, p. 568.
Pott, Joseph Holden, an English divine, noted especially as a Biblical scholar, was born about 1759, and was educated at Eton and at St. John's College, Cambridge, where he graduated B.A. in 1780, M.A. in 1783; was made prebendary of Lincoln in 1786; rector of St. Olave, Jewry, and St. Martin, Frommougers Lane, in 1787; archdeacon of St. Albans in 1789; rector of Little Burstead, Essex, in 1797; rector of Northall, Middlesex, in 1806; vicar of St. Martin's-in-the-Fields in 1813; archdeacon of London in 1813; prebendary of London in 1822; vicar of Kensington in 1824, and chancellor of Essex in 1826. He died in 1847. This exemplary divine published many separate sermons, collections of sermons, charges, theological treatises, and in early life some poems, etc., for a list of which we refer the reader to the *Lmd. Gent. Mag.* Aug. 1847, p. 210-12, see also p. 635. We notice: *Two Sermons for the Festivals and Fasts* (Lond., 1794, 12mo):—*Elementary Discourses, etc.; after Confirmation* (1790, 16mo):—*Three Sermons on the Festivals and Fasts* (1794, 12mo):—*Christian Conviction* (1803, 8vo); 1807, 2d ed.):—*Controversia respecting Baptism* (1810, 12mo):—*Sermons for the Lord's Day* (1817, 2 vols. 8vo); 1818, 3d ed.):—

Pottage (יוֹטָר, *nāzīd*, something boiled; Gen. xxv. 29, 84). The red pottage for which Esau profanely bartered his birthright was prepared, as we learn from this chapter, by seething lentils in water [see *Lustil*]; but the common pottage in the East, at the present day, is made by cutting their meat into little pieces, and boiling them with flour, rice, and parsley, all which is afterwards poured into a proper vessel. See Thomson, *Land and Book*, ii, 397.

Potter (יוֹטָר, *yôtér*, a fashioner; Chald. *pēcher*, ἔσσημα). This artificer, and the produce of his labour, are often alluded to in the Scriptures. The fragility of his ware, and the ease with which they are destroyed, supply apt emblems of the facility with which human life and power may be broken and destroyed. It is in this figurative use that the vessels are most frequently noticed in Scripture (Psa. ii, 9; Isa. xxxi, 14; Jer. xix, 11; Rev. i, 27). In one place, the power of the potter to form with his clay, by the impulse of his will and hand, vessels either for honorable or for mean uses, is employed with great force by the apostle to illustrate the absolute power of God in moulding the destinies of men according to his pleasure (Rom. ix, 21). The first distinct mention of earthenware vessels is in the case of the pitchers in which Gideon's men concealed their lamps, and which they broke in pieces when they withdrew their lamps from them (Judg. vii, 16, 19). Pitchers and bottles are indeed mentioned earlier; but the "bottle" which contained Hagar's water (Gen. xxi, 14, 15) was undoubtedly of skin; and although Rebekah's pitcher was possibly of earthenware (xxiv, 14, 15), we cannot be certain that it was so. The potter's wheel is mentioned only once in the Bible (Jer. xviii, 2); but it must have been in use among the Hebrews long before the time of that allusion; for we now know that it existed in Egypt before the Israelites took refuge in that country (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt*, iii, 165, large ed.). The art of pottery is one of the most common and most ancient of all manufactures. The modern Arab culinary vessels are chiefly of wood or copper (Niebuhr, *Jog.*, i, 180). The processes employed by the Hebrews were probably not in any way dissimilar to those of the Egyptians, from whom the use of the wheel may be supposed to have been adopted. They had themselves been concerned in the potter's trade in Egypt (Psa. lxxxi, 6). The clay, when dug, was trodden by men's feet so as to form a paste (Isa. xxii, 25; Wisd. xv, 7) [see *Barck*]; then placed by the potter on the wheel beside which he sat, and shaped by him with his hands. It consisted
of a wooden disk placed on another larger one, and turned by the hand by an attendant, or worked by a troddle (Isa. xlv, 2; Jer. xviii, 18; Ecclus. xxxviii, 23, 30; see Tenant, Ceylon, i, 492). The vessel was then smoothed and coated with a glaze, and finally burned in a furnace (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt*, ii, 108). We find allusions to the potsherds, i.e. broken pieces of vessels used as crucibles, or burnt by the furnace, and to the necessity of keeping the latter clean (Isa. xxx, 14; xlv, 9; Job ii, 8; Psa. xxii, 16; Prov. xxxvi, 23; Ecclus. xxxviii, 29). The materials, forms, and manufacture of earthenware vessels are still very similar throughout Western Asia, and are also the same which were ancietly in use. This we know from the comparison of ancient paintings and sculptures with modern manufactures, as well as from the vast quantities of broken pottery which are found upon the sites of ancient cities. The ancient potters "frequently kneaded the clay with their feet, and after it had been properly worked up, they formed it into a mass of convenient size with the hand, and placed it on the wheel, which, to judge from that represented in the paintings, was of very simple construction, and turned with the hand. The various forms of the vases were made by the finger during the revolution; the handles, if they had any, were afterwards affixed to them; and the devices and other ornamental parts were traced with a wooden or metal instrument, previously to their being baked. They were then suffred to dry, and for this purpose were placed on planks of wood; they were afterwards arranged with great care on trays, and carried, by means of the usual yoke, borne on men's shoulders, to the oven" (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt*, ii, 107 sq.; Birch, *Hist. of Pottery*, i, 152; Sandlschitz, *Archäol., c. Hebr.*, i, 14, 11). For a description of pottery as now, and from ancient times, practiced in Palestine, see Thomson, *Land and People*, ii, 291 sq. Earthen vessels were used, both by Egyptians and Jews, for various purposes besides culinary. Dregs were kept in them (Jer. xxxiii, 14). Tiles with patterns and writing were common both in Egypt and Assyria, and were also in use in Palestine (Ezek. iv, 1). There was at Jerusalem a royal establishment of potters (1 Chron. iv, 33), from whose employment, and from the fragments cast away in the process, the Potter's Field perhaps received its name (Isa. xxx, 14). Whether the term "potter" (Zech. xi, 18) is to be so interpreted may be doubted, as it may be taken for "artificer" in general, and also "treasurer," as if the coin mentioned were to be weighed, and perhaps melted down to be recoined (Geisen. *Theur.* p. 619). See CLAY.

**POTTER, Alonso, D.D., LL.D., bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born in the town of Bleeckman (now La Grange), Dutchess County, N. Y., July 10, 1800. His parents, who belonged to the Society of Friends, were country-people of good blood, honestly devoted to the best interests of home and friends. They were remarkably well educated for their times and surroundings, and highly esteemed in the vicinity. After securing a good elementary training at the district school, Alonso went, at twelve years of age, to an academy in Poughkeepsie, and three years after was admitted to Union College, where he at once took the highest rank in his class. Upon the completion of his college course he connected himself with the Episcopal Church, and soon after decided to prepare for holy orders in that communion. He commenced his theological studies under the direction of the Rev. Dr. Samuel H. Turner, but before Potter was one-and-twenty years old he reluctantly accepted the appointment of tutor in his alma mater. Within a twelvemonth he was promoted to the professorship of mathematics and natural philosophy, and at the age of twenty-three first appeared in print as the author of a treatise on *Logarithms,* which is said to have been a highly creditable performance. In 1827, after a three years' tour in Europe, in which his studies for the ministry, was admitted to deacon's orders by bishop Hobart, and was advanced to the priesthood by bishop Brownell in 1824. In the year 1826 he quitted the college to become rector of St. Paul's Church, Boston, a position in which he gained a wide influence by the simplicity and earnestness of his character, the fidelity of his ministrations, and the contagious fervor of his religious sympathies. The preaching of Dr. Potter opened a new era. With no spirit of dogmatism or controversy, he set forth the cardinal doctrines of the Church, appealing more to the intellect and the heart, and drawing many within a new circle of religious associations. "He was always ready," says his biographer, "to aid in promoting the interests of education and sound learning. He was an advocate of scientific pursuits. He gave his influence both by precept and example to the cause of temperance. Each of these subjects he advanced with great ability, sometimes by a course of public lectures, sometimes by a written discourse, but more frequently in an expository sermon on all which may be employed with apparent success. His engagements in these various departments, with his incessant parochial duties, constituted a vast amount of labor too great to be borne for a long time. Exhustion from this amount of work, together with other causes not under his control, compelled him to resign his rectory in 1831. No man more deeply loved by the people of his charge, or mourned with a deeper sorrow when he left them. Taken in all its aspects, his ministry in Boston was a marked success. It gave an impetus to vital religion which is still felt and will extend to the distant future." In 1831 Dr. Potter accepted the chair of moral and intellectual philosophy in Union College, which was urged upon him as soon as it was known that he would consent to sever his pastoral relations. He at once identified himself with the college as one who looked for nothing beyond it. He applied himself to study and instruction with the cheerful earnestness which was an attribute of his nature. He was eminently a teacher, calling out the power of thought and language in his pupils and exciting their own. He was distinguished for his rare power of analysis, and the fidelity of reasoning which it was rare to find in expression. He had a wonderful power of impressing himself upon those with whom he had to do. He trans fused himself into their nature, took possession of their minds and wills, and imbued them with his own ideas and principles of action. In 1838 was appointed vice-president of the college, and, with the advanced age of Dr. Nott, who had become his father-in-law, Dr.
Potter naturally took a leading share in the administration. He had an inborn aptitude for government, and, though more rigid and uncompromising in his measures than President Nott, understood the art of graciously blending suavity with decision. On the suspension of Bishop H. U. Underdonk (q. v.) in 1844, and after a protracted controversy, the support of the Baptist press, the influence of Dra. Bowman and Tyng, Dr. Potter was elected bishop of Pennsylvania on May 23, and consecrated in the month of September of the same year. Henceforth his life is thoroughly identified with the interests of the Church he served. Says Bishop Stevens:

"His ideas of the office and work of a bishop was very high: regarding him not merely as an ecclesiastical officer, but as one who, from his position and opportunities and his work as a whole, was fitted to guide and surround him, of guarding that Church and shaping great institutions of charity or learning, moulding the clergy and being a leader of the laity of God in its attacks upon the stronghold of sin, Satan, and death. Few men cared less for the honors of the episcopate; few read the office more as an instrument of largest good, and, as a necessary consequence following the divine law of God, who has said, "Thee have I made a little lower than the angels, but crown him with glory and honor." He made no show of power; it rather emanated from him than was wielded by him." —Funeral oration.

By his prudence and discretion he fused together elements which were in conflict with each other. He inaugurated great schemes of Christian benevolence and education, and carried them forward to almost complete success. He was diligent in cultivating all portions of the diocese, laboring when he should have been resting, and not sparing himself when the peculiar exigencies of the church called on him to pause and recruit. Although endowed with an admirable physical constitution, he was at length compelled to abstain entirely from intellectual exertion, and decided to accept an invitation from the Pacific Steamship Co. to take passage on one of their vessels and visit St. Francisco by the way of the Strait of Magellan. He arrived in the harbor of that city on the 1st of July, 1865, but was already prostrate with a fever which he had contracted by landing on the Isthmus and passing a night at Aspinwall, and was too weak to be removed from the ship. He died July 4th.

Sincerely attached to the Church in which he held a position of eminent honor and dignity, bishop Alonso Potter was singularly free from ecclesiastical prejudice and narrowness. He was a man of no less conspicuous mark as a churchman than as a scholar. He was a friend of wholesome reforms, without the tenacious adherence to the past which dreads the progress of light in novel manifestations. He was a patriot of the purest type, a man of the antique virtue which seasoned our republic with salt in the days of her noblest development. In the darkest hours of our great national struggle he was always decided and hopeful. He took strong ground in behalf of the government, and never cherished a doubt of the justice or the success of the national cause. From his youth he took a lively interest in the welfare of the African race, and was a minister to recognize the manhood of the negro and his claims to advancement to a higher sphere, and he was forced to a public declaration of these principles in order to silence the pro-slavery assumptions of bishop Hopkins of Vermont. The zeal, however, with which he labored in these observations for the extension of equal rights to all orders and conditions of men, was no sudden impulse of feeling, but a conviction which was formed in his early days, and strengthened by subsequent experience and reflection. His friends, which extended to a large circle, was due, in a great measure, to his weight of character, rather than to any extraordinary brilliancy of intellectual endowment. He possessed talents of a solid and masculine line. His mind was eminently discriminating, clear in its perceptions, and sound in its deductions. He had great powers of reasoning, his judgment was always unerring, and his habits of thought remarkable for justness and accuracy. His gifts of imagination were subordinate to the intuitive and logical faculty. He never sought to produce illusions by the pomp of words, but to generate convictions by the power of argument and illustration. But it was the singular prolixity of his nature, the temperate candor of his judgment, and the purity and elevation of his purposes which inspired such universal confidence in his character, and gave him such marked eminence among the eminent men of his day. Bishop Potter was especially identified with the organization of the Episcopal hospital of the Episcopal Church and the establishment of the Divinity School of the Church in Philadelphia. He published, The Principles of Science applied to the Domestic and Mechanic Arts (1841): Political Economy (1841) — Hand-Book for Readers and Students (1847) — Resources, Changes, Addresses, etc. (1858) — Religious Philo-sophy (1870)—Plan of Temperance Organization for Cities: and, with Geo. B. Emerson, The School and Schoolmaster (1844), which was widely distributed, especially in New York and Massachusetts, and greatly aided the cause of popular education. He edited six vols. of Harper's "Family Library.": Wilks's Christian Essays (1825); Maria James's Poems (1839), and Fifteen Lectures on the Evidences of Christianity by Clergy-men of the Protestant Episcopal Church (1835, 8vo).

Between his death and the last week in February, "Lowell Institute Lectures" on subjects connected with natural theology. Of these efforts bishop Stevens takes occasion to say:

"As a philosopher he would have been known with a European reputation had he published but one of the unprinted sermons of his. But this is not the case. I refer to his 'Lowell Institute Lectures.' These lectures showed that he had studied deeply the physiology and psychology of man, that he comprehended the forms of philosophy, and the profound ethics of the old masters of the art. They evinced the depth and comprehensiveness of his knowledge, and his ability in grappling with the great questions that grow out of man's relations to God, to men, and to a fallen world. They were full of thought, calm and logical reasoning, expressed with most aphoristic terseness, illuminated by the most apt and forcible illustrations, and rose at times to a degree of eloquence which, even as read in the printed pages of a newspaper report, makes the mind glow and tingle with delight. These sixty lectures, ranking in the public mind as among the best of the many good ones which that infatuation has poured forth, were delivered from a written page, and only occasionally did he use brief notes to guide his course."


Potter, Barnabas, an English divine of note, was born in Westmoreland in 1578. He was educated at Queen's College, Oxford, where he was first chosen a scholar, then a fellow, and afterwards provost. After leaving college, he was for a time lecturer at Abington and at Totnes, in Devonshire. In the following year he determined to emigrate to Virginia to be a minister of the gospel and the pastor at Devonshire. He was next unanimously elected provost of Queen's College, and also made chaplain-in-ordinary to prince Charles, and was called at court "the penitential preacher." He held this position for ten years, and was then called to the former charge at Devonshire. King Charles, who held him in high esteem, promptly nominated him bishop of Carlisle, in 1628. In the episcopate he was a man of few words, and a very affecting preacher; his custom was to write his sermons in parts and commit them to memory. He was a close student, and possessed a remarkable memory. He became very proficient in the Hebrew language. He preached at Westminster, and so strongly did he attack the corruptions which had sprung into the Church that he was censured as popeish; and this accusation, it is said, he took so much to heart that
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he fell sick and died, in 1642. He published, The Baro-
nel's Burial (Oxford, 1618), a sermon — Easter Tu-
day, another sermon: — Lectures on some Chapters of
Genesis. See Wood, Athenae Oxoni.; Fuller, Worthies of
Westmoreland; Allibone, Dict. of Brit, and Amer.
Authors, s. v.; Middeton, Exemp. Biog., 152 sq. (J.H.W.)

Potter, Christopher, D.D., a learned English
Arminian divine, nephew of the preceding, was born
in Westmoreland about 1591. He was admitted to Queen's
College, Oxford, in 1606, where he took, in due time,
both the degrees in arts and divinity. He was first
made fellow of the college in 1626 successively on his uncle's
in the provostship of his college. Though a zealous puritanic
preacher, he became at length an adherent of Laud.
In 1628 he preached a sermon at Ely House upon
the consecration of his uncle, who, "tho' a thorough-
paced Calvinist," says Wood (Athen. Oxoni.), was made
bishop of Carlisle by the endeavors of Laud. In 1633
Christopher Potter published, An Answer to a late Popish
Pamphlet entitled Charity Mistaken," which he wrote
by the special order of Charles I, whose chaplain he was.
In 1636 he was promoted to the deanery of Worcester,
and in 1640 became the vicar-chancellor of Oxford, in
the execution of which office he met with some trouble
from the members of the Long Parliament. Upon the break-
ning-out of the civil wars he sent all his plate to the king,
and declared that he would rather, like Diogenes, drink
out of his hat than that his majesty should want; and he afterwards suffered much for
the royal cause. He was nominated to the deanery of
Durham January, 1646; but was prevented from being in-
stalled by his death, which happened at his college in the
March following. He was learned, and of exemplary
life and conversation. He published, Father Paul's
Hist. of the Quarrels of Pope Paul V with the State of
Venice (Lond. 1626, 4to.); — Sermons (1629, 8vo.); — Want
of Charity (Oxf. 1635, 12mo.); to this publication ref-
rence was made above: — Indication of Myself touch-
ing the Doctrine of Predestination (1651, 12mo, and often
since). See Hook, Eccles. Bioq. viii, 135; Fuller, Wor-
thies of Westmoreland; Allibone, Dict. of Brit, and Amer.
Authors, s. v. (J.H.W.)

Potter, Francis, an English divine, was born in
1594 at Myre, in Wilts, and was educated at Trinity
College, Oxford. He took holy orders, and, after suc-
cessively holding various preferments in 1627 was
rector of Kilmington. He died in 1678. He was a man of
learning and mechanical ingenuity. He published, An
Interpretation of the Number 666, etc. (Oxf. 1642, 4to.;
lat in, translated by Thomas Gibbet and oth-
ers, 1668, 8vo.; also translated into French and Dutch).
It was attacked by Rev. Lambert Morehouse, to
whom Potter wrote a reply; but neither the attack
nor reply was ever published. A great authority (Jo-
seph Mede) thus commends Potter's Interpretation:
"This discourse of the Number of the Beast is the hap-
piest that ever yet came into the world, and such
as cannot be read (save of those that perhaps will not be
believe it) without much admiration." See Athen. Oxoni.;
Aubrey's MSS., in Letters of Eminent Persons (1813, 3
vols.)—General Dictionary; Walker, Sufferings of the
Clergy.

Potter, Isaiah, a Congregational minister, was
born at Plymouth, Conn., in 1746. He was educated at
Yale College, class of 1767, studied theology with Dr.
Smalley, of Berlin, Conn., and was the first settled
minister at Lebanon, N. H., from July 6, 1772, to his death,
July 2, 1817. He published some occasional Sermons.

Potter, John, an Anglican prelate of much note,
was born in 1574 of very humble parentage. He was,
however, given all the educational facilities as if of su-
perior rank, and, manifesting a more than usual aptitude
for study, was sent at fourteen to the University
College of Oxford; took the degree of B.A. in 1602, and in
1609, of A.M. In his college days he made great attainsments in classical learning, and,
though still very young, was encouraged by Dr. Char-
leste, the master of University College, to publish in
1604 a collection which he had made of various read-
ings and notes on Plutarch's treatise De Ambitione
Poetis, a work which he followed soon after by vari-
ous readings and notes on an octavo (J.H.W.)

Potter's greater works appeared soon after: his edition of
Ly-
cophron, and his Archiologia Graecae (1697), the former
gaining him a world-wide reputation. In 1638 he en-
tered into holy orders, and from that time his studies
appear to have been almost exclusively of a professional
kind, and he passed from one preferment in the Church to
other, till at last he reached the highest dignity. Archi-
bishop Tenison made him his chaplain, and gave him
the living of Great Mongeham in Kent, and subse-
quently other preferment in Buckinghamshire and Ox-
fordshire. He became chaplain to Queen Anne and
regius professor of divinity in the University of Oxford
in 1708. In the same year he published an excellent
edition of the works of Clemens Alexandrinus (2 vols.
fol.). His other publications were Sermonata and Chragges,
and A Subsequent Discourse on the Nation of Basii. In 1718
he was made bishop of Oxford, and in 1737 archbishop
of Canterbury, which high station he supported with much
dignity to the time of his death, Oct. 21, 1747. His
theological works were published at Oxford (1753, 8
vols. 8vo.). Bishop Potter was a man of the highest
industry, but hardly a great scholar: a compiler rather
than an original investigator, and hence his works are
of little value in our day. As an ecclesiastical he was
haughty and overzealous, as well as excessively narrow.
English Cyclopedia, a. v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit, and Amer.
Authors, a. v.; Perry, Eccles. Hist. of the Ch. of England,
iii, 199, 360 sq. (J.H.W.)

Potter, John W., a Presbyterian minister, was
born in Beaver Co., Pa., July 30, 1802. He was the
child of pious parents, and early made a profession
of religion. He graduated in Jefferson College, Camen-
bor, Pa., in 1859; studied divinity at the Western
Theological Seminary, Allegheny, Pa.; was licensed by
Allegheny City Presbytery; and, after supplying some
churches for a time, he accepted a call to the Church
of Plains, Pa., and was ordained and installed Sept. 8,
1863. Subsequently he was earnestly solicited, and,
after prayerful consideration, consented to take charge
of Fairmount Church, Pa., in connection with that of
Plains, which relation existed till he died, June 10,
1886. Mr. Potter was a favorite pastor and an excel-
ent preacher; his preaching was powerfully scriptural.
He always carefully prepared his sermons. See
Wilson, Pref. Hist. Almanac, 1867, p. 191. (J.L.S.)

Potter, Robert, an Anglican divine, noted some-
what as a poet, was born in 1721; was educated at
Emmanuel College, Cambridge, and was for some years
vicar of Scarning, after which he obtained the livings
of Lowestoft and Keswick, and a prebend in the
Cathedral of Norwich. He died in 1804. His original
poetry consists of a volume of Poems, and two Odes from
Isaiah (a translation of The Oracle concerning Babylon
and The Song of Exultation), and is much above medi-
ocity. But he is best known by his spirited versions
of Kekulychus, of Arion and Euripides. He is noted for
A Sermon on the Thanksgiving for the Peace (1802).

Potter's Field (πυρες τοιον εκποµενων; Vulg. ope
figulis), a piece of ground which, according to the
statement of Matthew (xxvii, 7), was purchased by
the priests with the thirty pieces of silver rejected by
Judas, and converted into a burial-place for sinners
coming to the city. In the narrative of the Acts (i, 18,
19) the purchase is made by Judas himself, and neither
the potter's field, its connection with the priests, nor
its ultimate application is mentioned. That Matthew
was well assured of the accuracy of his version of the
Biblical history, the occurrence of the potter's field is given
as a fulfillment of an ancient prediction. What that predic-
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Potter, Francois, a French missionary, was born at Loche in 1718. He was educated at Paris in the Seminary of Saint-Ésprit. In 1758 he was sent as a missionary to the countries of Western China. His zeal was rewarded with the apostolic vicariate of Tsz-chouan, and subsequently honored with the title of bishop in 1783. He visited the Chen-si (more to the north), and there made more than sixty thousand proselytes. He died Sept. 28, 1792.

Potter wrote several letters on his peregrinations in the Celestial Empire. They abound in curious information about the principal Chinese provinces, about Southern Tartary, and even Tibet. He describes the mountain-ranges of Sine-Ling, in which he often found a refuge in times of persecution. There is little flattery for the Chinese in his account of their manners, but he thinks that they are not incorrigible. It is to be regretted that Potter neglected altogether to give information about the natural history of those countries. His purpose was to write a journal of his life and of the progress of Romanism, rather than a work useful to the learned.—Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, s. v. See Saint-Martin, Éloge de M. F. Potter: Nouvelles Lettres édifiantes, vol. iii.

Potts, George, D.D., an eminent Presbyterian divine, was born in Philadelphia, Pa., March 15, 1802. In his father's family he enjoyed some of the best opportunities for forming his mind and heart. These were derived not only from parental counsels and instructions, but also from the frequent presence in his father's hospitable dwelling of refined Christian society. He had a good training for college, and graduated at the University of Pennsylvania in 1819. He studied theology at Princeton Seminary, and was licensed even before graduation in 1823, and ordained as an evangelist Oct. 7, 1828; was pastor of a Church in Natchez, Miss., 1823-85; of the Duane Street Church, New York, 1836-44; and of the University Place Church from 1845 till his death, Sept. 15, 1864. Dr. Potts was an eminent preacher. He was a man of fine presence, and possessed of great oratorical abilities. But his aim in preaching was practical rather than doctrinal; his style full, and bordering on the figurative; his executive ability was remarkable. He engaged at one time in a controversy with the Rev. Dr. Wainwright, on the rites and discipline of the Episcopal Church, in a pamphlet entitled No Church But a Bishop. Strongly argued, the doctrines of his own Church, and laboring zealously for the promotion of its interests, yet he ever cherished the most kindly and fraternal feelings for the followers of Christ in every communion. He was, during his ministry, connected with various literary, scientific, and religious institutions, and rendered efficient service in the cause of humanity. He published single Sermons, Addresses, Letters, etc. (1826-54), and contributed two Discourses to The National Preacher, The Character of Jesus to Dr. Wainwright's Women of the Bible, and Introductions to Potts's Mary, Nos. 1 and 2. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1886, p. 161; Appleton's Ann. Cyclop., 1864, p. 680; Wainwright, Women of the Bible: Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth. s. v. (J. L. S.)

Potts, John, an eminent minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, flourished near the opening of this century. He began to preach in 1812 within the bounds of the Philadelphia Annual Conference, of which body he became a member in the following year. For a quarter of a century he continued in this connection, filling many of the most important posts, and always giving great satisfaction. He died Sept. 22, 1837, after a long and very painful illness. Mr. Potts was a man of varied talent, an efficient business man, an able and dignified presiding officer, a useful pastor, and a successful preacher.—Minutes of Conference, ii. 577.

Potts, William Stephens, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Northumberland County, Pa.,
POU DE LOGOI

Oct. 13, 1802. His early education was limited. After learning the printer's trade in Philadelphia, he finally, in 1825, entered the Princeton Theological Seminary, which ill-health, the result of too close application to his studies, compelled him to leave in November, 1827. He returned to Philadelphia in 1828, and went to St. Louis, laboring on the way as opportunity offered, and was finally ordained and installed pastor of the only Presbyterian Church then in St. Louis, Oct. 26, 1828. Here he labored faithfully and successfully for the extension of the Church until, Mar. 12, 1830, on account of ill-health, he was elected president of that institution by the trustees in 1835, and entered at once upon this new field of labor. After four years of intense labor, the success of the enterprise not being equal to his expectations, he accepted another call to St. Louis. In 1841 his health obliged him to travel, and he went to Europe, whence he returned in October of the same year, greatly invigorated. Early in 1852 sickness compelled him to discontinue his labors, and he died March 26, 1852. He published a large number of occasional Sermons, Addresses, and controversial pamphlets. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, iv, 723.

POU de logoi (Ποῦ δὲ λόγοι τριτέροτες) is the beginning of one of Gregory of Nazianzen's (q. v.) hymns, which he probably composed during the eight years that he spent in retirement. "When his work was done, he went into the Church of the Apostles to rest. And father, mother, brother, and sister, all were dead. In the depths of its natural fears, and the firmness of the hope to which at last it rises, it tells the history of those solitary years, and echoes well the music of those ancient psalms which soar so often "out of the depths" into the light of God." (Mrs. Charles H. Du Bose.) The text does not allow us to give this beautiful hymn, of which the first stanza runs thus in Mrs. Charles's translation:

"Where are the winged words? Lost in the air.
Where the fresh flower of youth and glory lie?
That which is now well-knit limbs? Wilt thou bow by care.
Wealth? Plunder'd; none possess but God alone.
Where those dear parents who my life first gav'e
And where that holy twain, brother and sister? In the grave."


Fouquet, Antoine, a French Benedictine monk, was born in 1550 in the diocese of Béziers. He entered the Congregation of St. Maur in 1764, and devoted himself to the study of mathematics, in which he is said to have been very proficient, although he published nothing about that science. He was a professor of the Sacred Scripture, and taught distinguished pupils, among others Dom Guiraud. While teaching this language, he composed a very easy method, under the title Institutiones linguae Hebrewae. The work was not printed, but there are numerous copies of it. Fouquet published in collaboration with Mfonçois, the Latin translation of a volume of Analecta Graeca (1688, 4to). He made, together with Dom Martianay, an edition of the works of Jerome, called the edition of the Benedictines (Paris, 1592-1706, 5 vols. fol.), of which he directed alone the fifteen volumes. He died at Bordeaux Oct. 14, 1709.—Hoef. Nouv. Biog. Générale, s. a. See Le Cerf, Bibl. des Auteurs de la Congrég. de St. Maur; Fisquet, Biog. (éditée) de l'Hérault.

Fouquet, Bertrand de, a French cardinal, was born in 1280 at Le Pouget, now the commune of Aynac. If we may believe Villani and Petrarch, it was rumored in 1307 that he was the son of John XXII, who was born in the same diocese (Cabos); others affirm that the pope was his uncle. A simple deacon of Castelnaud Montranet and canon of Saint-Sauveur d'Aix, he was comprised in the first promotion of canons, made Dec. 17, 1316, by John XXII, who, three years afterwards, sent him to Italy with the most unlimited powers for the purpose of retrieving the dominions of the Church. At the head of a small army, Bertrand, together with Philip of Valois, who afterwards became king of France, directed his first blows against Matteo Viscconti, the nominal chief of the Lombard League, who was considerably assisted by the Provengal and Provençal.Ordered to resort to the anathemas of the Church, and to preach a crusade against Matteo. This attempt being unsuccessful also, he determined to unite with the Guelphs and oppose Galea Viscconti, who had succeeded his father. Genoa and Piacenza took his part, Milan and Venice as well, and the Pope was revolting, and he was elected, Oct. 29, 1322, president of that institution by the trustees in 1385, and entered at once upon this new field of labor. After four years of intense labor, the success of the enterprise not being equal to his expectations, he accepted another call to St. Louis. In 1841 his health obliged him to travel, and he went to Europe, whence he returned in October of the same year, greatly invigorated. Early in 1852 sickness compelled him to discontinue his labors, and he died March 26, 1852. He published a large number of occasional Sermons, Addresses, and controversial pamphlets. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, iv, 723.

Fouquet, François-Alain, a French theologian, was born at Montpellier Aug. 29, 1666. Almost immediately after his ordination he was appointed vicar of Saint-Roché at Paris, and it was in this capacity that he administered the last sacraments to La Fontaine (see his account in the Mem. de Litt. of the P. Desmolets, vol. i, pt. ii). He was made doctor, and entered in 1698 the Congregation of the Oratory. On the death of M. de Montpellier, gave him the direction of his seminary. He returned to Paris, and held at the Seminary of Saint-Magloire public lectures on the conscience. He was appointed member of the commission charged with the liturgical reform of the diocese of Paris. The Constitution de Montpellier, the principal work of Pouget, was published at Paris in 1702 (4to, or 5 vols. 12mo); it was at once adopted in all parts of France, has gone through many editions, and has been translated into several languages. At the time of his death Pouget was publishing a Latin edition of it, in which the passages merely indicated in the French work were extensively filled out. This edition, when in the printing-office, was seized at the request of cardinal de Biissy, and was published after examination by doctor Clavel, with his comments. The work was completed by the P. Desmolets, and published under the title of Institutiones Catholicæ (1725, 2 vols. fol., and Ven. 1768). There are few works of this kind in which the Christian dogmas, the religious morals, the sacraments, prayers, ceremonies, and customs of the Roman Church are set forth in a manner so simple and explicit. The other writings of Pouget are some Letters to Colbert and to cardinal Noailles, Instructions sur les principaux Devoirs des Chevaliers de Malte (Paris, 1712, 12mo), and various manuscripts, especially a work on the Breviary of Notre Dame, part of which had been printed in 1798. Pouget died at Paris April 4, 1723.
Poulard, Thomas Just, a French prelate, was born at Dieppe Sept. 1, 1754. He was ordained priest, and enjoyed an early renown as a preacher. His talents were rewarded by the Church with several preferments, and a curacy in the diocese of Lisieux. Attached to the clergy of Saint-Roch, he submitted in 1791 to the law that exacted the oath to the civil constitution, and became episcopal vicar of the Orne. On the 27th of July, 1793, he renounced the Catholic faith in the presence of the Convention; but in spite of this abjuration he was, after the Reign of Terror, appointed constitutional curate of the parish of Aubervilliers, near Paris, and took his seat as a deputy of the Haute-Marne in the council held at Paris in 1797. The Constitutionalists made him bishop of Saint- et-Loire June 14, 1801, but he lost his see by the Concordat, and retired to Paris. Shortly before the Revolu- tion of July he published a pamphlet under the title "Moyens de nationaliser le Clergé de France" (Paris, 1800, 8vo.), in which he attacked the clergy of the Revolution epoch he condemned the young men, and on three in 1801. Poulard persevered in his opinions, and chose to die un vrai constitutionnel. He declined the assistance of the curate of his parish, and his body was carried directly to the cemetery. Poulard died March 9, 1820. The following books have been most plausibly attributed to his au thorship: Épithématiques religieuses pour servir à l'His- torie ecclésiastique de la France (1801).—Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, s. v.

Poullaouen, Nicolas de Louis, a French painter, was born Feb. 10, 1703, at Avignon. He was destined to the magistracy, and studied law. But he did not allow those grave pursuits to interfere with his poetical tastes, and presented at the Jeux Floraux several poems which were crowned. Towards 1735 he received orders, and from that time devoted himself entirely to oratory. Encouraged by the favor some of his panegyrists and sermons had met with at the hands of his countrymen, he repaired to Paris in 1738, and preached in nearly all the great pulpits. In 1745 a life-rent of a thousand francs was granted by the abbé of Angers to bestow on him; and in 1748 he was nominated a companion of the Nobel of Nôtre- gent-sous-Coney, after pronouncing the panegyric of Saint-Louis before the French Academy. He was sub sequently honored with the titles of ordinary preacher of the king and grand vicar of Lyon. Some writers have supposed that the abbé Poulette was mistaken in this relation: such a parallel can only be made by those who mistake brilliancy of style for eloquence. He might be more properly compared with the abbé De Boismont, his contempor ary; they have the same qualities and the same defects. The abbé Poulette did not aspire to the honors of authorship: he was not in the habit of writing his sermons. In 1776, complying with the wishes of his nephew, Louis Poulette, grand vicar of Saint-Malo, he dictated to him eleven sermons which he had preserved in his memory for forty years, and these sermons were published, after he had corrected them himself, in Paris in 1778, 1781, 1818, 1821 (2 vols. 12mo). This edition con tains also his Panégyrique de Saint-Louis (1748, 4to) and a Discours pour la Prise d'habit de Mme. de Ruel meau-monde aux Comtesse (1749, 12mo). The Bibliothèque des Écrivains édités a volume of Œuvres Choisies of the abbé Poulette (1828, 18mo), preceded by a biographical notice. He died at Avignon Nov. 8, 1781.—Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, s. v. See De Sainte- Croix, Éloge de Poulette (Avignon, 1788, 8vo).

Pound (weight) is the rendering of one Heb. and one Greek word in the A. V. 

1. מזון, mazón (2 Kings x, 17; Ezra ii, 60; Neh. vii, 71, 72). See MASEH.

2. Ἁρπα, ἀρπα (John xii, 8; xix, 8, 89), is a Roman pound of twelve ounces, a libra. This pound, as used in trade and authorized by the Roman government, contained 6156 Paris grains, according to Boeckh (Metallurg. Unters. p. 160 sqq.). The word ARPA was adopted in the Armenian dialect, ԱՐՓԱ (Buxtorf, Lex. Robb. col. 1186). See Weight.

Pound (money), a value (pāvā, minā) mentioned in the parable of the Ten Pounds (Luke xix, 12-27), as the talent is in the parable of the Talents (Matt. xxv, 14-30), the comparison of the Saviour to a master who intrusted money to his servants wherewith to trade in his absence being probably a frequent lesson in our Lord's teaching (comp. Mark xiii, 28-37). The reference appears to be to a Greek pound, a weight used as a money of account, of which sixty went to the talent, the weight depending upon the weight of the talent. At this time the Attic talent, reduced to the weight of the earlier Phoenician, which was the same as the He broew, prevailed in Palestine, though other systems must have been occasionally used. The Greek name doubt less came either from the Hebrew shekel which has a common origin; but it must be remembered that the Hebrew talent contained but fifty manehs, and that we have no authority for supposing that the maneh was called in Palestine by the Greek name, so that it is most reasonable to consider the Greek weight to be meant. See Ninth.

Pounds, John, an English philanthropist, flourished in the second half of last century. He was born at Portsmouth in 1766 of very humble parentage, and enjoyed himself no educational advantages worth mention ing. But, endowed with a remarkably active mind and generous disposition, he used his leisure hours from the busy trade he plied as a shoemaker for the amelioration of the poor children of his surroundings. He collected a number of them in his shop, and there taught them the elements of education he had been able to master successfully, and thus became the founder of what are now called the Ragged Schools. He died Jan. 1, 1839.

Pouchot, Edmond, a French philosopher of some note, was born at Poilly, near Sins, in 1851. About 1678 he became professor of philosophy in the University of Paris, of which he was chosen rector seven times. He was a friend of Racine and Boileau. He died in 1734. He wrote Institutiones Politicae (1730), which was highly esteemed by his contemporaries. Pouchot was really the first of modern philosophers who taught by a rational method.

Pousain, Nicolas, a French painter of great cel ebrity, was born near Le Grand-Andely, in Normandy, in 1556 or 1594; was first a pupil of Quintin Varin, then painting pictures for the Church of Grand-Andely, but at the age of eighteen went to Paris, studied under Ferdinand Elle, the Flemish painter, and others; but chiefly improved himself by drawing from casts and drawings and prints after Raffaello and Julio Romano in the collection of M. de Courtois, who gave access to them. After a long and hard struggle, he at tained the object of his desire—namely, the means of visiting Rome. He was thirty years of age when he arrived there, and a considerable period elapsed after that before he obtained much employment. At length, however, he received several important commissions from the cardinal Barberini, which he executed so success fully that he afterwards rapidly acquired fame and fortune. After an absence of sixteen years he returned to Paris with M. de Chantelou, and was introduced by cardinal Richelieu to Louis XIII, who appointed him his painter in ordinary, and gave him apartments in the Tuileries. But while away at Rome, preparatory to re moval to Paris, the king died, and Pousain abandoned the proposed return to France. He died at Rome in 1666, after a most successful career. His pictures have
POUSSINES

been compared with colored bas-reliefs, a term not inexpressive of his style. His peculiar leaning to this sculptural treatment may in some measure be explained by his close intimacy with his friend Duquesnay, the sculptor, known as Flamingo: they lived in the same house, and were, together at Rouen, of the same coloring, compared with his drawing, is inferior and mannered, which is somewhat remarkable, considering that he studied in the school of Domenichino at Rome, whom he regarded as the best painter of his time. The Sken Sacraments, painted twice by Poussin, are among his most celebrated works, and both are now in England—one at Belvoir Castle, the other in the Bridgewater Gallery, London. His works are very numerous; the prints that have been engraved after his principal pictures only amount to upwards of two hundred. Some of his best works are in the British National gallery, as, The Hague among the Philistines at Ashdon, The Rachaelinius Festival, No. 42, finely engraved by Doo, which constitutes an excellent exponent of his style, with all his merits and peculiarities in perfection. He was especially remarkable as a skillful landscape-painter. His most drawing entitled The Finding of Moses has been made popular by autotype, but it is by no means one of his best productions. Poussin has been called a classical painter by Sir Joshua Reynolds, so successful did he imitate the works of antiquity. See Mrs. Clement, Painter, Sculptor, Architecture, etc., p. 50; Gombrich, p. 49; Bellori, Vita di Nicolò Poussino, etc. (Rome, 1672); Wor-num, Descriptive and Historical Catalogue of the National Gallery, etc.

His brother-in-law, Gaspar Poussin, also quite a celebrated painter, was born in 1613, and was a pupil of Nicolas. Poussin devoted himself principally to secular art, but his Sacrifice of Isaac is a notable production. He died in 1657. (J. H. W.)

Poussines, Pierre, a French Jesuit, was born in 1609 at Lauroc (diocese of Narbonne). After studying at Rome, he went to the University of Louvain in 1624, and was in the latter city and at Montpellier professor of humanities, of rhetoric, and of theology. Called to Rome in 1664 to continue The History of the Society, interrupted by the death of Sacchini, he devoted several years to that work, and was subsequently professor of exegetical theology at the Roman College. Many illustrious personages honored him with proofs of their esteem, among others queen Christina of Sweden and cardinal Barberini, who committed to him the interpretation of the works of Pachymers. Poussines was a good friend of the young prince of Orsini and to the abbé Albani, who afterwards became pope under the name of Clement XI. He returned to Toulouse towards the end of 1682, and continued his literary activity in spite of his failing health. He died at Toulouse Feb. 2, 1696. He left, Nouvelles Mémorialités de l'Académie, etc. (Paris, 1677, 1680).—Polemism, Socium, Orationes (ibid., 1657, 1680).—Anna Commena Porphyrogenita Alexias (Paris, 1651, fol.).—Sancti Nili Opera quondam (ibid., 1654, 4to).—Nouvelles Mémentos de la République Paganisme (ibid., 1661, fol.).—Georgii Pacchymers Michael Paliologus (Rome, 1666, fol.).—G. Ricini, Andromanceri Palaologisi (Ibid., 1697, fol.).—Sancti Methodii Convinimum Virginum (Paris, 1657, fol.).—Catenar Gregorii Politianae in Evangelium secundum Marcum (Rome, 1673, fol.).—Theotheodori Actores (Paris, 1698, 4to).—Theophylacti Instiut Regum (ibid., 1641, 4to). All these editions are accompanied with commentaries and notes full of erudition. Poussines is the author of a considerable number of lives of saints of Greece, of Languedoc, and these are known in the Bel-landistas; of a Latin translation of the letters of St. Francis Xavier, and of a number of other works, the list of which is given in the Biblioth. Soc. Jesu. See Lombard, Elogia hist. P. Poussines, in the Mémoires de Trévoux (Nov. 1756), and in the Dict. de Moreri (ed. 1709); De Bocccher, Bibliothe, des Ecrivains de la Com-
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the greater part of the riches of the kingdom; their possessions were so vast that the monopoly became the occasion to enact laws preventing the increase of their wealth or depriving them of that portion of it which was held in trust for the public welfare. In the United States the monasteries of Rome threaten to become the most powerful possessors of wealth. In New York they own property mounting up to several millions, and even in smaller cities are fast accumulating immense possessions. How admirably their rules are adapted to fastening upon individuals and to transfer to them so rich a fraction! Already in several states civil enactments have become necessary in order to restrain the inordinate acquisition of landed and other property by Roman Catholic institutions and to prevent undue interference by priests in the bequests of the sick.

The Fakirs and Dervishes of Mohammedan countries are under a vow of poverty, and go about asking alms in the name of God, being wholly dependent for their support upon the charity of the faithful. The Mohammedan monks trace their origin to the first year of the Hegira; and it is said that there are no fewer than thirty-two different orders existing in the Turkish empire, all of them grounding their preference of the ascetic life upon a saying of Mohammed, "Poverty is my passion; I can live no other way." Internal accessions to the numbers of the Fakirs, or Beggars, are not allowed to partake of a single morsel of food not received by them in alms, unless it be water or some substance used for the purpose of cleaning the teeth. Hence the Buddhist monk is seen daily carrying his alms-bowl from house to house, in the village near which he may happen to reside. The "Agyrs" of the ancient Greeks were mendicant priests of Cybele, and their origin is supposed to have been Eastern. The same priests among the Romans went their daily rounds to receive alms with the astra in their hands. The institutes of Manu laws have explicit rules for the Brahmin mendicant: "Every day must a Brahmin student receive his food by begging, with due care, from the houses of persons renowned for discharging their duties. If none of those houses can be found, let him go begging through the whole district around the village, keeping his organs in subjection and remaining silent; but let him turn away from such as have committed any deadly sin .... Let the student persist constantly in such begging; but let him not eat the food of one person only; the subsistence of a student by begging is held to be less than that of his master. This done, if the student is wise, he must ask for a Brahmin only; but no such act is appointed for a warrior or a merchant." In the same sacred book the householder is enjoined to make gifts according to his ability to the religious mendicant, who is described as the "light of the world." (Eliott, "Delineation of Romanism," p. 744; Barnum, "Romanism," p. 287, 295 sq.)

POVERTY, VOLUNTARY. See POVERTY, MONASTIC.

Powell, Baden. An Anglican divine, noted rather as a scientific student than as a theologian, was the son of a London merchant, and was born at Stamford Hill, near London, Aug. 22, 1796. He studied at Oriel College, Oxford, where he graduated M.A., with first-class mathematical honors, in 1817; took holy orders in 1820, and was appointed vicar of Plumstead, in Kent, in 1821. In 1824 he was elected a fellow of the Royal Society; and three years later was appointed Savilian professor of geometry, a chair which he held till his death, which took place in London June 11, 1860. Baden's great aim was to bring about a larger recognition of the importance of physical and mathematical science in the curriculum of learned study at Oxford. To the "Philosophical Transactions," the "Reports" of the British Association, and other vehicles of scientific instruction, he contributed numerous valuable papers; and he pursued his strenuous exertions to obtain for modern science the right of modifying the views of nature and the origin of the world, regardless of the views expounded in the O.T. Scriptures, especially in "The Study on Evidence of Christianity in Essays and Reviews" (1860). In this perilous task his ill success. He delayed great learning, logical power, moderation of tone, and philosophic urbanity; but his conclusions were too unmistakably rationalistic to be acceptable to orthodox Christianity. Powell does not exactly place himself on the same theoretical ground with Hume and Spinoza, but the moral effect of his work is to adduce evidence of Christianity is not less antagonistic than the theories of either of these authors. "Spinoza's" says Dr. Hurst ("Hist. of Rationalism," p. 487 sq.), "held that miracles are impossible, because it would be derogatory to God to depart from the established laws of the universe, and one of Hume's objections to them was their incapability of being proved from testimony ("Rep. to Essays and Reviews," p. 185). Prof. Powell objects to them because they bear no analogy to the harmony of God's dealings in the material world; and insists that they are not to be credited, since they are a violation of the laws of matter, or an interruption of the course of physical causes. The orthodox portion of the Church are laboring under the egregious error of making them an essential doctrine, when they are really mere exception to the law. External accessions to the numbers of the Fakirs must come to our aid in all examination of them. The key-note to Prof. Powell's opposition is contained in the following statement: 'From the nature of our antecedent convictions, the probability of some kind of mistake or deception somewhere, though we know not where, is greater than the probability of the event really happening in the way and from the causes assigned' ("Essays and Reviews," p. 120). The inductive philosophy, to which great respect must be paid, is enlisted against miracles. If we only knew all about those alleged and held as such, we should have found them too involved into natural phenomena, just as the 'angel at Milan was the aerial reflection of an image on a church; the balls of fire at Plaucas were electrical; the sea-serpent was a basking shark on a stem of sea-weed. A committee of the French Academy of Sciences, with Lavoisier at its head, after a grave investigation, pronounced the alleged fall of aerolites to be a supernatural fable' (ibid. p. 155). The two theories against the reality of miracles in their received sense are, first, that they are attributable to natural causes; and, second, that they may involve more or less of the supernatural or the miraculous. This is the natural assumption do away with any real admission of miracles even on religious grounds." The animus of the whole essay may be determined by the following treatment of testimony and reason: "Testimony, after all, is but one form of a second-hand account; and it is by the testimony of miracles alone that Christianity can avail nothing against reason. The essential question of miracles stands quite apart from any consideration of testimony: the question would remain the same if we had the evidence of our own senses to an alleged miracle; that is, to an extraordinary or inexplicable fact. It is not the mere fact, but the cause or explanation of it, which is the point at issue" (ibid. p. 158). This means far more than Spinoza, Hume, or any other opponent of miracles, except the radical Rationalists of Germany, has claimed—that we must not believe a miracle, though actually witnessed. The different replies which this Essay on the Study of the Evidence of Christianity (in Essays and Reviews) elicited are: No Antecedent Impossibility in Miracles—some Remarks on the Essay of the late Rev. Baden Powell, etc. (1861, 8vo); A Rejoinder to Mr. Bacon's Essay on the Improbability of Miracles, etc., by William Lee, D.D. (1861, 8vo); Examination of Mr. Baden Powell's Treatise on Miracles (1861, 12mo); and are defended in, A Few Words of Apology for the late Prof. Baden Powell's Essay, etc., by a Lay Graduate (1861, 8vo); The late Prof. Powell and Bishop Thirlwell on the Improbability of Miracles, etc., by the Rev. R. B. Tindal (1864, 8vo). See also Farrar, Crit. Hist. of Free Thought, lect. iv; Moberley, Sermons on the Bodii
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POWELL, Howell, a Welsh Presbyterian minister, was born about 1839, and was a native of Glamorgan, South Wales, where he was educated for the ministry. He came to this country with his wife, and, settling in Ohio, began preaching. In 1851 he became pastor of the Welsh Presbyterian Church in Cincinnati, Ohio, where he labored prosperously for nineteen years. Accepting the call of the American Board, he arrived in New York on the Thirteenth Street, New York, he came to that city in 1870, and was actively engaged in the duties of his pastorate until his death in 1875. He was greatly beloved by his Welsh coreligionists both in this country and at home. He discharged his pastoral duties with zeal and diligence, and did many generous acts for the humble members of his flock.

POWELL, Thomas, an Anglican divine, flourished in the 17th century. He was born about 1608, and after taking holy orders was canon of St. David's, London. He died in 1660. His publications are of a secular character.

POWELL, Wavasor, a Welsh Puritan preacher, who was born in 1617, was educated at Jesus College, Oxford, but left the Establishment and became an itinerating minister. He was very zealous for the Church of God, was very outspoken and gave much annoyance to Churchmen and was often in trouble. He was imprisoned at Oxford Prison, London, in 1671. He published a number of Sermons, Theological Treatises, etc. (between 1646 and 171), for lists of which and notices of his author, see Sermons Vavasor (1654), Vavasor Exam'd and Purged (1654, 4to), and Life and Death of Powell Wavasor (1671, 8vo). His Concordance to the Bible, completed by N. P. and J. F., etc., was published in 1671 (8vo).

POWELL, William Samuel, an English divine of remarkable ability, was born at Colchester Sept. 27, 1717; was admitted to St. John's College, Cambridge, in 1734; and, having taken the degree of bachelor of arts in 1736, was elected fellow of it in March 1737. In 1741 he was taken into the family of lord Townshend as private tutor to his second son, Charles, afterwards chancellor of the Exchequer; was ordained deacon and priest at the end of the year, and instituted to the rectory of Colkirk, in Norfolk, on lord Townshend's presentation. He returned to college the year after, began to read lectures as an assistant to the principal tutor; but became himself principal tutor in 1744. He took the degree of bachelor of divinity in 1749, and of doctor in 1756. In 1765 he was elected master of his college; obtained the archdeaconry of Colchester the year after, and in 1768 was instituted to the rectory of Freshwater, in the Isle of Wight. He died Jan. 19, 1775. He published, Defence of the Subscriptions required in the Church of England (London, 1757, 4to);—Observations on Miscellaneous Subjects (1750) on Sermons on 1 Cor. 6, 23, 24 (1767, 4to);—Observations on Various Subjects (published with Life by Thomas Bulgy, D.D., 1776, 8vo). Dr. Powell's and Thomas Fawcett's Discourses, thirty-four in all, delivered before the University of Cambridge, were published in 1728 in the deaneries of the archdeaconry of Colchester, and in the sermons and charges of Dr. Powell; of whom, indeed, on every account, the whole society over which he presided might justly join with me in saying, 'Semper honos, nomenque tuum, laudesque manebunt' (Prof. Mainwaring). Powell's discourse are also highly commended by Matthew (See Parvilia Historiae Anglicae lin. 1822), p. 225, 371; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s. v.; Gen. Biol. Dict. s. v.

Power, or the ability of performing, is in an essential degree an attribute of Deity: God is emphatically styled All-powerful. Power signifies sometimes a right,
privilege, or dignity (John i, 12); sometimes absolute
authority of power (Matt. xxviii, 18); sometimes the exertion or
act of power, as of the Holy Spirit (Ephes. i, 19), of
angels, or of human governments, etc. (Rom. xi, 34); and perhaps it generally includes the
idea of dignity and superiority. So, the body "is
sown in weakness, it is raised in power" (1 Cor. xv, 43).
The "prince of the power of the air" (Eph. ii, 2) is a
figurative representation of Satan (q. v.). See AIR.

Power. Francis Herron, a Presbyterian
minister, was born in Allegheny County, Pa., July 14, 1829.
Born on the 14th of July. He had no academic training; graduated at
Washington College, Washington, Pa.; studied theology
in the Western Theological Seminary, Allegheny City,
Pa., and was licensed by Redstone Presbytery. Being
deeply interested in the efforts of the government to
suppress the rebellion, he became a delegate of the
United States Christian Commission. Joining the "Arm-
y of the Cumberland," he was zealous in his efforts in the
hospitals and in the field to administer to the per-
sonal and spiritual wants of the sick and wounded of the
public; but the excess of exposure which he
subjected himself broke down his system, and he
died in the hospital at Nashville, Tenn., Oct. 17, 1863.
Mr. Power was never ordained, but he was an earnest and
faithful missionary. Forgetful of self, in his zeal
for the good of others he sacrificed even his life to a
work, as "this man returned unto his whole
(J. L. S.)

Power. John H., D.D., a noted minister of the
Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Montgomery
Co., Ky., March 15, 1798; was converted at a very
early age; united with the Methodists in 1819; was
licensed to preach two years after, and joined the Ken-
tucky Conference, where his appointments were, Mount
Sterling and Hinkaton circuits, in Kentucky; Little
Kanawha, Charleston, and Parkersburgh, in Virginia;
Columbus, Salt Creek, Brush Creek, Chillicothe, and
Deer Creek, in Ohio; Burlington Circuit, Old Zion,
Mount Vernon, and South. Burlington—embracing a
period of eighteen years. As presiding elder, he
served on Norwalk, Wooster, Mount Vernon, Delaware,
and Mansfield districts, in Ohio; Burlington, Musca-
tine, and Keokuk districts, in Iowa—filling up twenty-
eight years. In 1848 he was chosen the general agent of the
Western Book Concern, where he remained until
1852. Failing health then necessitated rest, and he
maintained a superannuity relation until 1856, when
he resumed the pastoral work by transfer to the Iowa
Conference, and there held appointments (as above
mentioned) until his death, which occurred Jan. 10,
1873. In manner Dr. Power was reserved. He shrank
instinctively from that general acquaintance and no-
ternity in which persons differently constituted find
pleasure. His friendship, though not demonstrative,
was strong and enduring. As a preacher he was suc-
cessful: enlightening the mind, directing the judgment,
and influencing the will of his auditors—thereby win-
ing souls to Christ. He was a prudent legislator, and
as an administrator of discipline he had but few equals.
Notwithstanding the exhaustive labors of an itinerant
fifty years ago, at the age of forty-two he had acquired
a liberal education, including Greek and Hebrew, so as
to make the original available in the literal rendering of
the Word of Life. He had also completed a course
in law, with the view of meeting every demand that
might be made upon him as a servant of the Church.
As an author he holds a reputable place. His writings
(On Universalism:—Doctipte and Power: a discussion
on the same subject:—Domestic Piety:—and Letters to
Dr. Smith on Slavery) are all attractive in style, and
are meet of practical cleanliness. See Annals of Annual
Conferences, 1873, p. 103, 104. (J. H. W.)

POWERS OF THE MIND are those faculties by which we
think, reason, judge, etc. See God; Soul. "They
are so various," says Dr. Reid, "so many, so connected
and complicated in most of their operations, that there
never has been any division of them proposed which is
not liable to considerable objections. The most com-
mon division is that of senses, and imagination, and
under the will we comprehend our active powers, and all that
lead to action, or influence the mind to act—such as ap-
etions, passions, affections. The understanding com-
prehends our contemplative powers, by which we perceive
objects; by which we conceive or remember them; by which we
analyze or compound them; and by which we judge and reason concerning them. Or,
the intellectual powers are commonly divided into sim-
ple apprehension, judgment, and reasoning."—Locke
divides powers into those "able to make, or able to
receive, any actual action; the one may be called active, and
the other passive power" (Essay on Human Under-
standing, bk. ii, ch. xxii). But Reid takes exception to
this division, and passes the following sentence upon it:
"Whereas he (Locke) distinguishes power into active
and passive. I conceive powers must be of no
power at all. He means by it the possibility of being
changed. To call this power seems to be a misap-
lication of the word. I do not remember to have met
with the phrase passive power in any other good author.
Mr. Locke seems to have been unlucky in inventing it;
and it deserves not to be retained in the language."—
"This paragraph," says Sir W. Hamilton (Reid's Works,
p. 519, note), "is erroneous in almost all its statements."
The distinction between power as active and passive is
clearly taken by Aristotle. But he says that in one
point of view it is true that but one power (his, v.
c. 12), while in another they are two (obd. lib. ix,
c. 1). He also distinguishes powers into rational and
irrational—into those which we have by nature, and
those which we acquire by repetition of acts. These
distinctions have been generally admitted by subse-
quent philosophers. Dr. Reid, however, only used the
word power to signify active power. That we have
the idea of power, and how we come by it, he shows in
opposition to Hume. (Act. Pow. cas. i, ch. ii, iv.)
According to Hume, we have no proper notion of
power. It is a mere relation which the mind conceives
to exist between one thing going before and another
thing coming after. All that we observe is anteced-
tent and consequent. Neither sensation nor reflec-
tion furnishes us with any idea of power or efficacy in
the antecedent to produce the consequent. The views
of Dr. Berkeley are somewhat similar. It is when the
succession is constant—when the antecedent is unifor-
mally followed by the consequent—that we call the one
cause and the other effect; but we have no ground for believ-
ing that there is any other relation between them or any
virtue in one to originate or produce the other, but that
is, that we have no proper idea of power. Now, that
our idea of power cannot be explained by the philosophy
which derives all our ideas from sensation and reflec-
tion is true. Power is not an object of sense. All that
we observe is an effect. In all that we observe
invariably succeeded by another, we not only connect
the one as effect and the other as cause, and view them
under that relation, but we frame the idea of power,
and conclude that there is a virtue, an efficacy, a force
in the one thing to originate or produce the other, when
in truth there is no other connection or relation between
the two. This is the common idea of power, and that there is such an idea
framed and entertained by the human mind cannot be
denied. The legitimacy and validity of the idea can
be fully vindicated.

"In the strict sense, power and agency are attributes of
mind only; and I think that mind only can be a cause
in the strict sense. This power, indeed, may be where
it is not exerted, and so may be without agency or
causation; but mind can be no agent without power
to act and to produce the effect. As far
as I can judge, to every thing we call a cause we ascribe
power to produce the effect. In intelligent causes, the
POWER may be without being exerted; so I have power to run while I sit still or walk. But in inanimate causes we never think of power, nor what is exerted, and, therefore, measure the power of the cause by the effect which it actually produces. The power of an acid to dissolve iron is measured by what it actually dissolves. We get the notion of active power, as well as of cause and effect, as I feel in myself, and feel in ourselves a power to move our limbs, and to produce certain effects when we choose. Hence we get the notion of power, agency, and causation in the strict and philosophical sense; and this I take to be our first notion of these three things" (Reid, Correspondence, p. 774).

"The liability of a thing to be influenced by a cause is called passive power, or more properly susceptibility; while the efficacy of the cause is called active power. Heat has the power of melting wax; and, in the language of some, ice has the power of being melted" (Day, On the Will, p. 33). See CAUSE.

It is usual to speak of a power of resistance in matter, and of a power of endurance in mind. Both these are passive power. Active power is the principle of action, whether of the object or of the agent. Passive power is the principle of bearing or receiving. See Reid, On the Active Powers; Id. On the Human Mind, and the Intellectual Powers; Locke, On the Understanding; Stewart, Brown, and Abercrombie. See also MIND.

POWERS, Grant, a Congregational clergyman, was born at Hollis, N. H., May 31, 1784; was educated at Dartmouth College, class of 1810; studied theology, was a minister at Haverhill in 1815-18, and at Goshen from Aug. 27, 1829, to his death, April, 1841. He is the author of an Essay Upon the Influence of the Imagination on the Nervous System, contributing to False Hopes in Religion:—History of the Coa Country (1841, 12mo).—Drake, Dict. of Amer. Biog. s. v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth. s. v.

POWERS, Hiriam, an American sculptor, son of a farmer, and the eighth of nine children, was born at Woodstock, Vt., July 29, 1803, and acquired the rudiments of education at a free district school. While still a boy, he went to Cincinnati, Ohio, where he became an apprentice to a clock-maker, and about the same time formed the acquaintance of a German sculptor, who taught him to model in plaster. Subsequently he was employed for several years making wax-figures, and fitting them with machinery, for the Cincinnati Museum, where his Infernal Regions horrified thousands of visitors. It is a hideous scene representing hell filled with terrible figures, moved by machinery, and acting the supposed agonies of the damned. In 1835 he went to Washington, where he executed the busts of several distinguished persons. By the aid of Mr. Nicholas Longworth, he went to Florence, Italy, in 1837, to continue his art-studies. He resided in that country until his death, which took place at Rome, June 27, 1873. In 1888 Powers produced his statue of Erie, which excited the admiration of Thorwaldsen. His other works were of a secular character, but they gave him great renown. See H. F. Lee, Familiar Sketches of Sculpture and Sculptors (Boston, 1854, 2 vols. 12mo), vol. ii, ch. xxvii; Tuckerman, Book of the Artists, s. v.; Living Age, Oct. 1847.

POWERS, Jesse K., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in the county of Albemarle, Va., June 8, 1801. In May, 1826, while engaged in teaching a classical school, he was converted, and united with the Methodist Episcopal Church. Shortly after he joined the travelling connection, at the session of the Virginia Conference (held at Raleigh in February, 1829). In 1829 he was admitted into full connection and ordained deacon, and in 1832 was ordained elder. He was a plain, faithful, earnest minister of the Gospel, always conscientiously discharging the duties of a Methodist preacher. Being unencumbered with a family, he readily and cheerfully entered on whatever field of labor was assigned him, and everywhere endeared himself to the people whom he served by his unaffected and consistent piety. For upwards of twocentury years he gave full proof of his ministry. In the latter part of his life, through affectionate regard for his welfare, and in consideration of his infirmities, his brethren of the Conference placed him on the list of supernumeraries; but so anxious was he to be in the regular pastoral work that he appealed to the Conference to place him among the effective men, and he was appointed to the New Kent Circuit; but the work was beyond his strength; he soon began to fail in health, and died March 1, 1869. See Minutes of Annual Conferences of the M. E. Church, South, 1869, p. 303.

POWERS, John B., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born May 16, 1814, in Union District, S. C.; as a boy, removed to Alabama, and shortly after was converted; and, feeling called of God to preach the Gospel, accepted license in 1845. In 1856 he entered the itinerant ranks of the Alabama Conference, and was appointed to the Weewakalee Circuit. He filled successively the Harpersville and the Mount Vernon circuits. In 1861 he entered the Confederate army in command of a company. His health failed, however, and in 1863 he was mustered out. He was present at the Jasper Conference in 1867, and served the Elyton Circuit, 1868-69, the Murfree's Valley Circuit, 1870, the Joleneboro Circuit. In 1871 he was appointed to the Monticello Circuit, but died March 30. He was a conscientious and pious man. His administration as presiding elder was marked by promptness and great faithfulness in the discharge of all the duties pertaining to his office. His broad common-sense and acquaintance with men gave him wisdom in council. As a preacher, he had great control over the emotions of men, and was eminently successful in seasons of revival. See Minutes of Annual Conferences of the M. E. Church, South, 1871, p. 565.

POWATI is the name of a Chinese divinity signifying contentment.
four poya days in each month. 1. The day of the new moon. 2. The eighth day from the time of the new moon. 3. The day of the full moon. 4. The eighth day from the time of the full moon. It is said by Prof. H. Wilson that the days of the full moon are sacred and full secrets of the Hindus; but according to the institutes of Manu the sacred books are not to be read upon these days.

Poydras, Julien, an American philanthropist of French descent, who flourished in the early days of our republic, and was first delegate to Congress from the territory of Orleans (1809-12), gave $20,000 for the founding of a French orphan asylum, and left $20,000 for a college at Point Coupée, La. He died there Jan. 25, 1824.

Poynet (or Pouet), John, an English prelate of the Reformation period, was born about 1516 in Kent- shire. He enjoyed a distinguished education, learned Italian and Flemish, was proficient in mathematics, and constructed in his youth a clock the complicated machi- ney of which was the admiration of Henry VIII's court. He graduated at King's College, Cambridge; was made doctor of theology and chaplain of archbishop Cranmer. At the age of thirty-three he was appointed bishop of Rochester (1549). In 1551 he succeeded at Winchester the deposed Gardiner, and was appointed to take a share in the redaction of the new code of ecclesi- astical laws. He was indebted for these distinctions to his zeal for the cause of reform; he defended it in the pulpit and in his books, and explained its doctrines in his Catechism, adopted under the name of "King Edward's Catechism." At Mary Tudor's accession to the throne he repaired to foreign parts, either dreading perse- cution for having had a share in Wyatt's Rebellion, or because he had been deprived of his see for having married. He died April 11, 1556, at Strasburg. He is spoken of as a man of great erudition and eminent piety. In his theology he was a decided Calvinist. Other works of his are, Defence for Marriage of Priests (1550, 8vo);—Short Treatise of Polite Power (1556, 8vo; reprinted 1639 and 1642)—and De Eucharistia (1557, 8vo). See Strype, Life of Cranmer; Dod, Church History; Fuller, Worthies of England; Milner, History of Winchester, i, 346; Lecky, History of Rationalism, ii, 174; Hook, Eccles. Biography, viii, 158; Col- lins, Hist. of England (see Index in vol. viii).

Poszi, Giovanni Battista, a Milanese painter who flourished in the latter part of the 16th century, was employed by Sixtus V in the palace of St. John of Lateran and in the library of the Vatican. In the Sistine Chapel he painted the Visitation of the Virgin and the Angel appearing to St. Joseph in his dream; in 11 Gesi, a Choir of Angels. He died in the pontificate of Sixtus V, aged twenty-eight, deeply lamented as the most promising young artist of his time. He was considered the Guido of his day; and had he survived to the time of the Caracci, it is impossible to say what degree of perfection he might have attained.

Poszi, Stefano, an Italian painter, born at Rome in the 18th century, studied first under Carlo Maratti and afterwards with Agostino Masucci. Lanzi says he was more noble in his design than Masucci, and more natural and vigorous in his coloring. He acquired considerable distinction, and executed several works for the churches at Rome, one of which, an altar-piece, repre- senting the Death of St. Joseph. In the pontifical palace of Monte Carlo is a fine picture by him representing St. Gregory. He died in 1768.

Porso, Andrea, an eminent painter and architect, was born at Trent in 1642. While studying at Milan he fell into company and became extremely dis- solute, until, disgusted by his course of life, he joined the Society of the Jesuits, who placed him under the

instruction of Scaramuccia. Afterwards, at Rome and Venice, he studied design and color, and the works of Raffaelle and other great masters. His oil and fresco works at Rome, Genoa, and other places gained him the reputation of one of the ablest artists of his time. His pictures are composed in grand style, and he is excelled by few artists in perspective and architecture, the principles of which he perfectly understood, and published a treatise on them. Among his best works in oils are, St. Francesca Borghia, in the church of Il Gesu at Rome; the Wise Men's Offering, at Vieno, and four pictures from the life of Christ, in the church at Genoa. The ceiling of the church of St. Ignazio at Rome is regarded as one of the ablest productions of his time, be- cause of its animated execution. As an architect he gained some distinction, and executed, among other works, the altar of St. Ignazio in the church of Il Gesu at Rome, which is said to be the richest altar in all Eu- rope. He died at Venice in 1702.

Pracrat, in the Indian mythology, one of the revelations of divinity as the supreme original being, and especially as the cause of all phenomena of change in the visible world. Hence Pracrat is the essence of the three gods Brahma, Vishnu, and Siva; he is three- colored, because he is creative like Brahma (red); conser- vative like Vishnu (white); and destructive like Siva (black). Pracrat, in consequence, is also the being which unites and separates these three divinities, as through him there is a perpetual vicissitude of life and death, of birth and annihilation.

Pracriti is the by-name of Parvati, the wife of the Indian god Siva; it means Nature. The Hindus make of her the wife of the destroyer, because, according to them, all life originates in death, there being no destruction, no. annihilation, in the universe. The word: matter only describes, in the course of its dura- tion, an eternal circle, in which it undergoes a perpetual change of forms, while its substance remains the same.

Practical Religion is that department of practi- cal theology which aims at the promotion of Christian practice, and the writings which are brought out to contribute to such an end are called Practical Works. They are from their very nature of a more temporary character than any other theological productions. Gen- erally speaking, they are, and must be, adapted to the peculiar circumstances of their own age; they must be specially addressed to correct its present infirmi- ties; they must pre-eminently promote those parts of the Christian character which are least cultivated. Such as are founded on a deep knowledge of human nature, and animated with genuine piety, must indeed benefit other ages, since human nature remains essentially the same; but their most direct influence belongs to the age in which they are written. Subsequently they may often form individuals: transfigured into their minds, they are reproduced in other shapes, but are themselves withdrawn from circulation. Their body perishes; while the soul which gave it life migrates into another and an- other frame, and thus continues often to diffuse an ex- tensive blessing, when the very name under which they originally appeared is forgotten. See Pusey, Historical Inquiry, p. 11-180. See also Practical THEOLOGY; RELIGION; THEOLOGY. (J. H. W.)

Practical Theology is one of the departments of theology, and aims principally at the treatment of the functions of Church life. For centuries the term was abused and confused, and the sphere of practical theology in the organism of theological science was an ill-understood question until the proper conception of its nature and life was given by that master-mind of German theology, Schleiermacher; and, thanks to his clear-sightedness, practical theology is no longer to be conformed with a dilated, popularized edition of scientific theology "for students incompetent to learn the theoretical core" (Pius IX). But, if it any longer unite a synonym of Christian ethics or pastoral theology, but
PRACTICAL THEOLOGY

it has taken its place in the circle of theological sciences as an independent department, co-ordinate with exegetical, historical, and systematic theology.

The Church religion presents itself to the student under four aspects—as a divine revelation, as a history, as a system of doctrines and duties, and, finally, as a corporate life. As now the department of exegetical theology embraces all those sciences which in any way treat of the Holy Scriptures; that of historical theology, at any wish of sacred or Church history; that of systematic theology, all which set forth the doctrinal and ethical systems of Christianity; so practical theology comprehends all the practices and hourly needs of the Church, and as such this department embraces the subordinate sciences of Church government, edification, and worship. It includes and covers such special branches as Pastoral Theology, Homiletics, Catechetics, Christian Pedagogics, etc. Being the science of the collective functions of the Church regarded in its unity, it is able to give due attention and prominence to each of those functions—the regulative, the educational, and the edifying, a thing impossible, under the old-fashioned arrangement [see THEOLOGY], to compass within the limits of a Pastoral Theology (q.v.). Says Dorn, "It is since the idea of the Church, and of her relations and institutions, has been most clearly recognised that practical theology, which was formerly for the most part an aggregate of rules and regulations without any organic connection between its several precepts, has been reconstructed. Nitzsch's practical theology, in particular, brings forward its connection with the other branches of theology. Systematic theology, which is based upon exegetic theology and faith, and developed by the history of doctrines, exhibits Christian truth in the abstract, and therefore the idea of faith and practice. Historical theology, finishing with the constitution of the present state of the Church, sets the empirical reality and its defects over against this ideal. The contrast between the two, the variance between the ideal and the real, produces the effort to reconcile this opposition by means of theological usages, in conformity with the requirements of the age. Thus practical theology, as a science, owes its origin to the ecclesiastical procedure of the times; and, as this is necessarily technical, practical theology is also a technical study." Schleiermacher called practical theology the crown of a theological course of study, and, as we have already said, was the first to bestow upon it a scientific organization. In this labor he was laudably followed by theologians of the most diverse schools, as, e.g., Roman Catholic Von Drey, Protestant Nitzsch, Hegelian Marheineke, etc. The newly emerging Hegelianism, painted by Herder, and such other noted men as Ehrenfeuchter, Mo1, Palmer, and Schweitzer. Most are agreed in describing practical theology as a science for the clergy, and thus not doing full justice to the vocation of the believing laity in Church work. Their rights in this respect have chiefly been made apparent by the hitherto much neglected theory of Church government, and by voluntary associations for domestic missions. On the other hand, the just notion that, since the Church's existence and increase are brought about by constant reproduction, it is necessary to start from the origin of the Church in individuals, to proceed to their gathering together, and thence to the Church, may be designated as the prevailing tendency in the construction of a practical theology. Hence the theory of missions (called also Hütten) and especially the aim of which is a preparation for confirmation, form the first or main division. The second embraces the doctrine of worship, or of the construction of the public services of the Church (liturgies, with hymnology and sacred music and homiletic), the superintendence of the spiritual interests of individual members, the organization of the Church (the pastoral office); while the organization of the Church, and the entire system of Church law, by which the activity, whether of the individual or of the community, must be limited, form a third division. See Nitzsch, Praktische Theologie; Dornier, Geschichte der protestantischen Systematik. Christiane's Biblical Assistant, p. 498; and especially Moll, Das System der praktischen Theologie (Halle, 1864, 8vo), which is a compendious but very systematic and thorough treatise, covering the whole field of practical theology as now understood. See also M'Clintock, Encyclopaedia and Methods of Church History, 2nd ed. (London, 1864, 8vo), p. 159 sq. The German support a Zeitschrift für praktische Theologie, which is printed at Leipsic and has a wide circulation.

Prades, Jean Martin de, a French theologian, was born about the year 1720 at Castel-Sarrasin. He was destined to the ecclesiastical career, studied first in the country, then went to Paris and lived there in several seminaries, among others in that of Saint-Sulpice. He became acquainted with the authors of the Encyclopédie, and furnished several articles to their work. He came into repute by a thesis which he defended at the Sorbonne for the doctorate of theology (Nov. 18, 1751). It contained the boldest assertions concerning the nature of the soul, the origin of good and evil, the origin of society, natural and revealed religion, the miracles, etc. His parallel of the cures performed by Jesus and those of Escorial was chiefly noticed particularly because this thesis was condemned forthwith by several prelates and by pope Benedict XIV. The Sorbonne, after having at first approved it, reconsidered its action, and declared it impious. Parliament ordered the arrest of the author at the request of the advocate-general, M. d'Ormesson, whereupon De Prades fled to Holland (1752), and there published his Apology (1752, 3 pts. 8vo), to which Diderot added a reiteration of a mandement of the bishop of Auxerre. Voltaire recommended Prades to the king of Prussia, who appointed him his lector, and bestowed upon him the order of merit and two cannons, one of them the other at Glogau. The bishop of Breslau finally prevailed upon him to retract solemnly the principles he had defended (April 6, 1754). He became archdeacon of the chapter of Glogau. He died in 1782. Prades left, besides, an Abrégé de l'histoire ecclésiastique de France (Berlin, 1767, 2 vols. small 8vo), supposed to be translated from the English, and to which Frederick II wrote a preface.—Hoefel, Nouv. Biog. Générale, s. v. See Brotier, Examen de l'Apologie de l'Abbé de Prades (1755); Fellner, Diet. Hist. s. v.; Jervis, Hist. of the Church of France, vol. i, p. 329-334.

Pradler, Jacques, a Swiss artist of note, was born at Geneva in May, 1792; went as a youth to Paris, and finally to Rome, where he studied for over five years, especially under Canova. He devoted himself principally to sculpture, and produced some remarkable works. In 1819 he settled at Paris, and died there in 1858. Satyrs, Bacchantes, Venuses, and the like, make up principally the list of his works; but he also devoted himself to sacred subjects, and produced, among others, a colossal figure of Christ on the Cross, a Pietà (now at Toulon), a Marriage of the Virgin (for the Madeleine, Paris), a Sainte Marie, a Virgin (for the Church of Avignon), etc. One of his greatest works is the tomb of Napoleon I at the Hôtel des Invalides in Paris. See Mrs. Clement, Handbook of Sculptors, Painters, etc., s. v.

Pradžapati is, in the Hindu mythology, the embodied creative desire of the original Being, or of that manifestation of this Being which includes the earthly elements.

Prado, Blas de, a Spanish painter, was born at Toledo in 1854. He was a pupil of Francisco Comontes. Philip II sent him to Morocco, where he painted the emperor Malay-Abdallah, his favorites, his children, and principal officers. He returned to Spain a wealthy man. But, after the abolition of the feud customs, and showed himself in public dressed in the Moorish attire, the Inquisition summoned him before his tribunal. He was
discharged on condition of painting exclusively religi-
ous subjects. He died about 1605. Prado is distinc-
tively gifted by the purity of his design and the majesty of his compositions, which are simple, but carefully worked out. He was a favorite of the Spanish court. He died at Madrid, in the royal palace, an Assumption; A Virgin with the Child; St. Anthony; St. Blasius; St. Maurice; A Dancer from the Cross; St. Catharina. At Toledo, St. Blasius, bishop; St. Anthony; The Presentation; A Holy Family (in the monastery of Guadalupe), etc.—Hoefner, Nova Biog. Gén. de, s. v. See Palomino, El Museo Pictórico (Cordova, 1718, 3 vols.); Quillet, Dict. des Peintres Espag., s. v.; Mrs. Clement, Handbook of Sculptors, Painters, etc., s. v.

Pradt, Dominique Dupouy né, a French prelate and diplomatist, was born at Allanche, in Auvergne, April 23, 1759. He studied for some time at the military school, but gave the preference to the ecclesiastical career, and gained in 1786 the degree of doctor of theo-

Pradis, see Pradis.

Præfend. See PRÆFEND.

Prebendary. See PREBEND.

Precentor. See PRECENTOR.

Preconies (i.e. heralds) is a name sometimes given to deacons, because it was their duty to pronounce the usual formulary of exhortation, etc., during the cele-
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Grand-Duché de Varsovie (Paris, 1815, 1826, 8vo). In this amusing and witty composition he holds a review over the personages of the empire with uncommon satir-

Praetor. See PRÆTOR.

Praetorius (i.e. preferred), in the larger sense of the word, is the name of all higher officers of the Church with whose functions is connected a jurisdiction in their own name—jure ordinario—i.e. a jurisdiction belonging essentially to the office, not conferred by a higher dignitary of the Church. In this meaning of the word we distinguish between prælati primi generis and second-

Praetorius de, a German prelate and diplomatist, was born at Weissenburg, in Bavaria, January 30, 1747. He entered the monastery of St. Gall, and was ordained a priesthood in April 1768. He proceeded to Rome, and was made a canon of the church of St. Peter's in 1770. He was consecrated bishop of Salzburg in 1785. He died at Munich, October 21, 1809. He was a learned man, and wrote a great many works on various subjects. He was a close friend of Mozart, and was one of the founders of the Academy of Sciences at Vienna. He was also a great patron of the arts, and was one of the most influential men of his time. His name is commemorated in many streets and squares throughout Europe. His works include a great many on music, and he is remembered as a great patron of the arts. He is also remembered for his great kindness to the poor, and for his efforts to promote education. He was a man of great character, and his influence was felt throughout Europe. His name is remembered as a great example of kindness and generosity.
In a more restricted sense, praestat is the name given to the local superiors or deans of the congregations and abbeys of many ecclesiastical orders, especially to those who enjoy, either by privilege or tradition, the right of wearing the pontifical insignia.

_Praestitutus_ nullius dioeceseos, Cima titolo di abbati o altri dignitari che non sono ammissibili alla giurisdizione di un vescovo, e quindi non sono autorizzati a detenere i privilegi della giurisdizione, che i vescovi o papi concesionano loro in virtù di un decreto pontificio. Il termine è usato quando un vescovo o un papa concede una certa autorità a un suo rappresentante, come un vescovo o un abate, per esercitare una certa responsabilità ecclesiastica. Il termine è stato sovente usato in letterature storiche e canoniche.

Prepositus is a term used in English canon law as well as British common law to designate a species of offence of the nature of a contempt of the ruling power, for which encausation was passed, and was called from the mandamus rules with which the writ directing an officer to perform his duty is analogous.

The different statutes of premonstrates were originally framed in order to restrain the encroachments of the papal power. They begin with the 27 Edward III, st. 1, c. 1, and continue from that period down to the reign of Henry VIII, when the kingdom entirely renounced the authority of the Roman pontiff. The exorbitant powers exercised by the pope in presenting to benefices and in other ecclesiastical matters, and the privileges claimed by the clergy, who resisted the authority of the king’s courts, and recognized no jurisdiction but that of the court of Rome, rendered some enactments absolutely necessary to uphold the law of the country and the independence of the nation. This, then, is the original meaning of the offence termed premonstrata—viz., introducing a foreign power into the land, and creating an imperium in imperio by paying that obedience to the papal process which constitutionally belonged to the king alone. Its penalties have been subsequently applied to other heinous offences, some of which bear more and some less relation to this original offence, and some no relation at all, as a chapter refusing to elect as bishop the person nominated by the sovereign, neglecting to take the oath of allegiance, transgressing the statute of habes corpus (by 6 Anne, c. 7), the asserting by preaching, teaching, or advisedly speaking that any person other than according to the Acts of Settlement and Union has any right to the British throne, or that the sovereign and parliament cannot make laws to limit the descent of the crown.

The knowledge and willfully solemnizing, assisting, or being present at any marriage forbidden by the Royal Marriage Act is declared by 12 George III, c. 11, to infer a praestitutio. The penalties for the offence are no less than the following, as shortly summed up by Sir E. Coke (1 Inst. p. 129): "That from the conviction the defendant shall be out of the king’s protection, and his lands and tenements, goods and chattels, forfeited to the king, and that his body shall remain in prison during the king’s pleasure, or (as others have it) during life."

The offender can bring no action nor recover damages for the most atrocious injuries, and no man can safely give him comfort, aid, or relief. (See Baxter, Ch. Hist. p. 291; Hartlib, Hist. of the Ref. p. 187, 361.)

In very recent times the dissenters have laboured for the abolition of the statute of premonstrare (see London Globe, Nov. 1869).

Prepositus, Pietro, an Italian theologian, who flourished near the opening of the 15th century, was a native of Cremona, taught theology in the schools of
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loances to ecclesiastics given otherwise than as benefi-
cial revenue for ecclesiastical duties, or to laymen even
for ecclesiastical services, are no prebends in the canonic
 mooii (f. 1, 14, 8). Philo
expressly says that the palace, which had lighthore been
Herod's, was named the "Exaiaia" or "the house of the praetors" (Legat. ad Caes. [ed. Franc.], p. 1083). It was situated on the western or more elevated
hill of Jerusalem, overlooking the Temple (Josephus,
Ant. xx, 8, 11), and was connected with a system of forti-
fications the aggregate of which constituted the mo-
xxvii, 27 the common version renders the same word
common koll; in Phil. i, 13, palace; in John xviii, 28,
koll of judgment; and elsewhere, once in the same verse
in Acts xix, 35, judgment koll. It is plainly one of the many Latin words to be
found in the New Testament [see Latinisms], being the
word praetorium in a Greek dress, a derivative from
praetor; which latter, from prose, "to go before," was
originally applied by the Romans to a military officer;
but because the Romans subdued many
countries and reduced them to provinces, and governed
them afterwards, at first by the generals who subdued
them, or by some other military commanders, the word
praetor came ultimately to be used for any civil governor of a
province, or even the governor in the Antonian
period; not; and who acted in the capacity of chief-justice, hav-
ing a council associated with him (Acts xxv, 12).
Accordingly the word praetorium, also, which originally
signified the general's tent in a camp, came at length to be
applied, as a praetor's residence, to the public places in pro-
cities and cities (Cicero, Verr. ii, v, 12); and being prop-
erty an adjective, as also is its Greek representative, it was
used to signify whatever appertained to the praetor or
governor; for instance, his residence, either the whole
or any part of it, as his dwelling-house, or the place
where he administered justice, or even the large enclosed
court at the entrance to the praetorium residence (By-
nes, De Morte Juei Christi [Amsterd. 16956], ii, 407).
There dwelt not only the commandant and his family
(Josephus, Ant. xx, 10, 1), but a division of the troops
occupied barracks there; and the prisoners who awaited
hearing and judgment from the chief were there de-
tained (Acts xxiii, 35).

The praetorium in the capital of a province was usually a large palace; and we see by
Josephus (War, ii, 14, 8; comp. xv, 6; Philo, Opp. ii, 281) that the procurators of Judaea, when in Jerusalem, occupied a praetorium near the palace of King Herod, or a former royal residence served the same purpose.

The rendering of the Latin praetorium in general by the word palace (by Schleusner and Wahl) is wrong. The places in Susetinae misquoted refer only to the imperial praetorium, the residence of the emperor, and resided in the domus praetoria, which belonged to king
Hiero (Cicero, Verr. ii, 5; xii, 31). See JERUSALEM.

1. As to the passages in the Gospels referred to above,
tradition distinguishes the judgment-hall of Pilate,
which is pointed out in the lower city (Korte, Reisen,
p. 71; Troilo, p. 112), from the palace of king Hiero
and others have believed (as Rosenmüller, Alterth. ii, 229) that the procurator took up his quarters in Jerusa-
lem in the tower of Antonia, and set in judgment there.
The tradition has no weight; yet on general grounds we may believe, since the palace of Herod stood vacant
and was rooney and suitable, that the procurators usually
resided there, surrounded by a body-guard, while the
troops with their officers occupied the tower of Antonia
(comp. Faber, Aeham-bogey, i, 281 sq.). A description of
that marble palace of justice, which joined the north
wall of the upper city, and was so well enclosed and well forti-
sed, is given by Josephus (War, v, 4, 4; comp. Ant. xv, 6,
3). The Roman procurators, whose ordinary residence
was at Cæsarea (Acts xxiii, 25, etc.; xxv, 1, etc.), took
up their residence in this palace when they visited Je-
rusalem, or at least when on the road, or in the
area or before. Thus Josephus states that Florus
took up his quarters at the palace (iv ruris bæxovii
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when the despotic authority of the Roman officers might be exercised with moderation. But such a state of things also afforded constant opportunities to an unprincipled officer to extort money under the pretense of a loan, as the price of exemption from personal services which he was competent to insist upon, or as a bribe to buy off the prosecution of some vexatious charge before a military tribunal (Matt. v. 42; Luke iii, 14). See ANAN.

The relation of the military to the civil authorities in Jerusalem came out very clearly from the history of the Crucifixion. When Judas first makes his proposition to betray Jesus to the chief-priests, a conference is held between them and the στρατηγοὶ as to the mode of effecting the object (Luke xxii, 4). The plan involved the assembling of a large number of the Jews by night, and Roman jealousy forbade such a thing, except under the surveillance of a military officer. An arrangement was accordingly made for a military force, which would naturally be drawn from the Antonia. At the appointed hour Judas comes and takes with him "the troops" (called τὴν στρατιάν, although of course only a detachment from the cohort), together with a number of police (στρατιέραι) under the orders of the high-priests and Pharisees (John xviii, 8). When the apprehension of Jesus was at hand, they furnished any reference to the presence of the military. Matthew and Mark altogether ignore their taking any part in the proceeding. From Luke's account one is led to suppose that the military commander posted his men outside the palace, that he accompanied himself with the Jewish authorities (xxii, 52). This is exactly what might be expected under the circumstances. It was the business of the Jewish authorities to apprehend a Jewish offender, and of the Roman officer to take care that the proceeding led to no breach of the public peace. But when apprehended, the Roman officer became responsible for the custody of the offender, and accordingly he would at once chain him by the wrists to two soldiers (Acts xxii, 86) and carry him off. Here John accordingly gave another glimpse of the presence of the military: "the troops then, and the chiefarch and the officers of the Jews, apprehended Jesus, and put him in bonds, and led him away, first of all to Anna's" (xxvii, 12). The insults which Luke mentions (xxvii, 63) are apparently the barbarous sport of the ruffianly soldiers and police while waiting with their prisoner for the assembling of the Sanhedrin. The details that are the most striking are those with the vine-stick, which the centurions carried, and with which they struck the soldiers on the head and face (Juvénal, Sat. vii, 247), not a flagellation by the hands of lictors. When Jesus was conveyed from the Antonia to the Praetorium, and Pilate, the Jewish officials certainly expected that no inquiry would be made into the merits of the case, but that Jesus would be simply received as a convict on the authority of his own countrymen's tribunal, thrown through into a dungeon, and on the first convenient opportunity executed. They were and were assured at the question, "What accusation bring ye against this man?" and at the apparition of the governor himself outside the precinct of the praetorium. The cheapness in which he had held the life of the native population on a former occasion (Luke xiii, 1) must have led them to expect a totally different course from him. His scrupulousness, most extraordinary in any Roman, stands in striking contrast with the recklessness of the commander who proceeded at once to put St. Paul to torture, simply to ascertain why it was that so violent an attack was made on him by the crowd (Acts xxvi, 24). Yet this latter is undoubtedly a typical specimen of the feeling which prevailed among the conquerors of Judea in reference to the conquered. The order for the execution of a native criminal would in ninety-nine instances out of a hundred have been given by a Roman officer, not a military act—wherein it is a common objection by the advocates of the crucifixion that the sentence was executed at any rate, such an explanation is more in accordance with what we know of the feeling prevalent among his class in that age. When at last Pilate's effort to save Jesus was defeated by the determination of the Jews to claim Barabbas, and he had testified, by washing his hands in the sight of the presence of the people, that he did not consent to the judgment passed on the prisoner by the Sanhedrin, but must be regarded as performing a merely ministerial act, he proceeded at once to the formal imposition of the appropriate penalty. His lictors took Jesus and inflicted the punishment of scourging upon him in the presence of all (Matt. xxi, 26). This, in the Roman idea, was the necessary preliminary to capital punishment, and had Jesus not been an alien his head would have been struck off by the lictors immediately afterwards. But crucifixion being the customary punishment in that case, a different course was necessary. The execution must take place by the hands of the military, and Jesus is handed over from the lictors to these. They take him into the praetorium, and muster the whole cohort—not merely that portion which is actually present, but the whole body on duty at the time. While a centurion's guard is told off for the purpose of executing Jesus and the two criminals, the rest of the soldiers divert themselves by mocking the reputed king of the Jews (Matt. xxvii, 28-30; Mark xv, 17-19; John xix, 2, 9). Pilate, who in the meantime has gone in, is being probably a witness of the pitiable spectacle. His wife's dream still haunts him, and although he has already delivered Jesus over to execution, and what is taking place is merely the ordinary course, he comes out again to the people to protest that He is passive in the matter, and that they must take the prisoner, there before their eyes in the garb of mockery, and crucify him (John xix, 4-6). On their reply that Jesus had asserted himself to be the Son of God, Pilate's fears are still more roused, and at last he is only induced to go on with the military execution, for which he is himself responsible, by the threat of a charge of treason against Caesar in the event of his not doing so (John xix, 7-18). Sitting, then, solemnly on the bema, and producing Jesus, who in the meantime has had his own clothes put upon him, he formally delivers him up to be crucified in such a manner as would be an act of mockery, an act of rule in the discharge of his duty to the emperor (John xix, 13-16). The centurion's guard now proceed with the prisoners to Golgotha. Jesus himself carrying the cross-piece of wood to which his hands were to be nailed. When they were, accordingly, sent to the execution, scourging, he is unable to proceed; but just as they are leaving the gate they meet Simon the Cyrenian, and at once use the military right of pressing (ἀγγαπάω) him for the public service. Arrived at the spot, four soldiers are told off for the business of the executioner, who, the remainder remaining with the crowd to be required to hold the hands, and a third the feet, while the fourth drove in the nails. Hence the distribution of the garments into four parts. The centurion in command, the principal Jewish officials and their acquaintances (hence probably John [John xviii, 15]), and the nearest relatives of Jesus (xix, 26, 27), might naturally be admitted within the corona—a square of perhaps one hundred yards. The people would be kept outside of this, but the distance would not be too great to read the title, "Jesus the Nazarene, the King of the Jews," at any rate to gather its general meaning. The whole acquaintance of Jesus, and the women who had followed him from Galilee—too much afflicted to mix with the crowd in the immediate vicinity, and too numerous to obtain admission inside the corona—looked on from a distance. However, from the corona a small vanguard (John xix, 29) was set within the corona for the benefit of the soldiers, whose duty it was to remain un-
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des arms (Matt. xxvii, 38) until the death of the prisoners, the centurion in command being responsible for their not being taken down alive. Had the Jews not been anxious for the removal of the bodies, in order not to shock the eyes of the people coming in from the country on the following day, the troops would have left the prisoners under simple supervision. As their place was supplied by others until death took place. The jealousy with which any interference with the regular course of a military execution was regarded appears from the application of the Jews to Pilate—not to the centurion—to have the prisoners despatched by breaking their legs. For the performance of this duty other soldiers were detailed (John xix, 32), not merely permission given to the Jews to have the operation performed. Even for the watching of the sepulchre recourse is had to Pilate, who bids the applicants “take a guard” (Matt. xxvii, 65), which they do, and put a seal on the stone in the presence of the soldiers, in a way exactly analogous to that practiced in the custody of the sacred robes of the high-priest in the Antonia (Josephus, Ant. xv, 11, 4). See Crucifixion.

2. The prætorium in Rome, mentioned in Phil. i, 13, where Paul lay imprisoned, has occasioned much discussion among the interpreters, and formed the theme of a learned dispute between Jac. Perizonius and Ulrich Huber (see Perizonius Cum U. Hubero Disquisitio de Praetorio [Lugd. Bat. 1595]). It was not the imperial palace of Rome, nor was it, as some think, the residence of the praetorius, the imperial body-guard, the prætorius cohors, which had been built for it by Tiberius, under the advice of Sejanus (Sueton. Tib. 37). Before that time the guards were billeted in different parts of the city. It stood outside the walls, at some distance short of the fourth milestone, and near either to the Salarian or the Numantian road that Nero, in his flight by one or the other of them to the house of his freedman Phaon, which was situated between the two, heard the cheers of the soldiers within for Galba. In the time of Vespasian the houses seem to have extended so far as to reach it (Tacitus, Ann. iv, 2; Sueton. Ner. 48; Pliny, H. N. iii, 5). From the first, buildings must have sprung up near it for quarters and other purposes. An opinion well deserving consideration has been advanced by Wieseler, and by Conybeare and Howson (Life of St. Paul, ch. xxvii), to the effect that the prætorium in which Paul was imprisoned was a part of that detachment of the Praetorian Guards which was in immediate attendance upon the emperor, and had barracks in Mount Palatine. Thither, wherever the place was, Paul was brought as a prisoner of the emperor, and delivered to the effect of the imperial custom (Acts xxviii, 16; see Pliny, Ep. x, 65; Philostr. Soph. ii, 32), as the younger Agrippa was once imprisoned by this officer at the express command of the emperor Tiberius (Josephus, Ant. xvii, 6). This office was then filled by Aurelius Burchus Afrasianus, Annal. xiii, 42; see Anger, Temp. Act. Ap. p. 100 sqq.). Paul appears to have been permitted for the space of two years to lodge, so to speak, “within the rules” of the prætorium (Acts xxviii, 30), although still under the custody of a soldier. See Otho, Tropoq. des idem Jerusalem, § iii, p. 3; Perizonius, De Origine et Significante et Usu Vocab. Praetoriae et Praetorii (Frank. 1690); Svorius, De Prætorio Pilati in Ezevrit. Phil. (Hag. Com. 1774); Zorn, Opuscula Sacra, ii, 639. See FACL.

Pragaladén, a particular and holy worshippers of the Hindú god Vishnu, who was for a long time tortured by the devils in the wilds, until Vishnu, appearing in his fourth incarnation, as man-lion, killed the giant. See Vishnu.

Pragmatic Sanction was a general term from poiyona, business) for all important ordinances of Church of State—those perhaps more properly which were enacted in public assemblies with the counsel of eminent jurists or pragmatickis. The term originated in the Byzantine empire, and signified there a public and solemn decree by a prince, as distinguished from the ordinary simple rescript or放过 which was the answer to a question propounded by an individual. But the most familiar application of the term is to the important articles decided on by the great assembly held at Bourges (q. v.) in 1438, convoked and presided over by Charles VII. These articles have been regarded as the great bulwark of the French Church against the encroachments of the Roman Church and of the pope. King Louis IX had drawn up a pragmatic sanction in 1268 against the encroachments of the Church and court of Rome. It related chiefly to the right of the Gallican Church with reference to the selections of bishops and clergy. But the great articles of 1438 entirely superseded those of Louis IX; for though they reasserted the rights and privileges claimed by the Gallican Church under that monarch, the articles were chiefly founded on the decrees of the Council of Basle. Some of them relate to the periodical assembling and superior authority of the gallican councils, and to the celebration of divine offices and other matters not connected with papal prerogation; but of the rest it has been truly said that the abuses of the papal prerogation against which they were directed were chiefly connected with the invocation of the holy see, and was at the bottom of more than half the grievances which alienated its children from it. Pope Pius II succeeded in obtaining the abrogation of this sanction for a time; but the Parliament of Paris refused to sanction the ignominious conduct of Louis XI in setting aside, and he was compelled to restore it to its original influence position. Accordingly the pragmatic sanction continued in force till Francis I concluded in 1516 supplanted it. Although by the concordat privileges were given and received on both sides, yet the real advantages were on the side of Rome, which advantages it has ever since been her constant aim to improve. See Jervis, Hist. Ch. of France, i, 23 sq.; Hist. of Popery, p. 202; Gieseler, Eccles. Hist. (see Index to vol. iii); Fisher, Hist. of the Ref. p. 48, 49; Mosheim, Eccles. Hist. vol. iii; Milman, Hist. Latin Christianity (see Index to vol. viii); Hardwick, Hist. of the Church in the Middle Ages, p. 272, 358, 362; id. Ref. p. 7, 538; Waddington, Eccles. Hist. p. 576; Hanke, Hist. of the Popery, i, 28 sq.; Alzog, Kirchengesch. ii, 48, 160, 189, 191; Ebeling, Joynynge. iv, 200; Brit. Quart. Rev. Apr. 1873, p. 332 sqq.

Prague. COUNCIL OR (Concilium Propositis), an important ecclesiastical gathering, was convened by archbishop Ernest of Prague in 1346, and passed among other regulations one relating to the proper observance of the Christian faith, the abuses arising from the use of rescripta from Rome, the impropriety of allowing strange priests to assist at cominations without letters from their own bishop, the rights of Roman delegates upon subjects of interdicts, and the private life and morals of the clergy. (See Mann, Concil. iii, col. 548 sqq.; Heffele, Concilienkunde, vol. vi.) How little these efforts for the purifying of the Church and strengthening of the Christian observances were at the time proposed is but too well known to the historical student of the Hussite movement which followed in the next century and finally brought about many strong reforms in Bohemia, besides preparing the way for the great Reformation. See HusITES.

Praise, an acknowledgment made of the excellency or perfection of any person or action, with a commendation of the same as of some excellence. In the elegant writer, "is generally connected with all the finer sensibilities of human nature. It affords a ground on which exhortation, counsel, and reproof can work a proper effect. To be entirely destitute of this passion betokens an ignoble mind on which no moral impression.
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is easily made, for where there is no desire of praise there will also be no sense of reproach; but while it is admitted to be a natural and in many respects a useful principle of action, we are to observe that it is entitled to no more than our secondary regard. It has its benefits, but it must have a building up, a strengthening, a sanctification, if it is to be transformed from an innocent into a most dangerous passion. When, passing its natural line, it becomes the ruling spring of conduct: when the regard which we pay to the opinions of men encroaches on that reverence which we owe to the voice of conscience and the sense of duty, the love of praise, having got out of its proper place, instead of improving, corrupts, and instead of elevating, debases our nature.” See *Young, Love of Fame*; Blair, *Sermons*, vol. ii, ser. 6; Jortin, *Diss. No. 4* passim; Wilberforce, *Preach. Piece*, ch. iv, § 3; Smith, *Theory of Moral Sent*. i, 233; Fosbroke, *Letters*, No. 18.

Praise of God is a reverent acknowledgment of the perfectness, works, and benefits of God, and of the blessings flowing from them to mankind, usually expressed in hymns of gratitude and thanksgiving, and especially in the reception of the Holy Eucharist, that “sacrifice of spiritual fruit” of our joyful works, and which has received the name (συγκατάστασις) because it is the highest instance of thanksgiving in which Christians can be engaged. Praise and thanksgiving are generally considered as synonymous, yet some distinguish them thus: “Praise properly terminates in God, on account of his own excellencies and our own perfection, and is that act of devotion by which we confess and admire his several attributes; but thanksgiving is a more contracted duty, and imports only a grateful sense and acknowledgment of past mercies. We praise God for all his glorious acts of every kind that regard either us or other men—for his very vengeance, and those judgments which he sometimes sends abroad in the earth; but we thank him, properly speaking, for the instances of his goodness alone, and for such only of these as we ourselves are some way concerned in.” — Buck, *Theol. Dict.* See *Atterbury, Sermon on Psalms li, 14*; *Saurin, Sermons*, vol. i, ser. 14; *Tillotson, Sermons*, ser. 146 (conclusion). See *Thanksgiving*.

Praise-meeting, a meeting recently inaugurated in this country, first in New England, for a service of song by the congregation. The people gather, and, under the lead of some competent precentor, unite in a service which is widely, or almost wholly, musical, and in which all participate.

Pray Mogla is, in the mythology of the Siamese, a celebrated disciple of Sommacodon, their great saint and protector. His statue, which represents two bodies, is often found beside the statue of his master. He was so compassionate and benevolent that he attempted to extinguish the fire of hell by turning the earth upside down, and gathering in his hand all burning things he found; but the fire destined to punish the lost for their sins was so violent that it burned to ashes everything that was near, and dried up rivers and seas. In his distress Pra Mogla recurred to his master and himself. The saint could easily have fulfilled his wishes, but he feared lest mankind, free from that satanic terror, should fall into greater depravity, and the fire was suffered to keep burning. The wisdom of the god was admired, but the love of the disciple was memorialized by numberless images and statues.

Pra Nas, in Hindo mythology, the breath, the vital principle, which dwells in every man, and has its seat in the heart; it is the divine principle of motion that spreads everywhere life and activity, through which alone the whole nature can subsist, and which manifests itself in the animal world by the act of breathing.

Pra Nasla, a sect among the Hindoos which was originated by Pra Nas, who, being versed in Mohammedan as well as Hindo learning, endeavored to reconcile the two religions. With this view he composed a work called *The Mahajiridgul*, in which texts from the Koran and the Vedas are brought together, and shown not to be essentially different from each other. Bundelkund is the chief seat of the sect, and in Panina they have a building for the propagation of their sect, and the ancestors of this sect are buried under a great tree covered with gold cloth, lies the volume of the founder. “As a test of the disciple’s consent,” says Prof. H. H. Wilson, “to the real identity of the essence of the Hindo and Mohammedan creeds, the ceremony of the initiation consists of eating in the society of members of both communities.” The ceremony, however, in the love of the general principle, it does not appear that there are two classes confound their civil or even religious distinctions; they continue to observe the practices and ritual of their forefathers, whether Mussulman or Hindo, and the union, beyond that of community or that of eating, is no more than any rational individual of either sect is fully prepared for, or the admission that the God of both and all religions is one and the same.”

Pra Nasla, a name for *driving* among the Lithuanians, which, according to immutable laws, directs the gods, nature, and men, and whose power knows no limit.

Pra Rasi, in the mythology of the Siamese, hermits who live in complete seclusion, and, by many years of a contemplative existence, have acquired a knowledge of the most remarkable mysteries of nature. Those mysteries are described on the wall which encircles the world, and hence the name Rasi is derived, their knowledge. Thus they possess the secret of flying, of assuming any form at their pleasure, of making precious metals, etc. As they know also the means of giving their body indefinite duration, they could enjoy eternal life; yet every thousand years they undergo the sacrifice of their life by burning themselves on a heap of wood, with the exception of one, who awakens the saints again to renewed life. There are religious writings which indicate the means of getting to these hermits, but it is said to be a very dangerous enterprise.

Pratenia, Felix, is noted as the famous editor of the *editio princeps* of Bomberg’s Rabbinc Bible. Little is known of his personal history beyond that he was born a Jew, was corrector of the press in Bomberg’s famous printing-office, embraced Christianity in Rome in 1518, was a Benedictine, master theologian, and died in Venice in 1589. The Rabbinc Bible, which immortalized him, was published in four parts (Venice, 1516–17) four years after his embracing Christianity; and, besides the Hebrew text, contains as follows: 1. In *The Pontifex*, the Chaldee paraphrase of Onias. 2. In *The Commentaries of the Recepta*. 2. In *The Prophecy*, the Chaldee paraphrase and the commentaries of Kimchi. 3. In *The Hagiographa*, the Chaldee paraphrase and Kimchi’s commentary on *The Psalms*, the Chaldee paraphrase and the Chaldee paraphrase and Kimchi’s commentaries on *Job*; the reputed Chaldee paraphrases of Joseph the Blind and Rashi’s commentary on *The Fire Megiloth*; Levi ben-Gershom’s commentary on *Daniel*; Rashi’s and Simon Darshan’s (יוסף ירושמוי) commentary on *Exodus*, *Nehemiah*, and *Chronicles*, the latter consisting of excerpts from the Jalkut Shimoni. See *Cara*, *Midrash*, *Appendix to the volume*, the Targum Jerusalem on the Pentateuch, the Targum on Esther, the variations between Ben-Asher and Ben-Nachthali, the differences between the Eastern and Western Codes, Aaron b.-Asher’s Dissertation on the Accents, Maimonides’s thirteen articles of faith [see *Mishneh Torah*], six hundred and thirteen precepts [see *Precepts*], a Table of the Parboth and Hapharthoth, both according to the Spanish and German ritual. Considering that this was the first effort to give some of the Masoretic apparatus, it is no wonder that the work is imperfect, and that it contains many blunders. Pratenia also
published a Latin translation of the Psalms, with annotations, first printed at Venice in 1515, then at Ha-
zenau in 1522, and at Basel in 1526. See Wolf, Biblio-
theke Hebraica, ii, 383, iii, 393 sqq.; Masch's ed. of
Le Long's Bibliotheca Sacra, i, 96 sq.; Steinheilner,
Catholic Lit. Heb., in Bibliotheca Bodlensis, col. b.
2111 sq."

Praet, Francisco-Maria, an Italian ecclesiastic,
noted especially as an antiquarian, was born November,
1689, at Capua. He received holy orders, and was at
once provided with a canonry at the Cathedral of Capua.
He died at Naples Nov. 29, 1705. Among his archae-
ological works was a description of the Appia riconstruita
et descritta da Roma a Brindisi (Naples, 1745, 4to); this
work is ornamented with plans and maps, and is full of
varied erudition:—Di una Moneta singolare del Tiranno
Giovanni (ibid. 1748, 8vo); explanation of a medal, the
only one of its kind, of a usurper who was proclaimed
emperor in 423.—De La Origine della Metropoli ecclesi-
astica di Capua (ibid. 1758, 4to). Praetii published an
edition, enriched with unpublished documents, disserta-
tions, and a life of the author, of the History Principium
4to). He also wrote De la Vita di S. Gregorio, Princes, in
6 vols. See Nomi illustri del Regno di Na-

Praetorius, Abdiades, a German theologian of some
renown, was born in 1524 in the Brandenburg territory.
He was master of many languages, and especially noted
as a Greek scholar. He was at first rector of a school at
Martenburg, and then at Frankfurt-on-the-Oder, where he
was called in 1569 to the electoral court of Brandenburg,
and died in 1573 as professor of philosophy at Witten-
berg. He attacked the Lutheran distinction between
law and Gospel, and the definition of the latter as an
unconditional message of grace. The most distin-
guished of his adversaries was Andrew Musculus, one
of the authors of The Formula of Concord.

Praetorius, Stephen, a German minister, flour-
ished at Salzwedel towards the close of the 16th cen-
tury. He was involved in various disputes in conse-
quence of some doctrines professed or approved by Lu-
ther, or which seemed to him logical conclusions to be
drawn from Luther's theory of justification. He as-
serted that between righteousness and beatitude there
was no difference; that every man who received bap-
tism and believed in Christ was saved, and could dis-
 pense with seeking the means to be saved; that the law
was useless; that faith and justification obtained by
it could be darkened and blemished by sin, but never
lost. John Arnd, the Fénélon of the Lutheran Church,
published a collection of the writings of Praetorius, and
Martin Statius (1655), minister at Dantzig, edited ex-
tracts from them under the title Geistliche Schatzkam-
mer der Glaubigen.

Pratt, Albert L., a minister of the Methodist
Episcopal Church, was born at Wilmington, Vt., in 1828,
and was converted and joined the Methodist Episcopal
Church in 1851. He was licensed as a local preacher in
1853. In 1855 he was received into what was then the
Oneida but is now the Central N. Y. Conference, and
was stationed successively at Union Village, Bella-
wa Falls, Brattleborough, Guilford, Woodstock, Bradford,
Rochester, Windsor, and Colchester, where he finished
his earthly work. Though constitutionally frail, his
pastoral labors were prosecuted with great diligence un-
til his death occurred (July 17, 1876), at Gor-
chester, Vt. He was a good man, and succeeded well
in the cause of his master.

Pratt, Almon Bradley, a Congregational min-
ister, was born in North Cornwall, Conn., June 8, 1812,
receiving his preparatory training at South Cornwall,
Conn., and then entered Yale College. He was not,
however, able to complete his collegiate studies, as his
health failed him. From 1839 to 1841 he was at the
Union Theological Seminary in New York City. April
13, 1852, he was ordained as evangelist at Geneseo,
Mich., and acted in that place as pastor until 1865, when
he removed to Flint, Mich. In 1868 he was called
again to the work, and accepted the pastorate at Berea,
Ohio. In 1878 he was made districting pastor at Camp Creek,
Nebraska, and there he died, Dec. 28, 1875. See The Con-

Pratt, Enoch, a Congregational minister of some
note, was born at Middleborough, Mass., in 1781, and
was educated at Brown University, where he graduated
in 1803. He taught for a while and studied theology,
and was finally called to the pastorate of the Con-
gregational Church at West Barnstable, Mass., and held this position until 1837. He never took another
pastorate, but preached and wrote occasionally. He devoted himself principally to secular historical studies, especially local subjects, and published in 1844 a Complete History, Ecclesi-
astical and Civil, of Eastham, Wellfleet, and Orleans,
Massachusetts (Yarmouth, 8vo). He died at Brewster
Feb. 2, 1860.

Pratt, James C., an Irish Wesleyan minister of
some note, was born in Queen's County, Ireland, in 1780.
His parents were respectable members of the Church of
England, and he was in 1806 converted, and joined the Wesleyans. He was licensed to preach in
1804, and four years later was accepted by the Con-
ference as a travelling preacher and appointed to the
Ballinafemail Circuit, in 1809 to Lisburn, in 1810 to
Carrickfergus, and in 1811 to the city of Armagh, etc.
He continued to travel regularly as a preacher, with
"zeal, acceptation, and usefulness," until 1842, when he
took a supernumerary relation and settled in Emniskil-
len, where he had been twice before stationed. In 1846
he removed to Wexford; but as several of his children
had settled in New York, he decided to retire to this
country, and obtained full permission from his Con-
ference, held in Dublin in 1848, to emigrate. He came
here in the fall of that year, and for nearly twenty-two
years resided in different places in this country, adorn-
ing by his holy life the religion of his country, and
loved so well to preach. He died at Jersey City March
11, 1875.

Pratt, Job, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal
Church, was born about 1790, and was admitted in 1814
a member of the New England Annual Conference. At
the organization of the Maine Conference he joined that
body, and served as its secretary until his death, which
occurred at Rumford Feb. 22, 1838. Mr. Pratt was a
generally acceptable preacher.—Minutes of Conferences,
n.ii, 216.

Pratt, John Bennett, LL.D., a Scottish Episco-
opal clergyman, antiquarian, and author, was born in the
parish of New Deer in 1791. He took the degree of
M.A. at Aberdeen, and, after his ordination as deacon
in 1821, was sent to Stuartsfield, where he served with
acceptance four years, and was then chosen as pastor of
St. James's Church, Cruden. There he became widely
known for his theological learning, literary accomplish-
ments, and professional zeal, and received from bishop
Skinner the appointment of examining chaplain. He
was a writer of several volumes, among which are,
Old Paths—Where is the Good Way? (Oxford, 1840)—
Buchan, with illustrations (Aberdeen, 1856)——The Dra-
nice (London, 1861)——Letters on the Scandinavian Churches,
their Doctrine, Worship, and Polity, and several Ser-
mons.

PraxeanS is the name of a sect of Monarchians, so
called after PraxeanS, the originator of their views. The
heretical tenet that there is no distinction of persons in
the Godhead, coupled with the acknowledgment of a
divine nature in Jesus, leads logically to the conclusion
that the Father was incarnate and suffered. Hence,
although he himself shrank from the inference, Praxeas is reckoned with the Patrarians. He did not form a schismatical party. Philaster states that the Sabellians, called also Patrarians and Praxeans, were cast out of the church by Victor, but what is the Holy Gospels in all this from this that Praxeas himself was excommunicated.

Our knowledge of Praxeas is derived almost entirely from Tertullian's treatise against him. Augustine, as well as Philaster, names him and his followers under the heresy of Sabellius and, excepting from Tertullian, we have only the bare mention of his name as a heretic. From Tertullian it appears that he went to Rome from Asia, and the words of Tertullian, "oconomiai intelligere nousant etiam Graeci," appear to contain reference to his nation. It is probable that he learned his heresy from a school in Proconsular Asia which produced Noetus (q. v.). If Praxeas held his heresy while in Asia, he can scarcely have been, as he is often said to have been, a Montanist. There was a connection between the later Montanists and the Sabellians; but the earlier Montanists were free from Sabellianism. Tertullian's words imply no more than that Praxeas had in Asia become acquainted with the character of Montanist pretensions and doctrine. See Montanism. In Asia Praxeas had suffered imprisonment ("de justificatione martyrii infanis, ob solum et simplex et breve careceris tanta punitione,"--Tertull., Adv. Marci, c. 17), and with the credit attaching to a confessor he preached his false doctrine at Rome. Whether the doctrine met with resistance, toleration, or favor is not told, but that Praxeas's endeavors to propagate it had but little effect we are entitled to infer from the silence of Hippolytus. There is, however, very great difference of opinion regarding this point: Gieseler says that Praxeas appears to have been unmolested in Rome on account of his doctrine (Compendi, i, 218); Newman, that he met with the determined resistance which honorably distinguishes the primitive Romans (The Ante-Nicene Fathers, ii, p. 313); and Millam, that the indignation of Tertullian at the rejection of his Montanist opinions urged him to array the pope, with what justice, to what extent, we know not, as having embraced the Patrarian opinions of Praxeas (Hist. of Lat. Christianity, 1, 49 [ed. 1867]). The two latter mention, as if inclined to the former, Beausobre's supposition that, in the words of the continuator of the De Prasc. Haret., "Praxeas quidem herearim introduxit, quam Victorinus corruere curavit, sed redit Vincit, Praxeas Victoria in vitam". One may be rather inclined to substitute Zeuxippos. The Refutation of Heresies was called forth by this very controversy, and Hippolytus details carefully the tenets of Noetus, and the action of the bishop of Rome with regard to them. Had Praxeas prepared the way the way for Noetus and the Church for Noetus, his influence would surely have been given, whereas all that can be said is, that in the separate tract against Noetus the opening words will include, but without naming, disciples of Praxeas joining Noetus. It is easy to suppose that Victor, discovering the heresy of Prax

ea, and not wishing, for his own sake, to disgrace one upon whose information he had acted, and by whom perhaps he had been influenced in the matter of the Montanists, quietly sent Praxeas from Rome. From Rome Praxeas went into Africa. (We take "hic quoque" in Tertullian's "Herculeavget avenae Praxenae; hic quoque superemine," etc., to mean Carthage; and that Tertullian speaks of himself in "per quem traducet," etc.) The date at which Praxeas arrived at Rome, and the length of his stay there, are not accurately known, but was probably after 201. Before Tertullian became a Montanist (Tertull., Adv. Prax. c. 1). Different dates, from A.D. 199 to 205, are assigned for this latter event. The history of the Montanists is best understood by supposing Praxeas to have been at Rome in Victor's time, and the date of Tertullian's Montanism to have been some time after 205. In such a case there is no dispute, probably with Tertullian, acknowledged his error, and delivered to the Church a formal recantation. But he returned again to his errors, and Tertullian, now a Montanist, wrote his tract in confusion of them.

Praxeas taught that there is only one divine Person, that the Church is the Holy Ghost in person, by concealing the Holy Ghost in person, as the Church is the Holy Ghost in person. He applied the titles which in Holy Scripture are descriptive of deity to the Father alone; and urged particularly the words from the Old Testament, "I am God, and before me there is no god," and from the New Testament the expressions, "I and my Father are one," "He who hath seen me hath seen the Father," "I am in my Father, and my Father in me." While Tertullian unhesitatingly charges Praxeas with holding Patrarian tenets as necessarily following from his principles, Praxeas himself appears not to have gone so far. "Ergo nec compassus est Pater Filii; sic enim directam blasphemam in Patrem ventrit, diminui carnem modo sperant, concedendo et velut duos esse; si Filii quidem patitur, Pater vero comparrit. Stulti et in hoc. Quid est enim compati, quum cum alio pati? Porro, si impassibilia Pater, utique et incompassibilia. Aut si compassibilia, utique passibilia" (Tertull., Adv. Prax., c. xxix). The complicity of the Church in the matter is apparent, in the example of the Praxeans, the second and altered position which Monarchians are obliged to assume when pressed by the difficulties of their original position. It is shown, as Tertullian remarks, that they are driven to conclusions involving the elements of Gnosticism. The Prax

ea, when confronted on all sides on the distinction between the Father and the Son, distinguished the Person of Jesus from the Christ. They understood "the Son to be flesh—that is, man—that is, Jesus; and the Father to be spirit—that is, God—that is, Christ." Thus Tertullian testifies that the Father and the Son are one and the same do in fact now begin to divide them rather than to unite them. Such a monarchy as this they learned, it may be, in the school of the Valentinian (ibid. c. xxix). Now this separation of Jesus from Christ was common to all the Gnostics. They were unanimous in denying that Christ was born. Jesus and Christ were to them two separate beings, and the son Christ descended upon Jesus at his baptism. The difference between them and the Praxeans appears to be that they would not say that Jesus is the Son of God, whereas the Gnostics are represented as arguing from the angel's words to Mary that the holy thing born of her was the flesh, and that therefore the flesh was the Son of God. Tertullian shows in opposition to them that the Word was incarnate. In the second stage, we have Jesus called the Son of God, solely, it will follow, on account of a miraculous birth: Christ, or the presence of the Father, residing in Jesus: Jesus suffering, and Christ (=the Father) impassibilia et compasstibilia. In ecclesiastical language the Gnost

ic doctrine is easily bridged over; and we have the cause of the comparisons and identifications that are often made of Sabellianism with Gnosticism. See Monarchians.

The heresy of the Praxeans, as distinguished from that of Noetus, did not make much progress. It was almost unknown in Africa before the time of Optatus (i, 37). See Schaff, Church Hist. vol. i; Neander, Church Hist. vol. ii: id., Hist. of Dogmas, i, 161; Gieseler, Eccles. Hist. (see Index in vol. iii); Baur, Dreieinigkeitslehre, 245—254; Liddon, A.D. 200, 124; I. Modern, Ancient Church, p. 455; Alzog, Kirchgesch. i, 192; Procrustes, Church Hist. (Hermes), p. 139 sq.; Kaye, Tertullian, p. 493 sq.; Millam, Hist. of Latin Christianity, i, 70; Ueberweg, Hist. of Philos. i, 308; Mommsen, Commentary on Eccles. Hist. (see Index in vol. iii); Lardner, vol. iii; Fausset, R., in Fas. See also note on Praxeas hel

l, Works, vol. vj; Biblical Repository, v, 393; and
PRAXEAS. See PRAXEANS.

Prazenes, Sr., was an early convert to Christianity, according to some accounts, of the apostle Peter; but this is, of course, very doubtful, since we do not even know whether Peter was ever at Rome. The acts of his life are so surrounded by traditions as to be almost entirely devoid of trustworthiness; but from these we learn that she was the daughter of St. Pudentianus, a Roman senator, and sister of St. Pudentiana (q. v.). According to the legendary account, Prazenes, with her sister Pudentiana, devoted herself, after Peter had suffered martyrdom, to the relief and care of the suffering Christians, and to the burying of the bodies that were slain in the persecutions. They had the assistance of a holy man named Pastorus, who was devoted in their service. They shrank from nothing that came in the way of their self-imposed duties. They sought out and received into their houses such as were torn and mutilated by tortures. They visited and fed such as were in prison. They took up the bodies of the martyred ones which were cast out without burial, and, carefully washing and shrouding them, they laid them reverently in the caves beneath their houses. All the blood they collected with sponges, and deposited in a certain well. Thus boldly they showed forth the fact that they were in them, and yet, according to the most trustworthy accounts, they escaped persecution and martyrdom, and died peacefully and were buried in the cemetery of Priscilla. Pastorus wrote a history of their deeds and virtues. Their house, in which the apostle is reported to have preached, was consecrated as a place of Christian worship by pope Pius I. Their churches are among the interesting remains of ancient Rome. In the nave of the church of Santa Prassede is a well, in which she is said to have put the blood of those who suffered on the altar of Sulpicius, while the holy sponges were placed in silver shrine in the sacristy. In the church of St. Pudentiana there is a well, said to contain the relics of 800 martyrs. In Christian art they have frequently been made the subject of the painter's brush, and the two sisters are usually represented together, richly draped. The sponge and cup are their especial attributes. They are commemorated on the days on which they are supposed to have died—July 21 and May 19, A.D. 148. See Schiff, Church History, vol. ii; Butler, Lives of the Saints. (J. H. W.)

Praxidice, a surname of Persephone among the Greeks. For a later period she was accounted a goddess who was concerned with the jurisdiction of justice to the human family. The daughters of Ogyges received the name of Praxidice, and were worshipped under the figure of heads of animals.

Praxiphanes (Πραξιφάνης), a Periatic philosopher, was a native either of Mytilene (Clem. Alex. i, 365, ed. Pottier) or of Rhodes (Strabo, xiv, 655). He lived in the time of Demetrius Poliorcetes and Ptolemy Lagi, and was a pupil of Theophratus, about B.C. 892 (Proclus, i, in Timaeum; Thesprot, Ad Iesiod. Op. et Dea, 1). He subsequently opened a school himself, in which Epicurus is said to have been one of his pupils (Diog. Laert. x, 13). Praxiphanes paid special attention to grammatical studies, and is hence named along with Aristotle as the founder and creator of the science of grammar (Clem. Alex. L. c.; Bekker, Anecdota, ii, 229, where Πραξιφάνης should be read instead of Τέλεμαρχος, ib.). The writings of Praxiphanes appear to have been lost, but have no historical interest today. See Preller, De disputato Praxiphanei Periatici inter antiquissimos grammaticos nobilis (Dorpat, 1842).

Pray, George, a Hungarian Jesuit, noted as a historian, was born at Pressburg in 1724. In 1740 he entered the Society of Jesus, taught in several of their schools, and bore an important part in all the suppression of his order, historiographer of the kingdom of Hungary, and conservator of the library of Buda. In 1790 he obtained a canonry at Grosswardein. He died near the close of the 18th century. Pray wrote, Annales veteres Hungariorum, Avarorum et Hungarorum ad annum Christi, MDCXCVII (Vienna, 1761, fol., followed by Supplements, ibid. 1762, fol.).—Annales veterum Hungarorum ad annum Chr. MDLXIV deducti (ibid. 1764–70, 5 pts. fol.).—De sacra destera divi Stephanii Hungariae regis (ibid. 1771, 4to).—De Ladalacii Hungariae regis (Peith, 1774, 4to).—De Solamone regis et Emersonico duce Hungaricae (ibid. 1774, 4to).—Scriptores Hierosolimitani et Romanenses, complectens seriem chronologicae archiepiscoporum et episcoporum Hungariae, cum diecresiis delineatione (Pressburg, 1778, 4to).—Index librorum rariorum bibliothecae universitariae Buduensis (Buda, 1780–81, 2 pts. 8vo).—Historia regum Hungariae, cum notitias ad coequumam veterum regum status (ibid. 1800–1, 3 pts. 8vo).—Nouus, Biog. Générale, s. v. See Horanyi, Memoria Hungarorum, vol. iii; Luca, Getthe, Oesterreich; Rotermund, supplement to Jöcher, Getthe, Lexikon, s. v.

Prayer. The words generally used in the O. T. are יְדַעַת, ἐπιθυμία (from the root תָּפֵּס, "to incline," "to be gracious," whence in Hiph. "to entreat grace or mercy;" Sept. generally, ἐπιθυμεῖ, Vulg. "deprecatio"); and יְפַלָּת, ἐπιθύμητα (from the root תָּפֵּס, "to judge," whence in Hiph. "to seek judgment;" Sept. προσέρχεται; Vulg. nortio). The latter is also used to express intercessory prayer. The two words point to the two chief objects sought in prayer, viz. the prevalence of right and truth, and the gift of mercy. A very frequent formula for prayer in the O. T. is the phrase יְדַעַת לְנָשֶׁגְתָה, סְבָלָה נִשְׁגְּתָה; to call upon the name of Jehovah. The usual Greek term is ἐπιθυμεῖ, which originally signified only a wish; but ἐπιθυμεῖ, to beg (properly to want), is a frequent expression for prayer.

1. Scriptural History of the Subject.—1. That prayer was coeval with the fallen race we cannot doubt, and it was in all probability associated with the first sacrifice. The first definite account of its public observance occurs in the remarkably expressive recorded in the lifetime of Enos, the son of Seth: "Then began men to call upon the name of the Lord." (Gen. iv, 26). From that time a life of prayer evidently marked the distinction between the pious and the wicked. The habit was maintained in the chosen family of Abraham, as is evident from frequent instances in the history of the Hebrew patriarchs. Moses, however, received no specific commands with reference to this part of religious service (comp. Spanheim, Ad Callimich. Pallad. p. 189; Creuzer, Symboli i, 164 sq.), and prayer was not by law interwoven with the public worship of God among the Hebrews (but comp. Deut. xxvi, 10, 18, and the prayer of atonement offered by the high-priest, Lev. xvi, 23). We do not know whether, before the exile, prayer was customarily joined with sacrificial offerings (Habid, i, 490 sq.; Odyg. xiv, 428; Lucian, Dea Syr. 57; Curtius, iv, 18, 15; Pliny, H. N. xxi, 8; see lambich, Mystere, v. 38). Yet, at the return from the Babylonian captivity, those prayers in which the Lord had appeared in Mount Moriah, or those prayers addressed to the Lord in the wilderness, or of which Moses was a special medium, were not recognized (comp. Otho, Lex. Rab. p. 164). An extraordinary instance of public prayer occurs in 1 Kings viii, 22. We see that prayer as a religious exercise, in the outer court of the sanctuary, though not expressly commanded, was yet supposed and expected. (Psa. cxii, 2; Rev. vii, 9; Psal. xxvi, 4, 6, 12, 17; Jer. xxiii, 1; see also Bähr, Symbolik, i, 461 sq.) As private devotion prayer was always in general use (comp. Isa, i, 15; Credner, On Joel, p. 192, supposes from Joel ii, 16, and Matt. xviii, 8; xix, 14; Psa. viii, 9, that especial virtue
PRAYER was ascribed to the prayers of innocent children; but without ground). After the time of the exile prayer came gradually to be viewed as a meritorious work, an opus operatum. Prayer and fasting were considered the two great divisions of personal piety (Tob. xii, 9; Jud. iv, 12). It was customary to offer prayer before eating meals (Exod. xix, 1; 2 Chron. ix, 40; Hiad. ix, 172; xxiv, 308; Pythag. Carmen Astr. 48); as in war before a battle (1 Macc. v, 38; xi, 71; 2 Macc. xxv, 26; comp. viii, 29). Three times a day prayer was repeated (Dan. vi, 11; comp. Psal. iv, 18; Tom. ix, 4, in Schöttgen, § 47, 419); namely, at the third hour (9 A.M., Acts ii, 15, the time of the morning sacrifice in the Temple); at mid-day, the sixth hour (12 M., x, 9); and in the afternoon, at the ninth hour (3 P.M., the time of the evening sacrifice in the Temple); comp. Dan. ix, 21; Josephus, Ant. xiv, 4, 8; see also Acts iii, 1; x, 80; Thilo, Apocr. i, 826; Schöttgen, Op. cit. p. 418 sq.; Wettstein, ii, 471). Compare the three or four fold repetition of songs of praise by the Egyptian priests each day (Porphy. Arg. iv, 8). The Mohammedans, too, are well known to have daily hours of prayer, either usual, too, before or after eating. The utter form of prayer or thanks (Matt. xi, 36; John vi, 11; Acts xxvii, 35; Philo, opp. ii, 481; Porphyry. Abstinent. iv, 12; see Kunoir, De precum ante et post comedam op. Judeos et Christ. faciendum venere, antiquitate, etc. [Lips. 1764]). The Pharaonic and Egyptian saves to this day. The formers, indeed, made a display of this form of devotion (Matt. vi, 5, and humored their own conceit by making their prayers very long. See Pharaonic. Permanent forms of prayer were already customary in the time of Christ (Luke xii, 1), perhaps chiefly the same which are contained in the Mishna, Berachoth (comp. Pirke Aboth, ii, 13). The Lord's Prayer, too, has several, though not very important, agreements with the forms in the Talmud (see Schöttgen, i, 180 sq.; Vir- tingers, De Synagog. vi. p. 302; Otho, Lex. Jud. p. 582; Tholuck, Brengprecht, p. 387 sq.). Private prayer was practiced by the Israelites chiefly in retired chambers in their houses (Matt. vi, 6), especially in the "upper room" (Dan. vi, 11; Judith viii, 5; Tob. iii, 12; Acts i, 18; x, 9), and on the roof. If in the open air, an emi- nence was sought for (Matt. xvi, 22; Mark vi, 46; Luke vi, 12; comp. 1 Kings xvi, 42). The inhabitants of Jerusalem were fondest of going to the court of the Temple (Luke xviii, 10; Acts iii, 1; comp. Isa. iv, 7; see Amos. Adu. Gen. vi. 4; Lakemacher, Antiq. Gr. Sacramentum, 255, by that hour of prayer in the street stood there and said prayer on the spot. In every case the face was turned towards the holy hill of the Temple (Dan. vii, 2; 2 Chron. vii, 4; 5 Esdr. iv, 58; Mishna, Berach. iv, 5), but by the Samaritans to Gerizim. In the court of the Temple the face was turned to the Temple Habitat (1 Kings viii, 38), to the Holy of Holies (Psal. vi, 8; see Thilo, Apocr. i, 29). Thus the Jews praying then faced the west, while the modern Jews in Europe and America face the east in prayer. It was an early custom among Christians, too, to turn the face to the east in praying (Orig., Hom. 5, in Num., in Op. ii, 284; Clem. Alex. Strom. vii, 724; comp. Tertul. Apol. xvi). The Mohammedans turn the face towards Mecca (Rosen- miller, Morgen. 11, 501). The usual posture in prayer was standing (1 Sam. i, 26; 1 kings vii, 22; 2 Kings, xx, 20; Matt. vi, 5; Mark xi, 25; Luke xvi, 11; comp. Hiad. xxiv, 308 sq.; Martail, xii, 77, 2; Al Koran, v, 8; Mishna, Berach. v, 1; Philo, opp. ii, 481; Wettstein, i, 821). But in earnest devotion, bending the knee, or actual kneeling, was practiced (2 Chron. xi, 18; 1 Kings xvi, 39; 2 Kings v, 2; Josh. xi, 40; the body was even thrown to the ground (Gen. xxiv, 26; Neh. viii, 6; Judith ii, 1; Matt. xxi, 89). The hands before prayer must be made clean. Says the Mishna, He that prays with unclewed hands commits deadly sin (Sokar Deut. f. 101, 427; comp. 1 Tim. ii, 8; Odys. ii, 261; Clem. Alex. Strom. iv, 581; Chrysost. Hom. 48, in 1 Cor.). The hands were then, in standing, often lifted up towards heaven (1 Kings viii, 22; Neh. viii, 7; Lam. ii, 19; iii, 41; Psal. xxxvii, 2; cxxxviii, 2; 2 Macc. iii, 20; 1 Tim. ii, 8; Philo, opp. ii, 481, 534; Hiad. i, 409; Virgil, Aen. iii, 38; Horace, Od. viii, 29, 13; 1 Cor. x, 10; 2 Cor. vii, 14); comp. Senec. Ep. 41; Wettstein, ii, 528; Doughtaiy. Anec. iii, 185); sometimes were spread out (Ios. i, 15; Ezra ix, 5); and in humble prayers of penitence were laid meekly on the breast, or sometimes the breast was struck with them (Luke xviii, 13). It was peculiar to prayer that was dropping the head beneath the breast (Psal. xxxvii, 18), or between the knees (1 Kings xvii, 42). This was done in great sorrow. The former is still customary among the Mohammedans (see the figs. in Reland's De Relig. Mus. p. 87). See Attitude. Extensive treatises on the kinds of prayer, and their order and conduct, are given in the Mishna (treatise Berachoth) and the double Gemara (in German by Rabe [Halle, 1777]; see also Otho. Lex. Rab. p. 537 sq.). One species of prayer was intercession. Almost infallible virtue was ascribed to it when offered to it with great fervor, and the Song comp. Dioec. Sic. iv, 61; Apollod. iii, 12, 6; Gen. xx, 7; Exod. xxxii, 11 sq.; 1 Kings xviii, 20 sq.; Josephus, Ant. xiv, 2, 1; 2 Cor. i, 11; 1 Tim. ii, 1 sq.; Phil. i, 19). Hence it was common to request the prayers of others (1 Thees. ii, 25; 2 Thes. iii, 1; Heb. xii, 18; comp. Deelyng, Opp. vii, 25; Phil. ii, 1). See Prayer. The formers, indeed, made a display of this form of devotion (Matt. vi, 5, and humored their own conceit by making their prayers very long. See Pharaonic. Permanent forms of prayer were already customary in the time of Christ (Luke xii, 1), perhaps chiefly the same which are contained in the Mishna, Berachoth (comp. Pirke Aboth, ii, 13). The Lord's Prayer, too, has several, though not very important, agreements with the forms in the Talmud (see Schöttgen, i, 180 sq.; Vit-
The latter contains a recital of all God's blessings to the children of Israel from Abraham to the captivity, a confession of their continual sins, and a fresh dedication of themselves to the covenant. It is clear that both are likely to have exercised a strong liturgical influence, and accordingly we find that the public prayer in the Mosaic period was: 'The Lord be gracious unto thee, etc.' closed this service. Afterwards, at the offering of the meat-offering, there followed the singing of psalms, regularly fixed for each day of the week, or specially appointed for the great festivals (see Bingham, bk. xiii, ch. v, § 4). A somewhat similar liturgy formed a regular part of the synagogue worship, in which there was a regular minister, as the leader of prayer (Ῥόμπτερ Βασίλειον), and public prayer, as well as private, was the special object of the Proseuche. It appears, also, from the question of the disciples in Luke xi, 1, and from Jewish tradition, that the chief teachers of the day gave special formal prayers to their disciples, as the badge of their discipleship and best fruits of their learning. See Forms of Prayer.

All Christian prayer is, of course, based on the Lord's Prayer; but its spirit is also guided by that of his prayer in Gethsemane, and of the prayer recorded by St. John (ch. xvii), the beginning of his great work of intercession. The first is the comprehensive type of the simplest and most universal prayer; the second justifies prayers for special blessings of this life, while it limits them by perfect resignation to God's will; the last, dwelling as it does on the knowledge and glorification of God, and the communion of love between himself and his people as the one object of prayer and life, is the type of the highest and most spiritual devotion. The Lord's Prayer has given the form and tone of all ordinary Christian prayer; it has fixed, as its leading principles, simplicity and confidence in our Father, community of sympathy with all men, and practical reference to our own life; it has shown, as its true objects, first the glory of God, and next the needs of man. To the intercessory prayer we may trace up its transcendental element, its desire of that communion through love with the nature of God which is the secret of all individual holiness and of all community with men.

The influence of these prayers is more distinctly traced in the prayers contained in the Epistles (see Eph. iii, 14-21; Rom. xvi, 25-27; Phil. i, 3-11; Col. i, 9-13; Heb. xiii, 20-21, 1 Pet. v, 10, 11, etc.) than in those recorded in the Acts. The public prayer, which from the beginning became the principle of life and unity in the Church (see Acts ii, 42; and comp. i, 24, 25; iv, 24-30; vi, 6; xii, 5; xiii, 2, 8; xvii, 25, xx, 36; xxii, 5), probably in the first instance took much of its form and style from the prayers of the synagogues. The only form given (besides the very short one of Acts i, 24, 25), dwelling as it does (Acts iv, 24-30) on the Scriptures of the O.T. in their application to our Lord, seems to mark this connection. It was probably by degrees that they assumed the distinctively Christian character.

Lastly, in the record of prayers accepted and granted by God, we observe, as always, a special adaptation to the period of his dispensation to which they belong. In the patriarchal period they have the simple and childlike tone of domestic supplication for the simple and apparently trivial incidence of life: 'pray for us.' Intercession for the welfare of Abraham for children (Gen. xv, 2, 8); for Ishmael (xvii, 18); of Isaac for Rebekah (xxv, 21); of Abraham's servant in Mesopotamia (xxvii, 12-14); although sometimes they take a wider range in intercession, as with Abraham for Sodom (Gen. xviii, 20-33), and for Abimelech (xx, 7, 17). In the Mosaic period they assume a more solemn tone and a national bearing, chiefly that of direct intercession for the chosen people, as by Moses (Num. xii, 2; xiii, 18; xxvi, 7); by Samuel (1 Sam. vii, 5, 19, 28); by David (2 Sam. xxiv, 17, 18); by Hezekiah (2 Kings xiv, 15-19); by Isaiah (2 Kings xix, 1, 2); by Daniel (Dan. x, 20, 21); or of prayer for national victory, as by Asa (2 Chron. xiv, 11): Jehoshaphat (2 Chron. xx, 6-12). More rarely are they for individuals, as in the prayer of Hannah (1 Sam. i, 12); in that of Hezekiah in his sickness (2 Kings xx, 2); the intercession of Samuel for Saul (1 Sam. xvi, 11, 25), etc. A special class are those which precede and refer to the exercise of miraculous power, as by Moses (Exod. viii, 12, 30, xv, 25); by Elijah at Zarephath (1 Kings xvii, 20) and Carmel (1 Kings xviii, 36, 37); by Elijah at Shunem (2 Kings iv, 38) and Dothan (vi, 17, 18); by Isaiah (2 Kings xx, 11); by St. Peter for Tabitha (Acts ix, 40); by the elders of the Church (James v, 14-16). In the New Testament they have a more directly spiritual bearing, such as the prayer of the Church for protection and grace (Acts iv, 28-30); of the Apostles for their converts (viii, 15); of Cornelius for guidance (x, 31); of the Church of St. Peter (xvi, 5); of St. Paul at Philippi (xvi, 25); of St. Paul against the thorn in the flesh answered, although not granted (2 Cor. xii, 7-9), etc. It would seem the intention of Holy Scripture to encourage all prayer more generally, especially intercession, for all relations and for all righteous objects. See Lord's Prayer.

II. Christian Doctrine on the Subject.—1. Prayer is a request or petition for mercies; or it is "an offering-up of our desires to God, for things agreeable to his will; or the name of Christ, by the help of his Spirit, with con-fession of our sins, and thankful acknowledgment of his mercies." Nothing can be more rational or consistent than the exercise of this duty. It is a divine injunction, so that men should always pray, and not fail (Luke xviii, 1). It is highly proper we should acknowledge the obligations we are under to the Divine Being, and supplicate his throne for the blessings we stand in need of. It is essential to our peace and felicity, and is the happy means of our carrying on and enjoying fellowship with God. It has an influence on our tempers and conduct, and evinces our subjection and obedience to God.

2. The object of prayer is God alone, through Jesus Christ as the Mediator. All supplications, therefore, to saints or angels are not only useless, but blasphemous. All worship of the nature of nature, however appropriate it may, is, idolatry, and is strictly prohibited in the sacred law of God. Nor are we to pray to the Trinity as three distinct Gods; for though the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost be addressed in various parts of the Scripture (2 Cor. xiii, 14; 2 Thess. ii, 16, 17), yet never as three Gods, for that would lead us directly to the doctrine of polytheism: the more ordinary mode the Scripture points out is to address the Father through the Son, depending on the Spirit to help our infirmities (Eph. ii, 18; Rom. viii, 28).

3. As to the nature of this duty, it must be observed that it does not consist in the elevation of the voice, the posture of the body, the use of a form, or the mere temporary use of words, nor, properly speaking, in anything of an exterior nature; but simply the offering up of our desires to God (Matt. xvi, 8). (See the definition above.) It has generally been divided into adoration, by which we express our sense of the goodness and greatness of God (Dan. iv, 85, 85); confession, by which we acknowledge our unworthiness (1 John i, 9); supplication, by which we pray for pardon, grace, or any special blessings we want (1 Pet. v, 7); intercession, by which we pray for others (James v, 15); and thanksgiving, by which we express our gratitude to God (Phil. iv, 6). To these some add invocation, a making mention of one or more of the names of God; pleading, arguing our case with God in a humble and fervent manner; dedi-
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oration, or surrendering ourselves to God; deprecation, by which we desire that evils may be averted; blessing, in which we express our joy in God, and gratitude for his mercies; but as all these appear to be included in the first five parts of prayer, they need not be insisted on. 4. The different kinds of prayer are, (1.) Ejaculatory, by which the mind is directed to God on any emergency. It is derived from the word *ejaculare*, to dart or shoot out suddenly, and is therefore appropriated to describe this kind of prayer, which is made up of short sentences, spontaneously springing from the mind. The Scriptures afford us many instances of ejaculatory prayer (Exod. xiv. 15; 1 Sam. i. 18; Rom. vii, 24, 25; Gen. xxiii, 29; Judges xi, 28; Luke xxi, 42, 43). It is one of the principal excellences of this kind of prayer that it can be practiced at all times, and in all places; in the public ordinances of religion; in all our ordinary and extraordinary undertakings; in times of affliction, temptation, and danger; in seasons of social intercourse; in worldly business; in travelling; in sickness and pain. In fact, everything around us, and every event that occurs, is an occasion for the ejaculation. It is worthy, therefore, of our practice, especially when we consider that it is a species of devotion that can receive no impediment from any external circumstances, that it has a tendency to support the mind, and keep it in a state of attention; that it is of great importance, in the salutary effects of the tempers and doctrines of the world; elevates our affections to God; directs the mind into a spiritual channel; and has a tendency to excite trust and dependence on Divine Providence.

(2.) Secret or closet prayer is another kind of prayer to which we should attend. It has its name from the manner in which Christ recommended it (Matt. vi. 6). He himself set us an example of it (Luke vi. 12); and it has been the practice of the saints in every age (Gen. xxviii, xxxii; Dan. vi, 10; Acts x, 9). There are some snares and dangers with the practice of this devotion, which may be practiced to advantage, as when we are entering into any important situation; undertaking anything of consequence; before we go into the world; when calamities surround us (Isa. xxxvi, 20); or when ease and prosperity attend us. As closet prayer is calculated to inspire us with peace, defend us from our spiritual enemies, excite us to obedience, and promote our real happiness, we should be watchful lest the stupidity of our frame, the intrusion of company, the cares of the world, the insinuations of Satan, the indulgence of sensual objects, prevent us from the constant exercise of this necessary and important duty.

(3.) Family prayer is also another part not to be neglected. It is true there is no absolute command for this In God's Word; yet, from hints, allusions, and examples we may learn that it was the practice of ancient saints—Abraham (Gen. xvii, 19), David (2 Sam. vi, 20), Solomon (Prov. xxii, 6), Job (i, 4, 5), Joshua (xxiv, 15). (See also Eph. vi, 4; Prov. vi, 20; Jer. x, 25; Acts x, 2, 50; xv, 15.) Family prayer, indeed, may not be essential to the character of a true Christian, but it is surely no honor to heads of families to have it said that they have no religion in their houses. If we consider what a blessing it is likely to prove to our children and our domestics; what comfort it must afford to ourselves; of what utility it may prove to the community at large; how it sanctifies domestic comforts and crosses; and what a tendency it has to promote order, decency, sobriety, and religion in general, we must at once see the propriety of attending to it. The objection often made that family prayer is a waste of time; but this is a very frivolous and silly objection to the time allowed for this purpose; need be but short, and may easily be redeemed from sleep or business. Others say they have no gifts; where this is the case, a form may soon be procured and used, but it should be remembered that gifts increase by exercise, and no man can properly decide unless he make repeated trials. Others are deterred through shame, or the fear of man: in answer to such, we refer them to the declarations of our Lord (Matt. x, 37, 88; Mark viii, 88). As to the season for family prayer, every family must determine for itself; but before breakfast every morning, and before supper at night, seems most proper. A quarter of an hour or twenty minutes may be sufficient as to the time.

(4.) Social prayer is another kind Christians are called upon to attend to. It is denominated social because it is offered by a society of Christians in their collective capacity, convened for that particular purpose, either on some peculiar occasion, or at stated and regular seasons. Special prayer-meetings are as such as are held at the meeting and parting of intimate friends, especially churches and ministers: when the Church is in a state of unusual deadness and barrenness; when ministers are sick, or taken away by death; in times of public calamity and distress, etc. Stated meetings for social prayer are such as are held weekly in some places which have a special regard to the state of the nation and churches; missionary prayer-meetings for the spread of the Gospel; weekly meetings held separately for the exclusive purposes of the congregation, at more particular reference to their own churches, ministers, the sick, feeble, and weak of the flock. Christians are greatly encouraged to this kind of prayer from the consideration of the promise (Matt. xxi, 20), the benevolence of the highest power. No people has more eminent primitive saints (Mal. iii, 16; Acts xii, 12), the answers given to prayer (Acts xi, 1-12; Josh. x; Isa. xxxvi, etc.), and the signal blessing they are to the churches (Phil. i, 19; 2 Cor. i, 11). These meetings should be attended with regularity; those who engage should study simplicity, brevity, Scripture language, seriousness of spirit, and everything that has a tendency to edification. We now come, lastly, to take notice of public prayer, or that in which the whole congregation is engaged, either in repeating a set form or acquiescing in the prayers of others to lead their devotions. This is both an ancient and important part of religious exercise; it was a part of the patriarchal worship (Gen. iv, 26); it was also carried on by the Jews (Exod. xxix, 48; Luke i, 10). It was a part of the Temple-service (Isa. lvi, 7; 1 Kings viii, 59). Jesus Christ recommended it both by his example and instruction (Matt. xxvii, 20; Luke iv, 16). The disciples also attended to it (Acts ii, 41, 42), and the Scriptures in many places countenance it (Exod. xx, 24; Psal. lxxi, 2, 11; Mal. i, 11; xxvi, 4, 11; xxvii, 4). Family prayer, Watts, On Prayer; Townsend, Nine Sermons on Prayer; Paley, Moral Philosophy, ii, 81; Mather, Student and Pastor, p. 87; Wollaston, Religion of Nature, p. 122, 123; Hannah More, On Education, vol. ii, ch. 1; Barrow, Works, vol. i, ser. 6; Smith, System of Prayer; Scamp, Sermon on Family Religion; Wallott, On Prayer. See Worship.

III. Philosophical Difficulties.—1. Scripture does not give any theoretical explanation of the mystery which attaches to prayer. The difficulty of understanding its real efficacy arises chiefly from two sources: from the belief that man lives under general laws, which in all cases must be fulfilled unalterably; and the opposing belief that he is master of his own destiny, and need pray for no external blessing. The first difficulty is even increased when we substitute the belief in a personal God for the sense of an impersonal destiny; since not only does the predestination of God seem to render prayer useless, but his wisdom and love, giving freely to man all that is good for him, appear to make it needless.

The difficulty is familiar to all philosophy, the former element being far the most important: the logical inference from it is the belief in the absolute uselessness of prayer. But the universal instinct of prayer, being too strong for such reasoning, generally exacted as a compromise the use of prayer for general things (the "men sana in corpore sano"); a compromise the-
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If we ask anything according to his will, he heareth us; and if we know that he heareth us, whatsoever we ask, we know that we have the petitions that we desired of him.

It is also implied that the key to the mystery lies in the fact of man's spiritual unity with God in Christ, and of the consequent gift of the Holy Spirit. All true and prevailing prayer is to be offered "in the name of Christ" (John xiv, 13; xv, 16; xxvi, 23-27), that is, not only for the sake of his atonement, but also in dependence on his intercession; which is therefore as a central influence, acting on all prayers offered, to throw off whatever in them is evil, and give efficacy to all that is in accordance with the divine will. So also is it said of the spiritual influence of the Holy Ghost on each individual mind, that while "we know not what to pray for," the indwelling "Spirit makes intercession for the saints, according to the will of God" (Rom. viii, 26, 27). Here, as probably in all other cases, the action of the Holy Spirit on the soul is to free agents what the laws of nature are to things inanimate, and is the power which harmonizes free individual action with the universal will of God. The mystery of prayer, therefore, like all others, is seen to be resolved into that great central mystery of the Gospel, the communion of man with God in the incarnation of Christ. Beyond this we cannot go. See PRAYER.

2. The discussion provoked by Prof. Tyndall's so-called "Prayer-test" (q.v.) has given a fresh interest to the question, How far are we entitled to expect the divine interference with the ordinary course of nature in answer to prayer? The question practically resolves itself into another and simpler one, Have miracles ceased in the present age of the Church? This latter is properly a question of fact; and it is very generally answered in the affirmative. The modern instances of miracle-working are too few and uncertain to warrant any other conclusion. And we have the objective evidence that, when we turn outward with claims to the power have sooner or later proved themselves miserable pretenders, and hence the world has justly abandoned all hope in this direction. Whether the power of working miracles was intended to be only a temporary grant to the apostolic age, and whether therefore it need have been lost out of the Church, is an entirely different question. For aught we can see, there is no limit set in the N. T. for its possession and exercise, save the implied one of its necessity; and whether this condition has yet wholly passed away admits of dispute. We are, however, persuaded that the fact that large portions of the earth are yet unchristianized. But it would be of little avail to argue this abstract question. Unless we can bring recent and well-authenticated cases of miracles wrought publicly and indisputably, few, if any, will believe that we have now the power. This, we apprehend, is really the settled and universal conviction of Christian people of the present day—of Protestants at least. Hence to Prof. Tyndall's challenge that we should test the efficacy of prayer by a miraculous answer, we simply reply that we do not expect any such thing, nor do we feel ourselves authorized to pray for it. This is not now the legitimate scope or province of Christian prayer.

We are well aware that a certain class of well-attested and indeed not infrequent facts is commonly appealed to in order to maintain at least the vestiges of this power as still extant in the Church. Most striking, perhaps, among these occurrences are the remarkable cases of recovery from an apparently incurable sickness, some of which have transpired within the knowledge of almost every one. These have sometimes taken place in a very marked manner in answer to the prayers of friends and congregations. Far be it from us to deny the efficacy of prayer in such cases, or to say a word that would discourage prayer in other like cases. But none of these cases—we mean those of which we have sufficient details and full authority—are any evidence to the idea and definition of a proper miracle. They all
lack at least three of the essential circumstances of such an event: 1st. They are not obvious, palpable, direct, and instantaneous reversals of the established laws of nature. Many persons have been raised from a seeming deadness or were restored to a state of life by various means of restoration had been abandoned, and yet no one thought of a miracle; perhaps no one had even prayed for recovery. The cases are not clearly supernatural. 2d. These cures are not effected by any individual consciously and avowedly authorized to exercise the divine power in the case. In a miracle there must be no misgiving, no hesitation, no shifting of responsibility on the part of the operator. He must positively know and explicitly assert that he is "the finger of God;" otherwise his act becomes the most blasphemous assumption. 3d. Genuine miracles have only been wrought as an ocular demonstration of the commission of a divine messenger or teacher; they have in all instances been resorted to solely in personal attestation of sacred truth. No new doctrine or fresh communication from Heaven purports to be made in connection with the remarkable cases under consideration. The cures are besought as a personal favor, out of regard for private feeling or public usefulness. But these were not the motives which induced our Lord or his apostles to work miracles. The object of them was to prove the truth of Christianity. Just here, if anywhere, may doubtless be discovered the reason why miracles have not been perpetuated. There remains no longer any fresh revelation of God's will to man; no new dispensation or even agencies are to be established on the divine part; and therefore no such special credentials are issued from the court of heaven. Its ambassadors have only the common seal of the Gospel—the fruits of their ministry.

The same kind of argument disposes of all the other special providences often cited in proof of a divine intervention in answer to prayer. These likewise are not miracles, nor are they commonly so regarded. There is, however, much of valuable truth in the assumption of their pertinency here, namely, that they are really and purposely interferences of God on behalf of those interested, and at the request of the petitioners. That God is able to introduce himself at any and every point in mundane affairs, whether great or small, is one of the clearest doctrines of the Bible; in fact, it is a necessary supposition in any religion. But that he is able to change the character of the universe, or to confound government with revolution, to destroy a universal and immemorial order, to suspend the "laws of nature" with equal certainty his prerogative as Creator and Preserver of all. To argue otherwise is either to dethrone him from the dominion of the universe, or to confound government with revolution. For God is both immanent and transcendent, it is extraordinary, but it is not therefore out of or contrary to fixed rule. Just here, on the other hand, we must be permitted to enter our protest against the specious reasoning in Bushnell's Nature and the Supernatural, which, in our judgment, virtually does away with all miracle by reducing it to an imaginary, higher, and hitherto unknown law of divine establishment, called "moral," so as to save it from the odium of conflict with nature. A miracle, by its very definition, must be a supersEDURE—or a temporary violation, if you please—of a well-known and fixed law of nature. It is upon precisely this point that its whole significance depends. Eliminate this element, and you destroy its entire moral force. That the laws of physical nature are administered in ultimate subservience to those of the moral universe is the economy approved no less by reason than by fact. But these must not be merged the one in the other, even if they should be imagined in any case to collide. Especially must we not assume the intrusion of a superior moral law into the domain of nature, supplanting it in that sphere, and so divesting a miracle of all its peculiarities. For God works a miracle be set aside, we must suppose, a certain law or series of laws of nature for the time being, and in that particular respect, by virtue of his own superior right as creator. It is not merely the spontaneous super- vention of a mightier overturning law up to that time held in abeyance for such conjunctions. The latter assumption is but the crudest base of a religious un- rationalism, which would fain, at all hazard, divest the miracles of the Bible of their supernatural character. We must never forget that a miracle is a physical fact, but one in its very nature abnormal from a scientific point of view.

Nor do we overlook the argument derived from the moral change effected by the Holy Spirit in regeneration and sanctification. These are often claimed as miracles of grace. That they are supernatural, in the sense of being wrought by a power beyond and superior to human nature, is certainly true; but the fact that they are specially, or even immediately, the work of God does not prove them to be properly miraculous. For, in the first place, in this respect they are merely analogous to any act of particular divine providence, and in like manner they lack all the characteristics of a miracle, namely, a point-blank contradiction of natural law, the authoritative behest of an operator, and a moral truth to be sanctioned. They are answers to prayer which await the divine pleasure, on the performance of which the performance in question is dependent, under fixed conditions. They are in no sense special or arbitrary. On the contrary, they are most fully under the dominion of law, and can be counted upon with the most invariable certainty. They are as sure to follow the diligent use of the appointed means as any other effect is to flow from its appropriate cause. Indeed, all the healful and legitimate influences of the Spirit are normal and in the regular line of our own mental action (John iii, 8). Even the afflatus of inspiration is no exception to this rule (I Cor. xiv, 23). But, in the second place, the spiritual character of the revolution at conversion places it altogether outside the category of miraculous events. These latter always have reference, more or less intimately, to the realm of physics; they appeal to the senses; they must be susceptible of ocular, audible, tangible proof. This is their only security against imposture or self-delusion. If in any case, as in the instance of the miraculous "gift of unknown tongues" in the early Church, and the expulsion of demons from the possessed, they have their seat in the mind, yet they exhibit palpable evidences through the organs and senses of the impressed subject, he is not the endowed, and the rational behavior of the dispossessed. In short, miracles are material evidences of a supernatural authority.

In the discussion of this whole question we would do well to see to our fundamental, or even extraordinary, but it is not therefore out of or contrary to fixed rule. Just here, on the other hand, we must be permitted to enter our protest against the specious reasoning in Bushnell's Nature and the Supernatural, which, in our judgment, virtually does away with all miracle by reducing it to an imaginary, higher, and hitherto unknown law of divine establishment, called "moral," so as to save it from the odium of conflict with nature. A miracle, by its very definition, must be a supersEDURE—or a temporary violation, if you please—of a well-known and fixed law of nature. It is upon precisely this point that its whole significance depends. Eliminate this element, and you destroy its entire moral force. That the laws of physical nature are administered in ultimate subservience to those of the moral universe is the economy approved no less by reason than by fact. But these must not be merged the one in the other, even if they should be imagined in any case to collide. Especially must we not assume the intrusion of a superior moral law into the domain of nature, supplanting it in that sphere, and so divesting a miracle of all its peculiarities. For God works a miracle be set aside, we must suppose, a certain law or series of laws of nature for the time being, and in
Christian teachers in the apostolic age. It is true there is nothing in the language that thus limits them, but it is claimed that the fact of the cessation of the miracle-working power proves that such was the intention of the Grantor. We suggest the query whether this very interpretation has not clipped the wings of that faith upon which the believer is here authorized to soar into the higher region of Christian privilege. For aught that legitimately appears to the contrary, if the grant has been revoked, it has been precisely and solely in consequence of unbelief in these identical promises. But, be that as it may, in point of fact, we repeat, few if any sane and orthodox Christians nowadays profess to have the requisite faith to venture upon such acts; and therefore the question is narrowed down, whether rightly or wrongly, to the commonplace sphere of non-miraculous subjects of prayer.

There is one passage of Scripture, however, that appears to have escaped the general attention of writers and speakers on this topic, but which is, as it seems to us, peculiarly apposite, if not conclusive of the whole ground of controversy. It is as follows in the ordinary English version: "The effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much" (James v. 16). The context shows that this language bears most appropriately to the situation before the Sanhedrin. In the Greek, the apostle had just been speaking of the prayer of the united Church on behalf of the sick, assuring them that these would be efficacious; and he goes on immediately to speak of the miracle-working prayers of Elias, taking care to observe that this noted prophet was after all only "a man subject to like passions as we are," and hence obviously inferring that prayer was still as available as it had been in his case. Unfortunately the common rendering of the passage as above has confused, if not wholly perverted, its real meaning. As it now stands it contains a double implication, for "effectual prayer," of course, "availeth much," and the epithet "fervent" likewise becomes superfluous, as well as the qualification of "a righteous man." The single Greek word translated by "effectual fervent" (λατρευτός) literally means imprecation. The only question among interpreters is whether it may be reflexive (middle voice), and thus signify imprecation itself, that is operative or effective. This was evidently the view of our authorized translators, and they have been followed by many scholars, including Robinson (Lexicon of the NT), Fenton (Commentary on the Acts), etc., who renders the passage after the order of the Greek words, "The supplication of the righteous man availeth much in its working," that is, as he explains it from Luther, "The prayer of the righteous can do much in its effecting the desired end," but this is not the same. Lange's note (Commentary, ad loc.), after reviewing the other instances of the use of the word in the N.T., accepts the true idea, "The full tension of the praying spirit under its absolute yielding to the divine impulse"; but Mombert's gloss (in the American edition), " Absence of opposition to the will of God," completely neutralizes its meaning. The passive sense of the participle is required by its grammatical form, and is justified by every passage where this form occurs: e.g. sinful passions are inwrought (Rom. vii. 19); salvation is inwrought by endurance (2 Cor. iii. 6); death is inwrought (2 Cor. iv. 12); faith is inwrought by love (Gal. v. 6); God's power is inwrought (Eph. iii. 20, precisely parallel with our text, as also in Col. i. 29), and similarly his word (1 Thess. ii. 13). On the other hand the "mystery of iniquity" (2 Thess. ii. 7). The thought of the apostle James, therefore, is, as Michaelis (after the Greek fathers) interprets, that the saint's prayer prevails 'when its earnestness is divinely inspired. To this sense the illustration of Elijah is most apt, as we may see by referring especially to the history alluded to (1 Kings xix. 14, ff.). The physical asceticism described by Stanley (Lectures on Jewish History, 2d series, p. 397, Amer, ed.), but as usual he misses the spiritual import. The seven-times bent form of the prophet, with his head between his knees, was not merely "the Oriental attitude of entire abstraction;" it denoted the intense struggle of his soul after the boon which Jehovah inwardly urged him to ask. Even this was an agony of prayer that would not be denied, similar, though less exhaustive, to that of our Saviour in the garden, which we learn (Heb. iv. 17) was effectual as to its main object (Luke xxii. 42). Another example of the same energized prayer is given us when Elijah is summoned by the apostle occurs earlier in the account of the raising to life of the son of the widow of Zarephath, where the praying prophet "stretched himself upon the child three times" (1 Kings xviii. 21), as if he would infuse his own ardent soul into the lifeless form (compare the more detailed narrative in the parallel case of Elisha and the Shunammite's son, 2 Kings iv. 24). He has had a very shallow experience of "the deep things of God" (2 Cor. iii. 10, the passage having reference to this very point) who has not felt "the Spirit itself making intercession with groanings which cannot be uttered" (Rom. viii. 26). At such times the veil between the natural and the miraculous becomes thin indeed. See Cocker, Thesm. (N.Y. 1876, 12mo); Dawson, Nature and the Bible, p. 96; Farrar, Crit. Hist. of Free Thought, p. 310; Blackwood's Magazine, Oct. 1864. Quarterly Rev. Occ. 1854, p. 526; New-Englander, Oct. 1878, art. i; Ch. Monthly, June, 1866, p. 386; London Quarterly Rev. 1854, p. 32; Prefab. Rev. April, 1870; Bapt. Quar. Oct. 1878, art. iv.; Brit. and Foreign Quarterly Rev. Oct. 1872, art. iii; Theol. Monthly, Jan. 1874, art. iii.; Boll. Sacra, Jan. 1870, p. 129; Jan. 1873. Art. v.; Contemp. Rev. July, Aug., Oct., 1872; South. Quar. Rev. April, 1875, art. iv., Cond. Miracle.

PRAYER, Christian Attitudes of. 1. The first Christians prayed standing, with hands outstretched and raised towards heaven. Then the face was turned towards the east. The proof of this appears everywhere in the primitive monuments. The frescos, sarcophagi, tombstones (especially those of the Roman catacomb), the painted glasses which are found there in abundance, the old mosaics with which the old basilicas were ornamented, etc., represent both sexes, especially women, in that attitude (Aringhi, passim, and especially ii, 285). These figures are generally called orantes. They are distinguished by the rich elegance of their garments; they wear long tunics or damaskes with wide folding sleeves, trimmed with embroidery and emblems of the trade or profession to which they are adorned with collars, bracelets, and other jewelry (Bottari, tav. 19, 158). These splendid garments might at first seem in contradiction with the well-known modesty of the women of the early Church; but in itself female clothing is not altogether incompatible with a desire to show what they had been in life, but what glory surrounded them in heaven. In the sepulchres of all kinds, the orante, generally standing between two trees—the emblem of Paradise—was the symbol of the soul who had become the bride of Jesus Christ, and as such was admitted to the celestial banquet. This explains the magnificence of the garment of St. Priscilla, represented as an orante in the cemetery of her name (Perret, Catacombes, vol. iii, tab. 3). Thus we find St. Praxeides, in a beautiful Roman mosaic, covered from head to foot with precious stones (Campani, Not. Monum. vol. i, tab. 47). In a celebrated vision St. Agnes had appeared to her parents, a week after her martyrdom, clothed in precious robes, and, to use the Bollandists' expression, uxor textis cyclopiads induit. This text became the type of most of the images of the young martyr: the most beautiful specimen is a gilded glass, published by Boldetti (Cimat. tab. 3, fig. 3, p. 194). Several of these female orantes, who were probably noble Roman matrons, as if fatigued by a prolonged prayer, have their arms supported by men, who, by their garments, must be supported by the faithful; thus (in Aringhi, ii, 17), which reminds us of Moses supported by Aaron and Hur in a similar manner (Exod. xviii, 12),
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We know this custom not only by the pictures, but also by the written monuments of Christian antiquity. The Christians, says Tertullian (Apol. xxx), while praying, raise their eyes to heaven, stretch out their hands, because they are innocents; they pray bareheaded, because we have not to blush—"Ille suscipientes (in cause) Christiani manibus expansis, quia innocuis, capite nudo, quia non erubescimus." To pray with uplifted hands is an attitude natural in the man who addresses himself to the Deity; it is a supplicatory posture which is found in all nations, even pagans, as among the Egyptians, where we meet it in funerary monuments; among the Etruscans there are in the Museo Campana two statues of Chiusi in terra-cotta, which have the arms raised in that way; among the Romans, as we see by the reverse of a number of imperial medals, especially those of Trebonianus Gallus, the praying figure is accompanied with the legend "Pietas Augg." (Miomnet, Rare des Medailles Romans, ii, 18). But Tertullian remarks that the attitude as well as intention of the faithful was quite different from those of the pagans.

"As to us," says this father, "we do not content ourselves with raising our hands, we stretch them in memory of the passion of our Lord." They meant to imitate the posture of Christ on the cross, as did several martyrs at their death. Thus St. Natale (Sancta Natale), disciple of St. Cyprianus (Ruiniart, p. 285), and SS. Fructuosus, Augurinus, and Eulogius (Usuardi, xii. Kal. Febr.): "Manibus in modum crucis expansa orantes." Several other fathers gave expression to the same idea. It is therefore easy to tell the Christian orantes from similar pagan pictures. The latter raise their hands vertically, the curve of the elbow forming a right angle, while the arms of the Christians are almost in a horizontal position.

Tertullian (De Ora to. xiii) describes this difference most minutely, to remove all idea of idolatrous imitation: "We do not raise our hands with ostentation, but with modesty, with moderation." Now, the priest alone observes at mass this rite of venerable antiquity, which has preserved its primitive character in the liturgy of the Church of Lyons, for there the priest expands completely his arms in the form of a cross while reciting the oration which immediately precedes the elevation. It is to be observed that in the primitive Church the catechumens prayed standing like the rest of the congregation, with this difference, that the latter held their face somewhat raised to heaven (Tertull. De Coron, iii), while the catechumen inclined slightly his head, not having obtained yet, by baptism, the divine adoption, the title of children of the Father who is in heaven.

2. The practice of standing erect in prayer was not exclusive, and the first Christians sometimes prayed kneeling. We have an example of this in the Acts (xxi. 5): "And we knelt down on the shore and prayed;" and another in the life of St. James Major, whose knees, by dint of prolonged praying, had become as callous as those of a camel; and another, of great celebrity, in the acts of the martyrdom of St. Ignatius (Ruiniart, vii, 10, ed. Vercaut). In less ancient times this custom becomes more frequent. We know by the testimony of Eusebius (Vit. Constant. iv, 21, 61) that Constantine often bowed his knees to offer his prayer to God. St. Jerome writes to the virgin Demetrias, "Frequently the solicitude of thy soul prompted thee to bend thy knees," and to Marcella (Epist. xxiiii, De agrot. Blesillie), "She bends her knees on the naked soil." It is likely that the custom of kneeling was borrowed by the Christians from the Hebrews. We read in the Scripture that Solomon, while dedicating his Temple to God, knelt down on both knees (1 Kings viii, 54), and that Daniel thrice a day knelt down in prayer (Dan. vi, 10). It is said also that St. Stephen, while suffering martyrdom (Acts vii, 59), knelt down and prayed for his murderers. St. Luke tells us that our Redeemer in the garden of Gethemani knelt down and prayed "three times with prayer and supplication" (Lukx xxii, 45). It is natural that, in conformity with this divine example, the Christians should have adopted this way of praying as a mark of affliction, a demonstration of sadness and sorrow. This is what we are led to conclude from these lines of Prudentius, one of the most trustworthy interpreters of Christian antiquity (Cuius. hymn. ii, 56):

"Te voce te cantu plo Rogare curvate genu Fiendo et canendo diecimus."

This is also shown by the custom of the primitive Church in the liturgical practice. The Church had directed from the earliest time that prayers should be said standing on Sundays and during the paschal period, in sign of joy, and kneeling all the rest of the year in sign of penitence. This rule was already in force at the time of Justin (Quast. ad orthodox. resp. 110); it is mentioned by Tertullian (De Coron, miliit, iii), and stated by St. Jerome in that curious passage where he speaks of St. Paul (Comment. Epist. ad Ephe. Procem.): "St. Paul stayed at Ephesus until Pentecost, that time of joy and victory when we bend not our knees, nor bow to the ground; but, when, remissed by the Lord, we raise ourselves to heaven." The same custom became a canonical law at the Council of Nicaea (Can. ult.). It is interesting to read what Pamphilus, in his notes on the treatise of Tertullian (De Coron, c. ii, n. 38), and Augustine (Ep. liii. 172, Suetorii), make of this manner of praying common to the Jews and Christians. We have no pictures at all representing Christians on their knees, which speaks in favor of those who assert that the orantes are images of the glorified soul. In conformity with the apostolic precept, the churches bareheaded, the priests bareheaded, the fathers endeavored, with all their might, to exclude from the prayers of the faithful all gestures and exterior practices bearing some strong features of paganism. Thus Tertullian (De Ora to. xii) blames sternly such Christians as, in imitation of the pagans, thought fit to make their prayers acceptable to God by putting down their penits.

See ATTITUDES.

Prayer-book. Since the article on this subject was written (vol. ii) the Church of England has considered the propriety of purging the Book of Common Prayer of the Athenasian Creed, which the American Church rejected. The Protestant Episcopal Church (Presbyter) has recently disestablished, the Athenasian Creed is purged of the damnable clauses, and retained in that modified form. Since the organization of the Reformed Protestant Episcopal Church, the Prayer-book originally framed for the (American) Protestant Episcopal Church was made the basis of another Book of Common Prayer from which all language that seems to justify the ritualism of the High-Church party has been carefully expunged. Recent literature on this subject may be found in the Edeos, Rec. Oct. 1874, art. vi; Brit. Qurr. Jan. 1876, p. 144; Church Journal (N. Y.), June 17, 1875; Blunt, Key to the Knowledge and Use of the Book of Common Prayer (Lond. 1869); Contemporay Rev. Dec. 1872, artv. vii. See COMMON PRAYER.

Prayer of Consecration is offered in the communion service for the elements served to the people as memorials of Christ's crucifixion. In the Church of Rome and other ritualistic bodies, this prayer is accompanied with much ceremony. In other Christian churches the form prescribed or adopted is in harmony with the grave occasion which it commemorates. See LORD'S SUPPER.

Prayer-days. There can be no doubt that the service in the Book of Common Prayer is intended to be repeated daily; yet the emergence of Luct xxii, 4 (other) passage come to prevail. As a substitute for this, and the nearest approximation the times will allow to the original
PRAYER FOR THE DEAD

usage, certain days of the week are selected on which morning and evening service is publicly held. Such days are denominated "Prayer-days," and are thus distinguished from the usual "holydays." See the rubrics before the order of public baptism.—Staunton, Ecclesiastical Dictionary, p. 546.

PRAYER FOR THE DEAD. See DEAD, PRAYERS FOR THE; POSTSCRIPT.

PRAYER, FORMULA OF. See FORMS OF PRAYER.

PRAYER, LORD'S. See LORD'S PRAYER.

PRAYER TO SAINTS. See INVOCATION.

PRAYER-TEST. This was a proposal anonymously put forth in the name of science in the Contemporaneous Review for July, 1872, with the strong endorsement of Prof. Tyndall, and couched in the following terms:

"I ask that one single ward or hospital, under the care of first-rate physicians and surgeons, containing certain numbers of patients afflicted with those diseases which have been best studied, and of which the mortality rates are best known, whether the diseases are those which are treated by medical or by surgical remedies, should be, during the coming year, treated according to a new plan. New methods to be mechanical. The ends in view are that at the end of the year mortality rates should be compared with the past rates, and also with the rates of other leading hospitals similarly well managed during the same period."

This proposal is open to several grave objections.

1. It is not warranted by the Scriptures nor by the nature of prayer. Neither religion nor science is under any obligation to accept all challenges. No system of truth does that. The true man of science comes to nature, not as a dictator, but as the humblest of learners. He does not invent tests and demand that she shall accept them; he ingeniously finds out what tests she pro-"potes to him. It is his office, not to alter nor to criticise, but to interpret her hieroglyphics.

In the same spirit we must study Christianity. The Bible is a collection of trigger words and hints with each other, and the whole with human consciousness and experience. We come to the book as learners. We are to accept and try the tests it offers, and not to set up tests of our own. It teaches a doctrine of prayer; it makes prayer to be a real and mighty power—a power produc-"ing physical results—but efficient only under prescribed conditions. These conditions, so far as they relate to the special case before us, are sufficiently indicated in these words: "The fervent, effectual prayer of a righte-"ous man availeth much;" "the prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up; if this be not, in the name of the Lord he shall be loosed from his bed;" "let the priests, earnest, important supplication of a righteous man, offered with full faith in God. The prayer proposed to he vacates the essential conditions of prayer. It aims not directly at the result it asks, but indirectly to test God. It says, "Will he?" Faith says, "He will." The thing it seeks is not really the healing of the sick, but to confer quantitative precision on the action of the supernatural in nature."

This sort of challenge is not new in substance, if it is in form. How do the Scriptures treat it? On a cert-"ain occasion, a large intelligence conducted the perfect man to a precipitous height, and challenged him to prove his claims by casting himself down, trusting to be borne up on angels' wings; and he quoted Scripture to enforce the test. The reply was simply, "Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God." When that perfect and divine man hung on the cross the minions of the arch-temptor pro-"posed another test, "Let him now come down from the cross, and we will believe in him!" but he came not down. When once a miracle was demanded of Jesus he said, "Ye have not that spirit which makes you-ready more convincing proofs than suffered for the Nineties and for the queen of Sheba; an evil and an adulterous generation seeketh after a sign." A lost spirit, himself convinced at last by the re-"sistance argument of hell-torment, prayed for the resurrec-"tion of a dead man to convince his brothers, but was assured on the highest authority, "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead."

2. The test proposed would be nugatory. Suppose it were admissible, and that the Christian world should gladly accept it, it is certain the results should be all that believers could desire. The hospital is in Ireland, Luke's, the west wing; one hundred patients of the kinds indicated are entered. The same surgeons, physi-"cians, and nurses have charge of both wings; the temper-ature, treatment, and diet are the same; there is per-"fect scientific exactness in all the conditions, except that the patients in the west wing are made the subjects of daily prayer wherever prayer to the God of the Bible is offered. After three or five years the hospital records are inspected and compared with other records, and it is found that twenty-nine and a half per cent. more recoveries have taken place in the wards which prayer has overshadowed than in, similar cases, anywhere else in the world.

Now, what will the sceptical men of science say? "The Lord, he is the God; prayer is vindicated forever; for we have found a new method of increasing the rate of recovery."

We could hear such suggestions as these: "It may be the morning sun is bad, or the clatter of wheels and hoofs on the avenue has injured the patients in the east wing;" "We more than suspect some of the nurses and physicians in the west wing have been killing them with kindness;" "Probably some new remedy has been secretly used; at all events, though there is something mysterious about it, this we know, nothing can constrain the laws of nature." Let not such a supposition be thought slanderous. The prototypes of such men were not convinced by miracles. Some of the persons who witnessed the resurrection of Lazarus went about from that very day to kill Jesus—yes, and to kill Lazarus too, lest the sight of him might convince others.

The test proposed would be nugatory for another reason—prayer could not be so offered. It is impossible to dam up Christian sympathy. It would burst over all such artificial banks like a spring freshet. Such forms of prayer would be mere magical incantations, impious shams, which would either be dinned over with no thought of their scope, or else would paralyze the lips that uttered them. Imagine the whole Church on earth thus to pray, "Grant, O Lord, thy special mercy to the one hundred sick persons in the west wing of St. Luke's Hospital. New York, U. S. of America." If any influence could move the Church to begin a three years' course of prayer thus before the time was up the Spirit of God would be searching many hearts with questions like this: "Who taught you so to limit your petitions?" "Professor Tyndall," "Why do you confine such supplications to one hundred of my needy millions, individ-"ually towards whom you have no reasons for special sympa-"thy?" "To prove thee, Lord, whether thine nearest prayers for the sick." "If you doubt it, you cannot offer such prayers acceptably; and if you believe it, why test me thus at the dictation of unbelievers? Thou shall not tempt the Lord thy God." Answers are promised on occasion to sincere, single-minded prayer, which looks simply for the object it asks. Such prayer must be double-minded—one eye resting faintly on the hospital, the other intently scanning the scientific world. Under such circumstances faith would be impossible; for faith rests solely on God's promise, and God has nowhere promised to answer any prayer offered as a test of himself.

3. Our final objection to the proposition before us is that it proposes an unnecessary test. There are allow-"able experiments which afford abundant proof of the truth of Christianity. There are many more convincing proofs than afforded by the Word of God and the experience of praying men. For a scientific atheist, or pantheist, or deist, or mere nominal Christian to insist on other tests is as unsci-"entific—we say not as irreverential, but as unscientific—as it would be for us to say, "If electricity be so powerful a
you assert, let it run along this hempen cord as you claim it does along the telegraphic wires," or, "Make your magnet attract copper." The prompt reply would be, "The laws of nature forbid." Our reply is, "The economy of grape soda." We can conceive of a strictly scientific test which might have been proposed by the author of this inadmissible, nugatory test. He might have sent out a circular letter to ten thousand of the ablest, most experienced, and most devout ministers of the Gospel and other Christians in all lands, explaining his object, and inviting careful answers to these questions: How many cases have you ever known of persons desperately sick who were made the subjects of fervent, importunate prayer? What were the particulars, and what the results? The candid and unbiased collation of the facts so obtained from witnesses whose capacity and honesty would give their testimony on all other matters the highest credit, might or might not cast some light upon the subject. But it would not convince unbelievers, for unbelief is a matter of the heart more than of the intellect; and very probably the secret and unsearchable workings of the divine providence would remove the whole business beyond the range of the laws of induction. The scientists discard faith, while the Bible tells us that only by faith can we know either the ends or the person or the Lord, the God of God. A scientific test, in whatever pertains to the divine action, is impossible and absurd—a truth that Christians need to understand scarcely less than sceptics. See Prayer; Providence.

Preachers, Local. See Local Preachers.

Preaching is usually and with literal correctness defined as the act of delivering religious discourses. But this definition fails to suggest the most significant insinuation: that in any case it can be restricted by considering it as designing the objective idea of a great and peculiar appointment of the Lord Jesus Christ. In this broad but legitimate sense, preaching means more than an individual act or series of acts. It represents an institution of Christianity which has been in existence some nineteen centuries, and an agency of religious influence destined to continue in action throughout the whole period of human affairs.

I. The Proper Character and Design of Preaching.—As Christ himself was the Divine Word made flesh, so, desiring to embody his humanity and mission to the hyperbolical extent of his kingdom among men, he made a special appropriation of man's distinguishing faculty of speech by appointing it as the primary and principal means of diffusing God's word of truth and message of salvation throughout the world. He chose from among his earliest hearers, "he ordained twelve, that they should be with him, and that he might send them forth to preach" (Mark iii, 14). To those disciples he said, "What I tell you in darkness that speak ye in light: and what ye hear in the ear that preach ye upon the house-tops" (Matt. x, 22). As had been fore-shadowed in prophecy, so Christ represented the preaching of the Gospel to the poor as the distinguishing characteristic of his kingdom. The great Preacher himself, having completed his earthly mission, crowned it with the ever-lasting command given to his disciples, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature" (Mark xvi, 15). Christian preaching, therefore, implies not only preachers, but hearers. It presupposes a personal conviction and a deep sense of truth in the mind of the preacher, accompanied by a purpose to transmit to the minds of his hearers the message of God. Although preaching is designed to embody an important element of instruction, yet, if properly executed, it rises in character superior to lecturing, or any of the forms of didactic discourse. It resembles the best forms of oratory, modifying it, but ascending all secular or-atory in the moral grandeur of its themes, and especially in its specific design of enlightening and quickening the consciences of men as a means of affecting their earthly character and their eternal destiny.

II. Historical Development.—Prior to Christ, preaching was known only among the Jews and among the Gentiles. It had been to some extent anticipated by several of the prophets, the greatest and last of whom was John the Baptist; but, from the time that Christ began his public ministry, preaching became common and constant. Following our Lord's ascension, the apostolic ministry of preaching was elevated and glorified by the gift of the Holy Ghost. The gift of tongues and the manifestation of the tongues of fire were alike designed to aid and encourage them in their work of evangelization. Hence, whether in the Temple, in synagogues, or in prisons, they preached Christ and him crucified as the power of God and the wisdom of God; and, when scattered abroad by persecution, "they went everywhere preaching the Word" (Acts vii, 4).

It was thus that the Gospel became rapidly diffused throughout the Roman empire; which, in an almost literal sense, represented "all the world" of that period.

It seems safe to believe, that had the apostolic zeal and fidelity in preaching been maintained without interruption, the triumphs of the Gospel would have been continuous, and perhaps even more extensixe with the habitable world. But the present century, and the latter part of the second; centuries witnessed the introduction into the Church of two classes of influences which had a tendency to reduce the number of preachers and limit the work and influence of preaching. The first was that of asceticism (q. v.); the second, by powerful but mistaken impulse, sent into deserts and caves, and afterwards into monasteries, thousands of earnest men, whose lives were thus withdrawn from evangelical activity and wasted in penances and self-torture. The second was that of ceremonialism (see CEREMONY), by which the preaching office was taken away from the lower clergy and for the greater part limited to bishops. Bingham states the limitation in these words:

"Preaching anciently was one of the chief offices of a bishop; insomuch that in the African churches a presbyter was never known to preach before a bishop in his cathedral church till Austin's time, and St. Austin was the first presbyter in that part of the world who was allowed to preach in the presence of his bishop. . . . It is true, in the Eastern churches presbyters were sometimes allowed to preach in the great church before the bishop: but that was not to discharge him of the duty, for still he preached a sermon at the same time. In lesser churches, in the city and country about, this office was devolved upon presbyters as the bishop's proper assistants. But in sermons of descent, except in special cases (of reading the homilies of the fathers, and when the presbyter was sick or infirm), were not authorized to deliver the sermon. The Christian Church, by ch. iv, 26, 27, not only gave the freedom of preaching to the bishop, but even to the deacons; and that more especially when the bishop was absent.

Not only was preaching shorn of its aggressive power by being thus limited and subordinated under the influence of a growing ceremonialism, but in some places it was for long periods scandalously neglected. Sozomen, the historian, "relates of the Church of Rome in his time that they had no sermons either by the bishop or any other." Sozomen himself had made a mistake; but Cassiodorus, who was a senator and consul at Rome, quotes the same out of Sozomen in his Historia Tripartita, without correction, and further says that no one can produce any sermons preached to the people by any bishop of Rome between the years 318 and 457. Instead of preaching by Leo appears to have been but temporary; for, according to Suriani, a Roman writer, it was afterwards discontinued for five hundred years together, till Pius Quintus, like another Leo, revived the practice. Not merely at Rome, but through large portions both of the Orient and Gauls and Celts of the West, as a consequence of there being a constant custom, was rare and exceptional during the long period between the 8th and 16th centuries. It ceased to be a regular part of the services of the Sabbath, although it was retained as a part of the ceremonial service of the church. In some places, the form of panegyrics or eulogies upon the Virgin and the saints.
The preaching of the Crusades (q.v.) by Peter the Hermit, St. Bernard, and others, and the organization of the Dominicans (q.v.) as a preaching order of monks, may be considered as exceptional to the usual practice of the Middle Ages. The chief medium of religious education, however, was by sympathetic preaching to the laity. It was chiefly upon the preaching of the Crusades that the discourses of some of the more venerable and eloquent preachers that ready writers were employed to report the words they uttered. Copies of reported discourses were circulated among those who prized them, and were held for reading to other assemblies. In this way the homilies of the fathers selected to represent them, when they could be better preserved and more rapidly multiplied by printing. During the medieval period, where preaching was not wholly abandoned, sermons and homilies were to a great extent substituted by postils (q.v.), which were very brief addresses delivered at the conclusion of the mass, and holding about the same relation to the preceding ceremonies of worship that a postscript holds to a letter, or a marginal note to the text of a book.

The preaching customs of modern times differ in minor particulars somewhat with reference to differences of national habits, but more with reference to the pre-eminence of the idea of worship or of religious address. In a certain class of churches the service is conducted with primary reference to forms of worship. In churches in that class, by matter of course, the sermon is made subordinate. In other churches the leading idea of a Sabbath assembly is that of an audience gathered together to receive instruction from the Word of God, both as read from the sacred page and as declared by his appointed messengers. In the latter, preaching is regarded as of principal importance, prayer and psalmody being auxiliary to it.

The principal places for preaching in modern times are churches constructed with primary reference to that object. It may be here remarked that even in Europe modern church architecture has been modified since the period of the Reformation, in a perhaps unconscious adaptation to the more general practice of preaching. Few large cathedrals have been built, but many churches of smaller proportions, and more available as auditoriums. Protestant churches in all countries are supplied with permanent seats for audiences, and, with rare exceptions, the pulpit occupies the central position allotted in Roman Catholic countries to the principal altar. On the continent of Europe movable seats only are used in Roman Catholic churches. In distinctly Protestant churches, pews or fixed sittings are generally introduced to accommodate hearers during the preaching services. But preaching, especially among Protestants, has by no means been limited to churches. While maintained with regularity in them, it has been extended as a matter of importance to highways and market-places, to public commons, to natural amphitheatres, to groves, to ship's decks, to extemporized tabernacles, and even to music-halls and theatres. In short, zealous evangelists show themselves ready, both in civilized and heathen countries, to preach wherever and whenever their fellow-men can be gathered to hear them.

IV. Literature.—The literature of preaching may be divided into two classes—the first embracing publications relating to the art and science of preaching; and the second embracing the printed products of preaching, whether postils, homilies, or sermons. Of the first class, an extensive list is given in connection with the article on homiletics (q.v.). Of the second, it would be easy to enumerate authors and books by hundreds. For select and classified lists, see arts.富丽 eloquence; sermons. Of recent books of the first class, the following may be named: Molois (M. L'Abbé Isidore; translated by George Percy Badger), The Clergy and the Pulpi in their Relations to the People (N.Y. 1867, 12mo); Hood, Lamps, Pitches, and Trumpets: Lectures on the Voice of the Preacher (1st and 2nd editions, 12mo); Parker, A Sermon: Advice to a Young Preacher (Boston, 1871, 12mo); Brooks, Preparation and
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Deliveries of Sermons (Phil. 1871, 12mo); Beecher. Yale Lectures on Preaching (1st, 2nd, and 3d series, N. Y. 1872-74, 3 vols. 12mo); Story. Preaching without Notes (ibid. 1876, 12mo); H orn. Whole Work on Preaching (ibid. 1876, 12mo); Broadus. Lectures on the History of Preaching (ibid. 1876, 12mo); Taylor, The Ministry of the Word (ibid. 1876, 12mo); Brooks. Lectures on Preaching (ibid. 1877, 12mo); Dale. Nine Lectures on Preaching (ibid. 1878, 12mo). (D. F. K.)

PREACHING PRISTS. See DOMINICAN.

PREDAMITE. Under this head we propose to consider, first, the question of the existence of men older than the Biblical Adam; second, Prehistoric tribes in India; and, third, the Prehistoric Era in Europe.

1. Prehistoric Men. — Whether men existed upon the earth before Adam is a question first made prominent in Europe by Isaac Peyreuru (La Peyrère). His reasoning in support of the affirmative is embodied in a work published anonymously in Paris, in 1655, and entitled Preamenita: sive Exercitatio super verbis duodecim, decimoterio et decimoguarto capitis quinta Epistolae S. Pauli ad Romanos, quibus inducantur Primi homines ante Adamum conditioni. Very soon afterwards appeared, from the same author, the following: Systema theologiæ sive Hypotheseis Principes Pars prima. Both works are now very rare (see Solger, Biblii. ii, 94; Freytag, AnaI. p. 671; Bibl. Feuerlin, p. 588; Brunet, Manuel, et al.). The most accessible edition embraces the two works bound in one volume, in 8vo, and published, without place, in 1690, under the title: Preamenita, Anno salutaris MDCXV. A work appeared in English the next year with the following title: Man before Adam, or a Discourse upon the Twelfth, Thirteenth, and Fourteenth Verses of the Fifth Chapter of the Epistle of Paul to the Romans: by which are proved that the First Men were created before the creation of the world (ibid. 1691, 12mo). It appears to be a "First Part". The novel teaching of Peyreuru was at once bitterly denounced, and a considerable number of treatises were written in opposition. A list of these has been compiled by Ebert (Dictiomaire, No. 16, 555). The following are the most important: Animadversiones in Librum Preamenitum in quibus: confutation superbus scriptor, et primum omnium fuisse, Adamum defenditur, authore Evarbio Romulo (Phil. Priorio, Paris, 1656, 8vo, and in Holland in the same year, sm. 12mo); Non ens Preamenitarum: sive Conjugiae Apologeticae in quantum Scripturae, quatuor praeocte incipientur super imponere composita est qui:dam anonymus fugiens, ante Adamum primun fuisse hominae in mundo; authore An. Hiulso (Lugd. Bat. apud Joan. Elzevir. 1656, sm. 12mo); Responso ecretae et superbissimae Regiae Praesidii, apud Ioann. L. Proctor, adv. et act. J. Pathoio (Lugd. Batavor. apud Johan. Elzivirium, 1656, 12mo). The argument on both sides, as might be supposed, was almost wholly Biblical and dialectical. The nature of the proofs employed by Peyreuru, and of his "theological system" built upon the fundamental doctrine of prelastic men, may be condensed in the following propositions: 1. The "one man" (Rom. v. 12) by whom "sin entered into the world" was Adam, as in ver. 14 that sin is called "the transgression." 2. "Transgression" is a violation of "law," therefore "the law" (ver. 18) signifies the law given to Adam—natural law, not that given to Moses. 3. The phrase "until the law" (ver. 18) implies a time before the law—that is, before Adam; and as "sin was in the world" during that time, there must have been men in existence to commit sin. 4. The sin committed before the enactment of the natural law was "material," "actual"; the sin existing after Adam, and through him, was "imputed," "formal," "legal," "adventitious," and "after the similitude of Adam's transgression." 5. Death entered into the world before Adam, but it was in connection with the "one man." And, Adam's prospective sin—"peccatum Adami fuisse recto intumatis prsimi hominibus ante Adamum conditioni; and this was necessary, that all men might partake of the salvation provided in Christ—"opporoerat prsimi illos homines peccavius in Adamo, ut sanctificarentur in Christo" (Rom. v. 19). Before Adam did not "reign." "Pecatum tune temporis erat mortuum; mora erat mortuus, etnullus erat sepulchri aculeus" (ibid. cap. xii). 6. Adam was the "first man" only in the same sense as Christ was the "second Adam," for Adam was the "image of God" (Gen. i, 26, 27). 7. All men are of one blood in the sense of one substance—one "matter," one "earth." The Jews are descened from Adam, the Gentiles from Preachamites (System. Thel. II. cap. vii-xi). The first chapter of Genesis treats of the origin of the Gentiles, the third of the origin of the Jews (ibid. lib. iii, cap. i-i). The Gentiles were created aborigines in the beginning, by the "word" of God, in all lands; Adam, the father of the Jews, was formed of "clay" by the "hand" of God (ibid. lib. ii, cap. xi). Genesis, after chap. i, is a history, not of the first men, but of the first Jews (ibid. lib. ii, cap. i). 8. The existence of Preachamites is also indicated in the Biblical account of Adam's family, especially of Cain (ibid. lib. ii, cap. iv). 9. Proved, also, by the "monuments" of Egypt and Chaldea, and by the history of the astronomy, astrology, theology, etc., of the Gentiles (ibid. lib. ii, cap. xii, 14). As well as by the racial features of remote and savage tribes, and by the recently discovered parts of the terrestrial structure (ibid. Proem.). 10. Hence the epoch of the creation of the world does not date from that "beginning" commonly figured in the beginning of the "book" of Genesis: "et die sequentes ad consummationem, nam omnium rerum temporum a die Creationis annorum MCM. LXXXV". A work appeared in English the next year with the following title: Man before Adam, or a Discourse upon the Twelfth, Thirteenth, and Fourteenth Verses of the Fifth Chapter of the Epistle of Paul to the Romans: by which are proved that the First Men were created before the creation of the world (ibid. 1691, 12mo). It appears to be a "First Part". The novel teaching of Peyreuru was at once bitterly denounced, and a considerable number of treatises were written in opposition. A list of these has been compiled by Ebert (Dictiomaire, No. 16, 555). The following are the most important: Animadversiones in Librum Preamenitum in quibus: confutation superbus scriptor, et primum omnium fuisse, Adamum defenditur, authore Evarbio Romulo (Phil. Priorio, Paris, 1656, 8vo, and in Holland in the same year, sm. 12mo); Non ens Preamenitarum: sive Conjugiae Apologeticae in quantum Scripturae, quatuor praeocte incipientur super imponere composita est qui:dam anonymus fugiens, ante Adamum primun fuisse hominae in mundo; authore An. Hiulso (Lugd. Bat. apud Joan. Elzevir. 1656, sm. 12mo); Responso ecretae et superbissimae Regiae Praesidii, apud Ioann. L. Proctor, adv. et act. J. Pathoio (Lugd. Batavor. apud Johan. Elzivirium, 1656, 12mo). The argument on both sides, as might be supposed, was almost wholly Biblical and dialectical. The nature of the proofs employed by Peyreuru, and of his "theological system" built upon the fundamental doctrine of prelastic men, may be condensed in the following propositions: 1. The "one man" (Rom. v. 12) by whom "sin entered into the world" was Adam, as in ver. 14 that sin is called "Adam's transgression." 2. "Transgression" is a violation of "law," therefore "the law" (ver. 18) signifies the law given to Adam—natural law, not that given to Moses. 3. The phrase "until the law" (ver. 18) implies a time before the law—that is, before Adam; and as "sin was in the world" during that time, there must have been men in existence to commit sin. 4. The sin committed before the enactment of the natural law was "material," actual; the sin existing after Adam, and through him, was "imputed," "formal," "legal," "adventitious," and "after the similitude of Adam's transgression." 5. Death entered into the world before Adam, but it was in connection with the "one man." And, Adam's prospective sin—"peccatum Adami fuisse recto intumatis prsimi hominibus ante Adamum conditioni;
moreover, as he went out from his native country, found other nations already in existence. The natural inference from these considerations would be that the Black Races existed before Adam.* Such a conclusion is sustained by other anthropological considerations.

The Black Races—a term used only for present convenience—may be regarded as the (1) Hamites and Hot-tentots and Bushmen, (2) Papuans, (4) Australians. They possess in common a dark or black skin and a marked degree of dolichocephalism, as well as much greater prognathism than the White and Dusky races. They are further characterized by long thighs-bones, sometimes long arms, lean shanks, oblique pupils, and deficiency of secondary sexual characters. The Negroes are distinguished generally by short crisped hair, with a flattened section, scanty or absent beards, thick lips, flattened nose, retracting forehead, and projecting jaws; and they inhabit Africa from the southern border of the Sahara to the territory of the Hot-tentots and Bushmen, stretching from ocean to ocean save where the Hamites have intruded on the extreme east. The Bantu or southern Negroes embrace the Zanijibar and Mozambique nations, and the well-known Betchuans and Kafirs. The South or northeastern tribes speaking a variety of languages, and stretching from the coast well into the interior. The Hot-tentots and Bushmen occupy the southern parts of Africa nearer the Atlantic Ocean, and are characterized by the tufted head hair, white hair, and the peculiar formation known as eutypoggy. The Bushmen have a leathery-brown skin, which becomes much wrinkled with age. The Ko-Koin (Hot-tentot) language possesses great ethnological interest, as it has been thought by Mooff, Lepuis, Pruner Bay, Max Müller, Whitney, and Bleek to possess affinities with the ancient Egyptian. Though some authorities have pronounced against any relationship, it is certain that we find among these savage linguistic elements which belong to a refined civilization, and which leave the question open whether they have lived in contact with the Egyptians or have descended from them, or from some common stock not very remotely removed. But even if it should appear probable that the Hot-tentots (and, inferentially, the Bushmen) are descended from the Hamitic Egyptians, we are not in possession of evidence indicating any immediate relationship between the other black races and the Adamites; so that the residual probability remains that these races are more ancient than the (perhaps Adamic) father of the White and Dusky races. The Papuans are intermingled with the population of Australia, the Polynesians, the Pelew Islands, New Hebrides, New Caledonia, the Loyalty Islands, and the Fiji Archipelago. They possess peculiarly flattened, abundant long hair, which grows in tufts surrounding the head like a crown eight inches high. The beard is abundant, the skin very dark, varying to chocolate color in New Guinea and blue-black in Fiji. The jaws are less projecting than in Negroes, and the nose is broad and aquiline, giving the features a Jewish cast. The Australians occupy the continent of Australia and the islands contiguous, including Tasmania. Their body is thickly pilose; the hair of the head is black, elliptical in section, and stands out around the head in a shaggy crown less striking than that of the Papuans. Though less gifted than the

* We call the attention of the reader to the fact that the positions of our respected contributor are purely inferences from the presumption that the ethnographical list in Gen. 10:13 was intended to represent the posterity of Noah or historically known to exist on the earth, whereas it is evidently meant only as a catalogue of those tribes to which the Hebrews were related or less remote. Therefore the black races were certainly included under the Cushites (p. 9), and this discussion is not. It may also be noted that Noah is the progenitor of the whites only. Indeed, if anything is to be inferred from the meaning of the name Adum, it would go to make him the parent, not of the Caucasian, but of the copper-colored or Tartar tribes. —Ed.
Papuans, they are higher in the psychic scale than formerly represented. They were, indeed, found living in the age of rude stone implements, and used simple tree-trunks for boats; but their language reflects a considerable degree of refinement and grammatical perfection. We regard the Black races from either a psychic, a zoological, or an archeological standpoint, we discover evidence that they diverged from the White and Dusky races at a period which, compared with the epoch of Egyptian and Assyrian civilization, must be exceedingly remote. The conclusion is indicated, therefore, that the common progenitor of the Black and the other races was placed too far back in time to answer for the Biblical Adam. This view has been maintained by McCausland (Adam and the Adamite [London 1872]; The Builders of Israel, ch. v), and was recently favoured by Dr. Wharton (Math. Quar. Rev. Jan. 1871, p. 158, and July, 1872, p. 526). See also an article entitled Was Adam the First Man? in Scriber's Monthly, Oct. 1871; and Pozzy, La Terre et le Récit Biblique de la Création, liv. iii, c. xii.*

To those who think the language of the Bible contemplates Adam as "the first being who could be called a man"—not alone the progenitor of the races which figure in Biblical history—it may be conceded that such is its meaning, in case it shall appear allowable, on Biblical grounds, to carry back the advent of man as far as the ancient knowledge of the Jews, and, in fact, having the complex which seems to be indicated by the term Adam can be reasonably regarded as the progenitor also of races of black color, and seemingly much lower in the organic and intellectual scale than the father of Seth and his civilized posterity not far removed.† The time-question involved is admittedly serious. In reference to the difficulty presented by the color of Adam's skin, it will be borne in mind that color alone is one of the most untrustworthy of ethnological characters (Peschel, Races of Man, p. 88). In reference to the inequalities generally endowed by the racial stocks of the Black races, it may also be observed that degeneration and deterioration of tribes are phenomena familiar to ethnology. But there are strong objections to the assumption that the Black races represent, in general, a degeneracy. We have no knowledge of the degeneracy of entire races, but only of tribes and fragments of tribes. Nor has tribal degeneracy taken place, except where the oppression of superior tribes has driven the weaker into the midst of natural conditions unfriendly to existence. But the Black races have been free to roam over entire and large areas, in the search of the most congenial conditions. Yet, on the healthful and luxuriant table-lands of Central Africa the black man is marked by an inferiority as real and almost as great as along the penitential borders of the west coast, or in the least favored regions of New Guinea. The structural peculiarities of the Black races, moreover, are inheritances of lower grade rather than reminiscences of a higher. The black man is not on a descending grade, but is ascending, according to the organic and psychic law of existence. His remotest progenitor was lower rather than higher. All these considerations militate against the idea that Adam, the father of the Noochian races, was low enough in the scale of organization, and remote enough in the genealogical line, to be the father also of the Melanic races. Thus, while the conflicting nature of the insufficient evidences forbids our dogmatism, the balance of proof seems rather to sustain the opinion that the Melanic races are descendants of real Preadamites.‡

* Such a conclusion, however, has in our judgment a very slender foundation, and cannot for a moment stand in the face of the complex which seems to be indicated by the term Adam. The origin of man is a question of the most complex, and the statements of Scripture must stand or fall by themselves, when fairly exposed by the usual laws of etymology, and we have no way to make them accord with any accommodation with discoveries in other fields. —En.

† From this conclusion we beg leave to dissent into, and we especially disagree with the view that the Black

‡ From this conclusion we beg leave to dissent into, and we especially disagree with the view that the Black
Rivers-drifts. — These are thick beds of sand and gravel lining the valleys of certain rivers, and containing a great variety of stone implements, chiefly of flint, with occasional occurrences of human bones, and more abundant remains of extinct quadrupeds of the species just cited, together with a small proportion of living mammals; and, along the valley of the Somme, of fresh-water and marine shells, of species still living in France and along the contiguous coast. The river-valleys most celebrated for such discoveries are those of the Somme, the Loire, and the Thames, Ouse, and Avon in England. The facts respecting the valley of the Somme have been chiefly developed by M. Boucher de Perthes (Antiquités Cébètes et Antédiluviennes [1847]), MM. Rigolot, Pouthet, Gau- dry, Helbert, and the English savans Falconer, Fretw, Evans, and Lyell. We should mention here the delta of the Tinière on the Lake of Geneva, investigated and described by Morlot, and more lately by Dr. Andrews of Chicago (Amer. Jour. Sci. [2] xlv. 180). In the deeper parts of these deposits remain of extinct quadrupeds predominate; at higher levels, those of living quadrupeds. Rude flint implements abound below, improved forms above, and still higher occur sometimes relics of Gallo-Roman times.

Loess and Moraines. — In the loess or loam, as it is termed in France, and elsewhere, have been found occasional remains of men—as at Labir, near Strasburg; at Maestricht, where human bones were associated with those of the mammoth and other extinct animals; at Kreuzberg, in the suburbs of Berlin; at Bournemouth, England, on the top of a sea-cliff one hundred feet high, where flints occur in gravel; in the drift-covered cliffs of Hampshire, and many other localities. At the bottom of an ancient glacier-moraine at Ravensburg, near Lake Constance, was found, in 1866, a great quantity of bones and broken instruments. Of these, eight hundred were incidentally, and four others, the remains of eight extinct animals, including the cave-lion. At Salzgirim, three to twelve feet, and enclosing only bones of the cave-bear; 6. Cave-earth, known as “breccia”—being a dark-red sandy loam, and containing bear’s bones. These flint implements and one flint chip have been found also in the lowest layer. Another example may be taken from the rock-shelter of Aurignac, a shallow grotto opening on a hill-side, which seems to have been employed for burial. Until 1832 the opening was concealed by materials washed down the hill-slope. When uncovered, fourteen skeletons of seventeen human beings. In 1860 M. Lartet discovered outside of the grotto, underneath the sloping talus, a layer containing the remains of extinct animals and some works of art; and beneath this, resting on a sloping terrace, a layer of bones and charcoal, about six inches thick, covering an area of six or seven square yards, and terminating at the entrance of the grotto. In the midst of this were fragments of a sandstone redened by heat, and resting on a levelled surface of lime- stone, which appears to have been used as a hearth. From the ashes of this hearth was obtained a great variety of bones and implements, including two hundred flint articles—knives, projectile points, and chips, as well as a curious tool for working flints. The bone instruments embraced arrows without barbs, other tools of reindeer’s horn, and a bolekin of the same.

In the stratum overlying the ashes were found numerous bones of carnivora, also of reindeer, ox, rhinoceros, one hundred and sixty-eight human bones, and many fragments of sun-dried or half-baked and hand-made pottery. The extinct species found there were the cave- bear, cave-lion, cave-hyena, mammoth, two-horned rhinoeeros, and stag; but the remains of living species, especially of the fox, horse, reindeer, and aurochs, were much more abundant. Within the grotto, after the removal of the skelets, there remained only about two feet above the surface of the grotto, a bed of small stone of lighter tint, and a bottom layer of yellowish color.

Fret Dogs. — The pest dogs of Denmark, ranging from ten to thirty feet in depth, have afforded a large quantity of human remains, mingled with those of animals contemporary with man (Morlot, Études Geologique archéologiques en Danemark et en Suise). In the lowest portion of the dogs are found remains of the Scythian frit, a tree no longer growing in Denmark; and with these are associated implements of flint. Above are found remains of the common oak, now very rare in Denmark, and associated therewith implements and ornaments of bronze, as well as stone; while in the still newer pest occur remains of the existing beech forest, mingled with relics of an age of iron. The dogs of Ireland have been similarly productive, affording, among other things, many skeletons of the great Irish elk. From the dogs of the Somme, newer than the river-drifts, many human relics have been exhumed, as well as those from the neighborhoods of Brussels and Antwerp.

Kitchen middens (Danish kjukkenmøddinger). — These are heaps of earth and human relics occurring along the Baltic shore of Denmark. They vary in height from three to ten feet, and some are 150 to 200 feet long. The feet long, the face of the grotto was made up of the shells of the oyster, cockle, and other edible mollusks, but plentifully mixed with the bones of various quadrupeds, birds, and fish, which seem to have served as food for rude sea-side inhabitants. Interspersed with the animal remains are flint knives, hatchets, and other implements of stone of lighter tint, and bone, with fragments of coarse pottery, mixed with
charcoal and cinders, but never with implements of bronze or iron. The stone hatchets and knives, nevertheless, have been polished and sharpened by grinding, and are thus less rude than those of the river-drifts and mountains of the cavern. Kitchen-middens also occur in England, Scotland, France, the United States, and other countries.

Very similar are the refuse-heaps ("*terramares") farther inland, accumulated (according to a custom still prevailing in Ecuador, Mexico, and other Spanish countries) upon the outskirts of ancient palustrine villages in the north of Italy. They embrace, naturally, relics of everything pertaining to the life of the ancient villagers, including implements for weaving, mill-stones, and spear-heads, hatchets, and ornaments of bronze. They occur especially over the plain bounded by the Po, the Apennines, the Adda, and the Reno (Sirobel and Pigorini, *Les Terramares et les Pilotes du Parmeisum*, Milan, 1864). Similar palustrine settlements have recently been discovered in Moravia and Mecklenburg. They are said to exist also on the coasts of Africa and Brazil. Certain mounds along the coasts of Holland, containing Roman and Cathaginian antiquities, seem to have served as earthworks, or places of refuge.

(3) *Megaliths and Tombs*.—Rude structures of huge rough stones, whose origin is fixed in the night of prehistoric times, are known to exist in nearly all the countries of Europe, and even of Asia, and were long regarded as druidical remains. Those called "dolmens" consist of a huge more or less fastened rock, resting on stones planted upright in the ground—the supposed stone-altars of the Gauls. Sometimes a series of massive slabs rests on two lines of upright stones, so arranged as to form a covered passage. In other cases the entire dolmen is covered to the depth of several feet by earth, which becomes a tumulus-dolmen. Some tumuli enclose two or more stone-covered passages. The passages seem to have been burial-crypts, for we often find within them human skeletons placed originally in a sitting posture. In one tomb hundreds of skeletons were discovered. Sometimes the crypts are divided into numerous compartments, each containing a skeleton. With the skeletons were deposited weapons and implements (generally of stone) and earthen vessels. The pottery was of a finer character than that of the kitchen-middens (Leguay, *Sépultures de la France*, 1865). The tumulus-dolmens attain colossal proportions. That of Silbury Hill, England, is nearly 200 feet high. The Egyptian pyramids belong properly in this connection. See STONE.

The structure known as a "cromlech" is a dolmen surrounded by one or more circles of stones planted like posts in the ground. Cromlechs occur singly or in groups. These erect, roughly hewn stones are known as "menhirs," and also occur either singly or in long parallel ranges, as at Carnac, in Brittany. Thousands of the various sorts of megalithic structures are known in Brittany and the south and south-west of France, in England, in Denmark, and, in less abundance, in all the other countries of Europe, except Southern Germany, Spain, Italy, Greece, the Danubian principalities, and Russia.

(8) *Lake-dwellings*.—The pile-habitations (Pylaètes, *Fjshlubauten*) were catkins erected on piles in the bottoms of lakes. First discovered and most abundant in the lakes of Switzerland (Desor, *Pylaètes*, ou *Constructions Lacustres*, 1859), they are now known in the existing and the peat-filled lakes of several other countries (the Italian lakes Varese and Mercurago are especially rich); and Herodotus (lib. iv, cap. 16) states that such habitations were anciently erected in Egypt, as part of the pharaohs of Lower Roumelia. By dredging the lakes which contained the Swiss lake-dwellings an enormous quantity of relics has been brought to light, embracing the different varieties of stone weapons and implements, industrial and ornamental articles in bronze, remains of plated cloth, stores of wheat and barley—in one instance baked into flat, round cakes—and metals of Greek production, and some iron swords, but all of pre-Roman origin. The bones of twenty-four species of wild mammals have been dredged up, besides eighteen species of birds, three of reptiles, and nine of fish, all of which have lived in historic times (Rütimeyer, *Die Fauna der Fjshlubauten in der Schweiz*, Basel, 1861).

In some instances, as on the north bank of Lake Neuchâtel, where the bottom was rocky, heaps of stones were thrown down, among which piles were fixed. The piles thus served to retain further supplies of stones, and by this means artificial islands were formed. Superstructures were built on these islands. They are now sometimes covered with peat, as in the Drumkellin bog, to the depth of fourteen feet. The Irish cromlechs have afforded vast quantities of bones of domestic animals, and works of human industry in stone, bronze, and iron.

(9) *Modern Saracens*.—Since, beyond controversy, prehistoric man existed in a condition similar to that of rude and primitive peoples of historic times, it appears likely that the study of modern pagans should afford important aids in the interpretation of prehistoric monuments, and the determination of the condition and capacities of prehistoric peoples. For instance, the flint arrow-heads of the American Indian are fashioned precisely like some of those found in European caverns and lake-habitations. To understand the ancient lake-dwellings and their occupants, we have not only the historical account of Herodotus, but D'Urville's narrative of the lake-dwellers of New Guinea. As illustrative of the kitchen-middens, we may turn to the modern shell-heaps on the south coast of England, or to the city-border offal-heaps of Guayaquil and Mexico. In India some of the hill-tribes still erect cromlechs. Prehistoric monuments even receive a light shed from the accounts of early historic times. Thus "Jacob took a stone and set it up for a pillar" (Gen. xxxi, 45; see further, chaps. 46-52). At Mount Sinai, Moses erected twelve pillars—menhirs (Exod. xxiv, 4; see also Josh. vii, 21, 22). In connection with tumuli, it may be remembered that Semiramis raised a mound over her husband; stones were piled up over the remains of Lactus; Achilles raised to Patroclus a mound of stones 100 feet in diameter; Alexander erected one over the ashes of Hephaestio which cost $1,200,000; and in Roman history we meet with several similar instances. So, finally, the small bronze chariot exhumed from a tumulus of Mecklenburg revives the wheeled structures fabricated for Solomon by Hiram of Tyre (1 Kings vii, 27-37).

2. Interpretation of the Facts.—(1) Divisions of Prehistoric Time.—The voice of all civilized nations has given expression to the belief in the existence of three great ages in the unwritten history of mankind: the ages of Stone, Bronze, and Iron. This division and the most modern indications from the relics of prehistoric times sustain this belief. In the Age of Stone the metals were unknown, and all implements, weapons, utensils, and ornaments were of stone, bone, horn, shells, or moulded and unbaked clay. In the Age of Bronze cutting instruments were made largely of that alloy, though stone continued long in use. In the Age of
Iron that metal had superseded bronze for arms, axes, and knives, though bronze continued in use for ornaments, and often for the handles of weapons. This succession, which is confidently traced for European populations of early times, is due to various circumstances, for mankind at large. It must not by any means be supposed, however, that the social condition implied by the Stone Age, or either of the others, answers to any particular period of absolute time in the history of the world. One race or nation has emerged from the condition of its Stone Age at a much earlier period than another, and some races and tribes still remain in their Stone Age. These three conditions of society are generally regarded as prehistoric, and it is certain that bronze and iron were already known to the northern nations of Europe when the Roman armies invaded them; but it appears also that the weapons used in the Trojan War, at the dawn of history, were mostly of bronze, though iron was beginning to appear, and that in the time of Joshua knives of stone were in use. A closer examination of the relics of the Stone Age indicates a division into three epochs. In the Palaeolithic, or Rude Stone Epoch, all implements were of stone, and shaped by chipping, without grinding. In the Reindeer Epoch, bone and reindeer's horn displaced flint to a large extent; while in the Neolithic, or Polished Stone Epoch, multitudes of implements were ground to an edge ("culta"). Mortillets makes the following classification, based on implements from the cairns of France: A. Flint implements predominant (Palaeolithic). (a.) Epoch of Mouster— the flints chipped only on one side, and having somewhat an almond shape. (b.) Epoch of Solntré— the flints chipped on both sides, and the extremities brought to a good point. The almond shapes wanting. B. Bone implements predominant, (c.) Epoch of Aurignac (Early Reindeer)— the lance- and arrow-heads slat at the base, so that the quiver shaft enters the bone. (d.) Epoch of the Madeleine (Late Reindeer)— the lower extremity of the lance- or arrow-head enters the shaft. Many implements of flint still remain. Some recognise three divisions of Palaeolithic flints: (a) the type of St. Acheul—large, thick, oval, roughly chipped on both sides; (b) the type of Mouster—thinner, and wrought on one side; (c) the type of Solntré—smaller, finely wrought, with thin borders and symmetrical form.

The Palaeolithic Epoch is further characterized by a marked step in the powers of attempts at or ornamentation or artistic delineation, as also by the contemporaneous existence of several quadrupeds now extinct—especially the cave-bear, the cave-hyena, cave-lion, tichorne, and hairy elephant, or mammoth. The Reindeer Epoch, with a colder climate, is distinguished by the advent of several species now native in the north of Europe or at Alpine elevations—such especially as the reindeer, musk-ox, elk, chamois, ibex, hamster-rat, lemmeing, grouse, and snowy owl. With them existed the horse, the near-horse, and various rodents. The Neolithic Epoch was marked by the presence of many species of domesticated animals—especially the dog, sheep, goat, ox, horse, and hog. The domestic cat and fowl, and the crooked-horned sheep, did not appear till the epoch of the very latest lake-dwellings (Noville and Chavannes), generally referred to the 6th century.

The Palaeolithic Epoch is illustrated chiefly by the finds of the river-gravels, the cavers of Belgium and England, the volcanic tuff of Denize, and a few of the cavers and rock-shelters of France; the Reindeer Epoch by a majority of the rock-shelters of France, and the Neolithic Epoch by a few cavers in the south of France, the kitchen-middens, crannoges, dolmens, the lowest portion of the Danish bogs, and the lake-dwellings of Western Switzerland. The Bronze Age by the finds of the lake-dwellings of Western Switzerland, many of the tumuli and the middle portion of the Danish bogs; and the Iron Age by the upper portion of the Danish bogs, and some of the latest Swiss lakes (as Bienne and Neuchâtel).

(2.) Geological Conditions. The physical conditions of Europe have changed to a remarkable extent since the first known epoch of human occupation; some finds indicate that Europe was just emerging from a secular winter which had buried all the mountains and plains beneath a mantle of glacier material, as far south, probably, as the Pyrenees. England and Scandinavia had been connected with the Continent; the English Channel and the German Ocean had been dry land, and the Thames had been a tributary of the Rhine. A subsidence now took place, which made Great Britain an island. An amelioration of the climate caused a rapid melting of the glaciers; the land was extensively flooded, and the drainage of the Continent now began to mark out and excavate the river-valleys of the modern epoch. The cave-bear, mammoth, and other quadrupeds of Pliocene time still survived; and now men appeared in Europe to dispute with them the possession of the forests and the caverns. The swollen rivers filled elevations of twenty to fifty feet above their present levels, and the relics of the stone-folk were mingled with the deposits along their borders. The Reindeer Epoch witnessed another elevation, and a new invasion of cold. England was again joined to the Continent. The cave-bear and mammoth being the implement. A new subsidence took place, and the other northern quadrupeds were driven south over the plains of Languedoc and through the valleys of Perigord. The hyena went over to England and took possession of the caverns. But the men of Europe had made a slight advance in their industries. Next, another subsidence resulted in the isolation of England and the Scandinavian peninsula; the climate was again ameliorated, and the reindeer and other arctic species retreated to Alpine elevations and northern latitudes. Now the modern aspects of the surface of the land began to appear. Various species of mammals destined to domestication—or, more probably, already domesticated in their Oriental home. The ages of Bronze, Iron, and authentic history succeeded.

(3.) Character of Prehistoric Europeans. Physically, the men of the Palaeolithic Epoch, judging from the few skeletons and skulls discovered in Belgium and England, were of rather short stature, and of a Mongoloid type, like modern Finns and Lapps. In the Reindeer Epoch, the remains of Southern Europe indicate that the men near the North were larger than those of the Mediterranean type. The skulls of Belgians were still small and round-headed, and such they continued to be to the end of the Stone Age. The Neolithic men of the Swiss lakes were much like the modern Swiss. The Palaeolithic men were not decidedly different from the Caucasians, but a jaw now found at Nautile shows remarkable marks of inferiority, being somewhat thick and small in height, and having molar teeth increasing in size backwards, the wisdom teeth being largest instead of smallest, and having, moreover, five fangs instead of two, while the chin also is deficient in prominence. The famous Neanderthal skull has a low forehead and prominent brow-ridges; but the cranial capacity was seventy-five cubic inches—about the average of modern races, and "in no sense," as Huxley says, "to be regarded as the remains of a human being intermediate between man and the apes." The English skull exhibits no special marks of inferiority. The Cro-Magnon skull of the Reindeer Epoch had a capacity of ninety-seven cubic inches—the human average. There was no prominence of the jaws or the cheek-bones, but the tibia was much flattened (platy-gramic), as in most prominent men. The Neolithic Dorbeys belonged to the type of Neanderthal. Socially and intellectually, Palaeolithic man, in the
regions in question, seems to have existed in a most primitive condition. Dwelling in wild caverns, he hunted the beasts with the rudest stone implements, and clothed himself in their skins. We find no evidence of the use of fire, though probably known; and there are some indications that he made food of his own species (on anthropophagy, see Congrès International d’Anthropologie et d’Archéologie Préhistoriques, 1867, p. 138; Fliegerer, Zur Frühgeschichtlichen Ethnologie Italica, Wien, 1877, pp. 7, 8). Few attempts at pottery have been discovered, and in these the product was rude, hand-made, and simply sun-dried. In the Reindeer Epoch fire was in general use, and it was employed in baking (imperfectly) a better style of hand-made pottery, and in cooking food employed in funeral, and quite possibly human, balistic, feasts. Many pieces of highly ornamented reindeer’s horn, pierced with one, two, or three holes, discovered in Périgord, are regarded as staves of authority, either civil or priestly. Here also occur numerous phalangial bones of the deer so pierced with a hole as to serve for whistles. Bone and reindeer’s horn were now wrought into barbed harpoons and arrow-heads. On one of the bones from the cavern of La Vache (Ariège) were graven some peculiar characters, which, as suggested, may have been a first attempt at writing, though perhaps distinguishable. In the Neolithic Epoch cereals were cultivated, and ground into flour for cakes; cloth was formed for clothing, and bone combs for the hair; stores of fruits were preserved for winter’s use; garden-tills were fashioned from stag’s horn; log-canoes were employed in navigation; planks and timbers of oak were made by splitting tree-trunks with stone wedges; log cabins were constructed on piles or artificial islands; fortifications were employed in war; fish-nets, well made from flaxen cords, have been dredged at Robenhausen, and the abundant debris of numerous flint-workshops, showing a degree of division of labour, have been discovered at Grand-Presigny and other places in Belgium and France. As to intelligence and manual dexterity, a surprising amount is developed in the working of flint Implements, especially in the north of Europe.

Esthetically, Paleolithic man had advanced no further than the use of necklaces formed of natural beads, consisting of fossil foraminifaera from the chalk. Some flints from the river-drift of St. Acheul present rough sketches which, it has been conjectured, may have been prehistoric efforts at drawing. Some of them bear remote resemblances to the human head, in profile, three-quarter view, and full face; also to animals, such as the rhinoceros and mammoth. If the cavern of Massat (Ariège) is Paleolithic, it affords us the most ancient attempt at portrait, the engraving designed for St. Acheul woman has found there a stone on which was graven a wonderfully expressive outline of the cave-bear. In the Reindeer Epoch the taste for personal adornment had become considerably developed. They manufactured necklaces, bracelets, and pendants, piercing for these purposes both shells and teeth, and the bone part of the ear of the horse. Amber also came into use. The aesthetic feeling was specially developed in the south. Some of the curious pieces of reindeer’s horn supposed to be staves of authority are handsomely engraved. Some remarkable illustrations of premeval art belonging to this epoch are the following: (a.) Sculptures.—Handsomely wrought spoons of reindeer’s horn; hilt of a dagger carved in the form of a reindeer; two ivory daggers, artistically executed, representing reindeer; a harpoon in the shape of an animal’s head; the head of a staff of authority, consisting of reindeer’s horn carved into a faithfull representation of a pair of steers; another representing the head of a mammoth; a pair of pieces representing the chase of the aurochs.—On one a rude aurochs fleeing from a man casting a lance (remarkably well executed), and on the other a figure of a bovine animal different from the first; a serpent in relief on reindeer’s horn. Many of these from Laugerie-Basse. (b.)

Carvings on slate, ivory, horn, and bone.—A staff of authority, with representations of a man, two horses, and a fish; a stag graven on reindeer’s horn; part of a large herbivorous animal; no evidence of a staff of authority; reindeer-fight on slate; heads of a fish on reindeer’s horn; slates bearing other unknown animals; a young reindeer at full gallop; a hare; a curious animal with fetal characteristics; a spirited profile of a horse on bone; human head in profile on a bone spatula, in the style of a stag’s work; finally, the entire outline of a mammoth on ivory (Madeleine), and another on reindeer’s horn, forming the hilt of a poniard (Bruniquel). Most of these from Laugerie-Basse. The Neolithic Epoch seems to have been marked by a decline of the artistic feeling. The ornamentation of the pottery is more elaborate, and the finish of the stone and bone implements more symmetrical and neat, but we discover few relics of carving and engraving.

Religiously, there is little to be affirmed or inferred of the Paleolithic tribes. Some of the curiously wrought flints may have served for amulets; and occasional discovery of deposits of food near the body of the dead may very naturally be regarded as evidence of a belief in the future life. In the Reindeer Epoch this class of evidences becomes very greatly augmented, as shown in a tomb in Brittany; and in the Neolithic periods in some of the tumulus-dolmens, and in the traces of funeral remains in those and the rock-shelters of Aurignac, Bruniquel, and Furioux. The numerous specimens of bright and shining minerals found about many settlements—as of hydrated oxide of iron, carbonate of copper, fluor spar—may have been used as amulets, and thus testify to the vague sense of the supernatural which characterizes the infancy of human society. The Neolithic people add to such indications the erection of megalithic structures, some of which, surrounded by their cemeteries, are so large and sacred, must naturally be considered as their sacred temples.

Prehistoric man, in brief, represented, in Europe, the infancy of his race. All his powers were undeveloped and uneducated. Every evidence sustains us in the conclusion that he was not inferior in psychic endowments to the average man of the highest races; but he was lacking in acquired skill, and in the results of experience accumulated through a long series of generations, and preserved from forgetfulness by the blessings of a written language.

(4.) Art and Industry in Prehistoric Europe.—In debating this question, social and intellectual considerations signify nothing, since all conditions have existed in all ages. As to the geological antiquity of European man, we have stated that he dates from some part—

accidental and human—that of the Natufian culture, for St. Acheul woman has been earnestly maintained, however, and is still believed by some, that man appeared in Europe before the epoch of the last general glaciation. The following are the grounds on which the opinion has been based: (a.) Regional remains erroneously supposed human.—Some bones found at Saint-Prest (Loire-Cher), near Bourges, a fossiled bones of an extinct species of deer, and of certain cetaceans and chelonians, which bear marks appearing to have been made by human implements. The manatee in question is of Miocene age. But in the same deposits occur the remains of a carnivorous bear._ (b.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Prehistoric</th>
<th>Historic</th>
<th>Recent</th>
<th>Tertiary</th>
<th>Quaternary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Bricks</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>Clay</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>Clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Work</td>
<td>Pottery</td>
<td>Tools</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Art</td>
<td>Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geologic</td>
<td>Rock</td>
<td>Soil</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>Rock</td>
<td>Soil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Climate</td>
<td>Ecosystem</td>
<td>Pollution</td>
<td>Climate</td>
<td>Ecosystem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>Textiles</td>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>Textiles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>Art</td>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artifacts</td>
<td>Tools</td>
<td>Weapons</td>
<td>Sculptures</td>
<td>Tools</td>
<td>Weapons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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bones of Pourçé (Maine-et-Loire), as well as the notched and scratched bones of a cetacean (Balaenoptera) described from Piolenc deposits in Tuscany by Prof. Capestrani (Le piolenc pelagico in Toscana, 1876). Finally, at Thenay (Loir-et-Cher) occur flints in certain Lower Miocene limestones which were at first declared to be the works of human hands (Congrès International [1867], p. 67); but that opinion is scarcely entertained at present. (H.) Human remains erroneously supposed present.—A human skeleton found in volcanic breccia near the town of Le Puy-en-Velay, in Central France, was for a time supposed to have been enclosed by the same eruption that buried, in the same neighborhood, the remains of the Pliocene Elephas meridianus. The elephant-bearing lava, nevertheless, was of a different character; and exactly the same lava as that containing human remains was subsequently observed at another point. This enclosed the bones of the mammoth and other animals of the Champlain period, and thus demonstrated that the "man of dennece" was post-glacial. Again, the river-drifts of the Somme have been set down as glacial or preglacial; but that opinion is now almost wholly abandoned, for abundant localities are known in which it appears to a demonstration that the river-valley was excavated after the glacial drift was laid down. The Sinian beds of the time have been subsequently deposited along the chalk-slopes of the valley. Examples are seen in the sections at Menche-court and other places; and the same is shown in England at Biddenden and Summerborn Hill, in the valley of the Ouse, and at Icklingham, in the valley of the Lark. In 1859 a human skull and numerous bones of the same skeleton were exhumed (but now mostly lost) from the Colle del Vento, in Liguria (Issel, Congrès International [1867], p. 76, 156), said to be associated with extinct species of oyster of the Pliocene age. The age of the bones is disputed by Trumbull, Beys; and as no naturalist saw the remains in situ, we must candidly await further investigation. Similarly, the celebrated pelvic bone of Natches, in Mississippi, once thought to have been derived from a preglacial deposit, is now generally believed to have fallen down the bluff from an Indian grave at the surface; and the human remains of California reported to have come from beneath a bed of Tertiary lave are perhaps not sufficiently well authenticated to form the subject of speculation (Blake, Congrès International [1867], p. 101; Whitney, Geological Survey of the U. S., 1860). Other historic men in America were non-Caucasian, and therefore probably of prehistoric origin; we must expect to find their remains attaining a much higher antiquity than those of Europe.

As a measure of the time which separates Paleolithic man from the present, it is likely that a medium judgment will be reached at last. (Consult on this question Southall, The Recent Origin of Man [1873]; and Andrews, Amer. Jour. of Science [2], xiv, 188; Trans. of the Chicago Acad. of Sciences, ii, 1; Meth. Quart. Regia, Dec. 1873.) The impression of his high antiquity has been derived from the magnitude of the geological changes which have transpired since his advent. But the time required for these, in the judgment of the writer, has by some been greatly exaggerated. The contemporaneous existence of man with animals now extinct has little bearing on the question, since it has been ascertained that extinctions have been occurring throughout historic periods, even down to the present century. The disappearance of the glaciers does not seem remotely remote when we remember that their stumps are still visible in the valleys of the Alps, in the gulches of the Sierra Nevada, and even in the ice-wells of Vermont and Wisconsin. The elevation requisite to join England to the Continent cannot be thought to require a vast period after learning in what directions the glaciers moved in actual advance upon various shores, and the enormous changes in the geographical features of China within 8000 years (Pumelly, Smithonian Contributions to Knowledge, vol. xv, art. iv). The calculations based on the rate of erosion of modern river-valleys, and the growth of sphenous peat, are very misleading, since it is certain that these processes have proceeded with indefinitely greater rapidity in the pluvial and palustrine conditions of the Champlain period. (For the results of sundry calculations, see Le Hon, L'Homme Fossilé, p. 247.) Furthermore, the extreme opinions entertained within a few years on all these points have more recently been greatly modified (see King, Catastrophism and Evolution, in the Amer. Naturalist, Aug. 1877). At the same time, the evidences seem to tend towards the conclusion that the advent of man in Europe occurred from 5000 to 7000 years ago; still more, that the Oriental stock from which he had descended came first into existence more than 6000 years ago. * Such a conclusion would not be alarming on Biblical grounds, since it does not appear that the absolute age of Adam is stated either directly or by clear inference; and there is room to suspect that, in those singular cases in which the names of the patriarchs as given in the Hebrew text differ as they do from the Septuagint, the integrity of the Greek text has been better preserved than that of the Hebrew, since the Jews had a direct interest in the abbreviation of the time-table. For all this epoch always assigned by their rabbins for the advent of the Messiah had not yet arrived;† Moreover, there are some indications that a Paleolithic man in Europe was not of the Adamic (Caucasian) type, though it is pretty certain that he was succeeded, probably as early as the Reindeer Epoch, by an Eastern tide of Caucasian immigration.

We must remind the reader, in conclusion, that our condensed discussion of prehistoric peoples relates only to the European continent, and that the primitive history of the men of other quarters of the world may have differed in some important respects; while it is certain, since European man seems to have immigrated from the east, that the first appearance of his Oriental ancestors must have been considerably more remote; and still further, in view of the probable common origin of the Adamic and the other races of man, the antiquity of the human species upon the earth must have taken place at an epoch removed perhaps into the Tertiary age of the world's history. [See, however, Geology.]

In addition to the works already cited, see Figuier, L'Homme Fossilé; Brongniart, Le Paléolithique et le Quaternaire (1870); Quetrefages, Rapport sur le Progrès de l'Anthropologie (1868); Rau, Early Man in Europe (N. Y., 1876); Tylor, Researches into the Early History of Mankind and the Development of Civilization (Lond. 1865); Nilsson, Travels in the Pacific (N. Y., 1872); Vogt, Lectures on Man (ibid. 1864), A translation of Vorlesungen über den Menschen; Pozzi, La Terre et la Régle Biblique de la Création, bk. i, ch. vi-x; bk. iii, ch. xi, xii; Lubbock, The Origin of Civilization and the Primitive Condition of Man (Am. ed. 1871); Morgan, Ancient Society (N. Y. 1877) and 1881 edition); of the prechrichten der Menschheit (Leips.: 1873); Tylor, Primitive Culture (Lond. 1871, 2 vols.); Evans, Quart. Rev. April, 1866. Figuier, Quetrefages, and Pozzi oppose the doctrine of the derivative origin of man. For information respecting America, see Foster, Prehistoric Races of the United States (8d. ed. Chicago, 1874); B. C. Y., The Remote Antiquity of Man not Proven (Lond. 1882). (A. W.)

Preadamites is a name of a Christian sect which was originated in the 17th century by Isaac La Peyrère (1646-1714). The publication in 1676 of the Life of Jesus Christ by J. Naude, containing in the last chapter a statement that the son of his in 1655, the chief object of which was to show that Moses had not recorded the origin of the hu-
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man race, but only of the Jewish nation; and that other nations of men inhabited our world long before Adam. His views were espoused by many people, especially at Groningen and other places in Holland. At Brussels, however, he was seized as a heretic, and only escaped punishment by renouncing the Reformed opinions and embracing the Roman Catholic faith. In the same time he, of course, also retracted his Predestination views. See PREDESTINATION.

Prebend (from the Lat. prebendus, proceeds, i.e. an allowance of food, from prebend, to furnish), in its common acceptation signifies an allowance or provision of any sort. As an ecclesiastical term it denoted originally any stipend or reward given out of the ecclesiastical revenues to a person who had not attached himself to any particular religious establishment. It was a system which was derived from the revenues procured by the See of Benefices. When, in the course of the 10th century, the cathedral churches—having then become well endowed—left off receiving the income of their lands into one common bank, and the members of most cathedral and collegiate churches ceased living in common and separated from the episcopal mensal property, certain shares or portions fell to all those so entitled. Besides, the lands were parceled out in shares, and the income thus obtained was used for the support of the clergymen within the cathedral territory. After the definite constitution of chapters for the maintenance of the daily religious services in the bishop's church, or in other churches similarly established, endowments were assigned to them, which were to be distributed (prebenda) in fixed proportions among the members. These portions were called positions canonicae or prebenda. Hence arose the difference between a prebend and a canonry (q. v.).

A canonry was a right which a person had in a church to be deemed a member thereof, to have the right of a stall thereto, and of giving a vote in the chapter; but a prebend was a right of income, and was independent of the chapter, and was not connected with the office. The number of prebends in the several cathedral churches was increased by the benefit of the revenues of the rural clergy, and oftentimes by exchanging the lands of prebends from paying tithes to the ministers of the parishes where they lay. To the prebend was commonly attached a residence; and when an insufficient number of houses existed, the oldest prebendaries enjoyed their advantages in exchange for a fixed tax, until it became the practice to pay a fixed tax, and the clergymen had the option of living in the bishop's house or in the chapter house, and these payments were called distributions.

In England there is a trace, previous to the arrival of William I, of the tenure of distinct lands, afterwards made prebendal, at St. Paul's; but the definite name of prebend is not much earlier than the time of Edward I. In the time of Henry II, the bishop's bursaries, prebendaries, and exchequer of the bishop's purse, were reconstituted at Lichfield, and endowed with lands. It is a separate endowment appropriated, as distinguished from the commune, manors or revenues appropriated to maintain all the capitular members. At Lincoln, in the 13th century, forty-two prebends were founded; in the 12th century, at Wells, the prebends were formally distinguished and the dignities founded; in the 13th century fourteen prebends were founded at Llandaff. At York archbishop Thomas divided the lands of the common fund into separate prebends; these were augmented by archbishops Grey and Romaine, who added the last stall in the 13th century. In the 16th century bishop Sherborne founded four stalls at Chichester, the latest endowed in England. The prebends were divided into stalls of priests, deans, and canons, a certain number coming up to reside in stated courses; but in 1343 all the stalls of York were declared to be sacerdotal. Dignities almost invariably held a prebend attached to their stall.

Presbendarie is the name applied to a clergyman who is attached to a cathedral or collegiate church and enjoys a prebend (q. v.), in consideration of his officiating at stated times in the church. See Dean and Chapter.

Precarium (from the Lat. precari, to request, beseech), in the language of civil law, is a right by which one leaves to another by request the use of a thing, or the exercise of a right, without compensation, but the grantor reserving to himself the power of a reversion. The receiver, as a rule, obtains thus the judicial use of the object in question; but the giver can regain possession at any time; and he can in the surrender be refused, recur to the interdict De precario, or to the Actio proscripta verbis. Hence the expression, Precarium possidere, to possess precariously. In canonical law, precarium has not exactly the same meaning. Here the word is in genitive (precarius), and it is not applied to movable goods, but always to real estate, which is not necessarily bestowed gratuitously, but generally for the obligation of paying certain taxes, or rendering certain services, and as a consequence it cannot be taken away at pleasure. The origin of the ecclesiastical precarium is found in the 6th century, when the custom began to prevail, especially in the country, of giving the priests the use of portions of land. Pope Gelasius, in 496, had disapproved of this custom, yet a few years afterwards we find it widely spread. This transfer of real property, dependent on the priest, was continued on the bishop, and was entirely personal, not essentially connected with the office. The ecclesiastical ususfructuary had sometimes to recognise its revocability by a special deed, this declaration being accompanied with the promise of paying interest. But little by little the Frankish legislation made these cessions permanent, and the possession of the land was so intimately connected with the performance of duties that it passed uninterruptedly from every occupant to his successor. Thus in the precarium to the course of time the character of real benefices. See Ecclesia.

It was not so rare an occurrence that ecclesiastical property of that kind was given for services rendered, or to be rendered, or against payment of a tax, even to laymen. These possessions also were called precaria, for not only did their collation depend on the bishop, but the deed had to be renewed every five years. But this also took in course of time the character of a real lease. Still another meaning given to the word precaria is that of deed—an instrument donating property to the Church, but stipulating for the grantee the undertaking of the religious life. The deed of consent given by the other side was called praxaria. Formularies of precaria and prebendalities may be found in Marculi Formul. lib. ii, no. 5, 40, and in the Append. Formul. no. 27, 28, and 41, 42. See Walter, Corp. Jur. Germ. antiq. vol. iii.

Precedence, a recognition of superiority in certain acts due to one person over another. Thus in the ecclesiastical order recognised in the hierarchies of Rome, England, and Russia, or wherever such distinctions of clergy exist, priests precede deacons; and rec- tors, vicars; and vicars, perpetual curates; and incumbents, assistant-stipendiary curates. Rectors rank with each other according to the size and importance of their livings or the date of their induction; bishops according to the precedence of their sees, as in the Anglican establishment, e.g. in the case of London, Durham, and Winchester, and of Meath in Ireland, where the incumbent bears the title of Most Reverend; or, otherwise, of the date of consecration, by Bishop Mili of Milevi (416), Braga (573), Toledo (630), and London (1075), unless their sees were privileged by ancient custom. Priests and deacons rank according to the date of their ordination. For a cathedral of the old foundation in England, there are deanons—dean, proctor, chancellor, treasurer, archdeacons, canons residentiary (subdean, subchancellor of canons), and canons non-resident. In chapter the bishop sits with the dean, chancellor, archdeacon, and residentiaries on the right, and the proctor, treasurer, archdeacon, and residentiaries on
the left; the rest of the canons in order of installation. At Salisbury two extra archdeacons sat on either side of the entrance. In all processions the members walked two and two, at regular distances—dignitaries in copes, canons priests in choasules, canons, deacons, and subdeacons in purple, canons in purple and dalmatic, and threepacesthererank; juniors first and seniors last in going, but in reverse order on their return; the right-hand side is the place of honor. At St. Paul's the dean walked last, between two dignitaries. The parish clergy go first, then follow vicars, canons, dignitaries, the dean, the bishop, and last the lay persons. Each parish had its cross or banner. Abbotts took precedence according to the date of their beneficent; Glastonbury, St. Alban's, and Westminster at various times challenged the first place among those who were mitred. Rural deans and honorary canons have only local precedence in a rudimentary meeting or cathedral respectively.

**Precentor** (Gr. πρωτοφάλης, κανώναρχος; Lat. domesticus cantorum; Fr. grand chanteur; Sp. cantor, or capo de.) was in the ancient and medieval churches the person who led the singing. He generally commenced the verse of the psalm, and the people joined him in the close. The verses were divided into two parts, and sung alternately, the singers answering to one another; but ordinarily the precentor commenced, and the people joined in the middle, the precentor finishing in the end of the verse. This was called singing acrostics. See **ACROSTICS**. The precentor was the dignitary collated by the diocesan and charged with the conduct of the musical portion of divine service, and required on great festivals and Sundays to commence the responses, hymns, etc., to regulate processions, to distribute the cope, to correct offences in choir, and to direct the singers. In France, England, Germany, and Spain he ranked next to the dean. He gave the signal note to the bishop, and was the successor to the canons and clerks. He supervised the admission of members of the choir and tabled their names for the weekly course on waxen tablets. He corrected and had charge of the choir books. In England when he ruled the choir he wore a rochet, cantolet, or cantor's cope, ring, and gloves, and carried a staff, and the rectors followed him in soutanes (often of red color), surplices, and cope. He installed canons at Exeter, York the dean and dignitaries, and at Lichfield the bishop and dignitaries. He attended the bishop when, as the dean, he walked on the prelate's right hand. At Paris he exercised jurisdiction over all the schools and teachers in the city and respondents in the universities. In French cathedrals, upon high festivals he presides over the choir at the lectern, and carries a baton of silver as the ensign of his dignity. At Rouen, Pau, and Brindisi he, like the other canons, wears a mitre at high mass, and at Cologne was known as chorepiscopus. At Chartres during Easter week all the capitular clergy go to the font, with the subchanter preceding the junior canons, carrying white wands, in allusion to the white robes of the baptized. At Rouen the chanter carries a white wand in certain processions, and no one without his leave could open a song-school in the city. In England his staff faces the dean, being on the north-west. In foreign cathedrals he occupied either the same position or sat next to the dean. The Greek precentor at Christmas wore white, and the singers violet. The exact was the imperial protospatulæ. The dignity of precentor was founded at Amiens in 1219; at Rouen in 1110; at Exeter, Salisbury, York, Lincoln, in the 11th century; at Wells, Chichester, Durham, Wells, Lincoln, and at St. Paul's in the 13th century. The precentor was required to be always resident, and usually held a prebend with his dignity. The Cluniac precentor was called armarius because he was also librarian, the treasurer being procurator. The singers of the primitive Church were regarded as a minor order by pope Innocent III, by the Council of Laodicea (360), and by that of Trullo. When the service of song was intrusted to lay persons in course of time, the title of chanter was preserved in cathedral chapters and collegiate churches as that of a capellan dignitary, having precedence in order of rank and duty in the church.

In modern times the name is applied to those who, in non-ritualistic churches, lead the congregation in singing. This office, lately revived, appears, from Bingham's *Antiquities*, to be of a very early date; the precentor, or phoinikios, was called in the early Church, either leading the congregation, or singing one part of the verse, the other part being sung by the congregation in response. See **Music**. In the medieval churches the precentor was one of the officers belonging to the old religious houses, whose office was afterwards continued in collegiate and cathedral churches in the capacity above first referred to. In Scotland the duties of the precentor have been greatly curtailed. He seems to have succeeded to the reader (q.v.) of earlier times. It was the habit of the precentor to repair to church about half an hour before the minister came, and read to the people several passages of Scripture. When the minister entered the precentor gave out a psalm and led the singing. After the beginning of last century he ceased by degrees either to read the Scriptures or prescribe the psalm. But his desk is still, from its original use, called the **precentorial** desk, and by the old people the **precentor's desk**. —Walcott, Sacred *Archaeology*, s. v.; Hook, *Eccles. Dict. s. v.*; Earle, *Eccles. Dict. s. v.* See Desk; Lectern; Singing; Staff; Worship.

**Precept** is a direction, command, or rule enjoined by a superior. Religious precepts are divided into moral and positive. The precepts of religion, says Saunin, are an essential as the doctrines; and religion will as certainly sink if the morality be subverted, as if the theology be undermined. The doctrines are only proposed to us as the ground of our duty. A moral precept derives its force from its intrinsic fitness; a positive precept from the authority which enjoins it. Moral precepts are commanded because they are right; positive are right because commanded. The duty of honoring our parents and of observing the Sabbath are instances, respectively, of each kind of precept. See **Law**.

**Preceptories** (or Commanderies) are estates or benefices anciently possessed by the Knight Templars. On the destruction of the Templars they erected religious and service and convenient houses for habitation, and placed some of their fraternity, under the government of one of those more eminent Templars who had been by the grand-master created **preceptors templi**, to take care of the lands and rents in that neighborhood. All the preceptors of a province were subject to a provincial superior, called Grand Preceptor; and there were three of these who held rank above all the rest—the grand preceptors of Jerusalem, Tripolis, and Antioch. Other houses of the order were usually called commanderies.

**Precepts, the Six Hundred and Thirteen**, or פרקטיים. In the preface to his *Heb Pictures* (fol. 2, col. 2), Moses Maimonides (q.v.) writes thus: "The number of the precepts of the law is 613, of which there are 248 affirmative precepts, or precepts of commission, במשרשים וברויאים, corresponding to the 248 members of the human body, and 365 negative precepts, or precepts of omission, בטלנין וברויאים, corresponding to the number of days of the solar year." The rabbis assert that the multiplicity of precepts which God has given to the nation of Israel in preference to all others is a sign of his predilection for them, for, says rabbi Chanaan ben-Akashia, "The Holy One (blessed be he) has been pleased to render Israel meritorious; therefore he multiplied them to the law and the commandments, as it is said, 'The Lord is well pleased for his righteous one's sake'; he will magnify the law, and
make it honorable" (Isa. xiii, 21). If we may believe Jewish notions, we also learn that the patriarchs already fulfilled the 613 precepts. The Jewish commentator Rashī (q. v.) thus comments very gravely on Gen. xxxii, 5: "ז"ע רבי רש"י עִבְּרֵי רֵעֲרוּ וְאֵּלִ֑י, יִהְבוּ שֵֽׁנֵים עִמָּ֖ם לָבֳנָֽא׃" The word רֵעֲרוּ, according to the Gemara (comp. the art. כֶּלֶּל, vol. ii, p. 4.), amounts to 619 (i. e. 10 × 61, 6000 = 600, 205, or 10 + 400 + 200 + 48 = 618), by which he (i. e. Jacob) wished to communicate (to his brother Esau). It is true I have sojourned with the wicked Laban, but still I observed the 613 precepts, and I have not been infected with his evil deeds; or, as the original reads, יִהְבוּ שֵֽׁנֵים עִמָּ֖ם לָבֳנָֽא׃", the same is the remark of Boal Halutrin, ad loc. Strictly orthodox Jews make their children commit to memory all the 613 precepts, as they consider a thorough knowledge of them to be a key to the oral law, though in their youth they are unintelligible to a child. Rabbi Gedaliah, of Amsterdam, published a catalogue of them in 1745, which he designated תְּרוּתָת קַאֲטָו, or The Law in Miniature. He says in his preface, "Which children are to learn in their infancy, to know them off by heart; which will be a great introduction for them to learn the oral law; and which, at the same time, they have learned in their youthful days they may remember in their old age; that they may know to do them, and live by them in this world and in the world to come." The arrangement of these precepts is different. Some, as Maimonides, arrange them according to the matter, and the same has been followed by Jon. Ebyensschtz, who put them in verse (Prague, 1765). Another is that by Gedaliah, of Amsterdam, who gives them according to the order of the Pentateuch, which is by far more preferable. As it would be tedious and fruitless to enumerate them, we will refer the reader who may feel interested to Jost, Geschichtc d. Juden u. s. Secten, i, 451 sq.; Bodenachts, Kirchliche Verfassung d. heutigen Juden (Erlangen, 1748), iv, 181 sq. (where the Hebrew is also given); Margoliouth, Modern Judaism Investigated (Lond. 1843), p. 115 sq.; and the Synagogum of the Modern Jew (ibid. 1843), p. 202 sq. (B. P.)

Preces (i. e. prayers) are the verses and responses said in the Roman Catholic, English, and other churches at the beginning of matins and even-song.

Preces Dominicales feriales. The preces Dominicales, so called from the Dominica or Lord's Day, when they are usually recited, are those prayers which are added as a complement to the Matins and complinetorium, after the regular psalms. These preces are not recited at all duplices (double feasts), nor within the octaves, nor in the vigil of Epiphany, in the feria sexa, nor in subбота, after the octave of Ascension. The preces feriales take place in penitential times, and on the days of penitence. They are prayed kneeling at laudes, and at every single hora (time of the day) at all offices in Advent, in the forty days of Lent, in the Ember days, and vigils connected with a day of fast; with the exception of the vigil of Christmas, the vigil of Pentecost, and the ensuing Ember days. These preces are also omitted in the vigils of Epiphany and Ascension, as these feasts have no day of fast. The preces feriales begin with the "Kyrie eleison" and a whispered "Pater-noster," then, at laudes and evens, follow, "in versicles" and "responsories," prayers for the clergy, sovereigns, and people, for the community, for the deceased, for the absent brethren, the oppressed, and prisoners. Then follows the psalm "De profundis," so full of abnegation and contrition (at laudes, or "misericordiae," with some suitable final verses and the oration of the day.

Pretchtl, Maximilian, a German Benedictine, noted as a theologian and renowned as a student of canon law, was born Aug. 29, 1577, at Hahnbach, in the Bavarian Palatinate; he studied first under the Jesuits at Amberg, and was at the age of eighteen years admitted to the college of the Benedictines at Michaelfeld, where he received a philosophical and theological education, and was consecrated in 1781. In 1782 his monastery sent him to Salzburg, where he acquired a knowledge of the law, which served in good stead to his congregation in several lawsuits. He was then a professor of dogmatics and morals; in 1790 he was called to Amberg as teacher of dogmatic and ecclesiastical history, and in 1796 he was rector in the same city. Jan. 14, 1800, he was elected abbot of the monastery of Michaelfeld. After the suppression of his monastery he lived at Vilsbek, entirely devoted to study and to acts of benevolence. He died Jan. 13, 1832. The following are his works: Possédences juridiques ecclésiastiques universelles, Germanicarum ac Helveticae accommodati (Amberg, 1807); Succincta serie theologiarum theoreticarum, quam in monasterio Michaelfeldiense defen- dent, etc. (ibid. 1811); Historia Monasteriorum Michaelfeldensis; Tractatus de usu satisfactorio et absolutione, datis an preconial odors:—Wie sind die oberpfälzischen Abteien im Jahre 1695 aberal an die geistlichen Ordensstände gekommen? (1802); Friedenssoworte an die katholische und protestantische Kirche für ihre Wiedereinigung (Salzburg, 1810); Seelensätze zur Weihsel Dr. Martin Luthers an den neuen Kirchen, und der neuen Strafe in den Papstum zu Rom vom Tenfel gestiftet (ibid. 1817); Abgedrungene Antwort auf das zweite Sendeschreiben Dr. Martin Luthers an den Herausgeber, etc. (ibid. 1818):—Kritischer Rückblick auf Brm. Chr. Robert's kritische Belehrung der Seelensätze zur Weihsel Dr. M. Luthers (ibid. 1818). Pretchtl, it will be noticed from the list of his works, entered into a controversy on the questions at issue between Romanists and Protestants. His own desire was a union of all Christians, and he first wrote for this, but was unsuccessful; but, like all Romanists, he was unwilling to acknowledge the ecclesiastical condition of his own ecclesiastical body, and was therefore assailed by the Lutherans. The result was a decided polemical cast in his later writings, and a proportionate decline of scholarship and increase of haste and acrimony. (J. H. W.)

Precipiano, Humbert William, Count of, a Spanish prelate of French birth, was a native of Besançon, where he was born in 1626. He came from an ancient family, originally from Genoa. He was canon at Besançon, and archdeacon at the Paroisse de Dole and abbot of Bellevaux in 1649. In 1661 he was elected high-dean of the chapter, but the validity of his election was contested by the Holy See. He found a compensation in the confidence of king Philip IV of Spain. In 1667 he was created bishop of Urgel, and in 1671 with his brother Prosper-Ambroise, to the Diet of Ratisbon. The talents which he displayed on that occasion were rewarded five years later by his nomination to the dignity of supreme councillor of Charles II for the affairs of Burgundy and the Netherlands. His nomination to the episcopal see of Bruges in 1689, where he passed in 1689 to the archiepiscopal see of Mechlin, was the reward of his devotion to Don Juan of Austria. His zeal for the consolidation of the ultramontane doctrines was so great that he imagined a formulary more exacting than that of Alexander VII. Two decrees of the Inquisition (Jan. 28 and Feb. 6, 1694) condemned the new formulary. The prelate refused to submit to the decrees. Innocent XII joined all bishops of Belgium to abandon those quarrels, which had already lasted too long, and which the fanaticism of Precipiano endeavoured to revive. In 1696 he recantated somewhat harshly, a little more moderation to the archbishop of Mechlin. The great blot in Precipiano's life is his consent to the Jesuits for the arrest of Quemel (q. v.), May 30, 1703, at Malines. The cities of Bruges, Besançon, Brussels, Malines, and the abbey of St. Hubert passed into possession of monuments of the magnificence and piety of this prelate. He died at Brussels June 9, 1711.
Precisians, one of the names given to the Puritans, or those who, about the time of the Commonwealth, erudite men, who conducted that the king be earned on the subject of religion. They were called précieux because they condemned swearing, plays, gaming, drinking, dancing, and other worldly recreations on the Lord's day, as well as the time-serving, careless, and corrupt religion which was then in fashion.

Precisat (from the Latin precisatus) is the name of a candidate priest, by means of the process, for a vacant spiritual prebend. See PREVEND.

Preconisation (i.e. publication, from praco, "a herald"). The appointments to all higher offices of the Church, especially episcopal and archiepiscopal sees, whether they be made by canonical election or by nomination, are subject to cause majoris ex parte and necessitas, for a vacant spiritual prebend. See PREVEND.

Preconisation (i.e. publication, from praco, "a herald"). The appointments to all higher offices of the Church, especially episcopal and archiepiscopal sees, whether they be made by canonical election or by nomination, are subject to cause majoris ex parte and necessitas, for a vacant spiritual prebend. See PREVEND.

Predestination (i.e. publication, from praco, "a herald"). The appointments to all higher offices of the Church, especially episcopal and archiepiscopal sees, whether they be made by canonical election or by nomination, are subject to cause majoris ex parte and necessitas, for a vacant spiritual prebend. See PREVEND.

Predestination (i.e. publication, from praco, "a herald"). The appointments to all higher offices of the Church, especially episcopal and archiepiscopal sees, whether they be made by canonical election or by nomination, are subject to cause majoris ex parte and necessitas, for a vacant spiritual prebend. See PREVEND.

Precisians procured his condemnation and his transmission as a prisoner to Hinckmar, archbishop of Rheims, to whose jurisdiction he properly belonged. On the arrival of Gottschalk, Hinckmar summoned a council at Quiercy, in A.D. 845, which was, however, in the end, decided by the learned Ratzmannus, as well as by Remigius, archbishop of Lyons, he was deprived of his priestly office, ordered to be whipped, and afterwards to be imprisoned. Worn out with such treatment, and after languishing for some years in the solitude of a prison, this learned and thoughtful man died under excommunication, but maintaining his opinions to the last While Gottschalk was shut up within the narrow walls of a prison his doctrines were the subject of a keen and bitter controversy in the Latin Church. Ratzmannus and Remigius on the one side, and Scottus Eriugena on the other, conducted the argument with great ability.

The contention was every day increasing in violence, and Charles the Bald found it necessary to summon another council at Quiercy, in A.D. 865, when, through the influence of Hincmar, the decision of the former council was repeated, and Gottschalk again condemned as a heretic. But in A.D. 865 the three provinces of Lyons, Vienne, and Arles met in council at Valence, under the presidency of Remigius, when the opinions of Gottschalk were approved, and those of the two councils of Quiercy were reversed. Of the twenty-three canons of the Council of Valence, five contain the doctrinal views of the friends and defenders of Gottschalk. Thus in the third canon they declare, "We confidently profess a predestination of the elect unto life, and a predestination of the wicked unto death. But in the election of those to be saved, the mercy of God precedes their good deeds; and in the condemnation of those who are to perish, their ill-deeds precede the righteous judgment of God. In his predestination God only determines with his will, what he should do, either in his grace or mercy or in his righteous judgment." "In the wicked he foresaw their wickedness, because it is from themselves; he did not predestine it, because it is not from him. The punishment, indeed, consequent upon their ill-desert he foresaw—being God, he foresees all things—and also predestined, because he is a just God, with whom, as St. Augustine says, there is both a fixed purpose and a certain foreknowledge in regard to all things whatever.” “But that some are predestinated to wickedness by a divine power, so that they cannot choose another character, and that the same believes, but if there are those who will believe so great a wrong, we, as well as the Council of Orange, with all detestation, declare them anathema.” The five doctrinal canons of the Council of Valence were adopted without alteration by the Council of Touli, in A.D. 865, which last council re-established the power of the bishops in the episcopal provinces. But on the death of Gottschalk, which happened in A.D. 868, the contention terminated. See PREDESTINATION.

Predestination, a doctrine upon which great division of opinion prevails among Christians.

1. Definition.—The word predestinate properly signifies to destine (i.e. to set apart, or devote to a particular use, condition, or end) beforehand. It therefore denotes a mere act of the will, and should be carefully distinguished from that exercise of power by which volitions are actualized or carried into effect. Etymologically it would be proper to say that God before the foundation of the world predestinated the sun to be luminous, the loadstone to attract, the atmosphere to perform its varied ministries. In theological language, however, God would be said to predestinate, not just the sun, but the destinatio late dicta, or predestination in its wider signification. The former was God's decree to save all
persevering believers in Christ; the latter was that original redemptive volition in which he "will have all men to be saved" (1 Tim. ii. 4). In the Reformed Church the word has sometimes been employed as synonymous with election (q. v.), sometimes as covering both election and reprobation (q. v.). Arminius, in his 15th Pub. Disputat., sect. 3, sought to distinguish between these two terms. His ideas were not more scriptural, but he is not followed in this respect by his remonstrant successors. Calvin and most of his followers employ the term as applying to the repulsive decree of God as much as to the elective (see this point discussed under Calvinism, vol. ii., p. 48, col. 29).

II. Is Predestination Absolute or Conditional? - The central point of the predestination controversy has always been this question: Are the decrees by which certain individuals are elected to eternal life and others decreed to everlasting misery respective or irrespective—that is, were these decrees based upon God's foreknowledge (q. v.) of the different use individuals would make of their moral agency, or were they not? The Arminian takes the affirmative, the Calvinist the negative. The former reasons in this wise: Divine predestination, regarded as the complete, all-embracing plan of God, was objectively absolute; it is obvious that the various individual decrees which are conceived of as components of that plan must mutually limit and condition each other. Thus the divine determination that "while the earth and harvest shall not cease" was not an absolute decree, but one conditioned upon the divine determination, antecedent to it in the order of nature, that there should be an earth with planetary motion, etc. Were not each decree adjusted to every other they could not compass the attainment of its common end. Instead of being integrating elements of one wise and self-consistent plan, some might be found superfluous, some perhaps in direct collision. Hence no individual decree can be regarded as irrespective or unconditioned; each is conditioned on the succeeding, and on the whole system of divine pre-volitions of which it forms a part. Now an absolute, irreversible decree, continues the Arminian, either electing an individual to eternal life or dooming him to everlasting death, fails to answer to either of these essential conditions or characteristics of a divine decree. It would be palpably inconsistent with the divine perfections on the one hand, and absolutely irreconcilable with known determinations of God on the other. Such an elective decree would be incompatible with God's rationality and impenetrability. To those who believe in a conflict not only with his benevolence, but even with his justice. Both would be at open war with the known design of the Creator that men should enjoy the enjoyment of moral agency and shape their own eternal destinies. Hence an unconditional, irrespective election of some unto life, and an unconditional, irrespective reprobation of others unto death, cannot be maintained. If any are individually elected or rehorted, they must have been elected or rehorted with reference to the foreseen use they would make of their moral agency, for only in this principle can the determinations be constructed which shall not compromise the divine character or conflict with known determinations respecting man.

So just and conclusive is this reasoning that the long task of the absolute predestinarians has been to devise some expedient by which unconditional election and reprobation may be shown to be compatible with the divine attributes and with all known divine decrees. Several have been tried. (1) Perhaps the most legitimate of them all is that adopted by those divines who consider the divine will the ground of all rational and moral qualities. If that will affirms, nothing is rational or irrational, just or unjust, right or wrong, except that for the time being it is God's will that it should be so, then evidently an arbitrary damnation of innocent beings may be just as right and proper an act as any other. If he wills it to be right, then it is right; however it may seem to us. Hence, on this scheme, we have only to suppose that God wills an act to be right to render it perfectly proper and consistent for him to perform it. Only on this hypothesis can irrevocable predestination be successfully defended. (2) Another class of divines, unable to adopt this bold principle (according to which God is able to abrogate the moral law as easily as the old ceremonial one of the Jews), yet forced to mitigate in some way the revolting horrors of an irrevocable predestination, have sought relief in the fiction, a posteriori, on the spurious foreknowledge. Calvinists, in themselves only, were incapable of anything supernatural. Only by the aid of supernatural and divine grace could their nature be conformed and strengthened if it should remain in its integrity, they're restored if it should then, as the means to produce a true understanding, God determined by an immutable decree to elect certain men, so viewed, to participation in his grace and glory. To show his sovereign freedom, he determined to pass by the remainder (pretitition), and not communicate to them that divine aid requisite to keep them from sin; then, when the persons passed by become sinners, he proposes to demonstrate his justice by their damnation. How much real relief this device affords may be seen by consulting Arminius, Declaration of Sentiments, or Watson, Institutes, pt. ii., ch. xviii. (8.) Another expedient sometimes employed in the reconciliation of a predestinarian theodicy is to regard sin as a mere negation. As brought forward by Dr. Chalmers (Institutes, pt. iii, ch. v), it might be viewed as a modification of the last-mentioned. Both fail to vindicate even the justice of God, since in each case the finally damned are damned solely for failing to do what they have no ability, natural or vouchsafed, to perform. (4) A fourth scheme is called sublaptoriasion. In this the fall of man was antecedent in the order of the divine decrees to election and reprobation. All men are viewed as personally great and powerful and Adam and Eve with him to eternal death. From this mass God sovereignly and graciously elected some unto life for a demonstration of his mercy; the rest he reprobated to everlasting woe for a demonstration of his justice. In all this it is claimed that there was nothing inconsistent with God's character, since all might justly have been damned. It happens, however, that few are ready to acquiesce in this all-important premise, to wit, that all the descendants of Adam are justly obnoxious to eternal death on account of his sin, hence the conclusion avoids nothing, is most obvious. For these ingenious contrivances to harmonize unconditional predestination with God's known attributes and principles of administration as moral governor, the abettors of the doctrine usually come finally (5) to bare assertion. They maintain the unconditionality of election and reprobation on the one hand, and on the other the perfect justice and benevolence of God and adequate agency of man, without attempting to reconcile the two. They resolve the palpable contradiction into a mere "mystery," and imperiously shut every opponent's mouth with the misquoted Scripture, "Who art thou that repliest against God?"

As our limits do not admit of a methodical examination of the various passages of Scripture in which Calvinists find their doctrine asserted or assumed, we shall be obliged to refer the reader to Watson, and to those
commentators who have not devoted themselves to Biblical interpretation merely as an advantageous polemical agency. We only remark, in passing, that no fact is more striking or significant in the whole history of Scripture than the steady preoccupation of all sound expositors to the exegetical views of the early Remonstrants. Tholuck gratefully acknowledges his obligation to them, and even Prof. Stuart quite as often follows Grotius as Calvijn. Indeed, he confesses that he cannot find irrespective election in Rom. viii, 26-30, nor can he "show how the fathers are to be made to stand," nor can he "square" or rationalize the views of the early Remonstrants. (Com. Exe. x, 347.) In like manner he adopts the interpretation of Rom. vii, 5-25, which it cost Arminius so much to establish, and believes the time is coming "when there will be but one opinion among intelligent Christians about the passage in question, as there was but one before the dispute of Augustine with Pelagius." (Exe. vii, 7.)

III. History of the Doctrine.—The unanimous and unquestioned doctrine of the Church on this point for more than four hundred years was, so far as developed into distinctness, precisely identical with that which owes its scientific form and name to Arminius (q. v.). The early fathers often expressed themselves unguardedly, and, in so doing, sometimes laid themselves open to the charge of a leaning towards the erroneous views and dogma of Pelagianism (q. v.) and his cypher, [Pele.]; but their general sentiment was soundly evangelical and capable of an enunciation entirely free from every suspicion of consanguinity with that heresy. "In respect to predestination," says Wiggers, "the fathers before Augustine differed entirely from them.... They had predestination upon presence. Hence the Massilians were entirely right when they maintained that Augustine's doctrine of predestination was contrary to the opinion of the fathers and the sense of the Church" (A. Aquas. and Pelagianism, p. 425). Justin, Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and Chrysostom—all in clear and decisive statements—gave their adherence to the theory of conditional predestination, rejecting the opposite as false, dangerous, and utterly subversive of the divine glory. It is evident that they did not investigate the subject to the depth to which it is requisite for the full discussion of it to go, and that various questions, which must be put before it can be brought completely before us, they either did not put or hastily regarded as of very little moment; but it is enough to do so, and not to lack others in the same line of thought, if they did express themselves upon it, and have so expressed themselves as to leave no doubt of the light in which it was contemplated by them. Justin, in his dialogue with Trypho, remarks, that "they who were foreknown as to become wicked, were such overlords of their own bodies that they did not commit any faults of God, aitir tou Theou, but from their own blame," by which observation he shows that it was his opinion that God foresaw in what manner his intelligent creatures would act, but that this did not affect their liberty, and did not diminish their guilt. A little after he says more that God has assigned the last name among the angels and men free to the practice of righteousness, having planted in them reason, through which they knew by whom they were created and through whom they existed, when before they were not, and prescribed to them a law by which they were to be judged, if they acted contrary to right reason. Wherefore we, angels and men, are through ourselves convicted as being wicked, if we do not lay hold of repentance. But if the Logos of God foretells that some angels and men would go to be punished, he does so because he foreknew that they would certainly become wicked by no means, however, because God made them such." Justin thus admits that man is wholly dependent upon God, deriving existence and everything which he has from the Almighty; but he is persuaded that we were perfectly able to retain our freedom, that, although it were preordained that we should not do so, this did not diminish our moral power, or fix any imputation on the Deity in consequence of our transgression. Tatian, in his oration against the Greeks—an excellent work, which, although composed after the death of Justin, was written, in all probability, before its date—had already stated all that he desired towards the conclusion of his life—expresses very much the same sentiments avowed by Justin. He says, "Both men and angels were created free, so that man becoming wicked through his own fault may be deservedly punished, while a good man, who, from the right exaltation of which it was given him to possess the law of the God, is entitled to praise; that the power of the divine Logos, having in him the knowledge of what was to happen, not through fate or unavoidable necessity, but from free choice, predicted future things, condemning the wicked and praising the righteous." Irenæus, in the third book of his work against heresies, has taken an opportunity to state his notions about the origin of evil. The seventy-first chapter of that book is entitled, "A proof that man is free, and has power to the extent, that of himself he can choose what is good or the contrary." In illustration of this he remarks, "God gave to man the power of election, as he did to the angels. They, therefore, who do not obey are justly not found with the good, and receive deserved punishment, because God, having given them the power of election, did not give them the riches of the divine mercy." The next chapter is entitled, "A proof that some men are not good by nature and others wicked, and that what is good is within the choice of man. In treating on this subject, Irenæus observes that, if the reverse were the case, the good would not merit praise nor the wicked blame, because, being merely what, without any will of theirs, they had been made, they could not be considered as voluntary agents. But," he adds, "since all have the same nature, and are able to retain and to do what is good, and not to do it, it is not only that they see men, even in the sight of men, and much more in that of God, deservedly praised and others blamed." In support of this he introduces a great variety of passages from Scripture. It appears, however, that the real difficulty attending the subject had suggested itself to his mind, for he inquires in the seventy-second chapter why God had not from the beginning made man perfect, all things being possible to him. He gives to this question a metaphysical and unsatisfactory answer, but it so far satisfied himself as to convince him that there could not exist any other thing, not, on the contrary, those who did not love God, those who did not love the perfections of the Almighty, and that, consequently, a sufficient explanation of the origin of evil and of the justice of punishing it was to be found in the nature of man as a free agent, or in the abuse of that liberty with which God endowed (see Irenæus, iv, 392; Justin, c. Trypho, c. 140.)

In the Western Church all the early theologians and teachers were equally unanimous. While the Alexandrian theologians laid special stress on free will, those of the West dwelt more on amara depravity and on the necessity of grace of God, and made the two points so far all agreed. It was conceded that it was conditioned by free will. Unconditional predestination they all denied. This stage of Church doctrine is represented by Hilary of Poitiers and Ambrose of Milan, as well as by Tertullian (A. dc. Marcion, ii, 6), who, much as he sometimes needed the doctrine of irresistible grace, would never so much as adopt an unconditional election, much less an unconditional repubration. Tertullian had also speculated upon the moral condition of man, and has recorded his sentiments with respect to it. He explicitly asserts the freedom of the will, and says that, if it can be denied, there can be neither reward nor punishment; and in answer to an objection that since free will has been productive of such melancholy consequences it would have been better that it had not been bestowed, he enters into a long and rationally pertinent argument. In reply to another suggestion that God
be made predestination to depend on prescience (De Fide, lib. v, § 83). In other places, however, his language approaches more nearly to that of Augustine (see Hase, Dogmatik, § 162; Gieseler, Dogmengeschichte, § 39; Neander, History of Dogmas, i, 348, 544). To quote Neander again: "Although the freedom and the creative agency of grace are made particularly prominent in these passages, still they do not imply any necessary exclusion of the state of reciprocity in the individual as a condition, and accordingly this assertion of Ambrose does not really reconcile with the assertion first quoted. In another place, at least (De Fide, lib. v, § 88), he expressly supposes that predestination is conditioned by foreknowledge (ibid., ii, 564)."

The substantial doctrines of the fathers as to the extent of grace before Augustine was that Christ died, not for an elect portion of mankind, but for all men, and that if men are not saved the guilt and the fault are their own (Gieseler, Dogmengeschichte, § 72).

Thus we see that for more than four hundred years not a single voice was heard, either in the Eastern or Western Church, in advocacy of the notion of an unconditional divine predestination. At this point Augustine, already in very advanced old age, and under controversial pressure, took the first step towards Calvinism by pronouncing the decree of election unconditional. In explaining the relation between man's activity and decision, he did not forget the necessity of a free will in man, and he maintained that, although God gives man the power to do good, the will and the act are man's. He denied that there was any divine energy in grace that could impair the operations of free will. Augustine, on the other hand, maintained that grace is an internal operation of God upon those whom he designs to save, imparting not only the power, but also the will to do good. The fact that some are saved and others lost he attributed to the will of God. Hence his doctrines of unconditional predestination, of particular redemption, and of the necessity of grace as a free gift of God, was based upon foreseen guilt, but apparently unconscious of the inconsistency, he denied the applicability of the same principle to election. In 529 the system of Augustine was established as Church doctrine by the Council of Arausio (Orange), but the reaction against the strictly logical yet essentially immoral nature of his dogma has been perpetually manifested. See Augustine.

Four hundred years more passed away before a man could be found bold enough to adopt a theory by declaring that, as God has sovereignly and immutably elected whosoever he pleased unto life, without any foresight of faith and obedience, so he has of his own good pleasure freely and unchangeably predestinated whosoever he pleased unto everlasting misery, without any reference to foreknown sin and guilt on their part. This anticipator of Calvin was a Saxon monk named Gottschalk (Godschals)us). His novel view brought down upon him not merely ecclesiastical censure, but even persecution. His doctrine was condemned by a council which Anselm of H Maurus had called at Mayence, A.D. 848 (Mansi, Concilii, iv, 914), and Gottschalk, who was then travelling, was sent to his metropolitan, archbishop Hincmar of Rheims, who called another council at Quierzy in 849. Here he was defended by Ratraminus, the opponent of Paschasius Radbertus in the Eucharistic controversy, and also by Remigius, afterwards archbishop of Lyons; but notwithstanding these powerful supporters, he was condemned a second time, and ordered to undergo the penitence of flogging, which the rule of St. Benedict imposed upon monks who troubled the Church. After this condemnation he was imprisoned in the monastery of Hautville, where he died, without having rescinded his opinions, about the year 868. See Gottschalk.

While the friends of Gottschalk were endeavoring to obtain his absolution and release, Hincmar put forward Johannes Scotus Erigena (q. v.) to answer his predesti-
nation theory, which Erigena did in 851, in his treatise *De Prædestinazione*, in which he raised up a cloud of adversaries by the freedom with which he contradicted the established doctrines of the Church as to the natural condition of human nature being thus aroused. Hincmar summoned a second council at Quiercy in 858, which confirmed the decision as to the real doctrine of the Church arrived at by the previous council (Mansi, Concil. xiv. 905). A rival council was called by the opposite party from the provinces of Lorraine, Namur, Liége, and Artois, which met at Aachen in 855, but instead of fully confirming the opinion of Gottschalk, this council considerably modified it by declaring that although sin is foreknown by God, it is not so predestined as to make it necessarily inevitable that it should be committed (ibid. xiv. 1). Hincmar now wrote two works on the subject, one of which is not extant; the other is entitled *De Prædestinatione Dei et Libero Arbitrio adversus Gottschalcum et ceteris Prædestinationibus*. Having thus explained his views at length, they were substantially accepted, in the form of six doctrinal canons, by the Synod of Langres, and by that of Tournai (A.D. 859), held at Savonnières a few days afterwards (Mansi, Concil. xv. 525-27), and thus the controversy terminated. See Manguin, *Collect. auct. de Prædest. et Gratia* (1650); Ussher, *Gottschalchi et Prædest. Controvers. Hist. Epochr* (1654). No authoritative or influential teacher appeared to support Gottschalk's views for seven hundred years. The most conspicuous of those who did was Thomas Bradwardine (A.D. 1290-1349), warden of Merton College, and afterwards archbishop of Canterbury. His work on the subject is entitled *De Causa Dei contra Pelagium et de Virtute causarum ad nos Mertonenses*, and in this he gave free will so low a place that he may be almost called a necessitarian. Thomas Aquinas, who flourished during the 13th century, wrote largely upon the nature of free will and predestination and upon these subjects were nearly the same as those of Augustine; and so much, indeed, was he conceived to resemble in genius and understanding that distinguished prelate, that it was asserted the soul of Augustine had been sent into the body of Aquinas. He taught that God from all eternity, and without any regard to their works, predestinated a certain number to life and happiness; but he found great delight in endeavoring to reconcile this position with the freedom of the human will. His celebrated antagonist, John Duns Scotus, an inquirer par excellence, in his *Quaestiones* and *Difficile* directed his attention in the following century to the same thorny speculations, but he took a different view of them from Aquinas; and we find in the works of these two brilliant lights of the theol. ages upon this subject, the most learned in the dark ages thought upon this question.

In the midst of the ferment of the Reformation, the subject of predestination was revived by a controversy between Erasmus and Luther, the former writing an able *Disputatio de Libero Arbitrio* in 1524, and Luther following it up with his halting treatise *De Servo Arbitrio*, in which he went so near to the predestinarians as to deny that any free will can exist in man before he has received the gift of faith. But at this stage stepped forth John Calvin (q. v.) as the champion of predestination. He found the Reformed churches in a perfectly chaotic state as respects doctrines. They possessed no coherent creed or system. They were held together by agreement in mere negations. They needed nothing so much as a positive system. Calvin, a stripping off of the human mind of all the false notions of the ancient and best divines in the land wore in the chiefest points in opinion against the heads and their resolutions. Another letter he sent to the heads themselves, telling them that they had enjoined Barret to affirm that which was contrary to the doctrine held and expressed in the first two articles of the Confession of Faith, the *Predestination of the Church of England*, and in other churches likewise men...
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of best account; and that which for his own part be thought to be false and contrary to the Scriptures; for the Scriptures are plain that God by his absolute will did not hate and reject any man. There might be impiety in believing the one, and, therefore, no impiety in believing the other. The question is not about any man's private opinion, but about the doctrine of the Church; and supposing the archbishop to be a Calvinist, as he seems to have been at least in some points, this only adds the greater weight to his testimony, that the English Church has nowhere declared in favor of that scheme. The archbishop descended to the particulars charged against Barret, asking the heads what article of the Church was contradicted by this or that notion of his; and Whitaker in his reply does not appeal to one of the articles as against Barret, but forms his plea upon the doctrines which then generally obtained in pulpits. His words are, "We are fully persuaded that Mr. Barret hath taught untruth, if not against the articles, yet against the religion of our Church, publicly received, and always held in majesty, established in all consistory, disputation, and lectures." But even this pretense of his, weak as it would have been though true, is utterly false, directly contrary, not only to what has been already shown to be the facts of the case, but also to what the archbishop affirmed, and that too, as must be supposed, upon his own knowledge. As to Dr. Barret, he met with many friends who espoused his cause. Mr. Smythe particularly mentions four—Mr. Overal, Dr. Clayton, Mr. Harriet, Dr. Andrews—all of them great and learned men, men of renown, and famous in their several parts of the kingdom for their great worth, and none of them, by any means, ready to afford the pillory. The heads in their letter to lord Burleigh do not pretend that the preaching against Calvinism gave a general offence, but that it offended many—which implies that there were many others on the opposite side; and they expressly say there were divers in the anti-Calvinistic scheme, whom they represent as maintaining it with great boldness. But what put a stop to this prosecution against Barret was a reprimand from their chancellor, the lord Burleigh, who wrote to the heads that as good and as ancient were of another judgment, and that the heads which most parts of him, and so his well-doing. But Dr. Whitaker, regius professor of divinity in Cambridge, could not endure the further prevalence of the doctrines of general redemption in that university; he therefore, in 1589, drew up nine affirmations, elements of doctrine of predestination, and obtained for them the sanction of several Calvinistic heads of houses, with whom he repaired to the archbishop Whitgift. Having heard their ex parte statement, his grace summoned bishops Fletcher and Vaughan, and Dr. Tindal, dean of Ely, to meet Dr. Whitaker and the Cambridge divines; and, in his grace's presence, the authors met him, the 23rd of November, 1593; where, after much polishing and altering, they produced Whitaker's affirmation, called the "Lambeth Articles" (q. v.). Dr. Whitaker died a few days after his return from Lambeth with the nine articles to which he had procured the patronage of the prime. After his demise, two competitors appeared for the vacant king's professorship—Dr. Wotton, of King's College, a professor Calvinist, and Dr. Overal of Trinity College, "almost as far," says Heylin, "from the Calvinist doctrine in the main platform of predestination as Barret, his chief antagonist, proved to be. But when it came to the vote of the university, the place was carried for Overal by the major part: which plainly shows that though the doctrines of Calvin were so hotly stuckle here by most of the heads, yet the greater part of the laymen, namely, the called themselves. "The Lambeth Articles," it is well observed, "are no part of the doctrine of the Church of England, having never had any of the least sanction either from the parliament or the convocation. They were drawn up by Prof. Whitaker; and though they were afterwards approved by the archbishop Whitgift, and six or eight of the inferior clergy, in the manner of articles, they had a judgment yet that meeting was only in a private manner, and without any authority from the queen; who was so far from approving of their proceedings that she did not only order the articles to be suppressed, but was resolutely bent for some time to bring the bishop and his articles under a praemunire, for presuming to make them without any warrant or legal authority." Such, in brief, was the origin and such the fate of the Lambeth Articles, without the countenance of which the defenders of Calvinism in the Church of England could not find any semblance of support for their manifold affirmations on predestination and its kindred topics. At the census of 1651 two congregations calling themselves "Predestinarians" were returned. Through the Puritans the Calvinistic notions were spread all over New England, and by the Reformed Dutch and other Presbyterian bodies carried through most of the Middle and Western States of America. In some quarters they have been either outgrown [see ONEKIN THEOLOGY] or so modified by outside Arminian influence as to lose all the marks of the original creed and standards of several large denominations of the world the peculiar doctrines of Calvinism are unequivocally enunciated. From that celebrated synod known as the Westminster Assembly came forth the Calvinistic Confession and its catechisms, and its form of Church government. These wonderful documents have been preserved unchanged to the present time. The formula of the Presbyterian Church of America at this time are essentially the same that were promulgated by the Westminster Assembly of Divines more than two hundred years ago. They have been revised and sanctioned by the members of the Church. They must be distinctly professed by all its ministers and office-bearers. They are taught from the chairs of its theological schools, and they are elaborately systematized and ably defended in its able-bodied divines—of which the best and ablest, by Dr. Hodge, of Princeton, has recently been issued. That these teach the doctrines of predestination nobody denies; that to unsophisticated minds they exalt the divine sovereignty at the expense of his justice and his grace is often contended, that this has seemed to be a hold that, to make them agree with the language of Holy Scripture, entirely illegitimate methods of accommodation have had to be resorted to. See ARMINIANISM; CALVINISM.

IV. Connection of Predestination with other Doctrines.

—Much confusion and obscurity has arisen in the progress of the predestinarian controversy from failing to keep the real issue always distinctly in view. The point in controversy is not whether or not God had a plan when he entered upon creation. See FOREKNOCKING; PROVIDENCE. Whether is it whether or not that plan embraced a positive preappointment of every individual event in the whole range of futurity. Nor yet is it whether or not an exercise of divine energy is inerably connected with any or all of God's predeter-

minations so that they are "effectual" decrees. See CALLING; GRACE. The real question is: Has God by an immutable and eternal decree predestinated some of the human family unto eternal life, and all the others unto everlasting destruction, without any reference whatever to the way they may make of their moral agency? This is the Calvinistic point. This point turns solely on what he regards as Scripture authority, and often admitting that the human mind cannot reconcile it with the character of God or the dictates of human reason. Among the denominations some have repudiated the "support of the predestinarian decrees". "The Lambeth Articles," it is well observed, "are no part of the
believeth shall be saved, he that believeth not, etc. Others allow an individual or personal election, but, like Watson, understand by it "an act of God done in the foreknowledge even to the foreordination of the means of salvation" (Inst. ii. 338). Others, as the older Arminians generally, suppose that specific individuals were eternally predestinated to life and death, but strictly according to their foreknown obedience or disobedience to the Gospel.

V. Literature.—The bibliography of this subject is blended with that of ARMINIANISM, ELECTION, FREEDOM, WILL, GRACE, REMONSTRANTS, REPORROBATION, and will be found under these titles. In addition to the works there cited, the following may be referred to as treating of the point of discord: the views of the Reformers, consult the symbolic writings of Möhler and Buchmann; Staudenmayer, In Behalf of the Religious Peace of the Future (Freib. im Br. 1846, 1st pt. 1 vol.); id. Thol. Encycl. (Mentz. 1840, fol.), p. 622; Vyatk, Die menschliche Freiheit in ihrem Verhältniss zur Sünde und zur göttlichen Gnade (Berl. 1841); Müller, Die christliche Lehre von der Sünde, ii. 241-301; Dähne, De praecisaio divina cum libertate humana concordia (Leips. 1680); Braun, De Sacra Scriptura praecis in domo Domini, theol. dogm. (Hamburg. 1684); De noodige concordia praecis et praedestinatis ne com Dei cum lib. arbit., etc.; Augustine, De Predestinatione Sanctorum, and De Dono Perseverantiae; Wiggers, Augustinius et Pelagianismus, and art. in Iglén's (Nieden's) Zeitschr. für Kirch. Theol. pt. ii. 1857; Hagemann, Hist. der philos. Theol. (1657); Deinhard, De praedestinatione, etc. (1657); Beza, Zanchi, Perkins, Gomar, Turretin; Arminius, Declaration of Sentiments, Friendly Discussion with Prof. Junius, and Review of Perkins; id. Scripta Synodalium Remonstrantium; the works of Epiclesis, Corelius, Limboch; Platina (early Eng. Annot.); Apologetic Evangelium; id. Tracts on Predestination (Camab. 1809); Womack, Calvinistic Cabinet Unlocked (very rare); Examination of Tillet, printed in Nicholl's Calvinism and Arminianism Compared (Lond. 1824); Wesley, Predestination Cudly Considered; Fletcher, Cheeks; Musley, Augustinian Doctrine of Predestination (ibid. 1857). A curiosity of the subject is Henry Brey's Script. Predelat, not Futurist; Two Conversations on Rom. viii. 29, 30, and Ephes. i. 5, designed to show that the Predestination of the Bible refers chiefly and primarily to the Restoration and Perfection of the Physical Nature of the Saints at the Last Day (ibid. 1855, 16mo). The best exposition of Calvinitic predestination is of course by Dr. Hodges, the Nestor of American theology of that type. See, therefore, his Systematic Theology, and compare Pope, General Theology. There is a divinity of persons, of human bodies, dos not indicate that a doctrine could be maintained by any more than pecytable in the foregoing. Classification, and not predication, is the ruling idea in each.

Pre-emminence of Christianity, i.e. the higher power and honor due to Jesus the Christ. This doctrine is laid down in Colossians i. 18. In all things in nature, in person, in office, work, power, and honor, Christ has the pre-eminence above angels and men, or any other creature. But a man has no pre-eminence above a beast as to his body; he is liable to the same diseases and death (Eccles. iii. 15). See Bibliotheca Sacra, 1863, p. 281; Church Remembrancer, Jan. 1850, p. 103 sq.

Pre-established Harmony. See Leibnitz.

Pre-existence of Jesus Christ is his existence before he was born of the Virgin Mary. That he really did exist is taught plainly in John iii. 18; vi. 50, 62, etc.; viii. 58; xvi. 5; 1 John i. 2; but there are various opinions respecting this existence. Some, acknowledging, with the orthodox, that in Jesus Christ there was a divine person, and a human body, go into an opinion peculiar to themselves. His body was formed in the Virgin's womb; but his human soul—the first and most excellent of all the works of God—they suppose was brought into existence before the creation of the world, and subsisted in happy union in heaven with the second Person of the Godhead until his incarnation. The doctrine is thus clearly set forth by bishop Bull in his Defence of the Nicene Creed: "All the Catholic orators of the first three centuries taught that Jesus Christ, he who was afterwards so called, existed before he became man, or before he was born, according to the flesh, of the Blessed Virgin, in another nature far more excellent than the human nature; that he appeared to holy men, giving them an earnest, as it were, of his incarnation; that he always prevailed over and provided for the salvation of his people in time to come he would redeem with his own blood, and of consequence that, from the beginning, the whole order or thread of the divine dispensation, as Terrallican speaks, ran through him; further yet, that he was with the Father before the foundation of the world, and that by himself all things were made. Those who advocate this doctrine differ in their chirostological views from those called Arians, for the latter ascribe to Christ only a created deity, whereas the
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former hold his true and proper divinity. They differ from the Socinians, who believe no existence of Jesus Christ before his incarnation; they differ from the Sabelians, who only own a trinity of names; they differ also from the generally received opinion, which is, that Christ was made in the likeness of Adam. He was born of a mother, in exact conformity to that likeness unto his brethren of which St. Paul speaks (Heb. ii. 17). The writers in favor of the pre-existence of Christ's human soul recommend their opinion by these arguments: 1. Christ is represented as his Father's messenger, or agent, being distinct from his Father, sent by his Father, long before his incarnation, to perform actions which seem to be too low for the dignity of pure Godhead. The appearances of Christ to the patriarchs are described like the appearance of an angel, or man really distinct from God; yet one in whom God, or Jehovah, had a peculiar indwelling, or with whom the divine nature had a personal union. 2. Christ, when he came into the world, is said in several passages of Scripture, to have divested himself of some glory which he had before his incarnation. Now if there had existed before this time nothing but his divine nature, this divine nature, it is argued, could not properly have divested itself of any glory (John xvii, 4, 5; 2 Cor. viii. 9). It cannot be said of God that he became poor: he is infinitely self-sufficient; he is necessarily and eternally rich in himself. Neither can it be said of Christ, as he was, that he was rich, if he were never in a richer state before than while he was on earth. 3. It seems needful, say those who embrace this opinion, that the soul of Jesus Christ should pre-exist, that it might have an opportunity to give its previous actual consent to the great and painful undertaking of making atonement for man's sins. It was the human soul of Christ that endured the weakness and pain of his infant state, all the labors and fatigues of life, the reproaches of men, and the sufferings of death. The divine nature is incapable of suffering; it is indifferent to and out of all relation with the Father and the Son is therefore represented as being made before the foundation of the world. To suppose that simple Deity, or the Divine Essence, which is the same in all the three Personals, should make a covenant with itself, is inconsistent.

Dr. Watts, moreover, supposes that the doctrine of the pre-existence of the soul of Christ explains dark and difficult Scriptures, and discovers many beauties and proprieties of expression in the Word of God, which on another view, as in Watts, works, v. 274, 385; Gill, Body of Divinity, i. 51; Robinson, Plea, p. 140; Fleming, Christology; Simpson, Apology for the Trinity, p. 190; Hawker, Sermon on the Divinity of Christ, p. 44, 45; Haag, Histoire des Dogmes Chrétien; Martensen, Dogmatik; Müller, Doctrine of Sin; Lindsay, Divinity of Christ; Hagenbach, Hist. of Dog- 

trines; Studier u. Kräiken, 1860, No. 3, Comp. Indwelling Scheme; Jesus Christ.

Pre-existents (or Preexisttials) is the name given to those who hold the hypothesis of the pre-existence of souls, the doctrine of the human soul of Christ, as well as that he bore something of the image and resemblance of the divine nature. Dr. Samuel Clarke, it will be borne in mind by the well-read student of Christology, did not accept the general orthodoxy view of the Trinity doctrine, but endeavored to form a theory holding an intermediate place between the Arian and orthodox systems, neither allowing Jesus to be called a creature nor admitting his equality with the Father. He held that from the beginning there existed along with the Father a second Person, called the Word in the Womb of Adam. Nor can it be said of Adam that he was an angelic spirit at first. Because of their apostasy in the angelic sphere, they were transferred, as a punishment for their sin, into material bodies in this mundane sphere, and are now passing through a disciplinary process, in order to be restored, all of them, without the aid of the divine and superstitious, and the powers from the Father. The Jews uniformly maintained the pre-existence of the Messiah. In English theology, Dr. Watts was the ablest exponent of this doctrine. In American theology the Rev. Noah Worcester advocated Dr. Watts's theory, but with modified modifications founded on the title "Son of God," which is so frequently applied to Christ in the N. T., and which Worcester alleged "must import that Jesus Christ is the Son of the Father as truly as Isaac was the son of Abraham; not that he is a created intelligent being, but a being who properly derived his existence and nature from God and the Father. Without disowning the doctrine of the pre-existence of Jesus Christ is a not self-existent being, for it is impossible even for God to produce a self-existent son; but as Christ derived his existence from the Father, he is as truly the image of the invisible God as Seth was the likeness of Adam. He is therefore a person of divine dignity, constituted as the creator of the world, the angel of God's presence, or the medium by which God manifested himself to the ancient patriarchs. According to this theory the Son of God became man, or the Son of man, by becoming the soul of a human body. Those who object to the doctrine of the pre-existence of the human soul of Christ do so on the principle that such a doctrine weakens and subverts that of his divine personalty, and assigns as grounds for such a position that—1. A pure intelligent spirit, the first, the most ancient, and the most excellent of creatures, created before the foundation of the world, so exactly resembles the second Person of the Arian Trinity that it is impossible to show the least difference except in name. 2. This pre-existent Intelligence, supposed in this doctrine, is so confused with those other intelligences called angels that we are not sure how to distinguish between the Risen Christ and the angel. 3. He is the Son of man, by making the person of Christ to consist of three natures. 8. If Jesus Christ had nothing in common like the rest of mankind except a body, how could this semi-conformity make him a real man? 4. The passages quoted in proof of the pre-existence of the human soul of Jesus Christ are of the same sort with those which others allege in proof of the pre-existence of all human souls. 5. This opinion, by ascribing the dignity of the work of redemption to this sublime human soul, detracts from the deity of Christ, and renders the last as passive as the first is active. 6. This notion is contrary to the Scripture. St. Paul says, "In all things he behoved him to be made like unto his brethren" (Heb. ii, 17): he partook of all our infirmities except sin. St. Luke says, "He increased in stature and wisdom" (Luke ii, 50). Upon the whole, this scheme, adopted to relieve the difficulties which must always surround mysteries so great, only creates new ones. This is the usual fate of similar speculations, and shows the wisdom of resting in the plain interpretation of the Word of God.
The doctrine of pre-existence first found its advocates in the Christian Church in the 2d century. The fathers Justin Martyr, Origen, and others espoused it, particularly Origen, who became its principal expositor and advocate. It was a belief very prevalent anciently, and is still widely spread throughout the East. The Greek philosophers, too, especially those who held the doctrine of transmigration (q. v.), as the Pythagoreans, Empedocles, Plato—although with him pre-existence is not simply a symbolical myth—were familiar with the conception; and so were the Jews, especially the cabalists. It is generally received by the modern Jews, and is frequently taught in the writings of the rabbinists. One declares that "the soul of man had an existence before its formation;" another that "the universe was there existing before the creation of man;" another says that "the soul of man is a particle of the Deity from above, and is eternal like the heavenly nature." A similar doctrine is believed by the Persian Sofia (q. v.). With the pre-existents should also be classed the metempsychosists, for pre-existence is connected with the idea of metempsychosis (q. v.), according to which doctrine the soul was, in a former life, in punishment for sin, united with a human body, in order to expiate, by the sorrows of earthly existence, anterior transgressions. Therefore, according to Augustine of Hippo, "as the authority of Socrates states (Contra Julianum, iv, 15): "Ex quibus humanae vitae erroribus et aerumnis fit, ut interdum veteres illi sive rates sive in sacris initiaque tradendis divine mentis interpretes, qui nos ab aliquo sceleras suspicatis, post mortem in frigore caelorum esse natos dixerunt, alicuius vidisse videantur." Nemesius, as a philosopher, and Prudentius, as a poet, seem to have been the only defenders of the pre-existence theory, which was condemned formally in the Council of Constantinople in 381, A.D. 540. Hence the doctrine has been embraced by mystics (q. v.) generally, both in ancient and modern times; and has since been revived, in a modified form, in German theology, by Julius Müller, and forms the basis of his work on The Christian Doctrine of Sin, one of the deepest works in modern theology. In American theology it has its able advocate in Dr. Edward Beecher (The Conflict of Ages), but the Christian Church generally has thus far failed to give its assent to it. In the domain of philosophy, direct intellectual interest in this doctrine has nearly ceased in modern times; yet the dream—for, whether true or false, it is and can be nothing but a dream in our present state, and with our present capacities of knowledge—has again and again haunted individual thinkers. Wordsworth has given poetical expression to it in his famous "Initiations of Immortality from Recollections of Early Childhood":

"Our birth is but a sleep and a forgetting,
The soul that rises with us—our life's star, Hath had elsewhere its setting, And cometh from afar. Not in entire forgetfulness, And not in entire shallowing Of bint trailing clouds of glory do we come From God, who is our home."

The latest philosophy of Germany—that of Hegel and of the younger Fichte (Psychologie [1804]—has moderately revived the doctrine; and, with the alliance of such theologians as Müller, may crowd it into prominent consideration upon the Church. It remains for us to say here that the name Predestination was given to the advocates of this belief to distinguish them from the Creationists, those who hold to the immediate creation of the human soul at the moment of the production of the body; and to distinguish them from the Traduciansists, who held that children received soul as well as body from their parents. See Culworth, Intellectual Development of the Universe; Delditzsch, Biblical Psycholgy, p. 41-48; Schadewaldt, Critical Dictionary of Christology, Register, Studien u. Kriften, 1829-37, n. v. Seele; Westminster Rev. April, 1865; Bibliotheca Sacra, Jan. 1855, p. 156; Methodist Rev. Oct. 1853, p. 567. (J. H. W.)

Prefaces (Immolation; the Gallican Controversies; the priest's witness to the veneration of the people; the Monarchic and Gallican State or Talde). It is certain and well-known that pre-existence is generally received by the Catholic Church, and that on certain occasions, particularly Christmas-day, the priest, having said "It is very meet, right, and our bounden duty that we should at all times, and in all places, give thanks unto thee, O Lord [Holy Father] Almighty, everlasting God," adds the proper preface which assigns the reason for peculiar thanksgivings on that particular day, viz.: Because thou didst give Jesus Christ, thine only Son, to be born as at this time for us; who, by the operation of the Holy Ghost, was made very man, of the Virgin Mary his mother, and that without spot or blemish, so that we, made clean from all sin; therefore, with angels, we worship thee. The antiquity of such prefaces may be estimated from the fact that they are mentioned and enjoined by the l30d canon of the African code, which code was formed of the decisions of many councils prior to the time of the Council of Constantinople, held in the year of 381. Pre-existence is not a peculiarly and primitive use of daily and weekly communications, and the people in the later ages did not receive but at the greater festivals; upon which custom there were added to the general preface mentioned before some special prefaces relating to the great mercy of that feast on which they did communicate, the Church thinking that, since every festival was instituted to remember some great mercy, therefore they who received on such a day, besides the general prayers offered for all God's mercies, should at the Lord's table make a special memorial of the mercy proper to that festival; and this seemed so rational to our reformers that they have retained those proper prefaces which relate to Christmas, Easter, Ascension-day, Whit-Sunday, and Trinity-Sunday; so as to praise God for the mercies of Christ's birth, resurrection, and ascension, and of the Holy Ghost, and for the true faith of the holy Trinity. On the greater festivals there are proper prefaces appointed, which are also to be repeated, in case there be a communion, for seven days after the festivals themselves (excepting that for Whit-Sunday, which is to be repeated only 6 days), because Trinity-Sunday, as the seventh, hath a preface peculiar to itself); to the end that the mercies may be the better remembered by often repetition, and also that all the people (who in most places cannot communicate all in one day) may have other opportunities, with those eight days, to join in praising God for such great blessings.

"The reason," says bishop Sparrow, of the Church's lengthening out these high feasts for several days is plain; the subject-matter of them is of so high a nature, and so nearly concerns our salvation, that one day would be too little to meditate upon them, and praise God for them as we ought. A bodily deliverance may justly require one day of thanksgiving and joy; but the deliverance of the soul by the blessings commemorated on those times deserves a much longer time of praise and acknowledgement. Since, therefore, it would be injurious to Christians to have their joy and thankfulness for such mercies confined to one day, the Church, upon the times when these unspeechable blessings were wrought for us, invites us, by her most reasonable commands and persuasions, to meditate on them, and so be thankful and happy. But those who would not meditate on the mercy, let them overleap eight days together.

"The reason of their being fixed to eight days," says Wheatley (Book of Common Prayer), is taken
from the practice of the Jews, who by God's appointment observed their greater festivals, some of them for seven, and one—namely, the Feast of Tabernacles—for eight days. And therefore the primitive Church, thinking that the observance of Christian festivals (of which the Jews' were only types and shadows) ought not to come short of them, lengthened out their higher fasts to eight days."

These prefaces are very ancient, though there were some of them as they stood in the Latin service of later date. For as there are ten in that service, whereof the last, concerning the Virgin Mary, was added by pope Urban (1095), so it follows that the rest must be of a more remote antiquity. The Church of Rome holds that they were composed by Gelasius in memory of Christ's singing a hymn with his disciples after the Last Supper, the Jews at their Paschal supper singing seven Psalms (Ps. cxiii–cxiv). Pope Sixtus added to them the Ter Sanctus. Pope Victor calls them caputula. From the 6th to the 11th century the Western Church had prefaces for every festival, but after that date they were reduced to nine, and are enumerated by pope Pelagius and Alexander as Easter, the Ascension, Pentecost, Christmas, the Apparition of Christ (Epiphany), the Apostles, Holy Trinity, Cross, and Quadragesima. The eucharist of Paul (1 Cor. xiv, 16) and St. Justin is probably the germ of the Western preface and the long thanksgiving over the consecrated gifts. It was due to the Greek Church. The Greeks, by the way, use only one preface. The Church of England has retained five, and those upon the principal festivals of the year, which relate only to the Persons of the Trinity, and not to any saint. "In this preface a distinction is made between ceremonies which were introduced with a good design, and in process of time abused, and those which had a corrupt origin, and were at the beginning vain and insignificant. The last kind the Reformers entirely rejected, but the first were still used for devotion and edification. Some well-disposed Christians were so attached to ancient forms that they would, on no account, suffer the least deviation from them; others were fond of innovation in everything. Between these extremes a middle way had been carefully observed by the Reformers. Many ceremonies had been so grossly abused by superstition and avarice that it was necessary to remove them altogether; but since it was fit to use some ceremonies for the sake of decency and order, it seemed better to retain those which were old than to invent new. Still, the eucharist was remembered that those which were kept rested not on the same foundation as the law of God, and might be altered for reasonable causes; and the English Reformers, in keeping them, neither condemned those nations which thought them inexpedient, nor promised them to any other nation than their own" (Carwithen, Hist. of the Church of England). See, besides the authorities already referred to, Walcott, Sacred Archaeology, a. v. Hook, Church Dictionary, a. v.

Prehislionic Man. See PREDAMITY.

Preissler, Johann Martin, an engraver, brother of the preceding, was born at Nuremberg March 14, 1715. After learning, under the direction of his father and his brothers, the arts of drawing and engraving, he went to Paris in 1738, where he made several engravers and models for the vast building the Temple de Vincennes. He was also as professor of the art of engraving to Copenhagen, was subsequently honored with the title of engraver to the court, and received other honorable distinctions. Among his numerous and much esteemed engravings we mention, of sacred subjects and ecclesiastical history, interest, the Cardinal of Bouillon; J. Andrewe Crasmer; Bald, Muster; Struensee; M. Luther; Gellert; Jul's Kloostack; Raffaello's Madonna of the Chair, a work in which we find in the highest degree all the excellent qualities of Preissler; Paul Veronese's Carrying of the Cross; Rosa's Jonah preaching to the Ninivites; Guido's Ninus and Semiramis; Rubens's Mary, Mother of Grace, and St. Cecilia; the Adoration of the Shepherds, after Vanlo; the Judgment of Solomon and the Happy Meeting, after his own sketches; the Inoculation of the Country of Bernardo; Moses, after Michael Angelo. Preissler made several engravings for the Museum of Florence and for the antique marts of Dresden. He died at Copenhagen Nov. 17, 1794. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, a. v. See Will, Nurnbergisches Lexikon, and Supplement of Altes-Tausch, Adler, Kalmmerlexikon: Nagler, Athenaeum, a. v. See also Serle, Sammlung, a. v.

Preiswerk, Samuel Dr., a Swiss theologian, was born Sept. 19, 1759, at Rümlingen, Switzerland. After having completed his theological studies at Basle, he was appointed in 1824 a minister at the Orphan-house, and in 1826 he succeeded R. Stier (q. v.) as professor at the Mission-house. He had hardly entered upon a new field of ministerial labors in 1830 at Muttenz, when the revolution broke out, which compelled him to leave the place, and two years afterwards he was appointed professor of Old-Testament exegesis and Oriental languages at the École de Théologie of the Evangelical Society at Geneva. In 1867 he returned to Basle, was appointed deacon in 1840, and in 1845 pastor of St. Leonhard, occupying at the same time the chair for Old-Testament exegesis at the university. From 1859 he occupied the position as antisite, or superintendent, of the Church at Basle, till he was called to his rest in 1879. Preiswerk was an excellent preacher and poet, and his fine missionary hymn, "Die ist der Gemeinde Stärke," has been translated into English by Mrs. Winkworth (Lyra Germ. ii, 88 — "Hark! the Church proclaims her honor"). He also published, Das elige und neu erfinden für Preisscher Schrifft (Basle, 1834–40): —Die Nötérerster oder die 10 Stämme Israel (ibid. 1843): this is a translation of The Nortowirs, or the Lost Tribes, by A. Grant (q. v.); —Grammatike Hieroglyfic, prëcëdie d'un Piëca hiëstigare sur la Langue Hiéroglyque (3d ed. 1871); See Furr, Bibliotheca Judaica, iii, 120; Zuchold, Hiklochron Theolozie, iii, 1012; Steinschneider, Bibliog. Handbuch, p. 112; Peck, Samuel Preiswerk, in the "Evangel. Messenger" (Cleveland, Ohio, 1877); Koch, Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenleides, vii, 99 sq.; Knapp, Eikommung Liederzatz, 1, (P. P.)

Prejudice (prejüd', to judge before inquiry) is a prejudice, that is, forming or adopting an opinion concerning anything before the grounds of it have been fairly or fully considered. The opinion may be true or false; but in so far as the grounds of it have not been examined, it is erroneous and without proper evidence. In most cases prejudice is the last to be known; in some cases, account, men are pleased with, independently of any conviction of their truth; and which, therefore, they are afraid to examine, lest they should find them to be false. Prejudices, then, are unreasonable judgments, formed or held under the influence of some other motive than the love of truth. They may therefore be classed according to the nature of the motives from which they
result. These motives are either, 1, pleasurable, innocent, and social; or, 2, they are malignant" (Taylor, Elements of Thought). Dr. Beil (Intel. Fovera, essay vi, ch. iii) has treated of prejudices, or the causes of error, according to the classification given of them by lord Bacon, under the name of idola. Locke (Essay on the Human Understanding, bk. iv, ch. xx) has treated of the causes of error. Some excellent observations on the prejudices peculiar to men of study may be seen in Malebranche (Search after Truth). See Christian Examiner and Gen. Rev. iv (1830), 280.

Prelacy. The organization of the Christian Church was in the beginning eminently simple, free, and popular. The government of the Church was at first purely democratic. All its controversies were settled by a voluntary and uncontrolled freedom of voluntary religious association. Prelacy takes its name and character from the assumed prerogatives of the bishop as a distinct order or rank—prae- lath, preferred, promoted over others. It began in the 2nd century with the distinction between presbyter and bishop, which were originally identical, merely different names for the same office. In the New Test. the appellations as titles of bishops and presbyters are the same. They are required to possess the same qualifications and to perform the same official duties. Neither was there in the apostolic churches any order or permanent class of officers superior to the presbyters.

I. In the Early Church.—Various circumstances conspired to give certain of the clergy influence and distinction over others. The pastors of churches founded by the apostles were, in the first instance, the elders of certain congregations of Christians and, when the number of converts increased, the more prominent of these elder leaders were constituted bishops. This was the beginning of the episcopacy, or the prelacy of a single individual, who was the spiritual head of the church under his care. The more advanced churches, such as those of Jerusalem, Antioch, Ephesus, Corinth, etc., became central points of influence which gave importance to their incumbents. They were the principal agents in appointing new stations for the extension of the Christian Church and in the organization of new churches dependent on the parent institution. With the increase of these churches a parochial system of churches arose, more or less relying on the central Church for support and spiritual instructors—all of which gave to the prelate of the metropolitan importance and pre-eminence over his subordinate presbyters.

In their persecutions the feeble churches relied for relief and protection on the parent Church. In their ecclesiastical assemblies the bishop of the metropolitan Church was of course the leader in all the deliberations of the assembly, giving direction to their deliberations and the results of the council. He was still only primus inter parres, foremost among his equals in rank in the ministry. Prelacy had not yet taken form and caratter by the exercise of the rights and prerogatives of the bishop, but the spiritual domination of the Church was increased in time to be claimed as an official right. Baptism was one of the rights of the bishop in the 2nd century (“Dandi baptismum quidem habet summus sacerdos qui est episcopus,” Tertullian, De Corp., § 7). The imposition of hands by the bishop in baptism and ordination soon followed as a prescriptive right of the bishop. This right was soon accorded to the presbyters and deacons by the authority of the bishop—non tamen sine episcopi auscultatione. In the unity of the Church and its officers Cyprian sought safety and defence both from the schismatic efforts of Pelagius and Novatian and the persecution of Decius, A.D. 251. "No safety but in the Church"—extra ecclesiam nulla situs. As is the branch to the tree, the stream to the fountain, and the members to the body; so is the constituency to the Church. Moreover, the bishop is the embodiment of the Church, and there can be no Church without a bishop (Cyprian, De Unit. Eccles. op. 4, 5). The bishop is appointed of God and invested with inviolable authority to rule over the Church. Such are the divine rights which were assumed to invest the prelate of the Church, invested with divine authority and power over the Church of Christ. The bishop now claimed affinity with the Jewish priesthood, a daysman of the laity, the medium of grace from God to man, and the recipient of illumination and divine guidance. The symmetrical order of the Council of Carthage contains similar pretensions to the spirit of the ancient law ("Plautus praeceptor, ut episcopus preceptorum," "Spiritus Domini praecepta, ut spiritus sacerdotalis et dominus no verba praecepta attinet""). A sacerdotal caste was formed by Cyprian about A.D. 250, who claimed the prerogative of a distinct order of the priesthood, separate from and superior to the presbyters. Prelates, bishops, diocesan bishops were the titles designating the assumed prerogatives.

Provincial synods began now to be held, in which the presbyters were for a time admitted, but the predominant influence of the bishops directed the deliberations and enacted the laws of the synod. Thus they became the heads of all the churches by the constitution of their prelatical authority under the guidance of the Divine Spirit—Spiritus Divino sacerdote. Gradually they constituted themselves at once the enactors and the executors of the ordinances of the Church. The rule of the priesthood was made more stringent over private members of the Church. In their travels they were required to have letters of recommendation—letters formatae, clerica, canonicae—from the bishop of the diocese. A long course of catechetical instruction and prayer were prescribed for admission to holy orders. Rigorous and relentless was the discipline of offending constituents. Subordinate orders of the clergy were created—subdeacons, acolytes, readers, exorcists, doorkeepers, etc.—all having the effect to exalt the rank of the prelate as prominent above all. But the prelatical position was sustained by the continuing influence which the laity still retained over the elections of the Church. This was gradually restricted by a crafty policy of having the candidates nominated by the subordinate clergy and their election confirmed by the bishop.

But a master stroke of policy was requisite to obtain control of the revenues of the Church. It was accomplished by successive expedients through a period of considerable time. The apostolic injunction was carefully urged on the Church to lay aside for charitable purposes "on the first day of the week or of the month a store as God had prospered them" (1 Cor. xvi, 2). At their love-feasts and sacramental seasons contributions were required as voluntary offerings—indeed, as late as Tertullian ("Nam nemo compellatur, sed sponte confert," Apol, § 89). This practice was not only urged upon the members of the Church as early as the 3rd century, but to the honor of the Church the offerings and contributions continued to be voluntary on the part of its members. Whatever taxes were imposed in later times for the maintenance of public worship and of the clergy were effected by those who were granted the title of ruler under the Christian emperors. On the rules of the Church requiring the gratuitous performance of religious offices the following references may be consulted: Concil. Hibier. c. 48; Gelasian, Epist. 1, al. 9, c. 6; Gregorius Naz. Orat. 81; Gel. Hist. Eccl. i. 20, q. i. c. 8; Concil. Trullan. ii. c. 23; Jerome, Quad. Hibr. in Gen. 23.

The Council of Blaga, in Portugal, A.D. 563, ordered a tripartite division of the property of the Church—one for the bishop, one for the other clergy, and the third for the lighting and repairs of the church. According to another authority four divisions were made, of which one portion was for the poor.

II. Under the Emperors.—When Christianity was the religion of the State, various other revenues accrued to the Church and the bishop. Upon the abolition of the heathen rites, under Theodosius the Great and his sons, the property of the heathen temples and priests which fell to the State was delivered over to the Christian clergy, or at least was appropriated to ecclesiastical uses (Cod. Theodos. lib. 19, c. 21; temp. Sutum. Hist. Eccl. lib. v, c. 7, 16). On the same principle the ecclesiastical property of heretics was confiscated and made over to the Catholic Church, as, for
instance, in the case of the Novatians (Cod. Theod. lib. xvi, tit. 5, leg. 52; Socrat. Hist. Eccl. lib. vii, c. 7).

It was also enacted that the property of such of the clergy as died without heirs, and of those who had relinquished their duties without sufficient cause, should lapse to the Church (Cod. 5, leg. 50; Cod. Justin. lib. x, tit. 5, leg. 20, 53; Cod. Nov. 5, c. 4; 123, c. 42). The Church was also made the heir of all martyrs and confessors who died without leaving any near relatives (Euseb. Vict. Const. lib. ii, c. 50).

The clergy enjoyed many privileges by which on the one hand they were in a measure shielded from the operations of the law, and on the other were intrusted with civil and judicial authority over the laity. Three particulars are stated by Planck: 1. In certain civil cases they exercised a direct jurisdiction over the laity. 2. The State submitted entirely to them the adjudication of all offences of the laity of a religious nature. 3. Certain other cases, styled ecclesiastical, causa ecclesiastica, were tried before them exclusively. The practical influence of these arrangements and their effects upon the clergy and the laity are detailed by the same author, to whom we must refer the reader (Gesell.-Verfass. i, 308 sq.). The laity were ultimately separated from the control of the revenues which they contributed for the maintenance of the government of the Church and for the distribution of the religious charity; instead of originating with the people, as in all popular governments, began and ended with the priesthood (Conc. Gang. Can. 7, 8; Hraccar. xi, c. 7; the canons alleged to clearly indicate the unjust and oppressive operations of this system). The wealth of the laity was now made to flow in streams into the Church. New expedients were devised to draw money from them. (It was a law of the Church in the 4th century that the laity should every Sabbath partake of the sacrament, the effect of which law was to augment the revenues of the Church above all others, being reserved to bring his offering to the altar. Afterwards, when this custom was discontinued, the offering was still claimed (Cong. Apoll. A.D. 585, c. 4).)

Constantine himself contributed large sums to enrich the coffers of the Church, which he also authorized, A.D. 321, to inherit property by will (Cod. Theod. 4, 16, tit. 2, leg. 4; Euseb. lib. x, c. 6; Sozomen. lib. i, c. 8; lib. v, c. 5). This permission opened new sources of wealth to the bishops, while it presented equal incentives to their cupidity. With what address they employed their newly acquired rights is a subject by itself, which was formerly treated "in the space of ten years every man at his decease left a legacy to the Church, and within fifty years the clergy in the several provinces, under the color of the Church, held in their possessions one-tenth part of the entire property of the province. By the end of the 4th century the emperors themselves were obliged to interpose to check the accumulation of these immense revenues—a measure which Jerome said "he could not regret, but he could only regret that his brethren had made it necessary" (Planck, Gesell.-Verfass. i, 281; comp. Pertch. Kirchengesch. c. 8, 111).}

Prelacy also gained great power from the Church by controlling the elections of the clergy. The sovereign rights of the people in their free elective franchise began at an early period to be invaded. The final result of these changes was a total disfranchisement of the laity and the substitution of an ecclesiastical despotism in the place of the elective government of the primitive Church. Of these changes one of the most effective was the attempt, by means of correspondence and ecclesiastical synods, to consolidate the churches into one Church by an usurpation of the Roman code of laws, and establish an ecclesiastical police administered by the clergy. The idea of a holy catholic Church and of an ecclesiastical hierarchy tor the government of the same was wholly a conception of the priesthood. What they may have been in the motive with which this doctrine of the unity of the Church was first promulgated, it prepared the way for the overthrow of the popular government of the Church.

Above all, the doctrine of the divine right of the priesthood aimed a fatal blow at the liberties of the people. The clergy were no longer the servants of the people, chosen by the people, but they were to be the masters of the people, an independent and privileged order, like the Levitical priesthood, and, like them, by divine right invested with peculiar prerogatives. This independence they began by degrees to assert and to exercise. The bishop began in the 3d century to appoint at pleasure his own deacons and other inferior orders of the clergy, but other appointments, also, he endeavored to disturb the freedom of the elections and to direct them agreeably to his own will (Pertsch, Kirchengesch. der ardt. Jahrhundr. p. 499-454; Planck, Gesell.-Verfass. i, 183). Against these encroachments of ecclesiastical ambition and power the people continued to oppose a firm but ineffectual resistance. They asserted, and in a measure maintained, their primitive right of choosing their own spiritual teachers (Gieseler, i, 272; for a more full and detailed account of these changes of ecclesiastical policy and of the means by which they were introduced, the reader is referred to the volume of J. G. Planck, Gesch. der christl.-Kirchl. Gesellschaftsverfassung, i, 149-212, 433 sq.). There are on record instances in the 4th, and probably more frequent in the 5th, century, where the appointment of a bishop was effected by the emperor ordering the people to ratify the nomination of the candidate to a vacant see (Gregorius Naz. Orat. 10; comp. Ort. 19, p. 808; 21, p. 877; Bingham, bk. iv, ch. 5, § 3; Planck, i, 440, n. 10). The rule had been established by decree of councils, and often repeated, requiring the presence and unanimous concurrence of all the provincial bishops in the election and ordination of one to the office of bishop. This afforded them a convenient means of defeating any popular election by an affected disagreement among their number, which was now the case. The ecclesiastical authority had made the concurrence of the metropolitan necessary to the validity of any appointment. His veto was accordingly another efficient expedient by which to baffle the suffrages of the people and to constrain them into a reluctant acquiescence in the will of the clergy (Cong. Nic. c. 4; Conc. Antioch. c. 16; Curt. A.D. 390, c. 12; Planck, i, 483-452).

Elections to ecclesiastical offices were also disturbed by the interference of secular influence from without, in consequence of that disastrous union of Church and State which the schism between the West and the East caused. During this century (1) the emperors converted and presided in general councils; (2) confirmed their decrees; (3) enacted laws relative to ecclesiastical matters by their own authority; (4) pronounced decisions concerning heresies and controversies; (5) appointed bishops; (6) inflicted punishment on ecclesiastical persons. Agitated and harassed by the conflict of these discordant elements, the popular assemblies for the election of men to fill the highest offices of the holy ministry became scenes of tumult and disorder that would disgrace a modern political careers.

To correct these disorders various but ineffectual expedients were adopted at different times and places. The Council of Laodicea (A.D. 361, c. 13) denied to the multitude—raic blyay; the rubble—all vote in the choice of persons for the sacred office. Justinian in the 6th century sought, with no better success, to remove the evils in question by limiting the elective franchise to a mixed aristocracy composed of the clergy and the chief men of the city. These were jointly to nominate three candidates, declaring under oath that in making the selection they were not influenced by the personal merit of the persons. From these three the ordaining person was to ordain the one whom he judged best qualified (Justin. Novell. 123, c. 1; 137, c. 2; Cod. lib. 1, tit. 3; De Episcop. leg. 42). The Council of Arles (A.D. 452, c. 54) in like manner ordered the bishops to nominate three candidates, from whom the clergy and the people
should make the election; and that of Barcelona (A.D. 599, c. 3) ordered the clergy and people to make the nomination, and the metropolitan and bishops were to determine the election. But these ineffectual efforts to restore measurably the right of the people to show to what extent it was already lost.

The doctrine that to the clergy was promised a divine guidance from the Spirit of God had its influence also in completing the subjugation of the people. Resistance to the authority under the influence of God's Spirit was rebellion against High Heaven, which the laity had not the impurity to maintain. The government and discipline of the Church by the priesthood was but the natural result of their control of the elective franchise. It established and organized the independence, the supremacy of prelacy. The bishops, no longer the ministers and representatives of the Church, are the priests of God to dictate the laws and administer the discipline of the Church (Mosheim, De Rebus Christ. sec. i, § 20). By the middle of the 4th century prelacy, by various expedients, acquired the control of the whole penal jurisdiction of the laity, opening and closing at pleasure the doors of the Church, inflicting sentence of excommunication, prescribing penances, absolving penitents, and restoring them to the Church by arbitrary clemency (Planck, Glossar, ii, 500).

III. Under the Popes. — Such are the various causes — influential in different degrees, perhaps, in the several organizations — in supplanting the popular government of the primitive Church and substituting in its place prelacy, which, under different forms and neutralizations, finally culminated in the pope of Rome. This culmination, and the craft by which it was accomplished, require a fuller detail than our limits will allow. We can only affirm that this important period in history, when the foundation was laid for rendering the hierarchy independent both of clerical and secular power, has not been noticed by historians so particularly as its importance requires. They seem not to have noted the fact that Hildebrand, who A.D. 1073 became Gregory VII, concerted measures for the independence of the Church.

"It was the deep design of Hildebrand, which he for a long time prosecuted with unwearied zeal, to bring the pope wholly within the pale of the Church, and to prevent the interference in his election of all secular influence and arbitrary power. And that measure of the council which wrested from the emperor a right of long usage, and which has never been called in question, may deservedly be regarded as the masterpiece of popish intrigue, or rather of Hildebrand's cunning. The concession which disguised this crafty design of his was expressed as follows: That the emperor should crown him as he ever had held, this instead of confirming the election of the pope derived from him. The covert design of this clause was not perceived, but it expressed nothing less than that the emperor should ever receive and hold from the pope himself the right of the appointment of the pope" (Voigt, Hildebrand [Weim. 1818, 8vo], p. 54, cited by Augusti, i, 269).

As might have been expected, the lofty claim of the pope was resisted; but he had the address to defend his usurped authority against all opposition, and proudly proclaimed himself "the successor of St. Peter, set up by God to govern, not only the Church, but the whole world." The gradations of ecclesiastical organization through which prelacy has passed are from congregational to parochial, parochial to dioecesan, dioecesan to metropolitan, metropolitan to patriarchal, patriarchal to papal — from the humble pastor of a little flock to the pope of Rome, the supreme and universal prelate of the Church of Christ on earth. See Coleman, Prelacy and Ritualism; National Repository, Feb. 1878 (Ex Cathedra). (L. C.)

Prelate (Lat., prælatu, i. e. promoted) is an ecclesiastic who has direct authority over other ecclesiastics. The term is a general one, and includes not merely bishops of various degrees, but also in Roman Catholic countries the heads of religious houses or orders and other similar ecclesiastical dignitaries. These, for the most part, are privileged to wear the insignia of the episcopal or subepiscopal rank. But these inchoate offices, although not possessing episcopal or quasi-episcopal jurisdiction, have the insignia and the title of prelate. They are of two classes — the higher, called del mandaletto ("of the little mantle"), and the secondary, called del mantellato ("of the great mantle"), from the robe which they respectively bear. The same root underlies other ecclesiastical terms in which all the clergy are on an equality, and are governed by a representative body or by the local church; prelati and prelati- cal, i. e. pertaining to a prelacy or a prelate, as pre- latical authorities are confined to those churches which recognize in the bishop (q. v.) a distinct and superior order of clergy. See Prelacy.

Prémare, Joseph-Henri, a French Jesuit, was born about 1670 in Normandy. March 7, 1698, he embarked with several other Jesuits at La Rochelle to preach the Gospel in China. He arrived Oct. 6 at Suneian, and addressed Feb. 17, 1699, a relation of his journey to pope La Chaise, with a descriptive notice of the countries he had visited. As soon as he had mastered the Chinese language he made a careful study of the antiquities and literature of the country. Though he expressed some strange ideas, it cannot be denied that his enterprise was considerable, as few Europeans thoroughly knew the philosophical works of the Chinese. He died at Peking about 1735. He left, Recherches sur les Tempa antérieures à ceux dont parle le Chou-King et sur la Mythologie Chinoise, published by Deguignes in the translation of the Chou-King, by pope Gauthier, in the form of a preliminary discourse (Paris, 1770, 4to) — a number of other works, three of them in Chinese: — The Life of St. Joseph, the Lou-chou-chi, or true sense of the six classes of characters, and a small treatise on the attributes of God, inserted in the Notices des sarees, which is the best of all those composed hitherto by Europeans on this subject: — several other treatises in Latin and in French, preserved among the manuscripts of the National Library of Paris, where we find also the originals of several letters of pope Pre- mare. Three letters of his mission are published in the Lettres édifiantes, and a fourth in the Annales encyclopédiques of Klaproth. He translated also a drama, Tchao chi Kou-cui (the Orphan of the House of Chao), which furnished to Voltaire some ideas for his Orphelin de la Chine. See Lettres édifiantes, vols. xvi. and xxii.; Catalogue de Fournier-Adair. — Houches, Novice. 

Prelate (primi or prima massio) is the first mass celebrated by the newly ordained priest (suo- myto), with the help of an assistant. The solemnity begins thus: the new priest sings on the steps of the altar "Veni Sancte Spiritus." performs the corresponding ovation, and then distributes the holy water, if this is prescribed by the rubrics of the day. It is an open question among the rubricists if at a preface the mass of the day or a votive mass is to be read. The probable solution of the difficulty is that, on simple Sundays and ordinary "festa duplicitas," a votive mass may be said, such a mass being permitted on such days pro gratia et publica, to which a preface solemnity may be said to belong; but the mass of the day must be preserved on high feasts, and on such Sundays on which votive masses are never admissible. The solemnity ends with the sacred benediction given by the new priest to the people by the imposition of hands (Lohner, Instructio practica de SS. Missae sacrificio, pt. iv., tit. v.; and Volti, Instructio practica de Missarvotiosa, p. 157 sq.). The festivities connected with a preface, and not belonging to the ecclesiastical order, vary with the customs of countries and places, and are not seldom regulated by special prescriptions of the ecclesiastical authorities.
PREMICE SERMONS

PREMICE SERMONS are discourses preached on the occasion of the first mass of an incurring priest. Their aim is to call the attention of both ecclesiastics and laymen to the dignity and importance of the sacerdotal state, and the duties which it imposes on both classes. Therefore the object of the sermon can only be some truth which relates to the clerical state: e.g., the dignity, the importance, of the priestly career; the priesthood of the Romish Church, its destination, or the duties arising from it, etc. According to the theme chosen, the sermon enlarges upon the object of the priestly functions, or the qualities, conditions, mode of action of the priesthood, or its duties and beneficial influences, etc. At the end of the sermon there may be a prayer, or an exhortation to prayer.

PREMONSTRATENSIANS or PREMONSTRANTS is the name of a monastic order which was founded at Premontre (Lat. Prémontré), in the diocese of Laon, France, about 1120, by St. Norbert of Cleves, afterwards archbishop of Magdeburg, with a view to restore the discipline of the regular canons, which had greatly deteriorated. The order followed the rule of St. Augustine, and was confirmed by popes Honorius II and Innocent III. The ground on which the order was established was given to St. Norbert by the bishop of Laon, with the approbation of Louis the Gross, king of France, who gave the Premonstratensians a charter of privileges. The place was called Prémontré, because it was pretended that the Blessed Virgin herself pointed out (prémonstratus) beforehand the site for the principal house of the order. According to these legendary authorities, the members of the order were at the same time commanded to wear a white habit, and consequently the White Canons wore a white cassock and rochet and a long white cloak. The abbots never wore pontificals, and any member promoted to the cardinalate or popedom retained his habit. At the time of the founding of the order St. Norbert had thirteen companions, but as the popes and kings of France granted it many privileges, and were very liberal to the Premonstratensians, they rapidly increased, and counted among their number many persons of distinguished birth, deep piety, and great scholarship. In the early history of the order there was such strict adherence to the rule of poverty that they had nothing they could call their own but one ass, which served them to carry wood, cut down by them every morning and sent to Laon, where it was sold to purchase bread; but in a short time they received so many donations, and built so many monasteries, that thirty years after the foundation of this order they had above a hundred abbey in France and Germany. The order has likewise given the Church a great number of archbishops and bishops. It once had 1000 abbeys and 500 nunneries (until 1273 their monasteries were double, a house of women always adjoinig the community), but it is now the mere skeleton of what it was. Of the sixty-five abbeys which they had in Italy not one now remains. These monks, vulgarly called White Canons, went first to England in the year 1146, where the first monastery, called Newhouse, was built in Lincolnshire by Peter de Saulus, and dedicated to St. Martin. In the reign of Edward I, when that king granted his protection to the monasteries, the Premonstratensians had twenty-seven houses in different parts of the country. They were commonly called "White Friars." They had six monasteries in Scotland—four in Galloway, one at Dryburgh, and one at Ferno, in Ross-shire. They had also several possessions in Ireland. In England their churches and conventual buildings were at Easby, Leiston, Bayham, Wendling, and Eggleston. They were very irregular in plan, the greater portion of the minster being aisleless and the transept unused, as they eschewed the sites. There is a fine ruin at Ardaines, near Casen, which gives a vivid illustration of the farming arrangements of the order—holy men and retired lovers of the country, and enterprising farmers. The principal houses were Torre, East Dereham, and Bawdeswell. They owned the manor of Torre over the right arm; the Canons of St. Victor wore it like a tippet round the neck. See Fosbrooke, Anci. Mon. (see Index); Herzog, Real-Encyk. xii, 82 sqq.; Helyot, Hist. des Ordres, s. v.

PÉROM. CHARLES-LEONARD, a French priest, was born at Honfleur July 30, 1760. He obtained in 1790 a canonry in the college of St. Honoré at Paris. Deprived of it soon afterwards, he returned to England, where he began by giving French lessons. Madame de Lévis-Mirepoix went with some French Benedictine nuns to establish herself at Cannington Court, and in trusted Pérom with the spiritual direction of the community. In 1816 he established himself at Paris, where cardinal Talleyrand-Perigord appointed him honorary canon of Notre Dame and chaplain of Charles X (1825). Pérom was also appointed vicar-general of Strasburg and of Quimper. After the Revolution of July he returned to England and rejoined his Benedictine community which he had so long directed. He left an English edition of Rules of a Christian Life, and a publication of the (Evêques choisis de M. Aeslin, critique de Roullongue (Paris, 1823, 6 vols. 12mo), accompanied with an incomplete notice. He died Aug. 26, 1857, at Colwich, Staffordshire. See L'ami de la Religion, 1837.—Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, s. v.

PREMONSTRATE ORDER. In a large class of English ecclesiastical structures reared anterior to the Norman invasion the style is so peculiar that it should be classified as distinctively Premonstrat. The walls are of rag or rubble, frequently of herring-bone work, and unbutteressed; the quoin present long and short work; strips of stone or pilasters bisect or relieve the towers; the imposts of the shafts are rude, massive, and ornamented either with classical mouldings or rude carvings; the arches are round or angled, and sometimes constructed of bricks; and baluster-like pillars are introduced into the windows, which are often deeply splashed within and without. Two pillars from Reculver Basilica are standing in the Green Court of Canterbury. The churches of Lyminge, Barnack, Bosham, Bradford (Wiltz), Brixworth (the oldest remaining church in England), and proceeding a basilican type by Lincoln, Lacy, Dover Castle, Bryford, Corhampton, Dunham Magna, Caversfield, and part of the crypt of York, those of Ripon and Hexham, the towers of Deerhurst, Barton, St. Benet's (Cambridge and Lincoln), Cholsey, St. Mary (York), Bolton, Brigstock, Earl's Barton, and the steeles of Bosham and Somerton, and portions of many other churches, exhibit some or other of these peculiar
Pretiss, Erastus L., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born at New London, Conn., in 1825, was converted at the age of fifteen, and, after joining the Methodists, was licensed to preach in 1848.

Prepont, an early Marcionite, was a native of Assyria, and flourished at the close of the 2d century. The Marcionites were then divided into several factions, some of which admitted two original principles, as Politus and Basilicas; others three (Rhodon, in Essebium, 7th, Eusebius, xvi, 13). To the latter belong the Prepont, who held that, besides what is good and evil, there is what constitutes a third principle, viz. what is just.

Prepont, 14; Preparation for Easter, 14; Preparatory Fatalities, 9; Prepotency, 9; Prepotency, 9; Presanctified, See PRESANCTIFICATIO.

Preebresbyter (Gr. πρεεβρεσβύτερος) is the title of an office or dignity in the Jewish synagogue (721). It was introduced into the Christian Church, and designated an officer whose functions in the apostolic period are disputed by different ecclesiastical bodies. In the Roman Catholic and in the English hierarchy, the title has been the occasion of a protracted controversy as to the respective claims of the bishop (q. v.) and the presbyter. Those who maintain the presbyter as on equality with the episcopate are considered by the papal legate cardinal Gentili, of Hungary. Nine canons of discipline were published, of which the eighth forbids Christian women to marry infidels, heretics, or schismatics. See Labbé, Concil. ix, 2458.

Presbytery is the title of an office or dignity in the Jewish synagogue (721). It was introduced into the Christian Church, and designated an officer whose functions in the apostolic period are disputed by different ecclesiastical bodies. In the Roman Catholic and in the English hierarchy, the title has been the occasion of a protracted controversy as to the respective claims of the bishop (q. v.) and the presbyter. Those who maintain the presbyter as on equality with the episcopate are considered by the papal legate cardinal Gentili, of Hungary. Nine canons of discipline were published, of which the eighth forbids Christian women to marry infidels, heretics, or schismatics. See Labbé, Concil. ix, 2458.
inspired writers were not true, or that it was incumbent at all times, and upon all Christians, to disregard them. It has been strenuously contended that there were such bishops in the infancy of the Church, and that allusion is made to them in Scripture; but, without directly opposing the assertion, this must be said that the proof of it is less clear than that bishops and presbyters were represented as the same in rank and in authority. Indeed, there does not appear to have been any occasion for this higher order. To presbyters was actually committed the most important charge of feeding the Church of God, that is, of promoting the spiritual improvement of mankind; and it is remarkable that their privilege of separating from the people by ordination the ministers of religion is explicitly acknowledged in the case of Timothy, whom the apostle admonishes not to neglect the gift that was in him, and which had been given by prophecy, and by the laying-on of the hands of the presbytery; by which can be meant only the imposition of the hands of those who were denominated presbyters or bishops. But although all the parts of the ministerial duty had been intrusted to presbyters, it is still contended that the New Testament indicates the existence of bishops as a higher order. There has, however, been much diversity of opinion in relation to this point by those who contend for the divine institution of EPISCOPACY (q. v.). Some of them maintain that the apostolic word, while it is applicable to the Christian Church; but this, and upon irrefragable grounds, is denied by others. Some urge that Timothy and Titus were, in what they call the true sense of the term, bishops; but many deny this, founding their denial upon the fact that these evangelists did not reside within the bounds, and were not limited to the administration, of any one church, but were sent wherever it was resolved to bring men to the knowledge of divine truth. Many conceive that the question is settled by the epistles in which the apostle addressed letters to the elders of the church, to the angels of the respective churches named by the apostle. But it is far from being obvious what is implied under the appellation angel. There has been much dispute about this point, and it is certainly a deviation from all the usual rules by which we are guided in interpreting Scripture to bring an obscure and doubtful passage in illustration of one about the import of which, if we attend to the language used, there can be no doubt. It may, therefore, be safely affirmed that there is nothing clear and specific in the writings of the New Testament to give to bishops or presbyters the special character which under most particular and affecting circumstances, he had received from the Lord after the Resurrection, and which includes in it the perfection of everything requisite for the comfort and the edification of Christians; and be accordingly expresses this by the word ιερουργος, being bishops of it, not by constraint, but willingly (1 Pet. v. 1, 2). This passage is a very strong one. The apostle speaks of himself in his extraordinary capacity, a witness of the sufferings of Christ, and in his ordinary capacity as a teacher; showing, by the use of a very significant term, that as to it he was on a footing of equality with the other pastors or presbyters. He gives it in charge to the presbyters to feed the flock of which Christ is among you, taking the oversight of it, ιερουργος, being bishops of it, not by constraint, but willingly (1 Pet. v. 1, 2). See ELDER.

It seems, by the passages that have been quoted, to be placed beyond a doubt that, in what the apostles said respecting the ministers of Christ's religion, they taught that the ιερουργος and the πρεσβυτερος were the same class of instructors; and that there were, in fact, only two orders pointed out by them, bishops or presbyters, and deacons. This being the case, even although it should be said that the presbytery, which was composed at the 3d Council of Nicaea, and to a period still later, was unknown in the first two centuries. It may be shown that the admission of the distinction is not incompatible with the great ends for which a ministry was appointed, and even in particular cases may tend to promote them; but it is merely a matter of human regulation, not binding
upon Christians, and not in any way connected with the vital influence of the Gospel dispensation. The whole of the writers of antiquity might be urged in support of this doctrine of the apostolic institution of bishops. For all, even if private Christian would be entitled to judge for himself, and to be directed by his own judgment, unless it be maintained that where Scripture has affirmed the existence of equality, this is to be counteracted and set at nought by the testimonies and assertions of a set of writers who, although honored with the name of fathers, are very far, indeed, from being infallible, and who have, in fact, often delivered sentiments which even they who, upon a particular emergency, cling to them must confess to be directly at variance with all that is assumed or received as the rule of faith and life in religion. It also follows, from the Scriptural identity of bishops and presbyters, that no Church in which this identity is preserved can on that account be considered as having departed from the apostolic model, or its ministers be viewed, at least with any good reason, as having less ground to hope for the blessing of God upon their spiritual labors; because if we admit the contrary, we must also admit that the inspired writers, instead of properly regulating the Church, betrayed it into error by omitting to make a distinction closely allied with the essence of religious truth; it is this but to say that it is safer to follow the erring direction of frail mortals than to follow the admonitions of those who, it is universally allowed, were inspired by the Holy Spirit, or commissioned by him to be the instructors of the world? It is clear that, being thus, that although bishops and presbyters were the same when the epistles of the New Testament were written, it would be going too far to contend that no departure from this should ever take place; because, to justify such a position, it would be requisite that a fund of injustice should have been given that equality must at all times be carefully preserved. There is, however, no such injustice. Unlike the Old Testament, which specified everything, even the most minute, in relation to the priesthood, the New only refers in general terms, and very seldom, to the ministry; and the reason probably is, that, being intended for all nations, it left Christians at liberty to make such modifications in the ecclesiastical constitution as in their peculiar situation appeared best adapted for religious edification. The simple test to be applied to the varying or varied forms of Church government is that indicated by our Lord himself: "By their fruits ye shall know them." Wherever the regulations respecting the ministry are such as to divert it from the purposes for which it was destined, to separate those who form it from the flock of Christ, to relax their diligent discharge of duty, and to destroy the connection between them and their people, so as to render their exertions of little or no use, there we find a Church not apostolical. But wherever the blessed fruits of Gospel teaching are in abundance produced, where the people and the ministers are cordially united, and where every regulation is calculated to give efficacy to the labors of those who have entered into the vineyard, we have an apostolical Church, or, to speak more properly, a Church of Christ built upon a rock, because devoted to the benefit of objects for which our Saviour came into the world.

Schauf, in his *Hist. of the Christian Church* (i, 418 sq.), adduces, in favor of the view which denies the apostolic origin of the episcopate as a separate officer or order, the following facts: 1. The undeniable identity of presbyters and bishops in the New Testament, asserted even by the best interpreters among the Church fathers, by Jerome, Chrysostom, and Theodore. 2. Later, in the 21st century, the two terms are still used in like manner for the same office. The Roman bishop Clement, in his first epistle to the Corinthians, says that the newly founded churches, appointed the first-fruits of the faith, i.e., the first converts, ἑκοῦσι ταῦτα τῆς καὶ ἄλλης ἑκοῦσι. He here omits the ἱεραρχεῖς, as Paul does in Phil. i, 1, for the simple reason that they are in his view identical with ἱεραρχεῖς; while, conversely, in ch. ix., he enlarges the family of presbyters or bishops, without mentioning bishops. He says that the episcopate is true, the deaconate, the presbyterate, and the episcopate; but he supposes only a twofold official character, that of presbyters and that of deacons—a view which found advocates so late as the Middle Ages, even in Pope Urban II., A.D. 1091. Lastly, Irénæus, towards the close of the 2d century, though himself a bishop, makes only a relative difference between episcopi and presbyteri; speaks of successions of the one in the same sense as of the other; terms the office of the latter episcopus; and calls the bishops of Rome ἱεραρχεῖς. Sometimes, it is true, he speaks of the priest in a more general sense, for the old men, the fathers. But, in any case, his language shows that the distinction between the two offices was at that time still relative and indefinite. 3. The express testimony of the learned Jerome is that the churches originally, before original errors arose through the instigation of Satan, were governed by the common council of the presbyters, and not till a later period was one of the presbyters placed at the head to watch over the Church and suppress schismus. He traces the division of the presbyters into three classes or in three ranks: the bishop, who rules in a more distinct from divine institution.

1. The custom of the Church of Alexandria was, from the evangelist Mark down to the middle of the 5th century, that the twelve presbyters elected one of their number president and called him bishop. This fact rests on the authority of Jerome, who, in his *Episcop donating*. The archontes of the Alexandrian patriarch Eutychius of the 10th century."

Kilien, in his *Ancient Church*, asserts: "Though the senior presbyter presided in the meetings of his brethren, and was soon known by the name of bishop, it does not appear that he originally possessed any superior authority. He held his place for life; but as he was sinking under the weight of years when he succeeded to it, he could not venture to anticipate an extended career of official distinction. In all matters relating either to discipline or the general interests of the brotherhood, he was expected to carry out the decisions of the eldership; so that, under his presidential rule, the Church was still substantially governed by 'the common council of the presbyters.' The allegation that presbyterial government in all its integrity towards the end of the 2d century does not rest on the foundation of obscure intimations or doubtful inferences. It can be established by direct and conclusive testimony. Evidence has already been adduced to show that the senior presbyter of Smyrna continued to preside until the year 165. The earliest episcopal see of which has been preserved, describes the manner in which the rulers of the Church dealt with the heretic Noster. The transaction probably occurred about A.D. 190. It shows that the presbyters then exercised episcopal functions, even to excommunication."

Says Dr. Blaikie (in *The Presbyterian Churches throughout the World* [Edinburgh, 1877, p. 1]): "It is admitted even by many Episcopalians that, so far as Scripture indicates, the primitive Church constituted under the apostles was governed by elders. The office of apostle was temporary, and some other temporary arrangements were reported to in the peculiar circumstances of the Church. But everywhere in settled churches there was a body of presbyters or elders; the terms presbyters and bishop were applied freely to the same individual; and when the presbyter became a bishop, the apostolical bishops of Ephesus were addressed at Mileth; there was no distinction of one of them having authority over the rest; they were called equally to feed and care for the Church.
over which the Holy Ghost had made them overseers.

The offices of presbyter and bishop, according to the Roman Catholic Church, belong, in the first instance, to the divine institution of the episcopate:

"Besides the apostles, the Lord marked out of the troop of his followers seventy (according to the Vulg. seventy-two), whom he sent out before him, two by two, into the cities and towns he intended to visit, with the power of healing the sick and proclaiming the kingdom of God. These seventy men were, in consequence, the assistants of the apostles, but subordinated to them. Soon their number proved insufficient, and the apostles established in every city of some importance, at the foundation of the community, or when it had reached a certain degree of development, besides the bishop, whom they intended for their permanent representative and successor, a number of presbyters, who assisted the bishop in his functions."

The Roman Catholic Church, as she considers the bishops the successors of the apostles, would also have the presbyters to be the successors of the seventy assistants chosen by Christ himself. Inasmuch as they are entitled to perform the highest function of the priesthood, the administration of the Eucharist, they are called also sacerdos (apache): yet this denomination, if not specified, applies only to the bishop: therefore we find frequently the term sacerdos, or sacerdos prae ordinis, i.e., the bishop, thus distinguished from the simple priest, who is sacerdos secundum ordinis. The presbyters of an episcopal church had a share in the government, not individually, but as a college, presided over by the bishop; they had no jurisdiction of their own, and were merely assistants to the bishop. The presbyters took their advice on the admission of higher clerical functionaries, on the management of discipline, especially of penitence, etc. They were themselves amenable to the spiritual jurisdiction of the bishop, and depended on him in the discharge of their duties as teachers and as priests. According to Roman Catholics, the bishop alone possesses the priesthood in its fulness, while the presbyters possess it only in part. The functions, however, which belong to the bishop himself, as well as to the college, are exercised by the bishop and the presbyters. What those functions are will be detailed under the head Pius X (q. v.). It is, of course, an easy matter for the prelatical churchmen to prove that by the end of the 20th century the bishop was above the presbyters of the 2nd century, for the Church had departed from her early simplicity, and the episcopacy became the only prevalent government of the Church, although in some cases, as among the Copts or the Waldenses, government by presbyters continued to prevail during the Middle Ages. The Church of the 3rd and 4th centuries was the superior of the episcopate. Thus Clement of Rome points out clearly three different hierarchical degrees—bishops, priests, and deacons; and Ignatius of Antioch lays particular stress on the superior power of the bishop (Epist. ad Magnes. c. 6; Smyrn. c. 8, etc.). Affirmations of the same kind are given by Tertullian, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Cyprian, etc. "It is true," say the Romanists, "that the bishops, in the fathers as well as in Scripture, are sometimes called merely priests, but there is not one passage in which a bishop is explicitly called bishop." They adopt the authority of St. Jerome for the equality of the bishop and presbyter because he says (Comment. on the Epistle to Timotheus), "Nor priests, nor sacerdotiales sunt dispositione Dominica presbyteri esse majores, et titulus magis haberi, ut formant a half-circle (see the map), or, according to their words, "Reverend father, the holy Catholic"
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Church requires that you consecrate the deacon here present for the burdensome office of priesthood. Whereupon the bishop asks the deacon if he knows that they are deserving of it? The archdeacon answers, "So far as human weakness allows me a knowledge of it, I know and declare that they are worthy to take upon them the burden of that office." The bishop says, "God be thanked!" and the ordinands are called to the choir, and the archdeacon says these words: "Beloved brethren! as the pilot of a ship and those who travel on it share together both security and danger, they must in matters concerning their common interest share the same convictions. Not without good reason, the fathers have directed that the people also should be admitted to the choice of those who are to be admitted to the service of the altar; for sometimes a few can give information about the way of life and habits of those who present themselves for consecration not known to the masses, etc. If, therefore, any one have objections of importance, let him step out before God, and for God's sake speak fearlessly; yet let him not forget that he is only a man (that he may err)."

After a short, expectant pause, the people asanting by their silence, the bishop turns to the candidates and addresses them thus: "Consecrando, fidelis dilectissimi, in presbyterio sanctificato, tuto et diligenter suppliantibus, sanctitate laus, sapiencia, et bonitatee, confirmare et regir: cum aliis in eis pontifices, ali minoris ordinis sacerdotis, diaconi et subdiaconi, diocesarum et aliorum ordinum viri consecratus, et ex multis et aliter dignitatis membris unum corpus efficitur. If no deacons or subdeacons have been consecrated, the Litany of All Saints is recited, while the ordinands are on their knees. Hereupon they step in, pairs, into the presence of the bishop, who, standing erect (with the infula), lays both his hands on the head of each of them, without speaking or singing. The same is done by all the priests present, dressed in the stola, and of whom there must be at least three. Then the priests and the bishop hold their right hands extended over the ordinands, and the bishop, standing with the infula, thus addresses the clergy: "Beloved brethren! let us implore God Almighty that he may pour over these, his servants, whom he has chosen for the office of priesthood, heavily gifts in abundance, so that, with his help, they may be able to perform the duties which they have been deemed worthy of assuming. Amen. The bishop lays down the sacred vessels and looks towards the altar, and says, "Omnis dominus." The ministers add, "Fleetamus tua." The response is "Levate!" Then he turns to the ordinands, saying, "Exaudi nos, quassumus, Domine Deus noster." After the conclusion—"in unitate ejusdem spiritali sancti Dei"—he extends his hands, saying, "Per omnia secula, etc." Now follow long prayers, after which the bishop sits down with the mitre, seizes that part of the stola which hangs backwards from the left shoulder of the ordinand, lays it over his right shoulder, and puts both parts crosswise over each other on this chest, saying, "Take the yoke of the Lord upon thee; for his yoke is easy and his burden is light." Hereupon the bishop dresses each of them in the missal garment, which hangs loose in front, but is rolled or pinned up behind, saying, "Take the priestly garment, which makes you holy; for God is mighty to increase love in thee and make thy work perfect." Response, "Thanks be to God." Now the bishop rises, lays down the infula, and prays, while all kneel, "Deus sanctificationem omnium sanctuarium," etc. After this the bishop kneels, facing the altar, and begins the hymn, "Venii Creator Spiritus". A solo voice is sung in the choir, and the first verse is sung the bishop rises, sits down on the chair, with the infula on his head, pulls off his gloves, puts on his ring, takes a white linen towel on his knees, and anoints the hands of each of the ordinands kneeling before him with the oil of the catechumens, passing with his thumb dipped into the holy oil crosswise from the thumb to the little finger on the other, with this prayer: "Consecrate and sanctify, O Lord, these hands by this anointment and our blessing." Then, with his right hand, he makes the sign of the cross over the hands of the candidate whom he consecrates, saying, "Omnis dominus," and the people with these words: "They may bless, may bless, and they may be consecrated and sanctified, in the name of Our Lord Jesus Christ." Each of the ordinands says "Amen." (From this anointment the thumb and forefinger of a priest are called the canonic fingers; and as this anointment is administered to the ordinands, it is said that the priests to whom the last sacraments are administered are anointed on the outside of the hand.) Then the bishop joins the hands of each of them, and one of the ministrants ties them together with a piece of linen. When all hands are anointed, the bishop wipes his thumb with crumbs of bread; then he presents to each of them a chalice with wine and water, with the paten placed over it, and containing a host. The ordinands touch the top of the chalice and the paten with the index and middle finger, and the bishop says to each in particular, "In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, receive the living water, and say mass for the living as well as for the dead, in the name of the Lord." Response: "Amen." Now the bishop washes his hands, returns to his chair, and reads the last verse of the Tractus, and then the Gospel, and proceeds to another consecration. After the ordinands steps in front of the altar with the book of the Gospels, prays the "Munda cor meum," and reads the Gospel, after receiving the benediction thereto. The newly consecrated priests wipe their hands with bread-crumbs, wash them, and dry them with the linen with which they were bound. The water used for washing is poured into the piscina. As all consecrated receive the Eucharist at the hands of the bishop, there must be as many hosts prepared as there are candidates for ordination. After the reading of the offeranture (short prayer preceding the sacriocede of the bread and wine), all those who have been consecrated—first the priests, then the deacons, then the others according to their rank—step in pairs into the presence of the bishop, who sits on his chair with the infula on his head, kneel down, kiss his hand, and present a burning taper as an offering. The bishop, after receiving the offerings, washes his hands, lays down the infula, rises, and, the chair being removed, continues the ceremony of the mass. The consecrated priests kneel down behind the bishop on the prie-dieu prepared for them, each his mass-book open before him. The bishop remains with the deacons, accompanying the offering of the bread and wine, and the whole mass. The bishop speaks slowly and somewhat loud, so that the consecrated priests can at the same time pronounce the same words, especially the words of consecration. The "secrets" (silent prayers) for the consecrated ones is pronounced with the secrets of the mass of the day under one formula of conclusion: "Per Dominum nostrum, etc. The secreta pro ordinandis is, "We ask thee, O Lord! let thy holy mysteries profit us in all things for our salvation. In the name of the Lord, amen. By the disposition, through our Lord Jesus Christ, thy Son," etc. After the paternoster the prayer "Domine Jesu Christe, qui," etc., which follows the "Agnus Dei," the bishop kisses the altar; and after the first of the newly consecrated has done the same, he kisses him at each step, with the words "May you be blessed with you," etc. The new priest, "And with your mind." Each of the consecrated ones gives the kiss of peace to the other person ordained to the same rank and standing next. After the communion of the bishop, the deacons and subdeacons proceed to the choir, etc. As soon as the intoned voice, the bishop, facing them, pronouncing the "Miserere veretii" and "Indulgentiam," if priests only have been ordained, they do not receive absolution, as they perform the sacrifice together with the bishop. All
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fessed to act) as lords of the congregation. The signing of the covenant was followed by a proclamation from the queen regent forbidding any one to preach or administer the sacraments without the authority of the Presbytery or bishop. At length, however, the party of the Reformers triumphed, and in the year 1560 (Aug. 17-24) the Parliament abolished the Roman Catholic worship, adopted a confession of faith agreeing with the confessions of the Reformed churches on the Continent, appointing ministers of the Protestant religion in eight principal towns, and assigned the remaining portions of the country to five other ministers as superintendents, who were to take temporary charge of the interests of religion in their several districts.

In the first General Assembly of the Church of Scotland was constituted in Edinburgh, consisting of six ministers and thirty-four laymen. Up to this period, the Scottish Reformers had followed their rule of worship and doctrine, the Book of Common Order used by the English Church at Geneva. In April, 1560, however, the Privy Council appointed a committee of five persons, including Knox, "to commit to writing their judgments touching the reformation of religion." This First Book of Discipline, setting forth a polity adapted to the national condition of affairs, though adopted by the Church, was rejected by the assembly, and this—confirmed in 1562 by King James, above the sanction of the law of the land,—nothing but the undisputed perseverance of those two eminent men, John Knox and Andrew Melville, succeeded at last in procuring the complete recognition of the Calvinistic faith and the Presbyterian form of government established at the Reformation. The Church of Scotland, which was finally and formally effected by act of Parliament and with the consent of King James (I of England and VI of Scotland) in the year 1592.

The duplicity of the king, however, soon became apparent, for within a few years he intrigued to bring about the establishment of Episcopacy, and to assimilate the two national churches of Scotland and England. In this he was followed by his successors, Charles I, Charles II, and James II. The resistance of the people, the bloody persecutions that ensued, the civil turmoil, and the subsequent downfall of the Stuart dynasty, are matters of history. From 1660 to 1688, the Church was in the wilderness, scourged by such men as Claverhouse (q.v.) and Dalziel (q.v.), but leaving the record of many noble martyrs—as given in the stories of the Witnesses and the Book of Martyrs. See COVENANT AND SOLEMN LEAGUE. Under William and Mary, Presbyterianism again became ascendant. In 1690 an "Act of Settlement" was passed, prorcy was abolished, and the Westminster Confession recognised as the creed of the Church. But the settlement of the Church on this basis was objected to by a small body of earnest men, the "Reformed Presbyterians," who had already distinguished themselves in zeal for the "Covenant" as securities alike for the freedom of the Church and the Christianity of the State, and who now felt unable either to enter into the Church or to give their unqualified adherence to the constitution of the State. Many of the more earnest descendants of the Covenanters (q.v.) protested against the reception of such men into the Church, and, finding their protest in vain, withdrew, and organized the Reformed Presbyterian Church. (See below.) Though this secession took place in 1681, the churches were not finally organized into a presbytery till 1743. Upon the union of the two kingdoms in 1707, Presbyterianism obtained every guarantee that could be desired. Since that time it has continued to be the established religion of Scotland, as much as Episcopacy is that of England.

The only confession of faith legally established before the Revolution of 1688 was that which is published in the History of the Reformation in Scotland, attributed to John Knox. It consists of twenty-five articles and was the confession of the Episcopal as well as of the Presbyterians. During the Commonwealth, adopted the Westminster Confession. At the Revolution this confession was declared to be the standard of the national faith; and it was ordained by the same act of Parliament which settled Presbyterian church government in Scotland, "that no person be admitted or continued hereafter to be a minister or preacher within this Church unless he subscribe the [that is, this] confession of faith, declaring the same to be the confession of his faith." By the act of union in 1707 the same is required of all professors, principal officers, masters, and other officers of the Church.

The Westminster Confession of Faith, then, and what are called the Larger and Shorter Catechisms, contain the publicly recognized doctrines of this Church; and it is well known that these formularies are an embodiment of the Calvinistic faith. No liturgy or public form of prayer is used in the Church of Scotland, the minister's only guide being the Directory for the Public Worship of God. The administration of the Lord's Supper, as a general thing observed four times a year, is conducted with simple form, but is accompanied and followed by special religious services, consisting of prayers and exhortations. A metrical version of the Psalms on the basis of that of Rou (died 1665) is used, and supplementary hymns have recently been introduced.

The provision which has been made by the state authorities for the benefit of the Established Church consists of a stipend, a small glebe of land, and a manse (parsonage house) and office house. By an act of Parliament passed in 1810, £10,000 per annum were granted for augmenting the smaller parish stipends and for religious education. The stipend assigned to a minister of the establishment is £130 sterling, with a small sum, generally £8 6s. 8d., for communion elements. Patronage, in part abrogated at the Revolution, was restored in 1712 by act of Parliament.

Scottish independence rebelled at this, the people claiming the right to elect their own clergy, or at least to exercise a veto over the appointment of an unsatisfactory one; and the controversy which ensued led to secession, which was ushered in first by indifference, and was helped on by the renewal of the old interest. From that time a wide field was opened up for the men of talents, but lax in principle, obtained possession of influential positions; the leaven of modernism—ridiculed in Dr. Witherspoon's Characteristics—set extensively to work; and in the course of time Arminianism, Pelagianism, and liberal views of Church and State, with little attempt at concealment. The result was the secession of several important bodies from the Church. The first who formally withdrew were the Covenanters, or Cameronians, who objected to the interference of the state authorities in Church affairs, and to the Established principle in the existing establishment, as inconsistent with the covenant to which the Church had sworn. See CAMERONIANS. A few faithful men, led by Ebenezer Erskine, endeavoured to breach the tide; but, being deposed by the commission of the Assembly, they were Moderates, they seceded in 1738, and formed themselves into a distinct body, called the Associated Presbytery, more commonly known as Seceders. They became known as the Secession Church. This secession proved a severe blow, and shook the establishment to its foundations. The Church resisted it, grew in 1750, and from it was formed the Presbyterians of Relief, better known as "The Relief Synod." These bodies have since been united, and constitute the United Presbyterian Church of Scotland. Those who remained in the Established Church were divided in opinion on the subject of patronage. The Seceders, to whom it continued to grow because of the indifference of the clergy, for a while modernism held the upper hand, but its reign was dreary. Under the dominant influence
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tice of principal Robertson, whose studies were more devoted to elegant literature than to the Holy Scripture, the preaching of the Gospel was superseded by moral essays, and Dr. Blair's cold and polished sermons were regarded as models of the highest excellence. This state of things continued till near the close of the 16th century, when Christian Society began to show itself in the making of evangelical principles which then pervaded Great Britain. A positive reaction set in, and gradually new life began to animate the frozen limbs of the Established Church. The evangelical party took heart, and constantly increased in strength. Dr. Andrew Thomson, Dr. Chalmers, and others came upon the stage of action, and under their vigorous lead a new era was inaugurated. The Assembly entered with zeal into the subject of foreign missions, while it multiplied churches to supply the need at home. The burden of patronage was felt to be a great hindrance to the progress of vital piety and active effort, and the autonomy or independent jurisdiction of the Church became a topic of earnest debate.

In 1834 the General Assembly passed the celebrated "Veto Act," giving to the Church courts the power of rejecting nominees for bishops or teinds. This act was set aside by the civil court, and subsequently, on appeal, by the House of Lords, in the Auchterarder case, in 1839. The Assembly yielded so far as the temporalities were concerned, but at the same time unequivocally pronounced the principle of assenting to no patronage as one that could not be given up consistently with the doctrine of the headship and sovereignty of Christ. The Strathbogie case next occurred, bringing the civil and ecclesiastical courts into direct collision, which ended at last in the Dissolution of 1843, under the lead of Chalmers, Cunningham, Welsh, Candleby, and Dunlop; 470 members signed an "Act of Separation and Deed of Demission," and the Free Church of Scotland was organized. Soon after the separation of 1843 an act of Parliament was passed, called "Lord Aberdeen's Act," to define the rights of congregations and presbyteries in the calling and settlement of ministers. But in 1874 this was suspended by another act, whereby patronage was abolished, and the right of electing ministers was vested in the people. Government still reserves, however, the appointment of theological professors. The Free Church carried off about one half the communicants of the Established Church, and became a rival communion in most of the parishes of Scotland. The three denominations—the Established Presbyterian Church, the United Presbyterian Church, and the Free Church of Scotland—constitute the chief Presbyterian churches of Scotland at the present time. See Scotland; Presbyterian Churches of.

The government, discipline, and worship of the Established Church of Scotland are in all respects the same as those of other Presbyterian churches. According to the constitution of the Church, there is a Kirk session in every parish, consisting of the minister and a body of lay elders. All the ministers within a certain district, with each of the Kirk sessions of the Presbytery of that district. The next higher court is the Provincial Synod, which embraces several neighboring presbyteries. The highest court of all is the General Assembly. It is a representative court, consisting of 247 members and 178 elders, the greater part chosen by the presbyteries, but a considerable number of elders chosen by the town-councils and universities. It meets early in May, is presided over by its moderator, and has the presence of a Lord high commissioner, appointed by the crown, who, however, is not a member, and who holds fees up to £100. "Commission of Assembly" meets in August, November, and March, consisting of the members of Assembly, and a minister named by the moderator, to attend to matters remitted to it by the Assembly, or that may arise in the intervals. In consequence of the connection with the state, there are certain peculiarities connected with the support of the ministers which it may be proper to notice. Dr. Jamieson, in his interesting sketch of the "Church of Scotland," contributed to the Cyclopaedia of Religious Denominations, thus describes these peculiarities: "The provision made for parish ministers by the law of Scotland consists of a stipend arising from a tax on land. It is raised on the principle of compensating the "teinds" into a modified charge—the fifth of the land produce, according to a method introduced in the reign of Charles I., ratified by William III., and unalterably established by the treaty of Union. To make this intelligible, we may say that the teinds were appropriated by the crown, with the burden of providing for the minister. In after-times they were often bestowed as gifts on private individuals totally unconnected with the parish, and who thus came so far in place of the crown. These persons received the name of titularies, from being entitled to collect from the heritors the unappropriated teinds; but they were also bound on demand to sell to any heritor the titularship to his own teinds at nine years' purchase. From the collective land-produce of a parish the court of session could order the titulants to pay the minister a stipend, or to give him the support of the minister. This general decree having fixed the amount, a common agent, appointed by the court, proceeds to divide it proportionately among the landholders, and this division, when fully made, is sanctioned by the court, and, by an act of session, and forms the authority or rule according to which alone the minister collects his stipend. According to this system, which has proved a very happy settlement of a question vexata, the burden falls not on the farmer or tenant, as in other countries where tithing exactations are made, but on the landholder or titular of the teinds, to whom a privilege of relief is opened by having them fixed. He may value them, that is, to use the words of principal Hill, 'lead a proof of their present value before the Court of Session, and the valuation, once made by authority of that court, ascertain the quantity of victual or the sum of money in the name of teind payable out of his lands in all time coming.' The advantage of this system is that it enables proprietors to know exactly the extent of the public burdens on their estate; and the teind appropriated to the maintenance of the minister, or to educational and educational uses, being sacred and inviolable, is always taken into account, and deducted in the purchase or sale of lands. But that would not be so advantageous to the minister by fixing his income at one invariable standard were it not that provision is made, in the case of a minister's stipend every twenty years in parishes where there are free teinds. This is done by the minister instituting a process before the judges of the Court of Session, who act as commissioners for the plantation of kirkis and valuation of teinds; and in this process the act of 1806 requires that he shall summon not only the heritors of the parish, but also the moderator and clerk of presbytery as parties. In the event of the minister being able to prove a great advance in the social and agricultural state of the parish, the judges, grant his application, allocating some additional charge on the arguments pleaded appear to them unsatisfactory, they give a small addition, or refuse altogether. In many parishes, however, from the teinds being exhausted, ministers had no prospect of augmentation in the ordinary way; but recently the liberal policy of the late Dr. Percival's government in 1810, who used his influence in procuring an act of Parliament to be passed according to which all stipends in the Establishment should, out of the exchequer, be made up to £150. This, together with an adequate provision for men of a liberal profession, was felt and gratefully received at the time as a great boon. But such is the mutability of human society that these stipends, which in 1810 formed the minimum, are now greatly superior to many which at the same period
were considered, for Scotland, rich benefices; but which, being wholly paid in grain, have, through the late agrarian law, fallen far below that standard. The incomes of city ministers are paid wholly in money. Besides the stipend, every parish minister has a right to a manse or parsonage-house, garden, and offices—the style as well as the extent of accommodation being generally proportioned to the value of the benefice and the character of the neighborhood. According to law, the glebe consists of 20 acres of land, in part lying within the manse of the minister; in fact, it generally exceeds that measure; and, besides, most ministers have a grass glebe, sufficient for the support of a horse and two cows. All these, by a late decision of the Court of Session, are exempt from poor-rates and similar public burdens. Ministers in royal burghs are entitled to manse only.

The statistics of the Established Church of Scotland vary very slightly from year to year. The number of parish churches was in 1877, 1,222. In addition to these there are forty-two Parliamentary churches, and a considerable number of chapels of ease and quiet sacred places, which, under a scheme efficiently organized by the Rev. Prof. Robertson, are in course of being endowed and erected into new parishes in the terms of the Act of James IV., passed in 1646. Altogether there are 120 parishes, town and village, in the Church of Scotland. The following are the chief missionary and other benevolent undertakings of the Church:

1. The Home Mission Scheme. It has three departments: (1) Church Extension. Local efforts in places requiring additional church accommodation are supplemented by grants from the funds of the scheme. In 1876, thirty-three churches, providing nearly 32,000 sittings, were thus aided. (2) Mission Churches, designed to be centres of mission work in destitute localities or in the more populous parishes of Scotland. These churches or church-halls, however, with a population of 25,000, are not inhabited by worshippers. The Home Mission Committee insist that they shall be served with invariable regularity. (3) Mission Stations, not having the permanent character of churches, intended as points of evangelical work among the landed, non-church-going, or far-scattered people. There are seventy-seven such stations supplied by licentiates, or students in divinity, or qualified evangelists. Besides these operations, aid is given in certain cases towards the employment of Scripture-readers in the Highlands and Islands. The revenue of the scheme, besides church-collections and legacies, amounted to £11,780.

2. Of undertakings more especially affecting the clergy of the Church may be noticed the Appointment for Augmenting the Smaller Livings, i.e., livings under £200 per annum, in order to make up the standard prescribed by the General Assembly. Also the Ministers' and Professors' Widows' Fund, to which every parish minister and every professor in the national universities is bound to subscribe. The capital sum of the fund amounts to upwards of £12,000. Ministers and professors may subscribe according to one or other of four rates, viz.: £5 3s., £4 14s. 6d., £5 6s., or £7 17s. 6d.

3. A report is yearly presented to the Assembly as to the condition of the Sabbath-schools in connection with the Church. Between 15,000 and 16,000 persons are engaged in the work of teaching 167,000 juvenile scholars, and upwards of 24,000 adults of both sexes.

4. Colonial Missions seek to provide means of grace for Scottish colonists in the various British dependencies and elsewhere. When the scattered communities are organized into churches—some large and influential, as in the dominion of Canada— the aid given by the Home Church is curtailed, if not wholly withdrawn. But the committee have a great sphere of labor in the ever-enlarging and developing colonial empire of Great Britain. Agents of the mission report from British Colonies, New Zealand, Australia, Ceylon, India. Under the Colonial Mission are also included European stations, such as Paris and Dresden, where ministers are maintained for the benefit of resident Presbyterians. The total income of the scheme in 1877 was upwards of £15,000.

5. Missions to India. The effort put forth in connection with this mission are concentrated on Turkey and Egypt. It has agents in Constantinople, Smyrna, Alexandria, Beyrut, and Salonica. The sum of the charge which it operates is upwards of £7,000.

6. Missions to the Hebrides. The success of these missions, comprehending as they do, the so-called "Foreign Missions," are India, Africa, and China. It can scarcely, indeed, be said that a mission exists in China; but steps have been taken to originate a Christian work in that vast empire. The agency in Africa is not yet complete. A station has been formed and is partly occupied by a company of Christian artisans, headed by a medical missionary, in the Highlands of East Africa—the station having received the name of Dr. Livingstone's birthplace, Blantyre. The Indian missions retain the mixed character which Scotch missions in India have hitherto borne—educational and evangelistic. In the Presidencies, the educational institutions are still maintained, and are at present in a state of efficiency. Evangelical efforts are also carried on in connection with the institutions and in native churches. In the Presbyterian towns, the educational institutions are maintained by the native Presbyterians. The committee have visited the Highlands of India at Darjeeling, and outside the British territory an agency is maintained at Chumbi, whose position is that the mission, conducted by Europeans, is kept apart from the Church presented over by natives. The income of these foreign missions for the year ending January, 1876, was upwards of £19,000.

7. Two other agencies may be briefly noted:

(1) Continental and Foreign Missions Committee. Established as the medium of communication between the Church of Scotland and other Churches of the same communion. It is charged with the duty of cultivating friendly relations with such churches, and administering such sums as the liberality of the Church bestows on societies and agencies abroad seeking to spread the pure Gospel of Jesus Christ. For many years the committee have been able to aid the Central Society of the French Reformed Church, and the Evangelization Commission of the Waldensian Church in Italy. From time to time it has aided other agencies. The care of certain chaplaincies on the Continent intended for the benefit of Presbyterian students and residents at foreign universities on this committee. Its income in 1876 was £1,205.

(2) The Army and Navy Chaplains Committee is entrusted with the oversight of chaplains laboring in garrison towns or at the camps. The convener of the committee consists of the Moderator of the Church, with the naval and military authorities.

No church in Europe has taken more prompt and energetic steps for the general diffusion of school education than the Presbyterians of Scotland. As early as 1805 it was enacted that there should be a school founded and a school-master appointed in every parish by advice of the presbyteries, and to this purpose that the heralds do, in every congregation, meet among themselves, and provide a commodious house for a school, and modify a stipend to the school-master, which shall not be under ten marks (£6 1s. 4d.) nor above twenty marks." As almost all the population of the country is Presbyterian, the common-school system has sustained a parochial character. When, in 1843, the Free Church of Scotland was organized, it was resolved to erect schools in connection with the congregations of the Free Church, and the educational scheme which in consequence sprang up was co-extensive with the parochial system of the Established Church. In 1873, of 2,108 schools inspected by the government inspectors, 1,579 belonged to the Established and 557 to the Free Church; while of non-Presbyterian schools, 607 are Episcopal and sixty-six to the Catholic Church. The introduction of the new national system of educa-
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Few schools now remain in relation to it. The care of the committee is now chiefly occupied with providing religious instruction in all schools desiring it, and giving grants for excellence in religious instruction. The Scottish Association and the Inverkeithing Institution are in organic connection with the Church of Scotland by means of theological professorships; while at St. Andrew's an entire college, St. Mary's, is appointed solely to the teaching of theology and the languages connected with it. The girls' schools in Edinburgh, and in the principal institutions are the theological faculties of the several national universities. The number of professors is, at Edinburgh, four; Glasgow, four; St. Andrew's, three; Aberdeen, four. Students, 196. Students of divinity are required to attend a full course of arts at the university, and three years more at the Divinity Hall. The sessions in both cases last about five months. Students in this and the other Presbyterian colleges of Scotland have often assistance from bursaries or scholarships, which are allotted chiefly by competition. See Hetherington, Hist. of the Church of Scotland from 1689 to 1746. London, 1747. Dr. Erskine, Sketches of Church History, and Review of Scott; Faus- senden, Encycl. of Relig. Knowledge; Cyclop. of Relig. Denominations (London and Glasgow); Wilson, Preb., Hist. and Almanac; Schem, Eccles. Year Book.

2. UNITED PRESBITERIAN CHURCH. — In 1722 the Robert Erskine, as resigning moderator of the Synod of Stirling and Perth, preached a sermon on Christ as the Cornerstone, in which he sharply inveighed against the corruptions and abuses that had crept into the Scottish Church. His sermon gave great offence, and incurred the censure of the synod. He appealed to the General Assembly, who condemned and rebuked him. Upon entering his protest, they hauled his case over to the Commission. The Commission summarily suspended Erskine and three other ministers—Wilson, Moncrieff, and Fisher, who had joined in his protest—and cast them out of ministerial communion. The brethren, deeming this treatment unconstitutional and unchristian, immediately organized themselves into a presbytery, to which they gave the name of the Associate Presbytery, and published their testimony, or vindication of their secession. The next Assembly showed a disposition to make concessions, but the seceders refused to listen. How far they were right in this has been debated. That they were not satisfied to return to the bonds of the Establishment is clear, for they were afterwards succeeded by other congregations and by a professed teacher of theology; and, in consequence of their activity and the popular sympathy, they increased rapidly. The Assembly next proceeded to harsher measures, and in 1740 deposed the seceding ministers, now eight in number. The doors of the churches were closed against them, and some of them, as Moncrieff, preached all winter in the open air. Great difficulty was found in procuring sites for houses of worship. Still they grew, and in 1745 the presbytery expanded into a synod with thirty settled congregations and sixteen vacancies. But now a dispute arose between them, and in 1747 they split into two synods. The General Associate Synod, or Anti-burghers, denounced the oath as sanctioning the Establishment with all its corruptions; the Associate Synod maintained that it only referred to the true Protestant faith, in opposition to popery. After seventy-three years of separation, during which each thrrove and sent offshoots to other parts of the world, both branches reunited (a few only standing aloof) in 1820, under the name of the United Secession Church, when the new body embraced 573 congregations.

The establishment of the church was the result of the 'disapac' deposition by the General Assembly in 1732. He had refused to assist in intruding an obnoxious presentee over the parish of Inverkeithing. After his deposition he continued to preach in Dunfermline, but labored alone for several years. At length, being joined by Messrs. Boston and Colier, the three constituted the Relief Presbytery. Soon after another presbytery was necessary, and in 1775 (Earle says 1779) the two met as a synod. It was characteristic of the Relief Church to maintain free communion with all true Christians, and to disapprove of the very principle of establishments. They founded a dispensary, and increased the number of Relief and Associate Presbyteries, 114 congregations, and 45,000 communicants.

These two bodies, the United Secession and the Relief, having so much in common, for some time contemplated a union, which was at last consummated in Edinburgh, May 16, 1847, in the form of a synod. They took the title of the United Presbyterian Church. In common parlance, they are often familiarly spoken of as the "U. P. Church." They constitute a very popular and powerful body of Christians in Scotland, reporting, as the statistics of May, 1876: number of congregations, 629; of elders, 5075; members, 190,242; Sunday-school teachers, 12,129; Sunday-school scholars, 92,502; total income for 1875, £419,965. In the synod held at Edinburgh May 11, 1876, its sanction was given by a vote of 578 to 45 for the union of the United Presbyterian communion with the English Presbyterian Church; and an animated discussion took place in advocacy of separation of the Church from the State. The following are the articles of the basis as adopted by the two synods:

1. That the Word of God contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments is the only rule of faith and practice.

2. That the Westminster Confession of Faith, and the Larger and Shorter Catechisms, are the confession and catechism of this Church, and contain the authorized exposition of the sense in which we understand the Holy Scriptures, it being always understood that we do not approve of anything contrary to the Word of God, or which may be supposed to teach, compulsory or persecution and intolerant principles in religion.

3. That Presbyterian government, without any superiority of office to that of a teaching presbyter, and in a due subordination of Church courts, which is founded on and agreeable to the Word of God, is the form of government of this Church.

4. That the ordinances of worship should be administered in the United Church as they have been in both bodies of which it is formed; and that the Westminster Directory of Worship continues to be regarded as a compendium of excellent rules.

5. That the term of membership is a credible profession of the faith of Christ as held by this Church—a profession made with intelligence, and justified by a corresponding character and conduct.

6. That with regard to those members and session members who think that the second section of the twenty-sixth chapter of the Westminster Confession of Faith should declare Christ excoriates free communion (that is, not loose or indiscriminate communion, but the occasional admission to full communion in both the Lord's Supper and the offices respecting which the Christian character satisfactory evidence has been obtained, though belonging to other religious denominations), they shall enjoy what they enjoyed in their separate communions—the right of acting on their consciences convictions.

7. That the election of office-bearers of this Church, in its several congregations, belongs, by the authority of Christ, exclusively to the members in full communion.

8. That this Church solemnly recognizes the obligation to hold forth, as well as to hold fast, the doctrine and laws of Christ; and to make exertions for the universal diffusion of the blessings of his Gospel at home and abroad.

9. That as the Lord hath ordained that they who are called by the Gospel should be one of the body of which they are taught in the Word should communicate to him that teacheth in all good things; that he who are strong should help the weak; and that, having been received, they should freely give the Gospel to those who are destitute of it—this Church assents the obligation and the privilege of its members, influenced by the authority of Christ, to support and extend, by voluntary contributions, the distributions of the Gospel through the respective bodies; and in maintaining the lawful and obligation of separation from ecclesiastical bodies in which dangerous error is tolerated, or the discipline of
the Church or the rights of her ministers or members are disregarded.

"The United Church, in their present most solemn circumstances, join in expressing their grateful acknowledgment to the great Head of the Church for the measure of spiritual good which he has vouchsafed to them. They have marked their ecclesiastical management, and their determined resolution, in dependence on the promised grace of their Lord, to apply more frequently to the great principle of Christ, fellowship, to be more watchful in reference to admission and discipline, that the purity and efficiency of their congregations may be maintained. They take this step in the assurance that the collective body may be answered with respect to all within in a spirit of love, all without in a spirit of charity to other members on all other denominations or the world lying in wickedness."

"And, in fine, the United Church regard with a feeling of reverence and love all the faithful followers of Christ, and shall endeavor to maintain the unity of the whole body of Christ by a readiness to co-operate with all its members in all things in which they are agreed."

The United Presbyterian Church is a voluntary Church.

The doctrine of its voluntary condition is not formally contained in any portion of her standards, but it is distinctly implied. She holds to the theology of the Westminster Confession of Faith, and of the Larger and Shorter Catechisms, but she objects to every part of the Westminster Confession "which teaches, or is supposed to teach, compulsory or persecuting and intolerant principles in religion."

"Her creed," says Ewing, "is the scriptural Jesus in the exalted Jesus in the Head of his Church, and that this headship wholly supercedes the patronage and endowment of the Church by civil rulers. She believes, indeed, that Christ is King of nations, and that therefore nations should serve God, and that all rulers and magistrates are bound to glorify him in their respective spheres and stations. But such service and such glorification of God must be in harmony with the revealed mind of Christ; and the duty of enduring Christianiwherewever appears among the statutes of the New Testament. States which establish Churches beyond divine appointment, and contravene the spirituality of that kingdom which is not of this world. It is plain, too, from recent events in Scotland and England, that neither purity nor freedom can exist as it ought in an established Church. Spiritual independence can flourish only in a Church which has no connection with the State." Ebenzer Erskine said in his day, "There is a great difference to be made between the Church of Scotland and the Church of Christ in Scotland; for I reckon that the last is to a great extent drawn into the wilderness by the first; and similar advantages have led us into the wilderness with her, I judge it our duty to tarry with her for a while there, and to prefer her afflictions to all the advantages of a legal establishment." Christ's house, according to Ebenzer Erskine, is "the freest society in the world." It should bear its marks of being a free church 300 years. Accordingly the United Presbyterian Church is a free Church, and will not submit to any law of patronage. The Relief Church had its origin in this grievance; and the Secession Church, while it had a special struggle for doctrine, no less distinctive than that of the people, is therefore chosen by the united voice of the members in full communion; for Christ's ordinances are meant solely for Christ's people. The Presbyterian exercises no control whatever over the popular suffrage. It sends one of its members to moderate in the call, and sees that the call is gone about in a regular way. No canvassing is allowed, and the whole work of the Presbyterian is, in fact, to guard and preserve purity of election. The Presbyterian sustains the call after being convinced that the one will continue it in the presence of the mind of the people. The minister so called may either be one who is or has been in a charge, or he may be what is called a probationer. The vacant churches are supplied by these probationers—a body of men who have finished the educational curriculum appointed by the Church here, who are examined by their respective presbyteries, and licensed as persons qualified to preach the Gospel, and fit, if they shall be called, to take the pastoral charge of a congregation. The probationers are thus a body of lay preachers, authorized candidates for the ministry. They are sent among the vacant churches, and when the people are satisfied, they are admitted as members of the congregation. If there be any objection, it is tried, and sometimes they are located for months together at a missionary station. When a probationer is called, and accepts the call, he appears before the Presbytery in whose bounds the Church calling him is situated, and preaches what are called trial discourses. Such appearances in the Presbytery on the part of the pastor elect is to win the confidence of his brethren. After all the prescribed trials have been gone through and sustained, a day for the ordination is fixed. One of the ministers of the Presbytery is appointed to preside and ordain, and another is appointed to preach. An edict is at the same time appointed to be publicly served in the congregation by the officiating minister or preacher at least ten days before the day of ordination. Upon the appointed time and place, and is constituted by the moderator. The officer is then sent to the assembled congregation to intimate that the Presbytery has met, and requiring all who have any valid objections to the ordination being proceeded with immediately to appear before the Presbytery and state them. The officer having received the objections, the only King and Head of his Church, and that this headship wholly supercedes the patronage and endowment of the Church by civil rulers. She believes, indeed, that Christ is King of nations, and that therefore nations should serve God, and that all rulers and magistrates are bound to glorify him in their respective spheres and stations. But such service and such glorification of God must be in harmony with the revealed mind of Christ; and the duty of enduring Christianiwherewever appears among the statutes of the New Testament. States which establish Churches beyond divine appointment, and contravene the spirituality of that kingdom which is not of this world. It is plain, too, from recent events in Scotland and England, that neither purity nor freedom can exist as it ought in an established Church. Spiritual independence can flourish only in a Church which has no connection with the State." Ebenzer Erskine said in his day, "There is a great difference to be made between the Church of Scotland and the Church of Christ in Scotland; for I reckon that the last is to a great extent drawn into the wilderness by the first; and similar advantages have led us into the wilderness with her, I judge it our duty to tarry with her for a while there, and to prefer her afflictions to all the advantages of a legal establishment." Christ's house, according to Ebenzer Erskine, is "the freest society in the world." It should bear its marks of being a free church 300 years. Accordingly the United Presbyterian Church is a free Church, and will not submit to any law of patronage. The Relief Church had its origin in this grievance; and the Secession Church, while it had a special struggle for doctrine, no less distinctive than that of the people, is therefore chosen by the united voice of the members in full communion; for Christ's ordinances are meant solely for Christ's people. The Presbyterian exercises no control whatever over the popular suffrage. It sends one of its members to moderate in the call, and sees that the call is gone about in a regular way. No canvassing is allowed, and the whole work of the Presbyterian is, in fact, to guard and preserve purity of election. The Presbyterian sustains the call after being convinced that the one will continue it in the presence of the mind of the people. The minister so called may either be one who is or has been in a charge, or he may be what is called a probationer. The vacant churches are supplied by these probationers—a body of men who have finished the educational curriculum appointed by the Church here, who are examined by their respective presbyteries, and licensed as persons qualified to preach the
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constitute the session of the congregation and introduce the minister to his seat there. The whole procedure of the day is entered on the Presbytery's record.

The formula put to ministers on their ordination is as follows:

1. Do you believe the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be the Word of God, and the only rule of faith and practice?

2. Do you acknowledge the Westminster Confession of Faith, and the Larger and Shorter Catechisms, as an exhibition of the sense in which you understand the Holy Scriptures, and believe that you are not required to approve of anything in these documents which teaches, or is supposed to teach, compulsory or persecuting and intolerance of religious principles in religion?

3. Are you persuaded that the Lord Jesus Christ, the only King and Governor of the Church, has appointed a government distinct from and subordinate to civil government? And do you acknowledge the Presbyterian form of government, as authorized and acted on by the Church, to be founded on and approved to the Word of God?

4. Do you approve of the constitution of the United Presbyterian Church as exhibited in the Basis of Union; and while cherishing a lively sense of brotherhood toward all the faithful followers of Christ, do you engage to seek the patty, edification, peace, and extension of this Church?

5. Are you convinced of the glory of God, in the Lord Jesus Christ, and a desire to save souls, and not worldly interests or expectations, so far as you know your own heart, your motives and chief inducements to enter into the office of the holy ministry?

6. Have you used any undue methods, by yourself or others, to obtain the call of this Church?

7. [The members of the Church being requested to stand up, let any question be put to them.]

8. Do you, the members of this Church, testify your adherence to the call which you have given to Mr. A. B. to be your minister? And do you receive him with all good- ness, and promise to provide for him suitable maintenance, and to give him all due respect, subjection, and encouragement in the Lord?

9. An opportunity will be given to the members of the Church of signifying their assent to this by holding up their right hand.

10. Do you adhere to your acceptance of the call to become minister of this Church?

11. Do you engage, in the strength of that grace which is in Christ Jesus, to live a holy, useful, and Christ-like life, to maintain your own house, and faithfully, diligently, cheerfully to discharge all the parts of the ministerial work to the edifying of the body of Christ?

12. Do you promise to give conscientious attention on the concerns of the United Presbyterian Church, to be subject to them in the Lord, to take a due interest in their proceedings, and to study the things which make for peace?

13. All these things you profess and promise, through grace, as you shall be answerable at the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ with all his saints, and as you would be found in that happy company?

The Church has one theological institution, with a staff of seven professors, including the principal. The number of students for 1876-77 was 107, and the average for the ten preceding years 136. Students have to pass through a full course of arts at the university before joining the theological hall, and the theological curriculum is over three years, with a session each year from the beginning of November to the middle of April. Very recently a change was made in the management of the theological hall, with a view to the more efficient training of students. It was found that the cost of maintaining the hall should be partly by a capital fund and partly by annual contributions, and the capital fund of £40,000 has already been nearly realized. In connection with the theological hall there is a scheme of scholarships, and a committee who have charge of the distribution of these on competitive examination of applicants. In 1876 eleven special scholarships were awarded of the aggregate value of £275; and from the ordinary fund two of £20 each, ten of £15, and forty-one of £10. In 1876 the number of young people under religious instruction in Sabbath-schools and Bible-classes was 102,750.

The following are among the other undertakings of the United Presbyterian Church:

Home Mission Fund.—This fund is under the direction more immediately of the Home Committee of the Board of Missions. Its object is to supplement the funds of the weaker congregations, to support missionary stations, to aid in the support of catechists, and maintain a scheme of home evangelization.

By the Stipend Augmentation Scheme and its Surplus Fund, including arrangements which have been made with certain denominations in reference to allowances for house-rent where manse accommodation has not been provided, the following general results in regard to the stipends of ministers for the year 1877 have been obtained:

All the other Stipends in the Church are upwards of £200 per annum.

In evangelistic effort and home evangelization £6467 were expended in 1876 under the direction of the Home Committee of the Board of Missions.

The Aged and Infirm Ministers' Fund has a capital fund of £85,585, with a reserve fund of £1000, and provides an annuity of not less than £50 per annum to aged and infirm ministers and missionaries of the Church.

Manse Fund.—For this scheme £57,772 have been raised by subscriptions and donations up to December, 1876, and £43,459 expended up to April, 1877, in grants to 222 congregations; and the conditions on which these grants were offered required the congregations to raise not less than £9,534, as it is stipulated where grants are given that the manse shall be free of duty when the last instalment of the grant has been paid.

The Foreign Mission Fund is to defray the expenses of the foreign missionary operations of the Church. The missions supported out of the fund, nine in number, are situated in Jamaica, Trinidad, Old Calabar, Kaffraria, India, China, Spain, Japan, and Algeria. In these nine missions there are 61 ordained missionaries, 7 European medical missionaries, 2 European male teachers, 21 European female teachers, 22 ordained native missionaries, 91 native evangelists, 212 schoolmasters, 44 native female teachers, 86 other agents, 84 principal stations, 131 out-stations, 13,242 communicants, 3080 inquirers, 197 week-day schools, 13,000 pupils, with a total educated agency of 384. The income of the Foreign Mission Fund for 1887 was £66,527 16s. 4d.

Under the direction of the synod, the Foreign Mission Board voted, during 1876, the following grants, viz.: (1) To the Union of Evangelical Churches of France, £500; (2) to the Evangelical Society of Lyons, £150; (3) to the Evangelical Society of Geneva, £250; (4) to the Belgian Missionary Society, £200; (5) for evangelistic work in Bohemia, £150; (6) to the Waldensian Church, £250 (including £100 towards the salary of the Rev. J. Simpson Kay of Palermo); (7) to the Free Church of Italy, £100; (8) for evangelistic work at Aix-la-Bains, Savoy, £50; (9) to the French Canadian Missionary Society, £100; (10) for Rev. Ferdinand Cesar's work in Moravia, £75; (11) for outfit and passage of two ministers to Australia, £50; (12) to Rev. David Sadey, Napiar, New Zealand, for salary of evangelist (three years), £150; and (18) salary of Rev. Dr. Laws, of the Nyassa mission of the Free Church. These grants amount in all to £7715. Besides these special grants made directly by the Foreign Committee, the following special contributions have been obtained through the hands of the synod's treasurer: (1) £1580 from the Theological Hall Students' Missionary Society, for pastor Yakopian's work in Cesarea, Cappadocia; (2) £5 for Protestant churches in Bithynia; (3) £1 6s. 6d. for Mount Lebanon Schools; (4) £100 for Protestant Church in Bohemia; (5) £50 for Rev. P. Cesar's work in Mo-
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ravias; (6) £20 for the Union of Evangelical Churches in France; (7) £45 £4. 4d. for evangelical work at Aix-
les-Bains, Savoy; (8) £24 for Christian work in Paris; (9) £13 for the Union of Church of the Diable in
Ireland; (10) £131 2£. 4d. for the Wallacean Church; (11) £50 for the Free Italian Church; (12) £2 4£.
for Rev. J. S. Kay, Palermo; (13) £5 for Mrs. Boyce's Orphanage, Bordi-
gue; (14) £33 £3. 4d. for Freedmen's Missions Aid Society; and (15) £606 8£. 7d. for the Agra Medical
Mission (Dr. Valentine's scheme). These donations,
denied by the donors for the objects specified, amount-
ed in all to £2831 5£. 2d., which, added to the grants
administered by the Board—viz., £2715—make the total
contribution to the Church during 1876, for objects out-
side the bounds of our Mission, £2506 £2. 2d. The
ordinary congregational income of the Church for the year 1876
was £233,114; the missionary and benevolent income
£82,297; and the benevolent income not congregational
£52,216—total, including the English congrega-
tions, up to June, 1876, being £406,204. See Hether-
ington, Hist. of the Church of Scotland; Cyclop. of Re-
ligious Denominations (London and Glasgow); Wilson,
Presb. Hist. Almanack. See United Presbyterian
Church.

2. THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.—This large and
usual body of Christians, now numbering nearly a
million of people, was organized into a separate reli-
gious denomination in May, 1843. The circumstances
which led to its formation as a Church distinct from
the Establishment have already been detailed in a
previous number of this paper. The length termi-
nated in the Disruption had its origin in the two re-
forming acts passed by the General Assembly of 1834,
the one of which, the Act on Calls, asserted the prin-
ciple of non-intrusion, and the other, usually called the
Church Act, asserted the right of the Church to deter-
dine who should administer the government of Christ's
house. Both of these acts gave rise to lawsuits before
the civil tribunals, thus bringing into discussion the
whole question as to the terms of the connection be-
tween the Church and the State. As the various proc-
cesses went forward in the courts of law, it became quite
plain to many, both of the Scottish clergy and laity,
that attempts were made by the civil courts to coerce
the courts of the Church in matters spiritual. Every
encroachment of this kind they were determined to re-
sist, and so far as it was practicable to do so, they con-
stituted the Church of Scotland, as well as an infringe-
ment on the privileges secured to her by the Act of Security
and Treaty of Union.

Matters were evidently fast hastening onward to a
crisis, and in the Assembly of 1842 a Claim of Rights
was agreed to be laid before the legislature, setting
forth the grievances of which the Church com-
plained in consequence of the usurpations of the courts
of law, and declaring the terms on which alone she
would remain in connection with the State. This
important document was adopted by a majority of 181.
The claim, however, which it contained, was pronounced
by government to be "unreasonable," and intimation
was distinctly made that the government "could not
advise her majesty to acquiesce in these demands." This
reply on the part of the supreme branch of the legis-
lature was decisive, and put an end to all hope of averting
the impending catastrophe. At the next meeting of
Assembly, accordingly, the moderator, instead of con-
stituting the court in the usual form, read a solemn pro-
test, which he laid upon the table, and withdrew, fol-
lowed by all the clerical and lay members of Assembly
by whom it was subscribed. This document protests
against the then recent decisions of the courts of law on
the following grounds:

1. That the courts of the Church by law established,
and the subscribers to the subscription or bequests as
lied to be coerced by the civil courts in the exercise of their spiritual functions; and in particular in the admission to the office of the holy minis-
tery, to the ministry of the word of God, and to the services
of the Word of God, and to the liberties of Christ's people.

2. That the said civil courts have power to interfere with and interpret the preaching of the Gospel and the admin-
istration of ordinances as authorized and enjoined by the Church and the Establishment.

3. That the said civil courts have power to suspend spiritual discipline imposed by the Church, as a part of the Establishment against ministers and probationers of the Church, and to interpret their execution as to spiritual effects, functions, and privileges.

4. That the said civil courts have power to reduce and set aside the sentences of the Church courts of the Estab-
lishment against ministers from the office of the holy ministry and depriving probationers of their license to preach the Gospel; and with reference to the imposition of discipline, functions, and privileges of such ministers and probation-
ers—restoring them to the spiritual office and status of
which the Church courts had deprived them.

5. That the said civil courts have power to determine on the right to sit as members of the supreme and other judicatories of the Church by law established, and to issue interdicts against sitting and voting therein, irrespective of the judgment and determination of the said judi-
catories.

6. That the said civil courts have power to supersede the majority of a Church court of the Establishment, in re-
gard to the exercise of its spiritual functions as a Church
court, and to authorize the minority to exercise the said functions, in addition to the court itself, and to the im-
portant judicatories of the Establishment.

7. That the said civil courts have power to stay proceed-
ances of discipline pending before courts of the Church by law established, and to interdict such courts from pro-
ceeding therein.

8. That no pastor of a congregation can be admitted into the courts of the Church of the Establishment, and allowed to hold office, save and except in accordance with the decisions of the office of the Head of the Church, nor to sit in any of the judicatories of the Church, inferior or super-
ior, and that no additional provision can be made for the ex-
cercise of spiritual discipline among the members of the Church, through any other power or authority, or in any way, except by the same authority as that having a
jurisdiction, and without the express consent of the Church.

All which jurisdiction and power on the part of the said civil courts generally above specified, whatever proceed-
ing may have given occasion to the principles, is, in our opinion, itself inconsistent with Christian liberty, and with the authority which the Head of the Church hath
conferred on the Church alone.

The document goes on to protest that in the circum-
stances in which the Church was thereby placed, "a free
Assembly of the Church of Scotland, by law established,
cannot at this time be holden, and that an Assembly cannot be lawfully constituted in connection with
the Church cannot be constituted in connection with the State without violating the conditions which must now,
since the rejection by the Legislature of the Church's
Claim of Right, be held to be the conditions of the Estab-
lishment; they can be holden only in close of this subscription, by subscribing claim to themselves the liberty of abandoning their connection with the State, while retaining all the privileges and exercising all the functions of a section of a Church's visible Church. " And, finally, they declare,
while firmly asserting the right and duty of the civil magistracy to maintain and support an establishment of
religion in accordance with God's Word, and reserving to ourselves and our successors to arrive by all lawful
means, as opportunity shall in God's good providence
be offered, to secure the performance of this duty agree-
ingly, in accordance with the conditions of the estab-
lishment of the kingdom of Scotland and the obligations of the
Treaty of Union as understood by us and our ancestors,
but acknowledging that we do not hold ourselves at liberty to retain the benefits of the Establishment while we
cannot comply with the conditions now to be deemed therein as essential, and that we shall, to the extent
of which we are placed, it is, and shall be, lawful for us,
and such other commissioners chosen to the Assembly
appointed to have been this day holden as may con-
cur with us, to withdraw to a separate place of meeting, for
consideration of the purposes and objects set forth as
here to us—maintaining with us the Confession of Faith, and
standards of the Church of Scotland as herebefore
understood—for separating in an orderly way from the
Establishment, and thereupon adopting such measures as may be competent to us, in humble dependence on God's grace and the aid of the Holy Spirit, for the advancement of his glory, the extension of the Gospel of our Lord and Saviour, and the administration of the affairs of the Church; and to do now, for the purpose foresaid, withdraw accordingly, humbly and solemnly acknowledging the hand of the Lord in the things which have come upon us, because of our manifold sins, and the sins of this Church and nation; but, at the same time, with an assured conviction that we are not responsible for any consequences that may follow from this our enforced separation from an Establishment which we loved and prized, through interference with conscience, the disbursement done to Christ's crown, and the rejection of his sole and supreme authority as King of his Church. This document, embodying the protest against the wrongs inflicted on the Church of Scotland by the civil power, was signed by no fewer than 203 members of Assembly. When the moderator had finished the reading of the protest, he was followed by a large majority of the clerical and lay members of the court; and the procession, joined by a large body of ministers, elders, and others who adhered to their principles, moved in solemn silence to Tansfield Hall, a large building situated at the northern extremity of the city, in the valley formed by the streams flowing into the Tweed, and near the Union Church of Scotland, which, while renouncing the benefits of an Establishment, continues to adhere to the standards and to maintain the doctrine, discipline, worship, and government of the Church of Scotland. Dr. Chalmers was chosen as their first moderator, and the ordinary business was proceeded with according to the usual forms. On Tuesday, the 23d of May, the ministers and professors, to the number of 474, solemnly subscribed the Deed of Demission, formally renouncing all connection with an Establishment by which they had been held in connection with the Establishment, declaring them to be vacant, and consenting to their being dealt with as such. Thus, by a regular legal instrument, the ministers completed their separation from the Establishment; and the Free Church of Scotland assumed the position of a distinct ecclesiastical denomination, holding the same doctrines, maintaining the same ecclesiastical framework, and observing the same forms of worship as had been received and observed in the National Church. In fact, they had abandoned nothing but the endowments of their superiors. The General Assembly of the Union Church of Scotland, now called the New College, which was completed at a cost approaching £40,000, is provided with a more complete staff of professors than any similar institution in Scotland, and with more effectual means of training an educated ministry for the service of the Church in the United Kingdom. The Free Church has also built a divinity hall in Aberdeen, and a third in Glasgow. The number of theological students in attendance on these colleges amounts in 1878 to 230. In connection with the Free Church, a fund was instituted in 1848 for Aged and Infirm Ministers, which already exceeds £39,000. In addition to the home ministry, which in 1878 numbered 1059, there are nearly 800 settled ministers belonging to this Church in the different departments of the colonial field.
dividend platforms; to maintain lay evangelists, and send out ministerial evangelists from time to time; and to encourage the employment of students and others as missionaries in necessitous districts in large towns. To encourage ministers of experience to undertake mission congregations in populous places, grants of £200 a year and a corresponding amount being diminishing gradually from year to year, till it is extinguished. In other cases the grants are smaller. The income of the fund, derived from a church-door collection thrice in two years, donations, legacies, etc., is between £8000 and £10,000, and the fund is steadily diminishing.

Highland Mission. — This is a somewhat similar scheme, managed by a separate committee of the General Assembly, for districts of the country where Gaelic is spoken. It has a collection every second year. Its average revenue is about £3000.

Church and Manse Building Fund. — This is intended to help congregations in their building operations. At first the principal encouragement, Dr. Guthrie being raised for the General Manse Fund alone about £10900, but of late years its income has been only about £1500. A special Building Fund is contemplated for new charges.

Education Scheme. — Till recently a large proportion of the congregations had day-schools, for which grants were given. Of these are now in the national scheme of education. There are still some schools receiving grants; but the chief remaining part of the scheme is the Normal Schools, of which there are two — at Edinburgh and Glasgow. The instructors receive a salary from a general fund, which is raised by monthly contributions in all the congregations, and which is divided at the end of the year according to a certain scale, proportioned to the qualifications of the respective teachers.

Continental Scheme. — For aiding stations, societies, and churches on the continent of Europe. Revenue about £4000.

Miscellaneous. — For sending out ministers to the colonies and aiding colonial churches, especially in their earlier stages. Revenue about £4000.

The Foreign Misions Scheme. — The late Rev. Dr. Duff, the first missionary to the heathen from the Church of Scotland, went to Calcutta in 1829, and founded the India Mission of the Church of Scotland. In the previous year Dr. Wilson went to Bombay, and later, the Rev. John Anderson to Madras. In 1843 all the missionaries in India adhered to the Free Church, and the old localities were continued. The Foreign Missions of the Free Church embrace India, Africa, Syria, and New Hebrides. In India, there are 6 principal and 12 branch stations in Bengal; 3 principal and 10 branch stations in Western India; 2 principal and 3 branch stations in Central India; and 1 principal and 7 branch stations in Southern India. In South Africa there are 6 principal and 31 branch stations in Kaffraria; 2 principal and 2 branch stations in Natal; and 1 principal station at Livingstonia. In New Hebrides, where the Reformed Presbyterians (who joined the Free Church in 1876) had their field, are 4 stations, on the island of Banks, in Syria, the headquarters are at Swieir, about twenty miles from Beyrut. In all, the Free Church missions embrace 107 stations, 38 European missionaries, 3 European medical missionaries, 21 European teachers, 19 European artisans, 15 native missionaries, 97 Christian teachers, and Christian laborers of various sorts. In the native churches are 2350 communicants, and about 3000 baptized adherents. The number of institutions and schools is 228, and the total number of scholars is 13,109. In the principal Indian stations many of the pupils are undergraduates of the universities. The revenue of this scheme for 1876–77 was £51,217.

Rev. Mr. Mission. — This was begun in 1839, and in 1843 it was continued by the Free Church, all the missionaries having adhered. At present it has stations at (1) Amsterdam, (2) Prague, (3) Veys, (4) Breslau, and a special Church Extension Fund, amounting to £100,000, is being raised, and the greater part of it has been contributed in a few months.

Reformed Presbyterian Church of Scotland. — This is the only Church which can be legitimately described as the Reformed Presbyterian Church of Scotland in her period of greatest purity, that of the Second Reformation. It was that memorable period of Scottish history between 1638 and 1650 which formed the era of the Solemn League and Covenant, of the Westminster Assembly, of the revolution which deposed the first Charles and asserted those principles of civil and religious liberty which all enlightened Christians and statesmen are now ready with one voice to acknowledge and to admire. For their strict adherence to these principles Cameron, Cargill, and Renwick shed their blood, and to these principles the Reformed Presbyterian Church glo- riol in owing her attachment. As has already been noticed in the article COVENANTERS, on the day after the execution of Charles I was known at Edinburgh, his son, Charles II, was proclaimed king at the public cross by the Committee of Estates, with this promise, however, that "before being admitted to the exercise of his royal power, he shall give satisfaction to this kingdom in the things that concern the security of religion according to the National Covenant and the Solemn League and Covenant of 1643; and he shall not make any law or ordinance as necessary to the maintenance of the constitution of the country, as well as the promotion of the great principles of civil and religious liberty, that it was enacted both by the Parliament and the General Assembly. The document issued by the latter body exhibits, in the clearest manner, their design in insisting upon the subscription by the king. It is dated July 27, 1649, and contains the following important statements: "But if his majesty, or any having or pretending power and commission from him, shall invade this kingdom upon any pretense or pretext of a power, whether temporal or spiritual, or for the purpose of the maintaining or advancing any such power — as it will be a high provocation against God to be accessory or assisting thereto, so it will be a necessary duty to resist and oppose the same. We know that many are so forgetful of the oath of God, and ignorant and careless of the interest of Jesus Christ and the Gospel, that they do little trouble to mind his kingdom and the privileges thereof, and do so much dishonor absolute and arbitrary government for gaining their own ends, and so much malign the instruments of the work of reformation, that they would admit his majesty, or any having or pretending power, or any who are upon any terms whatsoever, though with never so much prejudice to religion and the liberties of these kingdoms, and would think it quarrel enough to make war upon all those who for conscience' sake cannot condescend there- to. But we desire all those who fear the Lord, and
mind to keep their Covenant, impartially to consider those things which follow:

"I. That as magistrates and whose power is ordained of God, so are they in the exercise thereof not to walk according to their own will, but according to the law of equity and good conscience, as being the word of God for the safety of his people; therefore a boundless and unlimited power is to be acknowledged in no king or magistrate; neither is it to be submitted to the preaching of his power as long as he refuses to walk in the administration of things according to the established laws of the kingdom, that his subjects may live under him a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and holiness.

"II. There is one mutual obligation and stipulation between the king and his people; as both of them are tied to God, so of each of them is tied one to another for the performance of mutual and reciprocal duties. According to this, it is statute and ordained in the eighth act of first Parliament of James VI, "That all kings, princes, or magistrates whatsoever, holding their place, which hereafter at the time of their coronation and receipt of their princely authority, make their faithful promise by oath, in the presence of the Eternal God, that during the whole course of their lives they shall serve the same Eternal God in the utmost of their power, according to the oath required in his most holy Word, contained in the Old and New Testaments: and, according to the same words, make and subscribe to the same oath and the preaching of his most holy Word, and due and right administration of his sacrament now received and preached within this realm; and shall abhor every doctrine contrary to the same; and shall rule the people committed to their charge according to the will and command of God contained in his holy Word, and according to the audible laws and constitutions received within this realm; and shall not seduce nor entice the people to do any thing contrary to the same." They are bound to the king as his subjects to give him obedience, but not without exceptions. That oath was sworn by king James VI, and afterwards by king Charles at his coronation, and is inserted in our National Covenant, which was afterwards confirmed by the king. The obligations of their majesties in this matter do not stand on a single point, but extend to all the duties inherent to their power. It is consonant to Scripture and reason, and the laws of the kingdom, that they should refer to their subjects for the execution of their government.

"III. In the League and Covenant which hath been so solemnly sworn and renewed by this kingdom, the duty of defending and preserving the king's majesty, person, and authority, and of maintaining the true religion and liberties of the kingdom; and therefore his majesty, subjected himself to the last and majestic obligation, to defend his majesty, person, and authority, and the true religion and liberties of the kingdom, and not to suffer any thing to remove the same. The pope is denounced to be the avowed enemy of the kingdom, and the king is bound to the interest of Jesus Christ, to bring him to the exercise of his royal power, and to promote the welfare of the kingdom, and to promote the cause of religion and the true religion of Jesus Christ, as being the only and true religion.

The stipulation was made known to Charles while he was still in Holland, where he had been for some time residing, but he refused to accede to it. The following year (1650) he set sail for Scotland, and before landing on its shores he consented to subscribe the Covenant, and the test was accordingly administered to him with all due solemnity. On the following August he repeated an engagement to support the Covenant. Yet the Covenant did not succeed in all its objects. But the schemes for the subversion not only of Presbyterianism, but even of Protestantism in Scotland. Again, when crowned at Scone on Jan. 1, 1651, Charles not only took oath to support and defend the Presbyterian Church in Scotland, but the National Covenant and the Solemn League and Covenant having been produced and read, the king solemnly swore them. The imposing ceremonial, however, was only designed, on the part of the profligate Charles, to deceive his Scottish subjects. Nor did the calamities in which he was involved lead to his dethronement and exile for several years in France—produce any favorable change upon his character. No sooner was he restored to his throne in 1660, than he forthwith proceeded to overturn the whole work of reformation, both civil and ecclesiastical, which he had solemnly sworn to support. The first step towards the execution of this determination was the passing of the Act of Supremacy, whereby the king was constituted supreme judge in all matters civil and ecclesiastical. To this was afterwards added the Oath of Allegiance, which declared it to be treason to deny the supremacy of the sovereign both in Church and State. The crowning deed of treachery, however, which Charles perpetrated, was his prevailing upon his Scottish counsellors to pass the Act Rescissory, by which all the acts taken from 1688 to 1650 for the reformation of religion were pronounced rebellious and treasonable; the National Covenant, the Solemn League and Covenant were condemned as unlawful oaths; the Glasgow Assembly of 1638 was denounced as an illegal and seducitious meeting; and the right government of the Church was alleged to be the inherent prerogative of the crown. The result of these acts was, that the advances which the Church and the country had made during the period of the Second Reformation were completely neutralized, and the Church of Scotland was subject to a long series of years to the most cruel persecution and oppression. With such flagrant and repeated violations of the covenant the king had entered with his subjects, it is not to be wondered at that, on high constitutional grounds, this body of the Covenanters, headed by Cameron, Cargill, and others, should have regarded the treacherous sovereign as having forfeited all title to their allegiance. They felt it to be their duty to uphold the truth of the Reformation, and yet own the authority of a monarch who had trampled these principles under foot, and that, too, in violation of the most solemn oaths, repeated again and again. The younger McCrie, in his Sketches of Scottish Church History, alleges that the principle laid down by Cameron's party was, "that the king, by assuming an Erastian power over the Church, had forfeited all right to the civil obedience of his subjects—a principle which had never been known in the Church of Scotland before." Such a view of the matter, however, is scarcely fair to the Covenanters. It was not because Charles had usurped an Erastian authority over the Church that they deemed it their duty to renounce their allegiance, but because he had broken the solemn vow made at his coronation. On that occasion he had entered, as they held, into a deliberate compact with his subjects, and yet, in the face of all his oaths, he had openly, and in the most flagrant manner, broken that compact, thus setting his subjects free from all obligation to own him as king. It is quite true, as the Westminster Confession of Faith affirms, that infidelity or difference in religion do not make void the magistrate's just and legal authority, nor free the people from their due obedience to him; but this remark does not meet the case as between Charles and the Covenanters. They renounced their allegiance not because the sovereign was an infidel, or differed from them in matters of religion, but solely and exclusively because he had broken a civil compact entered into between him and his Scottish subjects on receiving the crown, and confirmed by a solemn religious vow. By his own declaration and confession, as lying under the ban of the Church, he had forfeited his right to rule before they had renounced their obligation to obey. Such were the simple grounds on which Cameron, Cargill, Renwick, and their followers considered themselves justified in disowning the authority of the king, and bearing arms against him as a usurper of the throne and a traitor to the country.

This earnest and intrepid band of Covenanters brought down upon themselves, by the fearful avowal of their principles, the special vengeance of the ruling powers. One after another their leaders perished on the scaffold, and thus the people of God were left to the care of those who found themselves deprived of religious instructors, and wandering as "sheep without a shepherd." In these circumstances they resolved to form themselves into a united body, consisting of societies for worship and mu-
tual edification, which were formed in those districts where the numbers warranted such a step. To preserve order and uniformity, the smaller societies appointed deputies to attend a general meeting, in which was vested the power of making arrangements for the regulation of the whole body. The first meeting of these united bodies, held in Ayr on June 1688, at Logan House, in the parish of Leenahaw, Lanarkshire, where it was resolved to draw up a public testimony against the errors and defections of the times. The name which this body of Covenanters took to themselves was that of the "Persecuted Remnant," while the societies which they had formed for religious improvement led them to be designated the "Society People." They had taken up no new principles," as Dr. Hetherington well remarks: "the utmost that they can be justly charged with is, merely that they had followed up the leading principles of the Presbyterian and Covenanted Church of Scotland to an extreme point, from which the greater part of Presbyterians recoiled; and that in doing so they had used language capable of being interpreted to mean more than they themselves intended. Their honesty of heart, integrity of purpose, and firmness of principle cannot be gainsaid; and the character of men of sound unguarded language, it ought to be remembered that they did so in the midst of fierce and remorseless persecution, ill adapted to make men nicely cautious in the selection and exercise of terms to express their indignation of that unchristian tyranny which was so fiercely striving to destroy every vestige of both civil and religious liberty."

The first manifestation of the views held by the Society People took place during the dissections at Bothwell Bridge, when a body of the Covenanters refused to make a public avowal of their allegiance to the king in their declaration. A rude outline of the declaration was drawn up by Cargill, assisted by Henry Hall, of Haughhead, who was mortally wounded at Queensferry, and the document, being found on his person, received the name of the "Queensferry Paper." It contained some of the chief points held by the Society People; but it unfortunately embodied in it an avowal of dislike to a hereditary monarchy, as "liable to inconvenience, and apt to degenerate into tyranny." Though the paper in question emanated from only a few persons, and its errors, therefore, could not be charged upon the whole of the strict Presbyterian party, yet it was quoted without reserve by their enemies as a proof of diabolical and even treasonable tenets. To counteract the prejudices thus excited against them, the leaders of the Society People drew up deliberately a statement of their principles, which is usually known by the name of the "Sanquhar Declaration." This document, which carefully excluded all reference to a change in the form of government, was, nevertheless, classed by the persecutors along with the Queensferry Paper in all their proclamations, as if they had been identical, and made an excuse for issuing to the army the most ruthless and cruel commands to pursue to the death all who were suspected of connection with the bold declarations. Cameron, Cargill, and ten other persons were proclaimed traitors, and a price was set upon their heads. Nothing daunted, Cargill in 1680 boldly pronounced what is known as the Torwood Excommunication. In a meeting held at Torwood, in Stirlingshire, the intrepid Covenant, after divine service, solemnly excommunicated Charles and his chief supporters, casting them out of the Church, and delivering them up to Satan. This bold act of a Christian hero roused the government to greater fury, and a series of civil and military executions followed, down to the Revolution in 1688.

In the persecutions of this eventful period, the Society People had been subjected to painful discouragement by the loss of their able and devoted leaders. Cameron and Cargill, and many others, had sealed their testimo-
were: (1) that as it left the Acts Revisitory in full force, it cancelled the attainments of the Second Reformation, together with the Covenanters; and (2) that the civil rulers usurped an authority over the Church which virtually destroyed her spiritual independence, and was at variance with the sole headship of the Redeemer himself.

The defects of the Revolution settlement were due partly to William's Erastian policy, and his desire to retain the prælatic clergy within the Established Church of Scotland, but partly also to the temporizing policy of the Church itself. "Though the acts of Parliament," as Dr. Hetherington justly remarks, "made no mention of the Second Reformation and the National Covenant, it was the direct duty of the Church to have declared her adherence to both; and though the State had still refused to recognise them, the Church would, by this avowal, have at least escaped from being justly exposed to the charge of having submitted to a violation of her own sacred Covenant. In the same spirit of compromis, the Church showed herself but too ready to comply with the king's pernicious policy of including as many as possible of the presbytery within the National Church. This was begun by the first General Assembly, and continued for several succeeding years, though not to the full extent wished by William, till a very considerable number of those men whose hands had been so freely guilted in persecution were received into the bosom of that Church which they had so long striven utterly to destroy. It was absolutely impossible that such men could become true Presbyterians; and the very acrimony with which many of them subscribed the Confession of Faith only proved the more clearly that they were void of either faith or honor. Their admission into the Presbyterian Church of Scotland was the most fatal event which ever occurred in the strange, eventful history of that Church."

It was not to be expected that the Society People could approach with a spirit of sentiment and feeling, or with the views of the Church in the matter of the Revolution settlement. They occupied, accordingly, an attitude of firm and decided protest against the principles avowed by William and acted on by the Church; and they maintained that there had been a decided departure on the part of both the one and the other from the principles of the Second Reformation and the obligations of the Covenant.

Holding such views, it was impossible for the Society People to incorporate themselves with the Established Church of Scotland. They were compelled, therefore, to separate into a distinct and constantly increasing body, whose constitution was radically vitiated, and as protested against a professedly national government which had violated the most solemn national obligations. Three Cameronian ministers, it is true—Messrs. Shields, Linning, and Boyd—applied for admission into the National Church for themselves and their people, on condition that they might acknowledge breach of Covenant, and purge out the ignorant and heterodox and scandalous ministers who had taken part in shedding the blood of the saints. But every proposal of this nature was met with a reprobation more obstinate than redress, they at last submitted, and the people who had adhered to them remained in a state of disentilment.

For upwards of sixteen years after the avowal of their peculiar principles, the strict Presbyterians had remained without a stated ministry, or without any separate organization as a Church. In 1681, however, societies were formed which, though exercising no ecclesiastical functions, tended to give unity to the body, and to make such arrangements as were necessary for the maintenance of worship and ordinances, encourag making at the same time among the people a devoted attachment to Reformation principles. Availing themselves of these praying societies for nearly twenty years after the Revolution, the people waited patiently until the Lord should send them pastors. At length, in 1707, their wishes and prayers were answered, the Rev. John M'Millan, of Balmaghie, having resigned connection with the Established Church, and joined himself to their body. For a few years before, he had been contending within the pale of the Church for the whole of the Covenanted Reformation; but instead of meeting with sympathy, he was hasted and irregularly deposed. Having joined the Reformed Presbytery, he labored for many years in the work of the ministry among them with indefatigable earnestness and zeal, maintaining the principles of the Second Reformation till his dying day.

Soon after the accession of Mr. M'Millan from the Established Church, he was joined by Mr. John M'Neil, a licentiate, who, having adopted Cameronian views, had also seceded. These two faithful and zealous servants of Christ traversed the country, preaching everywhere, and encouraging the adherents of the Covenant. In 1712 the Covenants were renewed at Auchensawgh. Amid many trials and persecutions the cause went steadily forward; and in 1748 Mr. M'Millan, who had hitherto stood alone as an ordained minister, Mr. M'Neil never having been ordained for want of a presbytery, was joined by the Rev. Thomas Nairn, who, on the suspension of Mr. M'Millan in the Assembly, a con- cession Church in consequence of his having embraced Cameronian views. There being now two ministers, a meeting was held at Braehead on Aug. 1, 1748, when a presbytery was for the first time formed under the name of the "Reformed Presbyterian Church."

One of the first acts of the newly organized Church was to despatch missionaries to Ireland, and by the blessing of God upon the labors of these men, and others who speedily followed, a fully organized and independent section of the Reformed Presbyterian Church was formed in the sister isle.

In Scotland a Declaration and Testimony was published in 1741, and the Covenants were renewed in 1745, at Crawford-John, in Lanarkshire; but notwithstanding these steps, which were so well fitted to promote unity among the people, the year 1749 elapsed when a division took place in the Reformed Presbytery, two of the brethren, Messrs. Hall and Innes, having separated from their communion in consequence of their having imbibed heretical opinions on the subject of the atonement. The two brethren, after seceding from the Presbytery, formed themselves into a new presbytery at Edinburgh, which at length became extinct. The Reformed Presbytery, in reply to their misrepresentations, found it necessary to issue a treatise in defence of their proceedings in the case of the erring brethren, as well as in refutation of the doctrine of an indefinite atonement. In 1761 a very important step was taken by the Reformed Presbytery, the emission of a Testimony for the whole of the Covenanted Reformation as attained to and established in Great Britain and Ireland, particularly between the years 1688 and 1689 inclusive.

From this time the Reformed Presbyterian Church went steadily forward, adhering to their peculiar principles with unflinching tenacity; and amid much obloquy, misunderstanding, and even misrepresentation, from the other religious denominations around them, witnessing both by words and works the separation of the Covenanted Reformation. Their numbers in many parts of Scotland increased beyond the means of supplying them with ministers. This was unhappily the case, for a considerable time, in various districts of the country. But at length such was the increase of ministers connected with the body that in 1810 three presbyteries were formed, and in the year following a general synod was constituted for the supervision of these presbyteries. Since that time so rapidly has the denomination advanced in numbers that in the year 1860 the synod included six presbyteries, which consisted in all of thirty-six ordained ministers and eight vacant congregations. The synod met annually either in Edinburgh or Glasgow. The Divinity Hall met during the months of August and September, when the students, in five sessions, received the instructions of two pro-
fensors, one for systematic theology, and the other for Biblical literature and Church history.

In the year 1830 the synod resolved to commence the prosecution of missionary operations. Their attention was first directed to the colony of Van Diemen's Land, in particular to the Canadian. Nor have they been unmindful of foreign missions, three missionaries in connection with the synod being employed in New Hebrides. There has also been a missionary laboring since 1846 among the Jews in the Holy Land. These Presbyterians have been sometimes called Commenziani, from Richard Cameron; but they are otherwise called "M'Millans," or "M'Millanites," from the name of the first minister who espoused their cause after the Revolution. But these, as well as the terms "Whigs" and "Mountain Men," which are also occasionally applied to them, regard as accidental epithets. They are sometimes also called "Covenanters," from their adherence to the National Covenant of Scotland, and to the Solemn League and Covenant of the three kingdoms. Their proper designation, however, or that which they themselves adopt, is that of "Reformed Presbyterians." They hold the Holy Scriptures to be the absolute rule of faith and conduct, and to contain the standard of those both in Church and State. Next to this they adhere to the Westminster Confession of Faith, the Larger and Shorter Catechisms of the Church, the Books of Discipline, and the Westminster Directory for Public Worship. And, lastly, they regard the National Covenant of Scotland as a continuing obligation. To these are to be added the documents published by the body itself in explanation of their principles: namely, their Judicial Act and Testimony, the 5th edition of which was published at Glasgow in 1818; A Short Account of the Old Presbyterian Dissenters, published by authority of the Presbyterian Body in Scotland; and an Explanation and Defense of the Terms of Communion adopted by the Reformed Presbyterian Church. According to the statistical report made at the Synod in Glasgow, March 13, 1876, the Church included 42 congregations with 7500 members, and its annual contributions were £14,000. The synod then, by a vote of 57 to 6, adopted a resolution in favor of union with the Free Church, and such union was finally consummated in the General Assembly of that body, May 25, 1876.

The residuary Reformed Presbyterian Church musters its best ministers who held back, and are still contending about their Church property. Thus the Original Seceders, popularly known as "Auld Lichts" (Old Lichts), are a more considerable body. Though most of these joined the Free Church (as the true Church of Scotland free) in 1843, they have still some thirty congregations of poor but very worthy people, who consider it their mission to hold up the banner of the Covenanters, and to protest against the all but universal defection of their time and country. At the union in 1832, Drs. Candlish and Thomson, of Edinburgh, White, of Haddington, and the younger MacCrie (whose father had been in former days the great pillar of the Old-Light community) were added to the Free Church. The present Old Lichts are notably strict both in doctrine and practice. Unlike the New Lichts, who ultimately went to form the United Presbyterian Church in 1847, they are staunch supporters of the Establishment principle, which the Free Church also upholds in theory. It is chiefly the faithfulness of the latter with respect to the Covenanters which prevents the residuary "Auld Lichts" from joining the communion. See below.

United Original Secession Church. — In common with all true Protestants, the Synod of United Original Seceders acknowledges the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be the supreme and only rule of faith and practice, and also that they be a branch of the Reformed and Covenanted Church of Scotland, and adhere to the whole of the Westminster standards as these were received by the Church of Scotland as standards of uniformity for the churches in the three kingdoms, and feel themselves bound by the sacred pledge given in the Solemn League and Covenant to adhere to them as such. They thus take their stand upon the principles of the first and particularly of the second Reformation, which took place between the years 1588 and 1650, and which embodied in its proceedings and settlement all the valuable attainments of the first Reformation and carried them to a greater extent. They own the morality of public covenanting, and the continued and perpetual obligation of the National Covenant of Scotland, and of the Solemn League and Covenant, upon all ranks and classes in these lands, and acknowledge the duty of renewing these covenants in a bond suited to the circumstances. As Presbyterians, they hold that the Lord Jesus Christ, the alone king and head of his Church, has appointed a particular form of government to take place therein, distinct from civil government and not subordinate to the same, and that Presbyterian Church government is intended to be laid down and appointed by the Lord Jesus Christ in his Word. As they believe that Church communion consists in the joint profession of the truths and observance of all the ordinances which Christ has appointed in his Word, and as the Church in Scotland, in the unity of her visible fellowship, they regard free communion as an obvious violation of that unity, and hold it to be unscriptural, and that the practice encourages persons to continue in corrupt Governments, by leading them to conclude that there is no consciousness of ground of difference between these and the persons who make no scruple of occasionally joining with them in the intimacies of Church fellowship. In the worship of God they make use of the Psalms of David only, believing that they were delivered to the Church by the Holy Spirit to be used as the matter of public praise, and they regard hymns of human composition as unsuitable to the worship of God, and tending to endanger the purity both of the worship and the doctrines of the Church.

The Original Secession Synod dates its rise from 1738, and claims to represent the first seceders who in their testimony published in 1737 were careful to make it known that they were not dissenters from the National Church because of her civil establishment, but seceders from a corrupt and prevailing party in her jurisdiction, in opposition to the clear and pure light from the reformed and covenanting principles. The Original Secession Testimony, published in 1827, applies the principles of the Judicial Testimony to public events that had occurred up to the date of its publication, and like it was designed to be a declaration of the sense of the standards of the Church of Scotland in the way in which it was received by the Reformed and Covenanted Church of Scotland. It is a term of ministerial and Christian communion in the body—that is, office-bearers are required to signify their approval of its principles, and members are not to accede to them, so far as they know and understand them.

The synod has from time to time been lessened by the separation of brethren. At present it consists of 41 congregations in Scotland, England, and Ireland; of these 29 (including one in England) are in connection with the synod in Scotland, and 12 constitute the Secession Synod in Ireland, in full communion with the Scottish Synod. The members and adherents are estimated at 6500. The income of the Scottish Synod last year amounted to about £4000.

The synod owns the Home Mission stations, and also a prosperous Foreign Mission agency at Seoni, in India, under the immediate charge of Rev. George Anderson, who is assisted by two catechists. There is an orphanage in connection with the mission, having eleven children, who are instructed in the Church, and it is expected that the number will shortly be materially increased. A school is also carried on, having 170 scholars,
and four teachers in addition to the missionary, and one catechist; the children are instructed in English, Urdu, and Hindi. The synod is desirous of obtaining, and has ample funds for maintaining, another ordained missionary. At present, the Rev. Prof. John Sturrock is carried on under the superintendence of the Rev. Prof. W. F. Atkin, A.M., and the Rev. Prof. James Spenze. The library in connection with the hall has 1400 volumes. Under the editorship of the Rev. John Strurrock a bi-monthly magazine is published having a circulation of 1200 copies.

6. PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN ENGLAND.—In the reign of queen Elizabeth there were two well-defined parties—the Prelatists, favored by the queen, who were satisfied with the reformation begun by king Edward; and the Presbyterians, who desired a simpler form of worship and government, like that set up by Calvin in Geneva. The first adherents of this form of Church government in England were those Protestants who returned from Frankfurt, to which place they had fled for refuge in the reign of queen Mary. There they became acquainted with the Geneva platform, and, returning to their native country in the time of Elizabeth, they at first met in private houses, and afterwards more publicly, on which occasions the worship was conducted agreeably to the forms of the Geneva service. The Puritans who were called Nonconformists were averse from the established liturgy and hierarchy, and Puritans, from their anxiety for purity of life and worship. At the Convocation in 1562, the proposition to dispense with all ceremonies that had not the clear warrant of Scripture was lost by only one vote. Hallam says that the Puritan party outnumbered either the Roman Catholic or the Church of England, and that they composed the majority of Parliament under Elizabeth and her two successors (Const. Hist. Engl. ch. iv. v.). See PURITANS. They were taken up at the time of the vindication of doctrine and discipline, and with resistance to power expressed, as they believed, contrary to the Word of God. But they felt so much the constraint of circumstances, that they paid little heed to the development of their principles in Church government, and certainly had no thought of attempting to constitute a Church on the principles which they maintained, resting satisfied in giving effect to those principles by mere resistance in particular cases in which their consciences were aggrieved. Yet in 1572 a presbytery was formed at Westminster by a number of ministers and laymen, separating from the Church of England; and other presbyteries were soon formed, notwithstanding the extreme hostility of queen Elizabeth. Synods were now held occasionally. The court, looking to the episcopate as the support of its own supremacy, strove with great perseverance to supplant the presbyteries, and enforced with reckless energy the bloody laws enacted against the Catholics on one side and the radical Protestant sects on the other. The king having established a liturgy calculated to set limits to the arbitrary freedom of Puritan worship, the Presbyterians set it down as "worship of Baal" and a quenching of the Spirit of God. The dissension threatened to take the form of civil war, for the Presbyterians of England united with those of Scotland. On July 1, 1643, in obedience to a summons from Parliament (which summons had been issued in consequence of a remonstrance of the Presbyterian divines against prelacy), the Westminster Assembly met in Westminster Abbey. This Assembly was composed of 121 English divines, 10 lords, 20 commoners, with 5 ministers and 5 elders representing the Church of Scotland, and 2 ministers and 3 elders known as the Westminster Confession, a Form of Church Government, a Directory for Public Worship, and two Catechisms, the Larger and the Shorter, which were all approved by Parliament in 1648. Parliament then enacted an ordinance making Presbyterians the established religion of England, without admitting any penalties to nonconformity. A loud cry has been raised against the English Presbyterians on the alleged ground that, at this period of their history, their whole efforts were directed towards the attainment of Church power. "Now, what was this Church power," says the younger M'Crie, "which the Presbyterians in England were for so long time so anxious to secure, and which Neil would represent as 'a civil authority over men's persons and properties'? Will it be believed that it was neither more nor less than the power of keeping back scandalous and unworthy persons from the ordinances of baptism and the Lord's Supper? This was, in fact, the great point in dispute between them and the Parliament; for the Parliament had insisted on having the supreme power in ecclesiastical matters, and had passed a law to the effect that if any person were refused admission to sealing ordinances by the Church courts, he might appeal to Parliament, which might, by virtue of its authority, compel the Church courts to receive him, whatever his character might be. The Presbyterians, as Neil himself admits, 'were dissatisfied with the men in power, because they would not leave the Church of England independent'; and would Mr. Neil himself an independent, have had the Church to be dependent on the State? Would he have had the Presbyterians tamely submit to see the royal prerogatives of Christ assumed by a Parliament, after they had succeeded in wresting them out of the hands of a monarch, for the benefit of whom, for a time, the nation had long been engaged in a bloody war?" The ordinance which they had secured from Parliament in 1648, however, never went into practical operation, for as soon as Cromwell and the Independents rose into power, they showed an uncompromising hostility to the Presbyterians. This was partly owing to the resistance the latter had made to the trial and execution of Charles I, inasmuch that they had to be driven out of the House of Commons by force before those measures could be effectual. The city and its neighborhood were, meanwhile, formed into twelve prebendaries surrounding the Provincial Synod of London, which continued to hold regular half-yearly meetings till 1655, the meetings of presbyteries being continued till a later date; but the whole Presbyterian system was overturned by Cromwell's Committee of Triers, composed of thirty-eight persons of different sects, who were appointed in place of the Assembly for the examining and approving of all persons elected or nominated to any ecclesiastical office. Cromwell's policy aimed at bringing all ecclesiastical matters under the immediate control of the civil power. On the Restoration, Charles II no sooner found himself firmly seated on the throne than he proved false to the Solemn League and Covenant which he had sworn to observe, restored prelacy to its former power, and gave up the Presbyterian, who had fought for his return to persecution. The fruitless Savoy Conference (q. v.) was followed by the Act of Uniformity, which was carried into effect on St. Bartholomew's Day, Aug. 24, 1662. Two thousand conscientious ministers who would not consent to be reduced to the Book of Common Prayer, or to abjure the Solemn League and Covenant, were then ejected from their benefices, and wandered forth to a life of poverty. Sixty thousand of the laity were imprisoned or fined, 5000 of whom died in prison, and the fines, confiscations, and other consequent losses of property amounted to £2,000,000 sterling. See NONCONFORMISTS.

After the Revolution, and the passage of the Act of Toleration in 1689, Presbyterianism revived, chapels sprang up in every part of the kingdom, and within twenty-five years the Presbyterians numbered 800 congregations. They became one of the "three denominations" which received the recognition of the State and were permitted to petition the crown in a corporate capacity, and in the business meetings of deputies from these denominations the Presbyterians numbered two representatives for every Baptist and one Independent. Prosperity, however, proved more injurious than per-
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section, and there was an abatement of zeal and spirituality. Besides this, another cause operated disastrously. In 1691 the Presbyterians were induced to enter into union with the Independents. As a consequence, Presbyterian discipline began to be relaxed, the system was not carried out, the office of ruling elder was allowed to be dropped, the disuse of Church sessions naturally followed, presbyteries and synods were given up, the churches became virtually independent, and Presbyterianism and the members of the Church of England were allowed not to attend the meetings of the Church. The consequence of the union was a weakening of the discipline of the Church. The negotiations with the Independents had been occupied. The expenditures of the Foreign Mission Committee had been £28,694.

The schemes of the Church, placed under the charge of standing committees, are as follows:

1. Home Missions, including Church Extension, Evangelization, Temperance.

2. Foreign Missions.—Principally in China, where there are 15 European missionaries and 85 native evangelists. In 1876, 258 congregations, distributed into 10 presbyteries, with a membership of 25,740 communicants. The entire income of the Church during that year, both congregational and synodical, inclusive of £6,219.2s. from special sources, was £137,055.

3. Jewish Mission. —The sphere of this work, with one missionary, the Rev. Thomas Meyer, in London. There is a mission-hall, with reading-room. The means used are domestic visitations, public meetings in the hall, prayer-meetings, and meetings with inquirers. Thirty-seven Jews, besides casual inquirers, were more or less under regular instruction in 1877. There were three baptisms.

4. Education. —A theological seminary is maintained in London. It has three professors, the Revs. Dr. Lochner, Dr. Muir, and Mr. Mac. A generous member of the Church, H. Barbour, Esq., of Manchester, having made provision for the endowment of an additional chair, the Church is taking steps for making appointment of another professor in 1878. The committee has assumed the charge of arts and sciences, and is adding a number of schools, especially in rural districts.

5. Sabbath-schools. —The committee reported to the Synod in 1877 848 schools, 5892 teachers, 5,185 scholars on the roll, of whom 29,721 are children of parents belonging to the Church, and 4510 are in senior classes. Much Christian work is done among the young by other means.

6. Sustentation Fund. —This was a scheme in operation, at the date of the union, in the Presbyterian Church in England only—the United Presbyterian Church adding its weaker congregations by another plan. This necessitates now some transitional and imperfect action. The equal dividend for last year to the congregations on the fund was £200, raising the minimum ministerial stipend to that amount. The whole sum paid as salaries was £65,214, of which forty per cent. passed through this fund.

7. Publications. —This committee issues the Messenger and Children's Messenger, monthly periodicals of the Church, and during the past year has prepared a memorial volume containing records of the union. It contemplates the continuance of instructional manuals, of which two have been published for the use of the Church.

Other provisions are: (a) Widows and Orphans...
7. Presbyterians in Ireland.—In Ireland as well as in England there was a strong Puritan section of the clergy holding Presbyterian principles during the earlier years of the 17th century, and the party was considerably strengthened by the settlement of Ulster by Scottish colonists during the reign of James I. Scottish ministers also carried over to Ireland their peculiar views. But the Presbyterian party was not consolidated into a separate denomination until the Civil War broke out in 1641. The first Presbyterian minister who appeared in Ireland after the Reformation was the Rev. Walter Travers, the first regular provost of Trinity College, Dublin. He entered on his official duties in 1644; but, owing to the civil war in which the country was then involved, he did not remain long at the head of the university. Of those ministers who went to Ireland in the reign of James I, the earliest was Mr. Edward Brice, who became rector of Templecorran, near Carrickfergus, in the county of Antrim. About that time a number of Scotch-merchants settled in Ulster, who applied for the presbyteries, which had been brought up in the Presbyterian Church, and who had themselves been originally ordained by presbyters, were not at first disposed to exact conformity to the Episcopal ritual from the Scottish ministers settled around them. Thus it was that the ministers, though refusing to use the Liturgy, were permitted to preach in the parish churches and enjoy the tithes. But when the imperious Wentworth was placed at the head of the government of Ireland, a new policy was inaugurated. All the clergy were obliged to strict conformity; and in a short time the Presbyterians were driven into exile. At the time of the horrid massacre in 1641, not one of them was in the country. Thus they most providentially escaped that catastrophe. In 1662, when a Scottish army arrived in Ulster to put down the rebellion, Presbyterians obtained a permanent footing in Ireland, and, after various struggles, a Presbyterian Church was founded by the formation of a presbytery at Carrickfergus on the 10th of June, 1662. The Presbyterian population of Ulster was greatly increased in number by immigration from Scotland about the middle of the century, and the Presbyterians were driven into exile, from the opposition of presbyters and of the civil power, the Church continued to increase. While the civil war was going on in Scotland great numbers of the Scotch emigrated to the north of Ireland, and these made the country stronger than the Presbyterian population, a strong bond being also established between the two communions. For a time their ministers in Ireland were silenced by Cromwell because they refused to take the &quot;engagement&quot; of fidelity to the commonwealth; but for the last five or six years of his administration he had the Presbyterians of Ireland on a time of the Restoration, 1660. For the restored period, however, was not again ceased to be expected by the Presbyterian ministers. In the reign of William the regime dominus was augmented, although only to the paltry amount in all of £1000 a year. The sum has since, however, been repeatedly augmented. With the disestablishment of the Episcopal Church of Ireland, under Queen Anne's ministry, the regime dominus was discontinued, and the Presbyterian Church of Ireland is entirely relieved from state dependence. It was valued at fourteen years' purchase, and the sum of nearly £60,000 was paid over therefor, thus securing to the Ulster ministry a yearly income of £3000, a year of interest. In 1710 the synod of the Presbyterian Church resolved to institute the preaching of the Gospel to the Irish in their own language. During this period of its history the Irish Presbyterian Church experienced the utmost opposition from the High-Church party. Afterward the divisions raged up and down of it, and these with reference to the most important doctrines. Irish Presbyterians could not escape the influence of the latitudinarian spirit which prevailed during the 18th century. Early in the reign of George I, some of their ministers began to speak ambiguously on doctrinal subjects, and to oppose subscription to the Westminster Confession of Faith. In consequence, in 1726, a schism took place among them, and the non-subscribers formed themselves into what was called &quot;The Presbytery of Antrim.&quot; The separatists did not obtain much support from the mass of the Presbyterian population; but not a few who remained connected with the larger body, known as &quot;The Synod of Ulster,&quot; exhibited very little zeal in upholding and propagating the sound theology of their forerunners. Meanwhile the Scotch Seeders, who during the latter part of the 18th century, did much to maintain purity of doctrine in the Northern province. Their congregations rapidly multiplied, and within little more than sixty years after the organization of their first church, there were upwards of ninety Secession ministers in Ulster. In 1781 the Rev. Matthew Lynd, the first Irish Convening minister, was ordained at Vow, near Rhasarin, in the county of Antrim. Owing very much to the growing laxity of doctrine and discipline in the Synod of Ulster, the Covenanters, or Reformed Presbyterians, in the northern province of Ireland, in the 18th century, to make steady progress; and in 1792 their first Irish Presbytery was constituted. But early in the present century indications of a religious revival appeared in the Synod of Ulster, and when Arianism was openly avowed an earnest protest was raised against it. In 1829 the Arian controversy issued in the excommunication of the Unitarians from the great Northern Synod, and immediately afterwards the Irish Presbyterian Church, as if invigorated with new life, commenced a prosperous career. Its congregations rapidly increased; its ministers exhibited, in the face of many difficulties and trials, the most strenuous spirit, and them attracted attention all over the empire as platform-speakers and pulpit orators. In 1835 the Synod of Ulster adopted an overture requiring unqualified subscription to the Westminster Confession of Faith from all the members of the Presbyterian ministry; and as the grounds of separation between this body and the Secession Synod were now removed, a union between them was happily consummated in 1840. The united body, which assumed the designation of &quot;The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland,&quot; consisted, at the time of its first session in the year 1843, of 485 Presbyterians. Ever since the date of this union, the Irish Presbyterian Church has occupied a more commanding position in the country. It has at present under its care about half a million of people, including a large proportion of the substantial farmers and merchants of Ulster. Very few of the aristocracy were ever attached to it; but of late its members have been advancing steadily in social position; and at the present time it has in its communion seven members of Parliament, several considerable landed proprietors, and many gentlemen holding the commissions of the Privy Council, and publicly paid, as well as many of the clergy. The Remonstrant or Arian body has not increased in like proportion. After their withdrawal from the orthodox majority in 1829, the Unitarians formed themselves into an association which assumed the name of &quot;The Remonstrant Synod of Ulster.&quot; This body has since maintained a tolerating existence in the north of Ire-
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land; but doctrinal laxity does not flourish among Presbyterians; and though the Unitarians can reckon some forty congregations in the island, their numbers, including the remainder of the Presbytery of Antrim, amount, according to the government census of 1871, only to 3973 individuals.

The Covenanters, or Reformed Presbyterians, who are all strict Calvinists, are considerably more numerous. There are besides a few congregations in Ireland connected with the United Presbyterian Church of Scotland, as well as a few others known by the designation of Seceders; but they form a very small item in the national census. The Irish Presbyterian Church now consists of about 600 congregations, and has not only dissolved the connection of Presbyterianism in Ireland, but also of Christianity in other parts of the world. Immediately after its formation, the General Assembly inaugurated a Foreign Mission. India was selected as the scene of its missionary operations, and its agents have ever since been laboring there with encouraging success in Gujarat and Katiavvar. Connected with it are now 10 ordained European missionaries, assisted by a staff of native catechists, colporteurs, and school-teachers. Within the year 1872 the mission and the total number connected with the native Church amounted to 2158 individuals. The mission has been maintained during the year 1888 at an expense of £13,654. Its operations have been recently extended to China, where three mission stations have been established. In 1876 the mission the Presbyterian Church of Ireland supports a Jewish mission, a Continental and Colonial mission, and a mission for Soldiers and Sailors. In 1876 the Presbyterian Church in Ireland reported five synods, thirty-six presbyteries, 639 ministers, 74,445 families, and 107,362 communicants. The subscription fund amounted to £122,000; the total ministerial income for the previous year was £518,000. The average salary of the ministers was £870. In the schools of the National Board of Education, the Presbyterian children, in 1874, numbered 115,558, equal to about 11 per cent. A Presbyterian college (Magee College) was opened at Londonderry Oct. 10, 1865. In 1846, Mrs. Magee, widow of the Rev. William Magee, a Presbyterian minister, left £20,000 in trust for the erection and endowment of a Presbyterian college. This sum was so large as to accumulate in some years, until eventually the trustees were authorized, by a decree of the lord-chancellor, to select a convenient site at or near Londonderry. The Irish Society have granted an annual endowment of £250 to the chair of natural philosophy and mathematics, and £250 for five years towards the maintenance of six professors, at £250 each, leaving £500 to defray the expense of management. The government, on the passing of the act, granted a sum of £4,376 as compensation; and the interest of this sum, together with that at £3000 subscribed by friends of the institution, made up the annual income. Patrons have recently added prizes, worth from £20 to £50 per annum. A most valuable agency sustained by the Church and of comparatively recent establishment is the Orphan Society, which already supports 2400 poor children deprived of one or both of their parents, and has an annual revenue of about £2900. See Ireland.

8. PRESBYTERIAN SYNOD OF SIECEDERS IN IRELAND.

This denomination of Christians was formed by a union, which was effected in 1818, between the two sections of the Synod of Scotland in Ireland, the Burgbiers, and the Free and Antiburghers. For a hundred years previous to the present century negotiations had been carried on with a view to the accomplishment of this most desirable object; but such negotiations had uniformly failed, from the circumstance that the Antiburghers, who were subject to the general synod in Scotland, had been prevented by that court from taking effectual steps in the matter. At length, however, they resolved to act independently of the Scotch judicator, and the two synods of Seceders in Ireland, having agreed upon a basis of union, met at Cookstown July 9, 1818, and formed themselves into one body under the designation of The Presbyterian Synod of Ireland, distinguished by the name Seceders. The ministers of the united synod at this period amounted in number to 97. The basis on which the union rested consisted of the six following points:

1. To declare their constant and inviolable attachment to their ancient and recognised Presbyterian Church. From the same motive, the Westminster Confession of Faith, Larger and Shorter Catechisms, and the Directory for Worship, are adopted as the fundamental articles of the Presbyterian Church government, with the Original Scots Testimony.

2. That, as they unite under the banner of a testimony, they are determined, in all times coming, as their forerunners have set them the example, to assert the truth when it is injured or profaned, and to contend for it against error and immorality whenever they may seem to prevail.

3. To cancel the name of Burgher and Antiburgher forever, and to unite the two synods into one, to be known by the name, The Presbyterian Synod of Ireland, distinguished by the name Seceders.

4. To declare their unqualified submission to the General Synod of the Church of Scotland, at the same time they do hereby signify their hearty inclination to hold a correspondence with their sister Church in Scotland or elsewhere, for their mutual edification; but think it expedient not to lay themselves under any restrictions as to the manner of said correspondence.

5. To allow all the presbyteries and congregations in their connection to bear the same name, and, in the meantime, stand as they were before the constitution.

6. Carefully to preserve all the public records of the two synods from their formation in this kingdom till the present day.

This union was the means of imparting considerable strength and vigor to the Secession Church in Ireland. A home mission was now commenced, and the cause of Presbyterianism began to flourish in various towns and villages where it had hitherto unknown. The session of the grand assembly of the whole province of the Synod of Ireland, held at Edinburg, was by a high regard to purity of doctrine and the advancement of vital religion. The Irish Presbyterian Church, on the contrary, had long been hindered in its progress by the prevalence of Arian and Socinian doctrines, both among its ministers and people. By the division, however, they were at length enabled to rid themselves of the New-Light party; and, to secure uniformity of teaching in the Church, they passed an overture requiring absolute subscription to the Confession of Faith. The general synod was now, in almost all respects, assimilated to the Irish Secession Church, and the proposal of a union between the two was seriously entertained. An arrangement in regard to the regium domus made in 1838 paved the way for its completion, government having in that year agreed to equalize the bounty, and on certain conditions to grant £75, late Irish currency, per annum, to every minister connected with the two synods. Being thus placed on an equal footing by the government, and agreed both in doctrine and Church polity, the great obstacles to a complete incorporation of the two churches were removed.
established among themselves a united prayer-meeting. The desire for union, and a strong feeling of its propriety, rapidly spread both among ministers and people. Memorials on the subject, accordingly, were presented to the Synod of Ulster, and the Secession Synod, at their respective meetings in 1689. Committees were appointed by these bodies, respectively, to talk with the rulers of the two secessions, and the preliminaries and other matters of the union were a great deal considered and preliminarily adjusted, the final act of incorporation took place at Belfast, on July 10, 1840, the united body taking itself the name of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland. See IRELAND.

9. Wesleyan Calvinistic Methodists.—This body of believers is sometimes ranked among Presbyterians, because its form of Church government is a modified Presbyterianism. Each Church manages its own affairs, admits or expels members by the vote of the majority of those who belong to it, but this is rather Congregational than Presbyterian. It, however, allows an appeal from the decision of the individual Church to the monthly meeting of the county or presbytery to which it belongs, and then there is an appeal from the monthly meeting to the quarterly association of the province. Meetings are held for instruction and study, and for the discussion of topics relating to South Wales by the South Wales Association, and so of the North; but a few years ago a General Assembly of the whole connection was established, and the two associations may agree to refer matters to that body, which has the final decision. Its Confession of Faith is, of course, strictly Calvinistic. See Methodism (Vol. vi, p. 156, col. 6).

10. Presbyterian Church in the United States.—The denomination commonly known by this name, both on account of its numerical superiority and its priority of organization, derived its origin from the Presbyterians of Scotland and Ireland, and particularly the latter, with a considerable infusion of French Huguenots, Dutch and German Reformed emigrants. Many fugitives from persecution in the mother country took refuge in American colonies, in New England, New York, New Jersey, Maryland, New Jersey, Virginia, and the Carolinas. Francis Makemie, who may be called the founder of American Presbyterianism, was an Irishman, who several years before the close of the 17th century had gathered churches in Maryland. For several years before the organization of the first presbytery, his most intimate ministerial friend was Jedediah Andrews. The earliest traces of Church organizations of a trustworthy character indicate a congregation gathered in Upper Marlborough, Md., in 1698, and others collected by Mr. Makemie in Maryland in 1699, and the first Presbyterian Church organized in the United States as early as 1684—one in Freehold, N.J., called the Scotch Meeting-house, in 1692; and one in Philadelphia, under the care of Mr. Andrews, in 1698. The Presbyterian of Philadelphia is supposed to have been formed about the year 1705, if not before, this uncertainty arising from the first page of the manuscript minutes being lost. It was composed of seven ministers—Samuel Davis, John Hampton, Francis Makemie, and George McNish, from Ireland; Nathaniel Taylor and John Wilson, from Scotland; and Jedediah Andrews, from New England. The growth was rapid, and the formation of the Synod of Philadelphia, consisting of three presbyteries. The presbytery of Philadelphia had six ministers and six churches; that of New Castle six ministers and churches; that of Snowhill three ministers and churches; and that of Long Island two ministers and several churches—in all twenty-three ministers and more than that number of congregations. The Adopting Act was passed in 1729, designed to announce the Westminster Confession and Catechisms as the standards of the Church more formally than had ever been done. The history of this act has been of late years sharply discussed. It may be found in the printed minutes. It was a compromise measure accepted in consequence of the agitation which had been occasioned by the Irish presbytery. These had been in the midst of an exciting controversy against the introduction of Arian principles into the Presbyterian Church of Ireland, and had come over determined to suffer no loosening of subscription to the standards of faith. The Adopting Act occasioned, therefore, not a little controversy. The non-subscribers in sentiment disliked even the general terms of the Adopting Act, while the others were divided as to whether the act had been fully carried out. Though the measure was finally compromised, it failed to set differences at rest. They continued to develop, and became manifest in connection with certain synodical action on ministerial education, and ripened into a schism until they resulted in one or two secessions, which prepared the way for the establishment in this country of a branch of the Associate Presbyterian Church. In 1738, party feelings were revived by the visit of Whitefield, and the synod was divided into those who were known as friends or enemies of the revival. By 1741 the controversy resulted in a schism, by which the body was rent into two synods—that of the Old Side party, called the Synod of Philadelphia; that of the New, called the Synod of New York. The principal cause of the division was the insisting of the Old Side on a thorough and unqualified Calvinistic orthodoxy on the stress on pietistic zeal. There was no difference of opinion as to doctrine or discipline. Gilbert Tennent, the friend of Whitefield, was the leader and master-spirit of the New branch, and published several sermons, addresses, and pamphlets in the course of seventeen years, to the renovation of thirteen years, passion and party feeling cooled down, the leaders were disposed to make mutual concessions, past errors and mistakes were frankly confessed, and the two synods became again united, May 29, 1756, under the style and title of "the Synod of New York and Philadelphia," comprising ninety-four ministers. During the half century of existence that had now closed, the Church had taken some important steps. It had committed itself, for instance, to a polity distinctly Presbyterian, it had adopted Calvinistic doctrinal standards, and had set up a high standard of ministerial education. Nor were these things needless, or done too soon. A stream of population was rapidly flowing westward, having on its front line settlers of very diverse characters. Some were men of such lawless habits that they could no longer stay in orderly communities; others loved the wild excitments of frontier life, and others thought only of bettering their temporal condition by obtaining homes in the new lands. All classes were very poor. Indians were numerous, causing the preacher to carry his rifle as well as his Bible—while State and Church opposed the extension of the work of the Presbyterian evangelist. Only men of education—men of energy, full of zeal and of varied resource, could have even held their own in the face of such hindrances. Such men the Presbyterian Church desired to have in its ministry, nor desired in vain. Many of its early preachers—the Tennents of New Jersey, Braintree of the Indian Mission, Davies of Virginia, and a host of others, have been pre-eminent for ministerial efficiency, and will assuredly be held in everlasting remembrance. While the Church was thus supplying the Gospel in every direction, it was also spreading by a rapid influx of persons in every direction, it was led to enter into such relations with the Congregationalists as materially influenced its after-course. For some years before the Revolution, the Colonial Episcopal Church had sought to obtain a legal establishment. Fearing the success of this aim, the synod agreed in 1766 to meet in annual convention with the General Association of Connecticut, "to unite their endeavors and counsels for spreading the Gospel and preserving the religious liberties of the churches." This arrangement was carried out until the outbreak of war in 1776 which interrupted the plan.

When the war of the Revolution broke out, the Presbyterians, to a man, arrayed themselves on the side of the patriots—which may, at least in part, be explained by the fear, which they shared in common with the Congregationalists of New England, that there was a
design to introduce bishops and establish an oppressive and odious hierarchy in the colonies. During the Revolutionary war, in common with all religious interests, the Presbyterian churches and their church buildings were destroyed, and not a few congregations disorganized, yet its vitality remained unbroken. Rallying quickly on the return of peace, new interest in religious ordinances was manifested by the people, and synodical meetings were better attended by the ministers.

In 1785, steps were taken for revising the standards of the Church and organizing a General Assembly. A committee consisting of Drs. Witherspoon, Rodgers, Robert Smith, Patrick Allain, Samuel Stanhope Smith, John Farrar, Robert Cooley, James Madison, the George Duffield, and Matthew Wilson, was appointed "to take into consideration the constitution of the Church of Scotland and other Protestant churches," and to form a complete system for the organization of the Presbyterian Church in the United States. In May, 1786, the Synod convened and resolved itself into a General Assembly, which had its first meeting the following year, embracing four synods (New York and New Jersey, Philadelphia, Virginia, and the Carolinas), 17 presbyteries, 419 presbyters, 790 elders, and 809 ministers. The Westminster Confession of Faith was adopted with three slight alterations (in chapters xx., xxxii., and xxxvi.), and the Larger and Shorter Catechisms with but a single alteration, while the form of government and discipline of the Scottish Church was so modified as to discountenance the right of the civil magistrate to interfere in the affairs of the Church except for the purpose of protection alone. Shortly after the war, the Presbyterian ministers renewed their friendly relations with the Congregationalists. In 1792 the General Assembly and the Association of Connecticut agreed that each denomination should be represented in the annual meetings of the other by three commissioners, an agreement that afterwards embraced the general associations of Vermont, New Hampshire, and Massachusetts. In 1794 these representatives were allowed to vote on all matters under discussion. All these measures prepared the way for the adoption, in 1801, by both parties of the "Plan of Union." Under this arrangement a congregation, in polity, might have installed as its pastor a Presbyterian minister who still retained his seat and was represented thereto, and be itself represented in that court not by an elder, but by a commissioner or delegate chosen from its membership. On the other hand, a congregation Presbyterian in its polity, connected with a presbytery and represented therein by an elder, might have vested its whole property and authority as a congregation in the hands of a Presbyterian minister who remained a member of some Congregational association.

This procedure was the fruit partly of the co-operations of the previous years, but it made Presbyterianism less systematic in its movements and less submissive in its administration, as shall presently be seen.

During the earlier years of the present century, there appeared in the southern and western portions of the Church striking manifestations of religious interest, having, in many cases, singular physical accompaniments. In connection with these, zeal outstripped discretion; strange doctrines were soon taught; presbyterian order was violated, and confusion became widespread. Ultimately those things led to the withdrawal of some of the offenders and the removal of others from the Presbyterian Church, and the formation in 1811 of what is now known as "The Cumberland Presbyterian Church." (See No. 11 below.)

The increase of the Church was rapid, and by 1884 it contained 22 synods, 111 presbyteries, and about 1900 ministers. But only four years later (in 1888) Presbyterianism encountered a severe reverse by a widespread schism, for which the materials had been gathering for several years. In 1822, the Synod of the Associate Reformed Church having been brought, under the lead of Dr. John M. Mason, to favor union with the Presbyterian Church, that union took place; but a very considerable minority refused to acquiesce in the measure, and the church was split into two. In the fifteen years that followed, the growth of the Church was unprecedentedly rapid. New churches and presbyteries were multiplied in the Middle and Western States. Already measures had been adopted (1812) which resulted in establishing Princeton Seminary, Union Seminary in Virginia, and, though unenforced, the Southern and Western at Maryville, Tenn. Auburn followed in 1816; the Western at Allegheny City and Lane at Cincinnati in 1827-29; Columbia, S.C., and Danville, Ky., in 1828; and Union at New York in 1835. The accession from New England to the West in full career, the sympathy of the Presbyterian Church, were provided for by the "Plan of Union" agreed to by the General Association of the Presbyterian and the General Assembly in 1801. It aimed to secure the rights and the harmonious co-operation of two denominations of the same field. For nearly a quarter of a century no fault was found with it; but it led to the representation in Presbyterian and General Assembly of committees of communion from Congregational churches, and these were found to be favor volently an impositions in the assembly's control. Of these societies, that for home missions, within a few years after its organization in 1826, had several hundred missionaries under its patronage. Most of these were from New England, and many of them were alike opposed to Church boards and in sympathy with the "New Haven theology." Parties were thus formed in the Church, and the agitation on the subject of slavery, springing up at that time, tended to increase the alienation.

The crisis came in 1837. Two parties were arrayed against each other, and the Church was divided. In general, it may perhaps be said that the division was one of sentiment between the more progressive and the more conservative members of the Church. In the Old there was more of a leaning to the strict views of the Scotch Church on doctrine and discipline; in the New, the preference was as decidedly in favor of the laxer and more latitudinarian practice of New England, from which region many of the party had originally come. The New Lights wished to bear a decided testimony against slavery; the Old Lights thought that duty did not require any such action of the Church on that subject; the former wished to unite with other denominations in Christian work through voluntary societies; the latter believed that such work could be more efficiently and economically conducted by their denomination through boards which should be sustained as an organ of the Church. All these considerings and heart-burnings now prevailed; the General Assembly was an arena of constant strife; each party, as it obtained an accidental majority, set itself to work to nullify the measures of its opponents. The Old School made ineffectual attempts to try and contain the Dr. Dabney, Beecher, and Duffield for publishing heterodox opinions; the New School stood up for "substance of doctrine," and for the Great Voluntary or National Societies in opposition to denominational action. Confident in superior numbers and strategy, the latter anticipated an easy victory, and refused any concessions. The Old School, crippled on every side, and chagrined at being cast into the shade, held conventions to decide upon their future course. In 1838 appeared "The Act and Testimony," drafted by Rev. Robert J. Breckinridge, denouncing the increasing of doctrinal errors, the relaxation of discipline, and the violation of Church order. The signatures amounted to 2075. In 1837 another convention, meeting a week before the General Assembly, prepared a testimony and memorial to be laid before the Assembly, in which they testified against the sixteenth doctrinal errors having been in the Presbyterian order, and five declensions in Christian discipline, and proposed a method of reform. The Old-School...
party, finding themselves that year (the first for five years) in the majority, adopted the suggestions of the memorial as a basis of action, and pressed matters to a speedy issue. The Board of Foreign Missions, dissolved the Elective Affinity Presbytery, abrogated the Plan of Union of 1801 with the Congregational bodies, and disowned (or, as the New-School party termed it, excised) the four synods of (Genessy, Geneva, Utica, and Western Reserve as un-Presbyterian in their character); and the next year (1858) both parties made strenuous exertions for the ascendancy in the Assembly. Upon calling the roll, it was found that the delegates from the four synods were not recognized, nor would the moderator, Dr. Elliott, entertain any motion in their behalf. Hereupon, according to a concerted plan, the commissioners from the four synods and those who sympathized with them protested against the moderator's decision, and proceeded to make a new organization and elect new officers, after which they withdrew in a body to another place, and there held their sittings as the true Constitutional Assembly, and, among other things, elected several trustees of the property of the corporation. These trustees, being subsequently refused admission into the board, instituted legal proceedings, and received a verdict in their favor. The case being taken up by the Court of Chancery of the State of Pennsylvania, Chief Justice Gibson ordered a new trial. This, however, was never had, the rulings being such as to completely set aside the decision of Judge Rogers in the inferior court, and after a few years the suit was withdrawn. The New School later satisfied the moral effects of the trial, and with a later decision of the chief justice in the York case. The two bodies went on as separate denominations, though each claimed to have the genuine constitutional succession, and employed the same style and title, "The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America." Both of these churches were extended over the whole of the United States, and both of them had missions in different parts of the heathen world, their collections for missions forming a large part of the contributions for that object from the United States of America. The Old-School Presbyterians possessed the following theological seminaries: Princeton (Princeton, N.J.), Western (Allegheny City, Pa.), Columbia (Columbia, S.C.), Danville (Danville, Ky.), and North-west (Chicago, Ill.). The New-School Presbyterians held the Union College, a seminary in New York; Lane Seminary (Cincinnati, O.), Blackburn (Carlinville, Ill.), and Lind (Chicago, Ill.). The Old and New School Presbyterian churches were reunited in 1871. At that time the former comprised 2281 ministers, 7240 churches, and 258,568 communicants, the latter 1268 ministers, 1681 churches, and 172,560 communicants.

The theological history of the Old-School Presbyterian Church for the thirty-two years of its separate existence may be presented in a very few words. It was left by the separation in a state of almost unprecedented doctrinal homogeneity. One may well doubt whether any other Christian communion of equal size has ever excelled it as to unity in the reception of an evangelical creed of such extent as the Westminster Confession and Catechisms. Differences of opinion, even among its ministers, have, of course, existed; but these differences were comparatively trifling, or of very little prominence or prevalence. If in any quarter serious error was adopted, for the most part it must have been kept secret, or have been known to but a few. No agitating discipline on this ground was exercised, or, to the knowledge of any student of theSynodology," as it has often been called, was, beyond question, almost universally prevalent among the Old-School Presbyterians. If opposing systems must take a modern nomenclature, there may be no harm in making Presbyterianism the synonym of the Synod of the Old and the New Divinity: but it should be remembered that the text-books of Princeton have certainly been the simple Westminster symbols, and such long and generally approved systematic presentations of the reformed theology as the 'Instituto Theologia Elenchi' or 'Synopsis'. The Synod of Philadelphia has been slow to admit the idea of any possible improvement in the generally received system of Gospel truth. Recognizing fully the recent progress made in Biblical criticism and exegesis—the fact, too, that from time to time fuller and more exact statements of Christian doctrine may be arrived at, elaborated and by no means maintaining that any uninspired man has been wholly free from error, they have, nevertheless, rejected with singular unanimity the assumption that any part of the substance of the Gospel had lain hidden in Holy Scripture until modern times, or that the Church of Christ has new discoveries to make as to the system of truth in Jesus. A well-known Presbyterian quarterly publication—one identified with it from the beginning—has lately said, "It has been the honest endeavor of its conductors to exhibit and defend the doctrines of our standards, under the shield of Francis' book: it is the doctrine of the Synod of Philadelphia and it has produced within the time period so many theological books of standard value. A deep conviction of the Church's duty to carry on, through strictly ecclesiastical agencies, the work of foreign missions, had led the Synod of Pittsburgh, as early as 1831, to organize itself for this purpose as the Western Foreign Missionary Society. The New School had refused to consummate the desires and plans of the Old, by taking this enterprise under the care of the whole Church; but the Assembly of 1837 accepted the trust, establishing in New York City the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions. The Board of Publication was appointed, to which were transferred the property and business of the Presbyterian Tract and Sabbath-school Book Society, organized by the Synod of Philadelphia a few years before. The Assembly of 1839, then, having having now, in 1838, the building of Synodical Hall, and the Board of Missions, this supreme judiciary had first convened, recommend ed the second Sabbath of December for a semi-centenary celebration, a day of jubilee and thanksgiving for past mercies, and the offering at that time, by all the members of the Church, of gifts for the endowment of the new board. The fund raised reached the sum of $40,000. This sum, with about $22,000 donated for building purposes a few years later, has been the nucleus of all that board's permanent property. Before the division, two boards had been organized—the Board of Missions, now of Domestic Missions, for the home work, in 1816; and, in 1819, the Board of Education, to aid candidates for the ministry; both located in Philadelphia. These had been fostered by the Old School, while, as a party, the New School had preferred the American Home Missionary Society and the American Education Society, voluntary associations in which Philadelphia had not participated. The Board of Missions had, in 1844, the business of church extension or church erection added to its other operations. This was carried on by a special committee, which, ten years afterwards, for greater effect, was transferred to the Synod. Now a military board of committee of church extension was established at St. Louis, the name of which was changed, in 1860, to that of the
Board of Church Building, then the Board of Church Extension. Two other departments of Christian liberty and effort have been committed to similar agencies. For many years and a long while the Presbyterian Church has systematically raised funds for the relief of disabled ministers and their families. But in 1849 the General Assembly ordered collections for this purpose to be disbursed by the Board of Publication, a business transferred in 1862 to its own trustees; and in 1861 a separate department was founded to devote its time mainly to this enterprise, which has since more prosperously advanced. In 1864, the condition of the freedmen at the South demanding immediate attention, two committees—one in Philadelphia, the other in Indianapolis—were organized, and a large amount of educational and evangelistic work among this class; and the next year, in place of the two, a single committee on freedmen was established and located at Pittsburgh. Various arrangements and changes have been made to secure to the boards the advantage of periodical publications to disseminate intelligence of their work through the churches. The latest accounts show a circulation of 16,000 copies of the Monthly Record; nearly 100,000 of the Sabbath-School Visitor of the Month; and 5000 of the pamphlet, with almost 52,000 of the newspaper edition, both published in Philadelphia, besides many thousands of the several yearly reports and of various occasional issues. From about 1849 the project of a weekly religious paper, like the Methodist Advocate, was pressed upon the Assembly for several years successively, but without result. The New School Church has years always acknowledged the unanswerable importance of religious papers, many of which have been established by private enterprise.

The several departments of self-development in the New-School section at the time of union were as follows: (1.) The Presbyterian Committee of Home Missions. "It steadily increased in efficiency. Its receipts the first year were $27,244, and the number of its missionaries 195. In 1889 it had 1629 missionaries and an income of $885,518. Its missionaries reported 1603 new churches formed during the year; 12,000 hopeful conversions, and 10,400 added to the churches on profession of their faith. The freedmen's department, organized in 1865, received and expended during the year 1888 $113,082; and reported 573 teachers employed, 20 of whom are appointed, all in the Southern States. (2.) The "Trustees of the Church Erection Fund," organized in 1854, were incorporated by the Legislature of the State of New York in the year following. The original basis of their operations was the permanent fund of $100,000, raised by contributions from the New-School Church, and intended to be employed in the promotion of the church in the way of loans. The establishment of this fund operated as a strong bond of union in the Church. In the year 1866 the basis was enlarged and an annual contribution and free disbursements were ordered. Since that time this organization has been rapidly growing in importance, and now stands in the very first rank of the evangelizing agencies of the Church. In 1889 it reported an income of $125,205, and number of churches aided 185. (3.) The "Permanent Committee on Education for the Ministry," organized in 1856, came slowly into operation, moulding its plans gradually and embarrassed by the remnants of the old voluntary system. In 1889 its amount to $155,943, and the number of its benefactors—viz., 356 in the theological, 387 in the collegiate, and 59 in the preparatory department. (4.) The "Committee on Doctrinal Tracts," organized in 1852, became the "Presbyterian Publication Committee." In 1889 its income from all sources was $337,787, of which $25,087 was expended in its purely benevolent work. The Trustees of the Presbyterian House, located in Philadelphia, and incorporated by the Legislature of Pennsylvania to care for a valuable property purchased chiefly by donations made by individuals in the city of Philadelphia, now estimated to be worth more than $100,000. Under their charge has been placed the Ministerial Relief Fund, managed by an executive committee of the New School. The contributions for 1864. In 1889 they reported $127,502 received from ordinary sources, and $595,784 as a special donation towards a permanent fund; also 228 disabled ministers, 361 widows, and 33 families of orphans aided. The average age of the ministers was 76 years, and of their widows 82 years. The fund has also sustained a Permanent Committee on Foreign Missions, whose functions were not the raising and distributing of funds or the conducting of reports, but the supervising of the work and reporting the results to the Assembly. From their report in 1889 it appears that contributions for that year to the American Board were, in money, about $707,735, and in labors 71—viz., 52 male and 19 female missionaries. In 1867 the contributions were $110,175; in 1888, $110,602.

The beginning of a theological school for the education of ministers for the Germans, in which instruction is to be given both in German and English, has been made at Bloomfield, N. J., with encouraging success. The periodical literature of the New-School Church deserves honorable mention. Besides other local papers, the American Theological Review, with its warm zeal for Church interests, and the New York Evangelist has done excellent service. Much credit is due to the Presbyterian Reporter, a monthly published at Alton, Ill., for the ability and faithfulness with which it served the interests of the Church in the Northern States. During the ten critical years from 1852 to 1862, the Presbyterian Quarterly Review, ably conducted by an association of ministers in Philadelphia, defended the Church's cause and was an honor to Christian intelligence. The American Theological Review, founded in 1859 on a basis of denominational endorsement, and published with the Presbyterian Review in 1863, combining the names and objects of both, under the charge of the late Prof. H. B. Smith. It was merged in the Princeton Review, published since 1878 in New York City. The New Presbyterian Review was founded in 1890.

Prior to the separation of the Church in 1888, a session had taken place from it in Kentucky (1810), in consequence of a dispute between the Presbyterian of Cumberland, in that state, and the Kentucky Synod of the Presbyterian Church. The Presbyterian Church, on the basis of the ordination of persons who had not passed through the usual educational curriculum, but whose services the Presbytery regarded as demanded for the ministry by the exigencies of the times. In doctrine this branch of the Church does not very materially differ from the New-School Church. In 1854, the ten articles of faith are a modification of the Westminster Confession of Faith. It still exists as a separate organization. (See No. 11 below.)

In 1838 the New School experienced a defection of its Southern adherents. The 1837 the commissioners from the Southern section, who had attended the Assembly at Cleveland, O., proposed to withdraw and constitute the United Synod. This was organized at Knoxville, Tenn., April 2, 1838. In connection with the synod were over 100 ministers and about 200 churches, widely scattered over the Southern States. This body continued a separate organization until Aug. 24, 1854, when it was merged in the General Assembly formed by Southern ministers and churches previously in the Old-School connection. In 1861 the Old School suffered a like defection by the outbreak of the civil war. This defection caused the Southern body of Old-School Presbyterians, aggrieved by the Assembly's resolution on the state of the country, withdrew their connection and united to the organization of a "General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America," Dec. 4, 1861, at Augusta, Ga. The Southern Assembly was reorganized at Montgomery, Ala., May 1, 1862, since which time the meetings of the Assembly have been annually held.
concomitantly with those of the Northern assemblies. In 1876 fraternal relations were sought for the first time between the two bodies. (See No. 17 below.) Presbyterianism has never prevailed extensively in New England; but it has had such a distinct and independent in New England of its peculiarities dates back to about the year 1718, when a large number of Presbyterians, with four ministers, emigrated to this country from the north of Ireland. For some time, in cases of difficulty, the ministers and elders were wont to assemble informally, and hold what might be called pro re nata meetings; and where they were unable to reach a satisfactory result, they sometimes asked advice of the Synod of Ireland. On April 16, 1745, the Rev. Messrs. John Morrice, of Boston; David McGregor, of Londonerry, N. H.; and Ralph Abercombie, of Pelham, with Messrs. Jonathan Andrus of Concord, and John Jemmings and James Hughes, met in Londonerry, and "constituted themselves into a presbytery, to act, as far as their present circumstances will permit them, according to the Word of God and the constitution of the Presbyterian Church of Scotland," and the body so formed was called the Boston Presbytery, and met, according to adjournment, in that town Aug. 19, 1745. From the close of the year 1754 till October, 1770, there is a chasm in the records; but at the last-mentioned period the Presbytery consisted of twelve congregations and as many ministers. At a meeting held in Seaforth, N. H., on May 31, 1776, the Presbytery resolved to divide itself into three distinct bodies, viz., the presbyteries of Salem, of Londonerry, and of Palmer: these were then formed into the Synod of New England, which held its first session at the town of Hookey, Me., on June 27, 1771, a new presbytery was erected called the Presbytery of the Eastward, consisting of three ministers and four ruling elders, representing four churches. It had no connection with the Boston Presbytery, and its origin is said to have been in some way connected with the removal of the Rev. John Murray to Boothbay. It never exhibited on its roll more than eight ministers. Its last recorded adjournment now known was to meet at New Boston, N. H., on the first Wednesday of October, 1792. The only relic of this presbytery preserved to the extent, as far as can be ascertained, printed in 1783, with the following title: Rhet-Kol. A Voice from the Wilderness. Being an humble Attempt to support the sinking Truths of God against some of the principal Errors reigning at this time. Or a Joint Testimony to some of the Grand Articles of the Christian Religion, judiciously delivered to the Churches under their care, By the First Presbytery of the Eastward. In September, 1782, the Synod of New England, finding their numbers considerably reduced in consequence of existing difficulties, agreed to dissolve and form themselves into three separate presbyteries. Each of these years this Presbytery met regularly in Massachusetts proper, but after this its meetings were held in the district of Maine. Its last meeting was held at Gray Sept. 14, 1791. The Third Associate Reformed Presbytery, afterwards called the Associate Reformed Presbytery of Londonerry, was formed in Philadelphia Oct. 31, 1782, and held its first meeting at Londonerry on Feb. 11, 1783. It ceased to belong to its original denomination in 1802, and was thereafter an independent presbytery till 1809, when it was received into the Synod of Albany, and has since continued under the name of the Presbytery of Londonerry. The Presbytery of Newburyport was formed by the concurrent action of the Presbytery of Londonerry and the Synod of Albany. It held its first session in Boston on Oct. 27, 1826, and its last on Oct. 29, 1847, when it became reunited to the Presbytery of Londonderry. The Presbytery of Connecticut, consisting of several ministers and churches previously belonging to the Presbytery of New York, was constituted by the Synod of New York Oct. 15, 1850, and held its first meeting at Thompsville on Oct. 29, 1850. (a) Foreign Missions. The home mission work of the Presbyterian Church may date from the year 1707, when it was resolved "that every minister of the Presbytery supply neighboring destitute places where a minister is wanting and opportunity of doing good offers." Since that period this work has continued to be one of its most important enterprises. At the beginning in the hands of the presbyteries, the Assembly took charge of it in 1802, appointing a "Standing Committee of Missions," to which the presbyteries were to report. During the fourteen years that followed this appointment the Church sent out 511 missionaries, and collected $49,349. In 1810 this committee was changed into a General, "with full power to transact all the business of the missionary cause," reporting annually to the General Assembly. Under this arrangement the home missions of the Church entered on a new course of prosperity. Jabez Chamberlain, Jun., of Northampton, and James Hughes, met in Londonerry, and "constituted themselves into a presbytery, to act, as far as their present circumstances will permit them, according to the Word of God and the constitution of the Presbyterian Church of Scotland," and the body so formed was called the Boston Presbytery, and met, according to adjournment, in that town Aug. 13, 1745. From the close of the year 1754 till October, 1770, there is a chasm in the records; but at the last-mentioned period the Presbytery consisted of twelve congregations and as many ministers. At a meeting held in Seaforth, N. H., on May 31, 1776, the Presbytery resolved to divide itself into three distinct bodies, viz., the presbyteries of Salem, of Londonerry, and of Palmer: these were then formed into the Synod of New England, which held its first session at the town of Hookey, Me., on June 27, 1771, a new presbytery was erected called the Presbytery of the Eastward, consisting of three ministers and four ruling elders, representing four churches. It had no connection with the Boston Presbytery, and its origin is said to have been in some way connected with the removal of the Rev. John Murray to Boothbay. It never exhibited on its roll more than eight ministers. Its last recorded adjournment now known was to meet at New Boston, N. H., on the first Wednesday of October, 1792. The only relic of this presbytery preserved to the extent, as far as can be ascertained, printed in 1783, with the following title: Rhet-Kol. A Voice from the Wilderness. Being an humble Attempt to support the sinking Truths of God against some of the principal Errors reigning at this time. Or a Joint Testimony to some of the Grand Articles of the Christian Religion, judiciously delivered to the Churches under their care, By the First Presbytery of the Eastward. In September, 1782, the Synod of New England, finding their numbers considerably reduced in consequence of existing difficulties, agreed to dissolve and form themselves into three separate presbyteries. Each of these years this Presbytery met regularly in Massachusetts proper, but after this its meetings were held in the district of Maine. Its last meeting was held at Gray Sept. 14, 1791. The Third Associate Reformed Presbytery, afterwards called the Associate Reformed Presbytery of Londonerry, was formed in Philadelphia Oct. 31, 1782, and held its first meeting at Londonerry on Feb. 11, 1783. It ceased to belong to its original denomination in 1802, and was thereafter an independent presbytery till 1809, when it was received into the Synod of Albany, and has since continued under the name of the Presbytery of Londonerry. The Presbytery of Newburyport was formed by the concurrent action of the Presbytery of Londonerry and the Synod of Albany. It held its first session in Boston on Oct. 27, 1826, and its last on Oct. 29, 1847, when it became reunited to the Presbytery of Londonderry. The Presbytery of Connecticut, consisting of several ministers and churches previously belonging to the Presbytery of New York, was constituted by the Synod of New York Oct. 15, 1850, and held its first meeting at Thompsville on Oct. 29, 1850. (a) Foreign Missions. The home mission work of the Presbyterian Church may date from the year 1707, when it was resolved "that every minister of the Presbytery supply neighboring destitute places where a minister is wanting and opportunity of doing good offers." Since that period this work has continued to be one of its most important enterprises. At the beginning in the hands of the presbyteries, the Assembly took charge of it in 1802, appointing a "Standing Committee of Missions," to which the presbyteries were to report. During the fourteen years that followed this appointment the Church sent out 511 missionaries, and collected $49,349. In 1810 this committee was changed into a General, "with full power to transact all the business of the missionary cause," reporting annually to the General Assembly. Under this arrangement the home missions of the Church entered on a new course of prosperity. Jabez Chamberlain, Jun., of Northampton, and James Hughes, met in Londonerry, and "constituted themselves into a presbytery, to act, as far as their present circumstances will permit them, according to the Word of God and the constitution of the Presbyterian Church of Scotland," and the body so formed was called the Boston Presbytery, and met, according to adjournment, in that town Aug. 13, 1745. From the close of the year 1754 till October, 1770, there is a chasm in the records; but at the last-mentioned period the Presbytery consisted of twelve congregations and as many ministers. At a meeting held in Seaforth, N. H., on May 31, 1776, the Presbytery resolved to divide itself into three distinct bodies, viz., the presbyteries of Salem, of Londonerry, and of Palmer: these were then formed into the Synod of New England, which held its first session at the town of Hookey, Me., on June 27, 1771, a new presbytery was erected called the Presbytery of the Eastward, consisting of three ministers and four ruling elders, representing four churches. It had no connection with the Boston Presbytery, and its origin is said to have been in some way connected with the removal of the Rev. John Murray to Boothbay. It never exhibited on its roll more than eight ministers. Its last recorded adjournment now known was to meet at New Boston, N. H., on the first Wednesday of October, 1792. The only relic of this presbytery preserved to the extent, as far as can be ascertained, printed in 1783, with the following title: Rhet-Kol. A Voice from the Wilderness. Being an humble Attempt to support the sinking Truths of God against some of the principal Errors reigning at this time. Or a Joint Testimony to some of the Grand Articles of the Christian Religion, judiciously delivered to the Churches under their care, By the First Presbytery of the Eastward. In September, 1782, the Synod of New England, finding their numbers considerably reduced in consequence of existing difficulties, agreed to dissolve and form themselves into three separate presbyteries. Each of these years this Presbytery met regularly in Massachusetts proper, but after this its meetings were held in the district of Maine. Its last meeting was held at Gray Sept. 14, 1791. The Third Associate Reformed Presbytery, afterwards called the Associate Reformed Presbytery of Londonerry, was formed in Philadelphia Oct. 31, 1782, and held its first meeting at Londonerry on Feb. 11, 1783. It ceased to belong to its original denomination in 1802, and was thereafter an independent presbytery till 1809, when it was received into the Synod of Albany, and has since continued under the name of the Presbytery of Londonerry. The Presbytery of Newburyport was formed by the concurrent action of the Presbytery of Londonerry and the Synod of Albany. It held its first session in Boston on Oct. 27, 1826, and its last on Oct. 29, 1847, when it became reunited to the Presbytery
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action to that of so-called union societies. Before
eighteen months had elapsed, twelve missionaries had
been appointed to different fields of heathen labor. In
the following year sixteen more were sent out, while
$16,246 had been contributed towards their expenses.
In 1837, mission stations in Northern India, West Afrika,
Smyrna, China, and among the Indian tribes of the West
were under its charge, conducted by forty-four agents,
for whose support $40,266 were contributed during
that year. Such results strengthened the hands of those
in the Church that desired denominational agen-
cies. In 1837, therefore, the Assembly severed its con-
nection with the American Board, and established its
own "Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian
Church," to which the Western society at once trans-
ferred all its agencies and property. During the period
of the division, the Old-School Assembly extended its
foreign mission staff, forming, on heathen soil, synods
and presbyteries by means of native converts. The
New-School Church at first continued to send its con-
tributions of men and money to the American Board,
but in 1854 appointed a standing committee on mis-
sions, changing this in 1855 into a permanent commit-
tee, who should "superintend the whole course of for-
ign missions in behalf of the Assembly." On the
reunion, in 1857, the directors of the two societies
were brought together, while the reunited Church received from the American
Board a number of mission stations that previously it had
sustained.

Summary View of the Foreign Mission Operations of the Presbyterian Church.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Missionary Fields</th>
<th>Number of Missions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>America—Indians</td>
<td>1,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>4,976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South America</td>
<td>1,031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>1,056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>1,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>3,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>1,958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25,943</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contributions of the Presbyterian Church for Missionary and Beneficial Work during the Year 1862-3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foreign missions</td>
<td>$709,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>$900,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>$101,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church erection</td>
<td>$27,541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged ministers</td>
<td>$27,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedmens</td>
<td>$11,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And for colleges</td>
<td>$11,963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$2,796,768</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Presbyterian Church, from the earliest period, has been an earnest worker and strenuous advocate for educa-
tion; and one of the chief causes of the secession of the Cumberland branch was the tenacity with which the
General Assembly insisted on high educational qualifica-
tions for ministers. As early as 1739, a proposition
was brought before the Synod of Philadelphia for the
erection of a school or seminary of learning. The synod
approved of the design and appointed a committee to
carry it into effect, and in 1744 a synodical school was
established. The College of New Jersey at Princeton, char-
tered in 1746 and opened in 1747, was founded under the
auspices of the Synod of New York. Other institu-
tions have been organized under Presbyterian auspices,
as follows: Washington and Jefferson College (Washing-
on, Pa., 1838), Denison College (Cincinnati, Ohio, 1845),
Maryville College (Maryville, Tenn., 1819), College of
Danville, Ky., 1823), Hannon College (Hannon,
Ind., 1827), Lafayette College (Easton, Pa., 1831), Wa-
lash College (Crawfordsville, Ind., 1832), Lincoln Uni-
versity (Oxford, Pa., 1838), University College (San
Francisco, Cal., 1859), Blackburn University (Carlin-
ville, Ill., 1867), King College (Bristol, Tenn., 1860),
Emory and Henry College (Emory, Va., 1892), and Uni-
versity (Evans, Col., 1874), and Parsons College
(Fairfield, la., 1878). Three colleges are jointly under
Presbyterian and Congregational control: namely, Knox,
at Galesburg, Ill., 1841; Beloit, at Beloit, Wis., 1847;
and Olivet, at Olivet, Mich., 1869. The academies and
ladies' colleges under the auspices of the denomination
are numerous.

Not until 1812 did the Presbyterian Church make
any provision for the theological education of persons
seeking the ministry. In that year it organized its first
theological seminary, locating it at Princeton, N. J., al-
ready well known for its college, which had been
founded in 1746. Since then seminaries have been es-
tablised in different parts of the country by Presbyter-
ians or by synods. Of these institutions the appointing
the professors, the arranging the length of the curricu-
um, and the prescribing the course of study—the en-
tire control, in fact—has remained in the hands of their
founders. This state of things was so unsatisfactory
and so unprosbyterian that, on the reunion in 1859, the
assembly, in the persons of the directors, resolved, by
reserving to themselves the general control, the Assem-
by should in future have a veto power over the ap-
pointment of every professor, and should receive from the
directors an annual report of their administration.

The Church has thirteen theological seminaries, as
follows: at Princeton, N. J., 1812; at Auburn, N. Y.,
1820; Western, Allegheny City, Pa., 1827; Lane, Cin-
cinnati, O., 1832; Union, New York City, 1836; at Dan-
ville, Ky., 1839; Theological Seminary of the North-
west, Chicago, Ill., 1839; Blackburn University (theo-
logical department), Galat, 1867; at San Francisco, Cal.,
1871; German, Bloomfield, N. J., 1809; German, Dubuque,
Ia., 1870; Lincoln University (theological department),
1871; and Biddle Memorial Institute (theological de-
partment), Charlotte, N. C., 1867. Of these, the last
two are for colored people, and the two immediately
preceding them for Germans. In 1875-76 they had, in
all, 56 professors and 578 students. The number grad-
uating that year was 134. The board of education of the
Church in 1876 received $72,040, and gave financial aid to
456 students (222 theological, 218 collegiate, and 16
academical), and the same year 65 men were ac-
tained, for freedmen, 93 day schools, with 6 teachers and
3176 pupils and 5 higher schools, with 938 students,
of whom 43 were preparing for the ministry. See Gil-
lott, Hist. of the Presb. Church (2 vols. 12mo, rev. ed.,
1837), and Wollweber, Hist. of the Constitution and
Church (terminates in 1788; Phila. 1840-41, 2 vols.);
Webster, Hist. of the Presb. Church till 1758 (Phil.
1851, 8vo); Presb. Reunion Memorial Volume, 1837-71
(N. Y. 1871, 8vo); and Wilson, Presb. Hist. Allegheny
Minutes of the General Assembly (bid. 1877, new series, vol.
iv.); Black, Sketch of the Presb. Churches throughout the
World (Edinb. 1877), p. 88 sq.

II. CUMBERLAND PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.—In the
beginning of the present century there was a very ex-
tensive revival of religion in the south-western part of
Kentucky, within the bounds of the Presbyterian of
sylvania. It is frequently called "the Great Western
Revival of 1800," and is regarded by some as one of the
most important religious movements in the history of
the Protestant Church of the United States, as it firmly
fixed the people of the valley of the Mississippi in the
Christian faith. The supply of preachers was still insuffi-
ciate, the Presbytery appointed at different times a
number of lay exhorters, and, after trial of their gifts,
licensed some to preach. They did not require of them
the usual course of classical studies, and permitted them
to except the latter, according to the principle of divinie
volving the idea of Fatalism. In October, 1802, the
Presbytery was divided, and the Presbytery of Camp-
berland was formed, covering the region just named. In April, 1863, the new Presbytery met, and ordained two of the licentiates—Finis Ewing (who had formerly been an elder) and Samuel King—and licensed one other, for which permission had been granted by the General Assembly, laid before them of irregularity on the part of the Presbytery, appointed a commission of ten ministers and six elders, clothed with full synodical powers, to visit this remote region and investigate the whole matter. Accordingly the commission, when convened, summoned the Presbytery and the church, and the presbytery ordained the licentiate in or ordained persons, and endeavored to induce the latter to submit to an examination. This, with the sanction of the Presbytery, they refused; whereupon the commission prohibited them from teaching or administering ordina-
nances in virtue of any authority derived from Cumberland Presbytery until they should submit. It was after-
twards contended that, as the authority to preach had been originally conferred by the Presbytery of Transyl-
vania, this prohibition was technically powerless in the case. It may also be observed that it seems now gen-
erally agreed by writers on both sides that the main ob-
jection was not to the illiterate character of the licen-
tiates, but to their alleged unsoundness in doctrine. The Revival members (as they were called) of the Cumber-
land Presbytery after this met as a council and ab-
solved the ministers from charges. They incorporated the General Assembly, but in vain. The assembly sustained the synod, and exhorted the recusants to submit and act regularly. The synod, being directed to review their proceedings, complied, and on review confirmed all that had been done, and further dissolved the Cumberland Presbytery and re-annexed its members to the Presby-
tery of Transylvania. The council made an ineffectual effort to bring about a reconciliation, and offered to sub-
mit the licentiates to an examination; but as they re-
quired that all should be received in a body, the pro-
posed conciliation failed. On Feb. 4, 1864, Finis Ewing and Samuel King (ordained ministers, but silenced by the commission), and Samuel M'Dow, an aged minister, met and organized themselves into a presbytery under the name of the Cumberland Presby-
tery. In April following the Presbytery of Transyl-
vania suspended Mr. M'Dow for his schismatical con-
duct.

The progress of the new body was rapid. In three years a synod was necessary, with 3 presbyteries and 60 congregations, and in 1829 a General Assembly was con-
sulted. In 1846 the General Assembly created the con-
vention 96 presbyteries, 927 ministers, 1188 churches, 82,138 communicants, and 24 educational institutions. In 1814 the synod published an edition of the Westminster Con-
fession and Catechisms, altered to suit their system, which was not published until 1839. The Synod of Calvinism and Arminianism. It rejects eternal repara-
tion, limited atonement, and special grace, teaching that the atonement was made for all mankind, and that the operation of the Spirit is coextensive with the atone-
ment. Other points: Calvinism, as the necessity of the Spirit's work in regeneration and the perseverance of the saints, are retained. The Cumberland Presby-
terians are warm advocates of revivals and camp-meet-
ings.

An evidence of the altered state of feeling towards this body of Christians as contrasted with the deliver-
ance of the General Assembly of 1814—to the effect that they could be treated with not as a body, but only as individuals—it may be added that first the New-School General Assembly entered into correspondence with the Cumberland Synod; and again, in 1869 the Old-School Assembly also took this step. The Cumberland Presbyterians have increased very rapidly. The minutes of the forty-sixth General Assembly, 1876, show 26 synods, including nearly 125 presbyteries, ex-
tending over the territory between the Great Lakes and the Gulf of Mexico, the Ohio and Allegheny Mountains, on the east, to the Pacific Ocean, on the west.

The following statistical summary is approximately cor-
rect: Ministers, 1375; licentiates, 290; candidates, 220; congregations, 2000; elders, 6750; deacons, 2000; total communicants, 100,000; persons in the Sabbath-schools, 55,000; value of property, $7,000,000. The money contrib-
uted during the year, $350,000. The following are the principal institutions of learning under the control of this Church: Cumberland College (Princeton, Ky., founded in 1829, discontinued in 1861), Cumberland University (Lebanon, Tenn., founded in 1842, which has the leading university of the Missouri Conference (McKenzie, Tenn., 1847), Wayneburg College (Wayn-
seburg, Pa., 1850), M'Gee College (College Mound, Mo., 1853, now suspended), Lincoln University (Lincoln, Ill., 1856), Trinity University (Tehasca, Texas, 1870), Cane Hill College, Boonborough, Ark., 1892). The General Assembly, in 1876, approved the establishment of a Union Medical College, in connection with the three universities of the Church: namely, Cumberland, Lin-
coln, and Trinity. It is to be located at St. Louis, or some other large city. Wayneburg, Lincoln, and Trin-
ity admit young ladies on equal terms with young men. There are also several institutions exclusively for girls, owned by, or under the patronage of, the Church.

The colored Cumberland Presbyterian Church has been formed by the amicable separation of colored mem-
bers from the whites, who have organized their church and their organization into an independent body. The first number of their newspaper organ, The Banner of Light, was published in September, 1876. It stated that the number of members of the colored Cumberland Presby-
terian Church in the states of Kansas, Missouri, Illinois, Mississippi, Tennessee, Alabama, and Kentucky was, in May, 1874, 3925; that the number of ministers at that time was seventeen; and that the value of church prop-
erty was $12,550. Since that time the Presbytery of Missouri had added 240 members, and the same presby-
tery had reported 26 members for Arkansas for the year 1874 than for 1873 did not come from the other states.

12. The Reformed Presbyterian Synod.—During "the persecuting times," some members of the Cov-
enanting or Reformed Presbyterian Church of Scotland settled in Pennsylvania. In 1743 these met at Middle Octora, and again solemnly subscribed the Old Scot-
tish Covenant. In 1752 the Scottich Church sent the Rev. John Cuthbertson to be their minister. In 1770 he was joined by the Rev. Messrs. Linn and Dobbie from the Reformed Presbytery of Ireland, when a Reformed church of Pennsylvania was organized. In 1782 the General Assembly and the Reformed Synod of 1782 these three ministers and a portion of the people joined with the Associate Church in forming "The As-

cociate Reformed Church." The members who were opposite to this union kept together as praying societies in the state. In 1812 a synod was formed, and a committee of their number to take the oversight of them judicially. In 1738 a presbytery was organized at Philadelphia, and in 1808 the question of slavery forced itself upon the consideration of the newly or-

ganized "Reformed Presbyterian Church of the United States of America," when it enacted that no slaveholder should be retained in its communion, a position since then faithfully maintained. In 1806 it issued a Testi-

mony defining its position on several points not men-
tioned in the Westminster Confession. In the follow-
ing year it undertook the theological education of its ministry by opening a seminary at Philadelphia, and in 1809 organized itself into "The Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church in America," with three constituting prebyteries. Subsequent to the war of 1812 the relations of this church to the federal government were much discussed. A variety of senti-
nments was apparent as to the extent to which the se-
verance between the Church and that other ordinance of God—the State—should be carried. The result of these discussions was a rendering of the Church in 1830, and the formation of several churches in the Appalachian Mountains, on the east, to the Pacific Ocean, on the west.
While heartily accepting the Westminster standards as their symbolical books, this Presbyterian gave prominence to the distinctive doctrines of the Marrow divines. See Manuscript Chronology. Its members held the gospel as the highest gift of God, and that salvation to sinners of mankind as such—all having a common interest in him—faith to be a person's real persuasion that Jesus Christ is his—that he shall have life and salvation by Christ, and that whatever Christ did for God in his behalf, he did for him. Stress was also laid on the doctrine of the binding obligation of the Scottish covenanters—National and Solemn League. While the origin and doctrinal views of the Associate Presbyterian restricted its sphere of labor, inside of the United States, it grew rapidly, congregations being formed in New York, Virginia, and the Carolinas.

In 1776 a second presbytery, that of New York, was formed—like that of Pennsylvania, in subordination to the Scottish Synod. In 1784 Rev. Thomas Clark, minister of Baltimba, in Ireland, belonging to the Bughby Synod of Scotland, with the greater part of his congregation emigrated to this country, and settled in Salem, Washington County, N. Y. Two other ministers of the same communion followed them two years after, though some of them subsequently returned to Scotland. The Bughby ministers here have been engaged in the formation of a separate organization on this side of the Atlantic, united with their brethren; but the union was disturbed by the refusal of the Scottish synod to approve of it. The revolution of 1776 was chiefly instrumental in bringing about the existence of the Associate Reformed Church.

During the progress of the war several conventions were held between the members of the Associate and the Reformed presbyteries with a view to union. Their three presbyteries met in Philadelphia in October, 1782, and formed themselves into a synod, under the name of "The Associate Reformed Church in America," on a basis consisting of the following articles:

1. That Jesus Christ died for the elect.
2. That there is an appropriation in the nature of faith.
3. That the Gospel is addressed indiscriminately to sinners of mankind.
4. That the righteousness of Christ is the alone condition and ground of eternal life.
5. That civil government originates with God the Creator, and not with Christ the Mediator.
6. That the administration of the kingdom of Providence is given into the hands of Jesus Christ the Mediator, and magistrates exercise their authority appointed by him, to the end that in the world to be the prop of civil order among men, as well as other things, is rendered subservient by the Mediator to the glory of his kingdom, the spiritual kingdom of God, and has sanctioned the use of it and of every common benefit, through the authority of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the Spirit of grace.
7. That the law of nature and the moral law revealed in the Scriptures are substantially the same, although the latter embraces the will of God more evidently and clearly than the former, and therefore magistrates among Christians ought to be regulated by the general directory of the Word as to the execution of their office.
8. That the qualifications of justice, versatylty, etc., required in the law of nature for the being of a magistrate, are more explicitly revealed as necessary in the Holy Scriptures, but a religious test, any farther than an oath of fidelity, is not to be essential nor be essentially necessary in the being of a magistrate, except when the people make it a condition of government.
9. That the Lord's ordinances, when united, shall adhere to the Westminster Confession of Faith, the Catechisms, the directory for worship, and propositions concerning Church government.
10. That they shall claim the full exercise of Church discipline, without depending upon foreign judges and rules.

On this basis all the members of the Reformed presbyteries here in the United States, together with the Associate Presbyterians who sympathized with the Scottish Seceders applied to them for a minister, but at that time none could be sent. The application was renewed in 1750, but the first minister sent to this country by the Secession Church of Scotland was Alexander Geddes, who, however, did not arrive until 1753. He was from 1758 presbytery was organized under the name of "The Associate Presbyterian of Pennsylvania, subordinate to the Associate Synod of Scotland."
by ministers sent out from Scotland, and also by the return of a considerable part of those who had previously joined the union. In 1784 this Church put forth a Testimony intended to supplement the Westminster Confession of Faith, and to draw the members of the Separate Synod, public covenanting, the exclusive use of the Psalms in praise, and against private oaths, that is, secret societies. The first institution for the purpose of educating students in theology by this body was established in 1783, under the care of the Rev. John Anderson, D.D., of Beaver County, Pa. The Presbytery of Pennsylvania, being unable to meet the applications for preaching which were made from Kentucky and Tennessee, directed the applicants to apply directly to the Synod of Scotland for missionaries. They did so; and Messrs. Armstrong and Andrew Fulton arrived in Kentucky in the spring of 1788, and in November formed the Presbytery of Kentucky. This accession of strength enabled these presbyteries to form themselves into a synod; and accordingly the synod, or court of review, designated as "The Associate Synod of North America" was constituted at Philadelphia in May, 1801. The synod consisted of seventeen ministers, who were divided into the presbyteries of Philadelphia, of Clarion, of Kentucky, and of Cambridge. Until the year 1818 appeals might be made to this Synod, but at that time it was declared a coordinate synod by the General Associate Synod of Scotland. Between the years 1838 and 1840 serious ecclesiastical difficulties arose, and several ministers were deposed or suspended. These, with a number of ministers and congregations in sympathy with them, at once organized separately, having several presbyteries, who constituted a synod and claimed to be the true Associate Synod. This painful division was afterwards adjusted, and a union was effected in 1854. To the Associate Church belongs the distinction of being one of the earliest churches on the American continent to take up a decided position on the subject of slavery. As early as the year 1800 the Presbytery of Pennsylvania issued a warning on the subject to the members of its churches, declaring slaveholding to be a moral evil and unjustifiable. This declaration was repeated in 1811, while in 1813 the synod judicially excluded slaveholders from its communion—an action which cost it all its congregations in the Southern States. The loss thus sustained was made up by the formation of new congregations and new presbyteries, and by the annexation of the West Synod. In 1858, previous to the union with the Associate Reformed Church, the Associate Synod comprised 21 presbyteries, 231 ministers and licentiates, 231 congregations, and 25,505 communicants.

2. Associate Reformed Church. The earliest settlement of the Associate Reformed Church was in Pennsylvania, within the Cumberland valley; but colonies from these emigrated to South Carolina and Georgia, New York, Kentucky, and even to New Hampshire and Maine. One of the first acts of the synod, after its organization in 1682, was the adoption of a series of articles, afterwards published under the name of "The Constitution of the Associate Reformed Church"; but these articles were severely attacked both by the Seceders and Covenanters, and were finally laid aside for a fuller exposition of the Church's faith. The result was that the Westminster Confession and Catechisms, after a careful revision at several successive meetings of synod, in the articles relating to the power of the magistrate, were published in a volume in 1799, entitled "The Constitution and Standards of the Associate Reformed Church in North America," with the exception of the Old Testament and New Testament, which were inserted into it as a separate synod, with four subordinate synods—New York, Pennsylvania, Scioto, and the Carolinas. In 1804 the plan of the theological seminary was framed. Dr. John M. Mason was chosen professor of theology; and in 1805, the first class was graduated. The Associate Reformed Synod of the same year in the city of New York. This was the second theological seminary established in the United States. Dr. Mason's work on Catholic Communism, published in 1816, was regarded as being in conflict with the Church's principles and practices; and this, in connection with some other grounds of complaint, led the entire Synod of that communion to withdraw from the superintendence of the General Synod. In 1821 the Synod of the Carolinas petitioned the General Synod to be erected into an independent synod, on the ground that they were so distant from the place at which the General Synod usually assembled that it was impossible that they should be represented in it. The request was granted. For many years after that the Southern Synod gained but little in numbers, though in later years it became more prosperous; while the Scioto Synod rapidly extended itself and became more vigorous every year. About the time of the separation of this Western Synod, an unsuccessful attempt was made to unite the Associate Reformed and the Reformed Dutch churches, under the name of "The Reformed Protestant Church of North America." Immediately after this, that is, in 1821, a union was effected between the Associate Reformed and the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church; the consequence of which was that a portion of the former Church became incorporated with the latter, and the library of the Associate Reformed Church was immediately removed from New York to Princeton; though, as the result of a legal process, it ultimately fell back into the hands of its original owners. The act of union by the General Synod of the Associate Reformed Church was irregular, being contrary to the express will of a majority of the presbyteries. However, many of the ministers and congregations who had remained under the care of the General Synod went into this union. The Synod of Pennsylvania with but few exceptions was merged in it, and that synod never met again. The Synod of New York, however, survived the dissolution of the General Synod, becoming separate and independent, like its two sister synods of the West and South. But its interests languished till 1829, when it resolved to revive the seminary, whose operations had been suspended in 1821, and to establish it at Newburgh, under the care of the Rev. Joseph M'Carroll, D.D., who was at the same time chosen professor of theology. An attempt was made in 1827 to revive the General Synod on the old footing, but it proved a failure. However, the Synod of the West, having divided into two, erected a General Synod, which first met in 1841, and which has been the New York Synod since. In 1855. This united body numbered 4 synods, 28 presbyteries, 235 ministers and licentiates, 367 congregations, and 51,284 communicants. Its name then became "The General Synod of the Associate Reformed Church." They added to the Westminster standards as adopted in the Testimony of 1779, and held the doctrines of close communion, anti-slavery, and the exclusive use of the Psalms in praise.

In May, 1858, the Associate Reformed and the Associate churches, having been separated for more than three-quarters of a century, were reunited upon a common basis, under the name of "The United Presbyterian Church in North America," a Church which is now the largest representative of those distinctive views for which all the preceding churches have more or less contended. In addition therefore to its acceptance of the Westminster standards, which it modified, it has issued a Testimony whose adoption is a condition of communion both with ministers and members. In this Testimony are articles adverse to slavery and to secret societies, and in favor of close communion, the exclusive use of the Psalms and of old in the duty of covenanting. A few years ago a new metrical version of the book of Psalms was adopted by this body. A small number protested against the union, and have since then continued under the name of "The Associate Synod and General Assembly of North America." (See the section on "The United Presbyterian Church of North America" embraced a General Assembly, 8 synods, 56 presby-
teries, 753 ministers, 866 congregations, and 101,858 communicants. It has theological seminaries at New-
burgh, N. Y.; Allegheny, Pa.; and Xenia, O.; and missionary seminaries at Osaka and Ramleh, Egypt. 
Wesleyan, Mountie, and Oberlin colleges and the Oberlin colleges are also under its charge. It has boards of Foreign 
Missions, of Home Missions, of Publication, of Church Extension, of Freedmen, and of Education, with 
mission stations in India, Egypt, and Syria. The Mission to 
China, which was instituted as a memorial of the "union" of the different bodies in 1858, has been transferred to 
California. Its missionary contributions were, 
in 1876-77, for foreign, $77,126; home, $29,750. Its 
periodical publications are one monthly, one semi-
monthly, and two weekly newspapers.

The Associate Reformed Synod of the South has still its separate organization. Cordial in its relations with 
the United Presbyterian Church, it has one missionary 
now laboring together with the missionaries of the lat-
ter Church in Egypt; and, slavery having ceased to be 
an object of contention, is now considering the propriety 
of organic union with that body. In 1875 a plan of 
co-operation was proposed between this Church and the United Presbyterian Church, North, which provides that "the presbyteries of each Church shall sustain the same 
relation to those of the other that they do to the 
corporate officers of their own body; that the min-
isters and licentiates of each shall be eligible to ap-
pointments and settlements in congregations of the 
other; that the courts of each shall respect the disci-
pline of the other; that ministers and members of the 
two bodies be required to cultivate friendly rela-
tions and Christian fellowship with each other; that 
the existing relations of the two churches (actual co-
operation) in the work of foreign missions be continued: that a friendly co-operation of help and non-interference 
be permitted in home missions and Church Extension; that the two bodies co-operate in building 
and sustaining the Normal or Training School of the 
United Presbyterian Church for the Freedmen, estab-
lished at Knoxville, Tenn.; and that in the work of 
publishing the Associate Reformed Synod co-operate 
with the Board of Publication of the United Presbytery-
ian Church. These provisions were adopted by the 
synod. The committee on correspondence with the 
United Presbyterian Church was reappointed, but was 
instructed to take no direct steps towards union without 
further representations from the Southern Synods. The Southern Synod of New England has a liter.
ary association named Erskine College and a theological 
school, both at Due West, S. C. It numbers about 70 
ministers, nearly one third of whom are in South Caroli-
na, the rest in other Southern states.

The Southern Synod of NORTH AMERICA is composed of some who declined to enter into the union with the Associate Reformed Synod in 1858 (see No. 14 
above), and consists of the presbyteries of Iowa, Clarion, 
Muskingum, and Northern Indiana; and had, in 1876, 
12 ministers, 2 licentiates, 94 congregational charges or 
stations, and 110 communicants. The total contribu-
tions were $679,45.

16. THE UNITED SYNOD OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, SOUTH.—In 1857 the New-School Presbytery of Lexington affirmed slavery to be right and scriptural in 
principle. The Assembly (1857) replied by condemn-
ing the position, and refused to allow either the prin-
ciple or the practice. The delegates from the Southern 
churches protested, and, declaring this action to be an "indirect excision" of their congregations, withdrew; 
and in 1859, at Knoxville, Tennessee, organized themselves as "The United Synod of the Presbyterian 
Church, South," consisting of some 100 ministers and about 200 
congregations. A proposal for union with the Old-
School Presbyterian Church was declined by this latter 
body because coupled with the condition that the As-
sociate Reformed Synod cede to the Old-School 
Synod the United Synod reported 14 presbyteries, 118 minis-
ters, 187 churches, and 12,123 communicants, of whom 322 were colored. In 1864 the synod joined the Pres-
byterian Church, South.

17. THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, SOUTH, dates its 
organization from Dec. 4, 1861, when the commission-
ers from a number of scattered Presbyterian bodies, 
within the Confederate States met in Augusta, Ga., 
and organized as a General Assembly. The style and 
title then chosen was, The Presbyterian Church of the 
Confederate States of America; but after the over-
throw of the Confederacy the word united was substi-
tuted for Confederate, and of America was dropped. 
The Presbyterian Church, South, disavows all connec-
tion with political matters, and holds to strictly eco-
societal labor. In 1876, at the Assembly held in Sa-
vannah, Ga., when the appointment of delegates to the 
Pan-Presbyterian Council of Edinburgh in 1877 was 
considered, all expressions used in the different courts 
during the exciting times of the civil strife were re-
sinded as inconsistent with the platform of 1862. The 
report then adopted closed with the following declara-
tions: 

"1. We solemnly reaffirm the explicit and formal statement set forth at the time of the organization of our 
General Assembly in 1861, in an Address to the Churches 
of Jesus Christ throughout the Earth. This document 
clearly and forcibly details our position concerning the 
nature and the mission of the Church as the formative 
body, and, therefore, "non-sectarian and non-political." 

"2. Inasmuch as some incidental expressions, uttered in 
times of crisis, have been taken by others as 
impugning our records, and have been pointed out in the report of the 
committee aforesaid, which seem to be ambiguous or incompletely expressed, the above declaration and 
of like import, this Assembly does hereby disavow them 
whenever found, and does not recognize such as forming 
any part of the well-considered, authoritative teachings 
or testimony of our Church." 

At that time this Church consisted of 12 synods, 
92 presbyteries, 1821 churches, 1079 ministers, and 
112,183 communicants. Their contributions amounted 
to $1,183,681. The Assembly conducts its benevolent 
operations through three general committees (the work 
of foreign missions and of sustentation being united 
under the same committee), viz. the Executive Commit-
te of Foreign Missions and Sustentation of Education, 
and of Publication. Foreign missions are maintained 
in the Indian Territory, Mexico, South America, Greece, 
Italy, India, and China, and domestic missions in new 
and destitute localities in the South, at an annual cost 
of $71,121, supporting 75 missionaries in foreign fields, 
21 assistant missionaries, all from the United States; 
9 ordained ministers and 25 assistant missionaries are 
natives of the countries in which they labor. With these 
foreign missions are connected 22 churches, with 1200 
members and 1500 communicants. A publishing house is maintained at Richmond, Va., 
and, with a capital of about $40,000, issues Presbytery-
ian books for ministers and congregational and Sun-
day-school libraries. It also aids in the education for 
the ministry of young men of limited means, and in the 
publication and dissemination of a religious and doctrinal 
literature.

In all educational work, this branch of the Presbyte-
rian Church has always held very advanced ground. It 
declares in its constitution that "because it is highly 
reprehensible to religion, and dangerous to the Church, 
the Presbytery shall try each candidate as to his knowledge 
of the Latin language and the original languages 
in which the Holy Scriptures were written. They shall 
also examine him in the arts and sciences." The first 
committees of this character were organized in 1858. The Inhabitants of Madagascar, on 
testa on some common head in divinity." The common 
requirement in its presbyteries is equal to the curriculum.
in most American colleges. The demands of the Church for the education of its ministry and its own youth have ever been made in the patrimony of learning and engaged it in the founding of institutions for higher education. It has been the pioneer of education in nearly all the older Southern communities. During the civil war, many of the institutions of learning founded and endowed by the Presbyterian Church in the South perished by the loss of endowments in the general financial wreck. Among them were Oglethorpe University, Ga.; Oakland College, Mias.; LaGrange College, Tenn.; and other valuable institutions of less prominence. Centre College, Ky., was lost through decisions of the United States courts. It was more educational in its character than the Westminster Ern., than a large portion of the Northern churches, who came nearer the Congregational influence of New England. It was the united opposition of the Southern churches to what claimed to be a more liberal Presbyterianism which in large part caused the division of 1867 into Old and New School bodies. Since the separation in 1861, the Southern body has grown even more strict in its views of the standards, and the Henderson character of Church government. But, with all their zeal for a strict construction of the standards of doctrine and order, the Southern churches have ever been distinguished for their interest in protracted meetings and services of religion. The custom is almost universal of holding protracted services of several days' or weeks' duration in the churches at one or more communion services in the year, as the indication of the great love of worship and the great interest in the greatest; and most frequently at such meetings there is a revival in the hearts of God's people, and awakenings of greater or less extent among the unconverted. The special labors of evangelists such as Moody and Sankey, Dillinger and Whittles, have been spread to a great extent in the Southern churches. It is an opinion generally accepted among the Southern ministry that there is great advantage, especially in a sparsely populated region but partially supplied with the means of grace, in bringing the Gospel to bear for successive days upon the minds of men. In this way their thoughts can be more effectually withdrawn from their worldly connections and pleasures, and fixed more intensely upon the great matter of salvation. Hence the evangelists found that neither their methods nor their preaching of the Gospel of salvation by grace only, through faith, was much of a novelty to the Southern Presbyterian churches.

It has proved to be a great drawback to the proper influence of the Southern Presbyterian Church that, owing partly to the separations of professors from the government ability and learning—Union Seminary, at Hampden Sidney, Va.; and Columbia Seminary, at Columbia, S. C. It has recently established a third, at Tuscaloosa, Ala., for the education and training of colored men for the ministry; and for this it is now gathering an endowment. There are no Presbyterian schools or colleges for girls in the South endowed beyond the provision of buildings, apparatus, and libraries; but there are many institutions under Presbyterian control or auspices in which every reasonable comfort is provided with advantages for the thorough education and accomplishment of girls. Among these are many colleges, collegiate institutes, and seminaries which afford a high grade of instruction to young ladies, and are widely esteemed for general excellence and thoroughness.

The work of education for the ministry is conducted by the General Assembly, through an executive committee located at Memphis, Tenn. In the last ecclesiastical year, the committee received from the churches, for this purpose, $15,181, from which $8 young men, provided with assistant professorships at various colleges and theological seminaries, received assistance.

The standards of the Southern Presbyterian Church are the Westminster Confession (with the chapter "Of the Civil Magistrate" amended), the Larger and Shorter Catechisms, and the Westminster Form of Government and Directory for Public Worship, with the circumstances of the Church, with "Rules of Discipline," or "Forms of Process," gathered from the usages and laws of the Scottish Church. These standards are adopted by every minister at his ordination, in answer to the questions put to him publicly by the presiding minister, but are not required to be adopted by subscription to any written formula.

Anterior to the division of the Church into Northern and Southern churches, the Southern churches were disposed to adhere more closely to the standards, and were more careful to have these teachings in full standing by the Westminster Ern., than a large portion of the Northern churches, who came nearer the Congregational influence of New England. It was the united opposition of the Southern churches to what claimed to be a more liberal Presbyterianism which in large part caused the division of 1867 into Old and New School bodies. Since the separation in 1861, the Southern body has grown even more strict in its views of the standards, and the jure divino character of Church government. But, with all their zeal for a strict construction of the standards of doctrine and order, the Southern churches have ever been distinguished for their interest in protracted meetings and services of religion. The custom is almost universal of holding protracted services of several days' or weeks' duration in the churches at one or more communion services in the year, as the indication of the great love of worship and the great interest in the greatest; and most frequently at such meetings there is a revival in the hearts of God's people, and awakenings of greater or less extent among the unconverted. The special labors of evangelists such as Moody and Sankey, Dillinger and Whittles, have been spread to a great extent in the Southern churches. It is an opinion generally accepted among the Southern ministry that there is great advantage, especially in a sparsely populated region but partially supplied with the means of grace, in bringing the Gospel to bear for successive days upon the minds of men. In this way their thoughts can be more effectually withdrawn from their worldly connections and pleasures, and fixed more intensely upon the great matter of salvation. Hence the evangelists found that neither their methods nor their preaching of the Gospel of salvation by grace only, through faith, was much of a novelty to the Southern Presbyterian churches.

It has proved to be a great drawback to the proper influence of the Southern Presbyterian Church that, owing partly to the separations of professors from the government ability and learning—Union Seminary, at Hampden Sidney, Va.; and Columbia Seminary, at Columbia, S. C. It has recently established a third, at Tuscaloosa, Ala., for the education and training of colored men for the ministry; and for this it is now gathering an endowment. There are no Presbyterian schools or colleges for girls in the South endowed beyond the provision of buildings, apparatus, and libraries; but there are many institutions under Presbyterian control or auspices in which every reasonable comfort is provided with advantages for the thorough education and accomplishment of girls. Among these are many colleges, collegiate institutes, and seminaries which afford a high grade of instruction to young ladies, and are widely esteemed for general excellence and thoroughness.

The work of education for the ministry is conducted by the General Assembly, through an executive committee located at Memphis, Tenn. In the last ecclesiastical year, the committee received from the churches, for this purpose, $15,181, from which $8 young men, provided with assistant professorships at various colleges and theological seminaries, received assistance.

The standards of the Southern Presbyterian Church are the Westminster Confession (with the chapter "Of the Civil Magistrate" amended), the Larger and Shorter Catechisms, and the Westminster Form of Government and Directory for Public Worship, with the circumstances of the Church, with "Rules of Discipline," or "Forms of Process," gathered from the usages and laws of the Scottish Church. These standards are adopted by every minister at his ordination, in answer to the questions put to him publicly by the presiding minister, but are not required to be adopted by subscription to any written formula.

Anterior to the division of the Church into Northern and Southern churches, the Southern churches were disposed to adhere more closely to the standards, and were more careful to have these teachings in full standing by the Westminster Ern., than a large portion of the Northern churches, who came nearer the Congregational influence of New England. It was the united opposition of the Southern churches to what claimed to be a more liberal Presbyterianism which in large part caused the division of 1867 into Old and New School bodies. Since the separation in 1861, the Southern body has grown even more strict in its views of the standards, and the jure divino character of Church government. But, with all their zeal for a strict construction of the standards of doctrine and order, the Southern churches have ever been distinguished for their interest in protracted meetings and services of religion. The custom is almost universal of holding protracted services of several days' or weeks' duration in the churches at one or more communion services in the year, as the indication of the great love of worship and the great interest in the greatest; and most frequently at such meetings there is a revival in the hearts of God's people, and awakenings of greater or less extent among the unconverted. The special labors of evangelists such as Moody and Sankey, Dillinger and Whittles, have been spread to a great extent in the Southern churches. It is an opinion generally accepted among the Southern ministry that there is great advantage, especially in a sparsely populated region but partially supplied with the means of grace, in bringing the Gospel to bear for successive days upon the minds of men. In this way their thoughts can be more effectually withdrawn from their worldly connections and pleasures, and fixed more intensely upon the great matter of salvation. Hence the evangelists found that neither their methods nor their preaching of the Gospel of salvation by grace only, through faith, was much of a novelty to the Southern Presbyterian churches.

It has proved to be a great drawback to the proper influence of the Southern Presbyterian Church that, owing partly to the separations of professors from the government ability and learning—Union Seminary, at Hampden Sidney, Va.; and Columbia Seminary, at Columbia, S. C. It has recently established a third, at Tuscaloosa, Ala., for the education and training of colored men for the ministry; and for this it is now gathering an endowment. There are no Presbyterian schools or colleges for girls in the South endowed beyond the provision of buildings, apparatus, and libraries; but there are many institutions under Presbyterian control or auspices in which every reasonable comfort is provided with advantages for the thorough education and accomplishment of girls. Among these are many colleges, collegiate institutes, and seminaries which afford a high grade of instruction to young ladies, and are widely esteemed for general excellence and thoroughness.

The work of education for the ministry is conducted by the General Assembly, through an executive committee located at Memphis, Tenn. In the last ecclesiastical year, the committee received from the churches, for this purpose, $15,181, from which $8 young men, provided with assistant professorships at various colleges and theological seminaries, received assistance.
which is covered by it, and the hundreds of thousands of poor ignorant negroes, ever tending backward to heathenism, who must depend upon this Church very largely for a form of the Gospel that will enlighten and civilize them, no body of Presbyterians in the world has a greater work to do, or, in proportion to the work to be done, less financial ability to sustain it.

The Church of Scotland had some from 1620 to 1654. In this British dominion the Presbyterians are in point of numbers the third among the religious denominations, being only exceeded by the Roman Catholics and the Church of England. Presbyterianism dates in Canada at least from the conquest, in 1629. Its first exponent in a settled way was the Rev. George Henry, who appeared in Quebec as early as 1676, and was the chaplain of a British regiment stationed there. In 1784 the Rev. Alexander Spark went there, and in 1797 the first Presbyterian congregation was organized. It was composed principally of soldiers. In 1790 the Rev. Thomas Bethune, a minister of the Kirk who had come from Scotland as chaplain of a Highland regiment, preached first in Montreal, and afterwards organized several congregations in the county of Glengarry. In Montreal it was Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. These were organized in 1790. They built St. Gabriel Street Church, which is still used as a Presbyterian church, and is the oldest Protestant church in Canada. Previous to the completion of their own structure they worshipped, by permission of the Recollet Fathers, in a Roman Catholic church. These men were supported by the Synod of the Reformed Dutch Church. One of the principal laborers thus sent was the Rev. Robert M'Dowell, who was appointed by the classis of Albany as their missionary to Canada in 1790. He itinerated throughout the greater part of Upper Canada, forming and fostering congregations in various places. He died at a very advanced age in 1841. The Rev. W. Smart, who was sent out from England in 1811, and who labored long and faithfully in Brockville; the Rev. W. Bell, sent out from Scotland in 1817; the Rev. William Jenkins, originally from Scotland, who went to the United States in 1817; the Rev. Robert Boyd, from the Synod of Ulster, ordained in 1821; and the Rev. James Harris, also from Ireland, who began his labors in 1820 as pastor of the first Presbyterian church in York (now Toronto), were among the founders of the Presbyterian Church in Canada. To Kingston and a few other places ministers were, on application, sent out by presbyteries in Scotland, the Rev. John Barclay being the first minister of Kingston. In 1825, the Glasgow Colonial Society was formed, which sent out many ministers to Lower and Upper Canada, as well as to Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. These missionaries were all of the Church of Scotland. In 1827 bishop Strachan, of Toronto, published an ecclesiastical chart of Upper Canada, in which the Church of England was said to have thirty ministers, while two only belonged to the Church of Scotland—"one of whom," it was further alleged, "had made application to be received into the Anglican Communion." A change, however, was at hand. The tide of immigration had begun to flow in the direction of Canada, bringing large numbers of Presbyterians from Scotland and the north of Ireland. Scotland to the Church of Scotland—"for promoting the religious interests of Scottish settlers in British North America." Presbyterianism had taken root in Canada; it now began to make rapid progress. The supply of British ministers being necessarily cut off, owing to the ecclesiastical condition of the country, these provinces were at this time thrown almost entirely on their own resources. In 1829 the Synod of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland. On its first roll were 25 ministers. "The United Synod of Upper Canada," consisting chiefly of ministers of the Associate Synod of New Brunswick, was formed about 1819, but in 1840 was amalgamated with the synod in connection with the Church of Scotland, and then numbered 82 ministers. Several ministers from the Secession Church of Scotland came to Canada about 1820, and the number was increased from time to time. They were organized into a separate Church of Scotland, the United Secession Church, and known afterwards as the Synod of the United Presbyterian Church in Canada. In 1844, the year after the disruption of the Church of Scotland, a division took place in the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland; 25 ministers agreeing with the Free Church of Scotland withdrew, and formed themselves into "The Presbyterian Church of Scotland." The synod formed immediately a theological hall at Toronto under the name of the "United Synod of Canada." The Presbyterians also instituted a theological hall at London. The synod in connection with the Church of Scotland, having in 1841 obtained a royal charter for Queen's University and College at Kingston, set themselves to work for its better equipment. Then began a struggle between the free church and the general church for pre-emption of the lands in the new university. The Synod of the Church. With varying success, each maintained a separate existence for seventeen years. To Nova Scotia and New Brunswick the first Presbyterian ministers were sent from Scotland by the Burgher and Anti-Burgher synods. A missionary was also sent in 1788 by the United synods of New York and Philadelphia. About 1789 the real work of building up a Presbyterian Church in Nova Scotia may be said to have begun, the Rev. David Smith and the Rev. Daniel Cock having been sent out by the Burgher or Associate Synod of Scotland. Seventeen years afterwards, the Rev. James McGregor was sent out by the Anti-Burgher or General Associate Synod. From these beginnings grew up the Synod of Truro (Burgher), established in 1786, and the Synod of Pictou (Anti-Burgher), in 1796. In 1817 these united, forming "The Presbyterian Church of Nova Scotia." This was the first colonial union of which there is any record. Ministers from the Church of Scotland came at a later date. This Church was first represented in these provinces by the Rev. Samuel Russe, called to be pastor of St. Matthew's Church, Halifax, in 1784. But thirty-two years intervened before it could be said to have effected a permanent lodgment. In 1833 seven ministers of the Church of Scotland formed themselves into the Synod of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward's Island (the Presbytery of New Brunswick, however, declined to enter into the compact, and in 1835 constituted itself the Synod of New Brunswick). The Synod of Nova Scotia grew space, and when the division came, in 1844, it had outnumbered its elder sister. But now it was well-built, and as it is, both in Scotland and in New Brunswick, others joined the Free Church in these provinces. Three only maintained their former connection. The synod became defunct in 1848, and was not resuscitated till 1854, when it again put forth energetic efforts to recover its lost ground. In Canada the new body, founded in 1844, in sympathy with the Free Church of Scotland, took, as we have said, the name of "The Presbyterian Church of Canada." In 1861, after several years spent in negotiations, this body and the United Presbyterian Church in Canada united under the name of "The Presbyterian Church of Canada," forming the corresponding bodies in the Lower Provinces uniting under the name of "The Presbyterian Church of the Lower Provinces." "The Synod of the Canada Presbyterian Church" entered on a prosperous career, with
a roll of 268 ministers, of whom 128 had belonged to the Canada Presbyterian Church and 68 to the United Presbyterian Church. In 1870 the supreme court of this Church was for the first time constituted as a General Assembly, and the dominion of Canada for comprehensive union. In September, 1874, there were (omitting a few congregations connected with organizations in the United States) four Presbyterian bodies in the Dominion of Canada, viz.: the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland; the Canada Presbyterian Church; the Church of Scotland in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and adjoining provinces; and the Presbyterian Church of the Lower Provinces. In the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland there were 51 presbyteries and 123 ministers; in the Canada Presbyterian Church, 19 presbyteries and 329 ministers; in the Church of Scotland in Nova Scotia, etc., 6 presbyteries and 31 ministers; and in the Presbyterian Church of the Lower Provinces, 10 presbyteries and 118 ministers. There were theological colleges in Toronto, Montreal, and Quebec, and 7 in the Presbyterian Church; at Kingston and Quebec, to the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland; and at Halifax, to the Presbyterian Church of the Lower Provinces. Nearly one half of the ministers in the several provinces have been supplied by the theological colleges of the country. From the date of the union above referred to, overtures having reference to a yet more comprehensive union began to engage the attention of the supreme courts of all the churches in British North America, increased facilities for intercommunication were provided, and a closer and more direct supervision was exercised over the work of the churches, with at least as great a prospect of accomplishment. The confederation of the provinces which now form the Dominion of Canada having been consummated in 1867, there naturally followed a strong desire for that ecclesiastical union which had long been contemplated. This desire was shared by many who had previously opposed such a union. Formal negotiations were commenced in 1870 in all the provinces, culminating in the union which was happily consummated June 15, 1875, in the city of Montreal, when the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland, the Canada Presbyterian Church, the Church of the Maritime Provinces in connection with the Church of Scotland, and the Presbyterian Church of the Lower Provinces, declaring their belief that it would be for the glory of God and the advancement of the cause of Christ in that section, do formally and thus form one Presbyterian Church in the Dominion, were formally united under the name of "The Presbyterian Church in Canada." The aggregate of the United Church at that date was 834 ministers, 1,119 congregations, 90,653 communicants, and a population under its jurisdiction of about 650,000. Statistics of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, as they were reported to the General Assembly in June, 1876, then showed it to contain 4 synods, 83 presbyteries, 1076 congregations, 664 ministers, 92,186 communicants, and 58,949 Sabbath-schoolers. The contributions for all purposes amounted to $939,690; of this sum $148,058 were paid for the support of the ministry, $25,472 for home mission work, $116,173 for foreign missions, and $111,219 for missions among the French Canadians.

The work of the Church is co-extensive with this vast dominion. Their history is simply the history of the Church itself—one of continuous, steady progress. In the early years of Presbyterianism in Canada, owing chiefly to the lack of ministers, many came in their 1st with those branches of the Church whose ministers they thought they would most appeal to, and others, filled with romantic attachment to the Church of their fathers, waited long and patiently, and instances are not wanting of "vacant congregations" assembling themselves for public worship for years together to hear sermons read by one of their elders, or to be excused by the pastor and recognized as their temporary leaders. The work divides itself into two distinct departments: 1, the opening up of new fields, and supplying ordinances to purely mission stations; 2, to aid weak congregations in the support of their ministers. The number of purely mission fields occupied in the western section in 1876 was 150, including 300 preaching-stations, with 3000 communicants. The average Sabbath attendance at these stations was about 16,000 in the aggregate. There were also 78 supplemented congregations with settled pastors receiving grants from $20 to $300 each per annum from the home mission fund. The number of missionaries employed was as follows: 36 ministers and licentiates; 69 theological students; 44 catechists; 12 lay catechists—in all 150 missionaries. The grants made for 1877 to home mission fields amounted to about $25,000, to supplemented congregations $10,000, and for contingencies $2500, making in all $32,500. The eastern sections, although small in comparison with the immense territory assigned to the Western Committee, have a mission field which is neither very limited, very compact, nor very easily worked. It is a group of stations requiring missionary services. The greater part of the work is done by student catechists, of whom many were employed in 1877. In addition to these, eight Gaelic catechists are employed in the Cape Breton, and other parts of Nova Scotia. An interesting mission field was recently entered upon in New Brunswick. It is known as "The New Kincardine Colony," and is described as "a little bit of Scotland transplanted bodily into the forests of New Brunswick." Another has been opened in a long-neglected mission field, that of Newfoundland. The total number of home missions in this section is about 8500, and for supplementing the stipends of ministers in weak congregations about $4000.

In addition to the work above mentioned, missions of a special character are maintained. Of such is the mission to the lumbermen, instituted seven years prior to the union by the branch of the Church in connection with the Church of Scotland. The object of this mission is to supply the ordinances of religion to the large number of men employed in the forests during the winter season. There are ministers, missionaries, and student catechists. They supply the Scriptural and other literature in French and English. The average number annually employed in this branch of industry, in the valley of the Upper Ottawa, is about 5000 men. The amount expended on this behalf in the last five years is about $10,000 per annum.

Perhaps in no department of Church work are there more hopeful and encouraging signs of progress than in that under the care of the Assembly's Board of French Evangelization, which has for its herculean task the emancipation of 1,200,000 French Roman Catholics. Previous to 1875 missionary efforts in this direction had been conducted on a limited scale by the several churches. Since the union a great impetus has been given to the work, which is now assuming large proportions. In the service of the board there are at present forty missionary, colporteurs, and teachers, several of whom were at one time priests of the Church of Rome. In Nova Scotia an ordained missionary labor in a wide field with a fair measure of success. He reports 125 Romanists having embraced Protestantism through his labors. In the province of New Brunswick there are three French missions, each making steady progress. In the province of Quebec there are twelve rural missions, maintaining Sabbath-schooals, besides the ordinary services. In Ottawa, the capital of the Dominion, the board employs two missioners, who minister to about 2000 members of the Quebec city—the stronghold of popery in Canada—a church
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was erected in 1876, the first French Protestant church built in the city.

2. The staff of foreign missionaries consists at present of ten ordained ministers, one catechist, who acts as superintendent of schools, and three female missionaries. These are assisted by a large number of trained native teachers. The salaries of the ordained missionaries average about $1200 each; their assistants receive from $400 to $600 each per annum. The Church contributes annually towards the expenditure, in connection with the mission-ship Day-spring, $1200. The fields are four in number:

1. The New Hebrides. — This is the oldest and most distant. It originated in the mind of Rev. John Geddie, formerly a minister of the United Presbyterian Branch of the Church at Cavendish, Prince Edward Island, who landed on the island of Aneityam on July 18, 1848. This is no place to enter upon the details of Dr. Geddie's life work. Few missionaries have been more successful, and no higher encomium need be associated with his name than these touching words inscribed on a tablet recently erected to his memory on the wall of the chapel where he was wont to preach: "When he came here there were no Christians, and when he went away there were none but Christians." Since the commencement of this mission twelve missionaries, with their wives, have gone from Nova Scotia to labor in this field.

2. Trinidad. — The mission to the Coolies of Trinidad was begun in 1869 by the Rev. John Morton, also a minister of the Church of the Lower Provinces. In 1875 the Rev. J. F. Grant became superintendent of the mission, and in 1880 the Rev. Thomas Christie. Fifteen schools have been opened. Churches have also been built, and a number of native assistants take part in the work, which, notwithstanding many difficulties, is making satisfactory progress. The number of Coolie children under instruction is 500, and the missionary reports that 15 in one school can repeat the whole of the Shorter Catechism. The number of Coolies on the island is about 15,000.

3. Formosa. — This is one of the Church's most promising foreign mission fields. It was begun in 1873 by the Rev. G. L. McKay, of the Canada Presbyterian Church. In 1875 he was joined by the Rev. J. B. Fraser, M.D., a medical missionary. In these five years there have been erected ten chapels and two mission-houses, and 69 of the natives have renounced idolatry, and regularly attend Christian services. Seventy-five have, after careful preparation and examination, been admitted as communicants. There are five schools with native teachers, and nine native students are under training for missionary work.

4. Japan. — Ten of the union of the Canada Presbyterian Church and the Church in the Maritime Provinces in connection with the Church of Scotland had each broken ground in India by sending female missionaries. In 1874 the Rev. J. F. Campbell, a minister of the last-named Church, offered himself for foreign mission work. He has since proceeded to Madras as a missionary of the Presbyterian Church in Canada. At the same time the Rev. James Douglas also accepted an appointment to labor in Indore.

Next to the New Hebrides, the Japanese Mission in India, instituted by the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland, is the oldest foreign mission of the Church. It was originated twenty-five years ago, and has always been supported by a number of Sabbath-schools and the voluntary offerings of a few friends. The annual contributions received by the treasurer have been steadily increasing for some years. Besides supporting four Zenana day-schools and a Bible-woman, this juvenile agency provides for the education of about forty orphan children in India.

5. Colleges. — Queen's University and College at Kingston, founded in 1840, is the oldest. It was projected by the branch of the Church formerly in connection with the Church of Scotland, and is the only one that possesses the power of granting degrees. It combines the features of arts and theology. Since its establishment Queen's has educated more than 100 ministers for the Presbyterian Church. The combined resources and equipment of the Canadian Presbyterian colleges may be summed up as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Queen's College</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montefiore</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGill</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalhousie</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The General Assembly authorizes an annual collection to be made in all the congregations on behalf of its theological colleges. In addition to the above-mentioned theological colleges, there is a collegiate institute at Winnipeg, the capital of the province of Manitoba; it is controlled by the General Assembly, and supported by the funds of the Church. This institution has two professors — one of science and literature, and one of classics; also a lecturer in philosophy.

4. Periodicals. — Each of the churches previous to 1875 published a monthly magazine for the diffusion of missionary information and general religious intelligence. So that at the time of the above there were four such magazines — two in the maritime provinces, one in the province of Ontario, and one in the province of Quebec. Three of these had outlived more than a quarter of a century. The General Assembly agreed that there should be but one periodical in the whole Church, issued under its sanction, to be called The Presbyterian Record, and to be published monthly in the city of Montreal, at the rate of twenty-five cents per copy per annum. The first number of this periodical was published in January, 1876. Before the close of the year it had attained a circulation of 50,000 copies monthly.

5. A few ministers of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland refused to enter into the union with the Canada Presbyterian Church, and, after the union was consummated, declared themselves to continue the Church in connection with the Church of Scotland. This synod met in Montreal in June, 1876. The Rev. David Watson was appointed moderator. Trustees were appointed for the various funds of the synod, and the usual committees were also appointed. A petition was presented from the congregation of West King, praying for ordinances in connection with the Church of Scotland, and complaining of the proceedings which had resulted in their being deprived of their Church property. A list was presented of congregations in similar circumstances. It was agreed that a committee with synodical powers should be appointed to watch such cases, and, if that were called for, to appoint a deputation to proceed to Edinburgh and attend the next General Assembly, or the meetings at any time of the Colonial Committees of the Church of Scotland. New Sea, besides the articles in Blaikie, Sketch of the Presbyterian Church throughout the World, p. 49 sq., the references at the end of the article Presbyterianism.

19. PRESBYTERIAN CHURCHES OF COLONIES OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE. — Besides the above in Canada, there are the following. In the account of these we oblige to follow the report of the late Pan-Presbyterian Council of Edinburgh, which we have largely used in the preceding details:

1. Australian Presbyterian Church. — In 1888, while this country was still ruled for political reasons, the Presbyterian denomination found its exponent in Victoria in the person of the Rev. Mr. Cow, a retired chaplain of a Highland regiment. In 1888 a missionary preacher
was sent by the Church of Scotland to Melbourne, and
soon others went over, and, until 1846, Presbyterianism
in this colony was wholly dependent on the Kirk. Af-
der discovery of gold in 1851, and the consequent
mass migration of the colony, the Irish Presbyterian
Church sent a number of ministers; and, by 1859, when
a union of the different Presbyterian churches was pro-
aposed, there were congregations representing the regular
Kirk, the Free Church, and the United Presbyterian,
besides many smaller bodies. A complete union of all
these various Presbyterians was finally effected in 1867
on the abolition of state aid.

The Presbyterian Church in Victoria has been formed
on the Scottish model. In all its distinctive principles
it remains loyal to the parent Church. While it has
accepted an independent position by the adoption of the
Westminster Confession and Catechisms, and the Second
Book of Discipline, as its standards. Some var-
rations have been admitted on administration. For
example—(1) The General Assembly is not a represent-
ative body. (2) The Commission, which meets six
months after the Assembly, deals not only with matters
sent to it, but with all matters of which due notice has
been given; but its decisions in these latter are subject
to review by the next General Assembly. (3) It has
no synods. (4) And no deacons’ courts. The secular
administration of the church by a minister’s or elders’
congregation, one half of whom retire every year. (5).
Adeherents as well as communicants are allowed to vote
for the first minister of a newly formed congregation.
(6) The use of hymns and of instrumental music has
been allowed, and congregations have almost without
exception, and with wonderful unanimity, availed
themselves of the allowance. The hymn-book of the
English Presbyterian Church has been sanctioned and
recommended. (7) Further, the Assembly has sanction-
ted a “Book of Prayers for Social Worship,” which
has been compiled with the view of assisting Christian
men in the bush to hold service where a minister is not
available.

The following statistics will give an approximate
view of the present numerical and financial state of the
Church:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presbyterian population</td>
<td>120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastoral charges</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministers settled in pastoral charges</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church buildings and new stations</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elders</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate members</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicants</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churches (beside halls and school-houses)</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sittings in churches</td>
<td>36,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabbath-schools</td>
<td>564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>5,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholars</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bible classes</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholars</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Income for all purposes, 1873–74

£250,000

Capital funds held in trust for various schemes £50,000

The schemes of the Church embrace two departments,
ministerial and missionary.

(1) Ministerial. In order to make suitable provision
for the ministry, the following funds have been estab-
lished—(a) A capital fund for the endowment and sup-
port of a theological hall, established in 1865, with
cars—Systematic Theology, Apologetics, Church His-
tory, and Exegetics—held provisionally by four min-
isters of the Church, and attended by fifteen students, of
whom five are studying with a view to mission work.
£200,000 will be required for the endowment of these
four chairs. £1,400,000 are now in the hands of the
Church, yielding an annual revenue of £200. Two
university scholarships of £500 and £1,000 respectively
have been founded for intending theological students,
and two theological scholarships of the same amount.
But the larger of these is not confined to Presbyterian
students. It is open to all denominations. The As-
sembly raises additional scholarships, when needed, by
subscription. (b) A sustentation fund, for the more
adequate support of the ministry, aims at securing a
minimum stipend of £100 to every minister. Congreg-
ations lodge their monies monthly in the post-
office savings bank. Their ministers draw the deposits
once a quarter, and keep it for the current year. The
balance that remains undrawn, if any, accrues to the
general sustentation fund, which is distributed among
ministers whose stipend falls short of the minimum,
with the proviso, however, that no congregation re-
ceives more than £50. Last year 88 out of 122 minis-
ters participated in the fund. The income received from
the following sources: Congregational subscrip-
tions, £866; donations of £100 each from eight gentle-
men, £200; small donations and legacy, £187; interest
from savings bank, £95, in all £2075. (c) A capital
fund, for the support of aged and infirm ministers; in-
s tituted not only in the interest of ministers, but as
empathically of congregations, to relieve them, in some
measure, at least, from a very painful burden, and to
insure their enjoying the ministrations of men in the
prime and vigor of life. It is raised by voluntary con-
tributions, and by a payment of £2, spread over five
years, from every minister. The allowance is £50 per
annum, with £2 for every year beyond five that the an-
nuitant has held a charge. (d) A fund for the support
of the widows and orphans of deceased ministers, raised
annually by subscription of a minister’s congregation,
is added to the general congregational collection. In 1876 these two sources of income yielded £990. Interest on capital, 10½ per cent; in all £2055. Annuities to twenty widows and twenty-
four orphans, £965. The annuity is £50, with £10 for
each child below eighteen. The latter is doubled when
both parents are dead. By these and respective spec-
cies provision is made for the ministry in its four states
—when training for work, when at work, when past
work, and when finally done with work.

(II.) Missionary.—Comprised under two branches—
home and foreign missions. The home mission is charged with—(1) securing a supply of ministers; (2)
admitting accredited ministers from other churches; (3)
assisting presbyteries in supplying vacancies; and (4)
fostering mission-stations. As the Church, in planting
herself in a new land, is essentially a home mission, and
as the demand for ministers has always been ahead of
the supply, little has been attempted outside its own
community. One or two of the larger congregations
have, however, been vigorously prosecuting, while others
are commencing territorial work at their own hand.
The committee is recommending a system of sending
missionaries from the home churches in the way of ministerial supply. But the need is by no means abated. At this moment at least twelve men are urgently required. (b) The
heathen mission embraces three departments: (1) The
Teachers. Many Chinese, of whom there are about 17,000 in Victoria. They are scattered in groups of two or three hundred
over the colony. They are generally of an inferior
type, but are very accessible to the teachings of the
Gospel, which are given them at various points by the
Christian churches. The Presbyterian Mission has
taken the form of a quarterly report of a semi-annual
Chinese catechists. It is conducted by one of the ministers of the Church, assisted by Mr. Cheong, a Chi-
nese student. (2) The Aborigines, now reduced to
about 1000. Charles Kingsley and others have put the
natives of Australia at the bottom of the scale of ra-
tional beings, "if indeed they are entitled to be called
men." It seemed as if they were likely to furnish a
link in the ascending development of humanity. The
Presbyterian Mission at Rossill has exploited this no-
tion. It is under the charge of two Missionaries, and
furnishes delightful proofs of the elevating influence of
Christianity even upon the most degraded savage,
while the children of the school have outrivaled all
their competitors in the State schools of Victoria. (3)
The New Hebrides, in conjunction with other churches
in Scotland, Canada, and New South Wales, Presby-
terian Church of Victoria maintains a contingent of two
missionaries on this interesting field. The children of the Sabbath-schools are pledged to collect £500 per annum for the maintenance of the Day-spring, missionaries. The total contributions to the home and Indian missions in 1875 amounted to £2230. The capital invested funds of the Church, Sept. 30, 1876, were as follows:

1. Theological Hall endowment ........................................ £14,290
2. Ormond and Patrick Hamilton scholarships .................. £2,000
3. The Cramond Missions ................................................ £3,000
4. Intra-Ministers' Fund .................................................. 8,368
5. Widows and Orphans' Fund ......................................... 16,768
6. Bible Fund (Home-mission) ........................................ 2,000
7. Loan Fund for church and manse building (be- ing the accumulation of five years' state aid) .................. 15,000
8. Free Church Loan ....................................................... 60,663

There are two colleges in connection with this Church—one for boys, under the principalship of Dr. Morison, which has run a long and prosperous career; the other for girls, under the charge of the Rev. George Tait, which was but recently opened.

2. Presbyterian Church of New South Wales.—In 1822 about a dozen Presbyterian families, living on the banks of the Hawkesbury River, resolved to meet for the worship of God according to the forms of their fathers, though they had no minister. A Mr. James Mein ministered to them as catechist. At a cost of £250 they built a church, which bore the appropriate name of Ebenezer. In 1828 Dr. Lang went to the colony, the first Presbyterian minister. Considerable additions were made thereafter, but the history of the Church was harmonious, and various divisions took place. At length, in 1865, a general union took place through the amalgamation of separate bodies corresponding to the Church of Scotland, the Free Church, and the United Presbyterian; the new body being called "The Presbyterian Church of New South Wales." According to the articles of union the Word of God is the supreme arbiter of the governing rule of faith and practice for the Church; the Westminster Confession of Faith, Larger and Shorter Catechisms, the Form of Presbytery Church Government, the Directory for the Public Worship of God, and the Second Book of Discipline, are the subordinate standards of this Church; explanations are then given as to the relative authority of the subordinate standards, the renunciation of intolerant principles, and the recognition of the spiritual independence of the Church; the jurisdiction of the Church is declared to be independent of other churches, and churches of the Free Presbyterian Church are admissible if they afford satisfactory evidence of their qualifications and eligibility, and on their subscribing the formula. The Church has prospered since the union, but not in proportion to the growth of the colony. It now consists of 7 presbyteries, 68 ministers, 70 charges, and 108 church-buildings. It has schemes for Church Extension, Foreign Missions, Sabbath-schools, Sustentation Fund, and Church and Manse Fund; its foreign missions are to the New Hebrides and the Chinese; it has three theological tutors, and its estimated total income for 1876 was £15,000. The minimum stipend is £200 with, or £250 without a manse. It is expected that £300 will now be reached through the Sustentation Fund. The legislature having passed an act for the establishment of denominational colleges affiliated to the University of Sydney, St. Andrew's Presbyterian College has sprung into existence. It affords a home for young men attending the university, and the means of theological education for students of divinity. The General Assembly has enacted that one of 1875 note but graciously shall be admitted as candidates for the office of the ministry.

3. Mission Work.—Three classes are recognised: the aborigines, the Polynesian tribes, and the Chinese in the gold-fields. The aborigines are so widely scattered that efforts among them have been chiefly desultory. A desire of the missionaries to work successfully among their countrymen at Sydney. The New Hebrides Mission has a share of support from this Church, which at one time supported the Rev. James D. Gordon, who, after returning to Eromanga, was murdered in 1872.

4. Presbyterian Church of Queensland.—In 1859 the District of Queensland was declared a separate Missionary Field, called Queensland. The first Presbyterian minister had arrived in 1847. In 1863 the separate congregations belonging to the different sections of Presbyterianism united as "The Presbyterian Church of Queensland." The basis of union was the Westminster Confession, and all the Presbyterian congregations in the colony were embraced. There are 8 presbyteries, 24 charges, and 20 ministers. The General Assembly meets the first Monday of May. There are committees for Sabbath-schools (2410 scholars), Home Mission and Church Extension, Sustentation, Training Young Men for the Ministry, and the Support of Aged and Orphaned Ministers. The Presbyterian population of the colony is 22,000. The annual contributions are about £9000.

5. Presbyterian Church of Tasmania.—The first Presbyterian minister arrived at Hobart Town in 1826. In 1828 the first church was built, the property of Van Diemen's Land, and the Scotch Church was placed on an equality with the English. In 1845 an attempt was made by the bishop of the English Church in Van Diemen's Land to obtain authority over all the inhabitants, but the Presbyterians succeeded in blocking this, and in getting a resolution limiting the power of the English bishop in these colonies to the superintendence of his own clergy. The Presbyterian Church has not been equally prosperous in this as in other colonies, and there is still a division in the ranks. The Presbytery of Tasmania and the Free Presbyterian Church of Tasmania indicate this division. There are 17 charges in all, and 18 ministers.

6. Presbyterian Church of South Australia.—The first Presbyterian Church began in Adelaide in 1859, and for some years ministers from the different Presbyterian bodies continued to drop in. In 1865 a union was effected. There are now 11 ministers and 13 charges. Union College is supplied by an independent professor of Church history; a Baptist, of the Greek Testament; and a Presbyterian, of theology.

7. New Zealand.—The Presbyterian Church in New Zealand was first planted here about the year 1840; at least the first minister went there then. The Church has made good progress, and has been geographically divided into The Presbyterian Church of New Zealand and The Free Church of Otago. In 1875 the Church in the northern section had 7 presbyteries, 57 ministers in charges, and 4 unattached. The Otago branch, founded in 1848 by a Free Church colony from Scotland, had 45 ministers, but in both sections there is a great demand for more. Besides the ministers there is a considerable number of evangelists who strive in some degree to make up for the want of a stated ministry. The New Zealand Churches present the same interesting spectacle as other young colonial churches, striving after an organization on the model of Scotland, and having committees and schemes organized for that purpose. Much has been done by the Presbyterian Church for general education, and the chair of moral philosophy in the University of Otago was endowed by them. The effort to obtain a well-educated ministry is conspicuous in its struggles, and in Otago a beginning has been made toward the establishment of a theological institute in one of which a professor of divinity and various tutors appointed. In other parts of the colony efforts have likewise been made to supply an educated ministry. But the difficulties in this direction have been great; many Presbyterians have labored successfully among the Chinese, the aborigines, and the Maoris, the work having been done by the churches at home. Much is done in the way of Sunday-schools. Young Men's Christian Assoc.
PRESERVATIONISM

Some congregations do little or nothing for missions; others are much interested in them.

The New Hebrides Mission receives a good share of help, and recently something has been attempted for Fiji. There are committees for Sustentation, Church Extension, etc., and similar objects in both sections of the Church, betting no small amount of activity and earnestness.

8. Presbyterian Church in South Africa.—When the Cape became an English colony in 1654, an application was made to the Church of Scotland for ministerial supply, and in 1659 and following years eleven ministers joined the Cape Church. In 1860 eight more Scotch ministers joined this Dutch Reformed body. There are, besides, nine Independent Presbyterian congregations in Cape Colony and Natal, numbering about 1000 members.

9. Other Colonial Churches.—In connection with the Church of Scotland, there are:

- In South America: 14 ministers
- In West Indies: 0 ministers
- In Ceylon: 0 ministers

Connected with the Free Church of Scotland are:

- In South Africa: 5 ministers
- In Natal: 4 ministers
- In other places: 9 ministers

10. Presbyterian Church in Japan.—This body was organized in 1874 by a union of all Presbyterian missions in Japan. For doctrine, the Westminster Catechism, the canons of the Synod of Dort, the Shorter Catechism, and the Heidelberg Catechism were adopted.

The constitution of the American Presbyterian Church was chosen as the model for administration.

See, besides the works already quoted in different sections of this article, Smith, Tables of Church History; Gardner, Faiths of the World, vol. ii; The American Cyclop. xiii, 809 sq.; Schenck, Cyclop. of Education, s. v.; Marble, Westminster, or Christian Churches and Sects, ii, 109 sq.; and Bleeker's Report, all of which have been freely used.

Presbyterianism, in its narrowest sense, is commonly understood as the synonym of Anti-Prelacy. But, in truth, there are three systems of religious opinion, by no means necessarily affiliated, which are, with a noticeable uniformity, found in combination under this name. These are, a Calvinistic theology, the Parity of the Clergy, and Pseudobaptism. See PRESERVATION CHURCHES. All branches of Presbyterianism organized themselves into a Presbyterian Alliance in London in 1875 on the bases of the London, Edinburgh, and Dublin Confessions and of the United Presbyterian government, and held the first council at Edinburg in 1877. The next will convene in Philadelphia in 1880.

I. Doctrines.—The doctrines espoused by Presbyterians, in Great Britain and America, are found in the Confession of Faith of the Westminster Assembly of Divines, together with the Catechisms, Larger and Shorter, thereto appended. As a system, they are the doctrines generally known as Augustinian or Calvinistic. Presbyterianism coincide with other orthodox bodies in the reception of the Apostles' Creed, the Trinity, Redemption through Christ, Regeneration by the Holy Spirit, the Resurrection, and Eternal Judgment. They are distinguished specially by opposition to Arminianism, Pelagianism, and semi-Pelagian tenets. The decisions of the Synod of Dort on the "five points" of Presbyterianism, Particular Atonement, Original Sin, Special Grace, and the Perseverance of the Saints, have usually been acknowledged as settling forth their views. But while there is a substantial unity on these points, there are shades of difference, from High or Hyper Calvinism to Moderate Calvinism; from Supralapsarianism to Sublapsarianism; from Hopkinstianism to Baptisterianism; from the unbending Covenanters to the laxer Cumberlands; from the strict Old School with Scottish predilections to the more flexible New School with New England leanings. Though consenting to be called Calvinistic for purposes of convenience, Presbyterians do not receive all Calvin's views without qualification; neither do they admit within their system to the Genevan re- former, for they claim for it a higher antiquity, reaching even beyond the great champion Augustine to no less ancient a figure than Melancthon, who, according to their view, was the author of the points named, as appears from the harmony of the Augsburg Confession, the Heidelberg Catechism, the Helvetic Confession, the Scotch Confession, the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, the French Confession prepared and fixed by the Thirty, and the Scotch Confession, and the Decrees of the Synod of Dort in 1618.

The Westminster Confession, rejecting the Aporcypa, recognizes Holy Scripture as the only infallible rule of faith and practice. Hence every position is supported by proof-texts. The Confession teaches that there are in the godhead three persons, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, the same in substance, equal in power and glory. To God are ascribed the works of creation, providence, and redemption. Man having fallen, the Covenant of Works is replaced by the Covenant of Grace, of which Christ is the Mediator, the head and administrator for his elect people. Divine sovereignty and man's free agency are both fully and equally admitted, without attempting to explain this high mystery, but rather requiring it to be handled with special providence and care. The doctrine of the Divine Providence, of Free Will, Predestination, or Foro-ordination, is guarded from fatalism or perversion in several ways: it is explicitly stated that neither is God the author or approver of sin; nor is violence offered to the will of the creature; nor is the liberty or contingency of second causes taken away, but rather established; and they who perish are punished for their sins. The Covenant of Works having been broken by the first man, who was the federal head, representative, and root of his race, a consequent corruption of nature, a disability of the will to spiritual good, and a liability to subjection to death, temporal and eternal, were conveyed to all his posterity. Effectual calling consists in the special grace of God operating on the minds and hearts of all those whom he has predestinated to eternal life, in the reception of which grace men are passive, yet submit most freely, being made willing by his power. Elect infants dying in infancy, and other elect persons who are incapable of the outward call, are nevertheless regenerated and saved by Christ through the Spirit, who worketh when, where, and how he pleaseth. That all infants dying in infancy come under the above circumstances through a dispensation of the grace of God is the ground of the belief of many Presbyterians, so far as can be collected from their published writings. (See Chalmers, Rom. lect. xxiv, xxvi, Cumming, Infant Sale, p. 25; Smyth, Bereaved Parents, p. 18; Junkin, Justification, pp. 148; Hodge, System of Theology [see Index].) Justification consists, not in inherent righteousness, nor in imputing the act of faith or any other act as righteousness, but in the pardon of sin for Christ's sake, and the accepting as right- eous by imputing the righteousness of Christ received by faith. Adoption and sanctification accompany justification. Salvation being the sovereign grace of God, is shown to be sincere and active by repentance and good works, as evidential of regenerating grace. The perseverance of the saints is not owing to anything in them, but to the grace of God, which will not suffer them finally to fall away. Personal assurance does not belong to the essence of faith, and may be dimmed or lost, but it is a high privilege, and every believer should strive to attain it. It does not lead to laxity of morals, for the law, though no longer a covenant of works, is still binding as a rule of life and conduct.

III. Worship.—The Presbyterian forms of worship are extremely simple. The reading of a portion of Scripture, extemporaneous prayers, the singing of two or three psalms or hymns, a sermon or exhortation, and the pronouncing of the apostolic benediction at the close by the minister, comprise the entire service.
When no preacher is present, the people conduct the meeting themselves, an elder presiding and directing the several parts of reading, prayer, and praise. Nothing can be simpler or more flexible, capable of adapting itself to the necessities of the missionaries; like a master of ceremonies, the Presbyterian preacher, as well as to the wants of the most cultivated audiences. But while the Presbyterian Church neither uses nor condems a liturgy, she provides for the dignity and propriety of divine service by means of a Directory for Public Worship as a guide, and by requiring ministers among them and as for this duty, no less than for that of preaching, by reading, presidemation, and habitual communion with God in secret.

Presbyterians keep the Sabbath-day strictly as a day of rest and devotion; but they have conscientious scruples against the obligatory observance of such days as Christmas, Good-Friday, and Easter. The key to their practice in this and other respects (as declining to bow at the name of Jesus, avoiding the sign of the cross in baptism and its form in church architecture, refusing sponsors and confirmation, not marrying with a ring, disowning clerical vestments, etc.) is to be found in the adoption by the early Presbyterians of the principle that nothing is allowable in divine worship but what is divinely commanded, in opposition to the principle that everything is allowable except what is forbidden by God and prohibited by divine warrant—baptism and the Lord's Supper. Dipping or immersion is not in so many words forbidden, but is pronounced not necessary, and the ordinance is considered to be rightly administered by pouring or sprinkling—purification, not burial. Hence the idea symbolized thereby. The infant children of one or both believing parents have a right to baptism in virtue of the Abrahamic covenant, which, being anterior to Moses, was unaffected and unrepealed by the abrogation of the Mosaic law. Baptism being regarded as a public Church ordinance, no excuse or fitness of the case or necessity, are discouraged. The Lord's Supper is only a commemoration with bread and wine, and the idea of a sacrifice or of the real presence is carefully repudiated. At the same time, the spiritual presence of Christ, his special nearness to worthy receivers, and a peculiar blessing are as strongly maintained. To avoid the appearance of adoration of the elements, as well as better to conform to the supposed original posture of the apostles, this sacrament is taken sitting, either in the adjacent pews or around long tables provided for the purpose. Under the closest inspection, honey tumblers, a sort of jorum, or vessel for liquid, are admitted as having on profession their faith in Christ been received into the membership of the Church by the session, or such other persons as are known to be in good Church standing elsewhere. During the field-preaching of the Scotch Presbyterians, and subsequently, several neighboring congregations often joined together to observe the communion. On such occasions there were several successive celebrations of the Supper, called the first, second, or third "table," and so on. A small pewter token bearing a certain number was given to each worshipper, sealed, and put into the care of the person at which his bearer was expected to communicate. Sentiment congregations thus came to employ the token in their own services. Latterly the token has been replaced by a card on which the communicant writes his name and address, keeping in this manner the pastor aware of his residence. This using of a card at the same time exhibits the Presbyterian opposition to open or indiscriminate communion, while the welcome given to members of other evangelical churches shows equally opposition to close communion, so that the doctrine of the Church is that of restricted communion as an exercise of a privilege to brethren of known Christian character.

III. Government. Presbyterianism is the government of elders, being derived from the Greek ἀρχιεπίσκοπος, presbyter, or elder. It is conceived to be analogous to that of the Hebrews, the Synagogue of the Greeks, the senatus of the Romans, the aldermen of the Anglo-Saxons, and, so, to be founded in the necessities, instincts, and common-sense of human nature as well as in Scripture itself. Presbyterians acknowledge no other head of the Church than Christ. Instead of giving to the pastor or to presbyterian the right different from and superior to presbyter, and maintaining a distinction of ranks among the ministers of religion, it holds, on the contrary, that both in Scripture and the constitution of the Primitive Church bishop and presbyter are of equal rights and that there is complete equality in point of office and power among those who preach and administer the sacraments, however they may differ in age, abilities, or requirements. The argument as between the Presbyterians and Episcopalian is treated in the articles Bishop and Presbyter, and as between the Presbyterians and Congregationalists, or Independents, in the articles Elder and Ordination.

According to the views of Presbyterians, there ought to be three classes of officers in every completely organized Church—viz. at least one teaching elder, the bishop or pastor, a body of ruling elders, and deacons. The first is designed to minister in word and doctrine and to dispense the sacraments, the second to assist in the inspection and government of the congregation, and the third to manage its financial affairs. They disallow all jurisdiction or interference on the part of the civil ruler in the Church, and yet do not allow of no less jealous of ecclesiastical encroachments, and boldly assert that synods and councils may err, and have erred; that all Church power is only ministerial and declarative; that no Church judicature has the right to make laws to bind the conscience by virtue of its own authority; that God alone is lord of the conscience; and that the right of private judgment is universal and inalienable. They maintain the purity of the clergy, and protest against prelacy or episcopacy, or the one-man power, as a usurpation finding no warrant in the New Testament writings, and of which none of them are nearest to their time. They less disapprove of the opposite extreme of Indepedency, or the complete autonomy of each separate congregation. They view the whole collection of believers as one body, constituting the universal or catholic Church (meaning by "catholic" not confined to one nation, as before under the law), though distributed into particular congregations for the purpose of meeting together more conveniently.

Though Presbyterian churches hold the doctrine of a parity of ministers, they have, when fully organized, a gradation of able assistants from the elders, deacons, and other officers in the church, and discipline, and the Presbyterian system is thus further distinguished from others by this ascending series of appellate courts. The first or lowest court is the Church Session, consisting of the pastor and ruling elders chosen for the purpose. In the next, several elders chosen by the church, and so on. These in some cases are chosen and ordained for life, although, either of their own motion or that of the people, they may resign and cease to be acting elders. The next court above is the Presbytery, which is the only ordaining body, meeting twice or oftener in the year, and consisting of all the ministers and elders of each church within a given district. The Synod, which meets but once a year, comprises a number of adjacent presbyteries (those within a state, for instance), and is composed of all the ministers, and one elder from each church session, within those bounds. (For the peculiar authority and character of the synods in the state establishments of the Continent, see the article Synod.) The General Assembly, which meets annually, is the fourth and highest court in order, and embraces all the presbyteries in the connection. It is entirely a delegates body, in which an equal representation of elders or ministers and ruling elders elected by the presbyteries to represent them, the ratio being determined by the size of the body, and care being taken to prevent its becoming unwieldy. Each superior court or judicature has the constitutional right of reviewing, in the case of its own, the doings and decisions of the court below. A moored
question or a judicial case may thus be removed successively from one court to another, till the collective wisdom of the whole Church, represented in the court of final resort, free from local prejudices or partialities, has an opportunity of deciding upon it. The General Assembly, through its councils, directories, committees, or committees, a general jurisdiction over the common finances, theological seminaries, foreign and domestic missions, education for the ministry, publication, church building, and correspondence with foreign churches.

It only remains to add that though Presbyterians maintain that truth is in order to goodness, and are fantastic of what they understand to be the teaching of Scripture, they are, at the same time, neither bigoted nor exclusive, and to represent them as such they consider unfair in the extreme. They do not unchurch other denominations, but are ready to extend the hand of fellowship wherever they discern substantial truth and the image of Christ. Their standards explicitly say, "We embrace in the spirit of charity those Christians who differ from us, in opinion or practice, on these subjects. . . . There are truths and forms with respect to which men of good character and principles may differ; and in all these they think it the duty, both of private Christians and societies, to exercise mutual forbearance towards each other." (Form of Gov., bk. i., ch. i., p. 8.) See Hagenbach, Hist. of the Ref. Conf. (1877); Lewis, Presb. Manual, containing Forms for the Records of the Session Presbytery and Synod, and the Judicial and other Ecclesiastical Proceedings required by the Policy of the Presb. Church; and the Theod. Index. See also the Indexes of the Westminster Assembly; Hist, of Confessions; Miller, on Presbyterianism; Smyth, Works and Tracts on Presbyterianism; Schaff, History of the Reformed Churches, vol. iii.; and the Theod. Index. (E. H. 47.)

Presbyterians, as derived from the peculiar Church government which is advocated (see Presbyter and Presbyterianism), designates a large body of Protestant Christians not bound together in one large denomination, but associated in independent churches. As, however, the term Congregationalist embraces not merely the denomination which assumes that title, but also those whose principles of government are the same though their doctrines may be diverse, as the Baptists, the Christians or Campbellites, the Unitarians, etc., so the Presbyterian has been extended to all those who accept the Presbyterian principles of government, even though there be some differences in their theological beliefs. All Presbyterian or Reformed churches may in general be said to be divided into three classes—those who hold to government by or through bishops, i.e. to an Episcopal government; those who hold to government directly by the members of the Church without the mediation of any representatives, i.e. to a Congregational or Independent form of government; and those who hold to government by a board of elders or presbyters, i.e. to a Presbyterian form of government. Presbyterianism, variously modified, is the form of Church government observed by many Presbyterian churches, but is most perfectly developed in Britain and America. In Britain it prevails chiefly in Scotland, although during the Commonwealth in the 17th century it was for a very short time in the ascendant in England also. In the "General Presbyterian Council" held at Edinburgh in July, 1677, the German state establishments and the French and Dutch Reformed churches, as well as other bodies that admit of certain features of Presbyterianism in government, were represented; and in 1846, a Report on Presbyterian Churches, which was submitted and approved by the Pan-Presbyterian Council at Edinburgh, treats of all these churches as Presbyterian bodies. In most, if not all of these churches, while there is a consociational system that connects them with the state, giving the latter considerable control, there is also a true Presbyterian and synodal constitution. In virtue of the former, these churches have in some cases a general oversight of all matters affecting the moral and religious well-being of the community, and in the exercise of the latter they deal more especially with spiritual and moral matters. These churches are not all affiliated or advocated by the Scottish Reformers, and still exhibited to some extent by the presence in the General Assembly of the Scottish Established Church of a representative of the sovereign called the lord high commissioner, authorized to bring its sessions at any time to a close should the proceedings conflict with the royal prerogatives—by the presence as members of the Assembly not only of elders chosen by the churches, but of elders appointed to be there by the town councils of such places as are possessed of royal charters, and hence called royal burgesses, and by the wide range of social as well as of religious questions that it considers. In Presbyterian churches not connected with the state, whether in Great Britain, on the continent of Europe, in this country or elsewhere, the jurisdiction being over only their own members and civil representatives unknown, the discussions are confined to matters directly affecting the interests of religion, and a more purely spiritual type of Presbyterianism in consequence prevails. See the articles Belgium; Bohemia; France; Holland; Hungary; Italy; Prussia; Russia; Spain; Sweden; and Schaff, History of the Reformed Church. The system is more nearly Presbyterian than the German, and is not perfectly so only from the pressure of the civil power. In other churches, also, as well as in the Protestant Church of France, Presbyterianism is more or less modified by the relations of the Church to the State. See Reformed Churches.

The Presbyterians are for the most part Calvinistic in doctrine. They generally accept the Westminster Assembly's Confession of Faith as their symbol of belief, and every minister in the Presbyterian Church of the United States is required to declare his personal belief in it as an embodiment of the truths taught in the Scriptures. They do not agree, however, in their interpretation of that standard, and are divided into strict Calvinists and modernist Calvinists. See Calvinsim. This division in sentiment, combined with other circumstances, divided the Presbyterian Church of the United States into two bodies for a time, as we have already seen; but the division has been healed and a reunion effected, the theological differences having slanted. See Paxson, History of Presbyterianism. See also the Index. The Church in America not Calvinistic is the Cumberland Presbyterian. There was at one time, however, a serious defection in England, many of the churches becoming Socinian in doctrine; but the Unitarian churches in England at this day are nearly all Congregational in their polity. Calvin is generally regarded as the founder of Presbyterianism; but it should be borne in mind that government by a board of elders was maintained by certain bodies, as the Waldensians, from a very early date. Of course, we are ready to grant that he adopted the form, combined with other circumstances, which he believed to be "founded on and agreeable to the Word of God." Calvin may be regarded as the founder of Presbyterianism in the sense that he was the first to organize the Reformed Church on a Presbyterian model, just as he was the first to frame the Reformed faith of Southern Europe in a clear, distinct, and affirmative form. Says Blaikie: "It is not correct to say that Calvin originated the Presbyterian system. But in connection with it he rendered very essential service both in theory and in practice; he unfolded the idea more distinctly than any person before him, and the struggle he set it in actual operation in Geneva. What he thus established became the model on which the Reformed Church in France and other countries was formed." (Report, p. 7.)

The tables on the following page are from Blaikie's Report.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</th>
<th>Japan Presbyterian Church, Ch. of Scotland</th>
<th>Presbyterian Church, Ch. of Scotland</th>
<th>Irish Presbyterian Church</th>
<th>Chinese Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</th>
<th>Chinese Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</th>
<th>Chinese Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</th>
<th>Irish Presbyterian Church</th>
<th>Semi-Presbyterian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church</td>
<td>United Presbyterian Church of Scotland</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chinese Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chinese Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Irish Presbyterian Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church</td>
<td>United Presbyterian Church of Scotland</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chinese Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chinese Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Irish Presbyterian Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church</td>
<td>United Presbyterian Church of Scotland</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chinese Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chinese Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Irish Presbyterian Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church</td>
<td>United Presbyterian Church of Scotland</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chinese Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chinese Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Irish Presbyterian Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church</td>
<td>United Presbyterian Church of Scotland</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chinese Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chinese Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Irish Presbyterian Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>Established Church</td>
<td>United Presbyterian Church of Scotland</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chinese Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chinese Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Irish Presbyterian Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>Free Church</td>
<td>United Presbyterian Church of Scotland</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chinese Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chinese Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Irish Presbyterian Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Established Church</td>
<td>United Presbyterian Church of Scotland</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chinese Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chinese Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Irish Presbyterian Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>Free Church</td>
<td>United Presbyterian Church of Scotland</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chinese Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chinese Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Irish Presbyterian Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Free Church</td>
<td>United Presbyterian Church of Scotland</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chinese Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chinese Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Irish Presbyterian Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>Established Church</td>
<td>United Presbyterian Church of Scotland</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chinese Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chinese Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Irish Presbyterian Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>Free Church</td>
<td>United Presbyterian Church of Scotland</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chinese Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chinese Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Irish Presbyterian Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Free Church</td>
<td>United Presbyterian Church of Scotland</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chinese Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chinese Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Irish Presbyterian Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>Established Church</td>
<td>United Presbyterian Church of Scotland</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chinese Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chinese Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Irish Presbyterian Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>Free Church</td>
<td>United Presbyterian Church of Scotland</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chinese Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chinese Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Irish Presbyterian Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Free Church</td>
<td>United Presbyterian Church of Scotland</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chinese Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chinese Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Irish Presbyterian Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>Established Church</td>
<td>United Presbyterian Church of Scotland</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chinese Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chinese Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Irish Presbyterian Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>Free Church</td>
<td>United Presbyterian Church of Scotland</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chinese Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chinese Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Irish Presbyterian Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Free Church</td>
<td>United Presbyterian Church of Scotland</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chinese Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chinese Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Irish Presbyterian Church</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MISSION CHURCHES.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Mission</th>
<th>Church</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persia</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church (U.S.)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PRESBYTERIUM

PRESBYTERIUM

(1) A name sometimes given to the bishops, or in a portion of an ancient document, because it was the place in which the presbyters sat and discharged their functions. See CHANCEL.

(2) The name also of the senate formed by the presbyters and deacons of the episcopal residence, with whom the bishop deliberated about the most important affairs of his diocese. Although the government of the Church was claimed by the episcopate, as inherited from the apostolate, yet the spirit of community, koinonia, which prevailed in the Church required that the bishop, when important business was to be transacted, should take the advice of the presbyters and deacons. The limits of the respective attributes, however distinctly they might be traced, were neglected where the common care of the interests of the Church made it desirable, and the superiority of the episcopal dignity stood the less in the way, as even the apostles, in their humility, had called themselves presbyters (1 Pet. v. 1, διδασκάλους; 2 John 1; 3 John 1, ὁ πρεσβύτερος). Irenæus gives the name of presbyters not only to the disciples of the apostles (Papias, in Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. v. 29); but also to the bishops of his time (Iren. Ep. ad Phil. v. 17, in Euseb. v. 20): ταύτα δὲ διάγνησιν οἱ πρεσβύτεροι, οἱ Παπίαντες τὰς λαθέσεις τῶν αὐθηναίων ἄνεγκριτον καὶ παράδειγμα πρεσβύτερος. Hence, it is clear that the presbyterate was a part of the higher clergy, as is proved by the phrase βοηθεία ἐκκλησίας θεοῦ, by which Origen (cf. Origen, Adv. Cels. i. 10) designates the presbyterate. In a sense, all the people constituted the presbyters and deacons of the archiepiscopal city formed in the first five centuries the higher clergy, which, with its bishops, was considered as one body, as Thaumaturgus, Vetus et Nova Ecclesiae Disciplinae (Mogunt. 1797), iii. 82: Ἐργο πρεσβυτερίου diaconique civilium episcopaliun, quae est superior dioecescum — in unum corpus, in unum senatum constitutioneque cum episcopo collatis, cum omne principio et capite suoe, clericis populosque diocesii omnibus moderabantur. As this presbyterate forms the council of the bishop, it is said to be associated with the bishop along with the bishop. Thus, in the Council of Antioch, can. 1: "Si quis sacerdos, qui praebet ecclesiam, aut episcopus, aut presbyter, aut diaconus, si cum pontifici, haud propriis ministeris, aut aliis ecclesiasticis ordinibus laudati habeat, sed cum sacerdotibus, episcopis, et presbyteribus, et diaconis, et omni ecclesiasticis concilii communitate etiam in ecclesia imperiti," and consequently to the governing clergy. In the ecumenical Council of Ephesus, pt. i. c. 31, 84, and act i, we find several letters of the bishop Cyril of Alexandria, addressed to the presbyters and deacons, and to the people of Alexandria. When Theodosius I consecrated the heresy of Jovinian, he took the advice of his priests and deacons: "Fatto ergo presbyteri consilium Christiane legi esse contraria. Omnium nostrorum, tam presbyterorum quam diaconorum, quam etiam totius ecclesiae, et aliquarum clericarum una suscipta fuit sententia." Pope Felix proclaims his sentence against Petrus Enotheus, the unlawful bishop of Antioch, under the formula: "Firma sit hanc sua deposicio a me et ab his, qui mecum apostolicum dictum nuntium regunt." The presbyters and deacons of Rome deliberated in the Roman synods with the bishops who happened to be at Rome on all matters which were of interest to the Roman see. In a Roman council under pope Hilary, the transmutation of a Spanish bishop being in question, the account says: "Residuit etiam universa presbyteratus, adstantibus quoque concilio," and at the end of the council: "Ab episcopis universalibus et presbyteris acclamatum est, ut disciplina servetur, ut canones custodiantur, rogamin." The college of the cardinals is by the Romanists claimed to be a true picture of these presbyters of the apostolic Church. If in the experience of the Church in general the advice of the presbyters was requested, this was still more natural where the special business of the several bishoprics was concerned. The fourth Council of Carthage prescribes, can. 22: "Ut episcopus autiam in quocumque concilio suorum clericos non ordinaret," and in can. 23: "Ut episcopus autiam in quocumque concilio suorum audiat abeque presentia clericorum suorum." Alioqui
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irrita eit sententia episcopi, niai clerorum suorum majorum sententia confirmitur." St. Jerome says (In Ps. 1, 8): "Et nos sanctos Patres ad Petrum presbyterorum;" and Basil, Ep. 310, calls this senate του πρεσβυτηρίου το ν η την πωλει. St. Cyprian transacted no business of any consequence without consulting his presbytery. In the matter of the fallen ones, in the imitation of the only one constillobus cum episcope, presbyteria, diaconias, confessoriebus pariter astantibus laicis factis, laicorum tractare ratioem. In lib. iii, ep. 10: "Ad id vero, quod scripturam compresbyteri nostri, solus rescribere nihil potuit, cum a primordio episcopatis mei statutum, nihil sine consilio vestro. Qui enim in plebe res publicae partes in suis factis sententiae gerere. St. Ignatius (Ep. ad Trallianos) calls the presbyters the counsellors of the bishop: συμβουλη η αν ιν η των επιστροφων ς ς των συνεδριων των απόστολων. The difference between the presbyteries and the cathedral chapters, which were of later institution, is thus defined by Theodossin (c. 1, p. 36, nr. 8 sq.): "1. Non constat clericus ille nasi presbyteria et diaconia. 2. Presbyteri et diaconi hi, parochii ipse erant et pastores omniun civitatis ecclesiastici, aut si neodium essent divulgis a cathedrali parochii, in eo ipsi parochii, pleno potestate tribui. 3. Sacram omissae conversionis hunc gradum et hunc dignitatem consequentur. Nam presbyteratus et diaconatus per se episcopatus beneficia erant, non ordinum tantum; et id genus erant beneficia, quibus Incumbent salutis animarum cura, pro sua manu, a Christo mediante ministeriis ecclesiasticis formam pro se fert splendidissimam expressissimamque eunies cleri, qui olim singula in cathedralibus ecclesiis episcopo copulabatur. Constat enim pontificis clericis presbyteris, diaconisque cardinalibus, seu titularibus, ecclesiis omniun Romae parochialibus, parochiis, cum pontificis, et sub pontifici conscriptis et collaborantibus Romano in consistorio, de negotiis omnibus, que ex pontificii spiritualis ditiione, ex universal, inquam, Christiano orbe referuntur." A consequence of the participation of the presbyters in the administration during the lifetime of the bishop was that they governed alone during the vacancy of the see. After the death of pope Fabian, the clergy of Rome wrote to the clergy of Carthage (Ep. 29 ap. Cypri): "Omnes nos decret, pro corpore totius ecclesiae, suæ per varias quasque provincias membra digesta sunt, excubare." Only the decisions about the most momentous concerns were postponed till after the new occupancy of the see. Thus the clergy of Rome say (Ep. 81): "Quanquam nobis differente bus rei majoris natura necinbat, quibus post excessum Fabiani nullus est episcopus proprius rerum." And St. Cyprian (Ep. 10) says to his presbyters and deacons: "Hortor et mane, ut vos vos mutue, quern obsero operet, fungaminii circa ea gerenda quas administratio religiosa deposcit." And lib. ivr, ep. 6: "Officium meum diligentia vestra presentet, et faciat omnia, quae fieri operet circa eos." Thus St. Hilarius, in his petition to the emperor Constantius, states that he has administered his diocese through his presbyters: "Licet in exilio permans et ecclesiae adiacun communionem per presbyteros meos distribuens." But at an early period the bishops commenced to appoint vicars for the despatch of all their business at the time of their absence. Their authority over the other members of the clergy was increased with the secularization of the church. St. Eusebius of Vercelli and St. Augustine, to promote Christian life in their presbyters, had already given them monastic constitutions. Other cathedral churches imitated this arrangement; and in the empire of the Franks the institution of canons life, after the model of the institutions founded by bishop Ouen of Mesc, was rapidly extended. In consequence of the confirmation of the rule proposed by the descom Amalarius at the Council of Aix-la-Chapelle (816), the innovation was accepted in all episcopal churches. The bishops of those times, in the absence of the pope, relied on the advice and importance without their canons. We have an example of it in the business transacted concerning the lease of some real estate between Hincmar of Rheims and a Thuringian abbot. But if the cathedral chapter was the privileged part of the clergy in this respect, yet the bishop was not, in fact, independent of the other members both of the secular and regular clergy. Thus bishop Jonas of Autun, who wished to raise the income of his canons, insured the "consensus presbyterorum, diaconorum, ac totius sequentia ordinis ejusdem ecclesiae." When, in the 10th century, the canonic common life was given up, the canons continued to form the senate of the bishop. According to the decretales, the canons are the born counsellors of the bishops. Calixtus II forbids archpriests and archdeacons to interdict clerics: "Proter episcopos et totius capituli canonicos." Alexander III binds them to administer the patriarchal Jerusalem for appointing and deposing abbots and other prebendaries without consulting his chapter, and upon the mere advice of foreigners. Yet, as a rule, the bishop is not bound by the vote of the chapter, although there are exceptions. The Holy Council of Trent also, in sess. xxiv, c. 13, calls the cathedral chapter the senate of the bishop. He has to take its advice for the appointment of a lector of the Holy Scriptures (Conc. Trid. sess. v, c. 1); for the fixing of the holy orders, to be requested in those who are to be promoted to the dignities and canons of the cathedral (sess. xxiv, c. 12); for the establishment of seminaries (sess. xxiii, c. 18); for any addition to the number of the canons (sess. xxiv, c. 15). But the presumption is always in favor of the episcopal independence. Thus, when the chapters of the ecclesiastical province of Milan endeavored to increase to an unlawful extent the number of the cause majora, in which the bishop has to obtain the consent or take the advice of the canons, St. Bonomus declared, in the fourth Council of Milan, that the bishop was bound to have the approbation or to take the advice of his chapter only in such cases as are stated by law. The litigations about these cases had become of quite frequent occurrence since the dissolution of the community of goods in the chapters, and the latter had consequently reduced their rights as to regard to the bishop as independent corporations. In many places the bishop had become a simple member of the chapter. Up to the year 1808 the chapters of Germany held the same time two sharply defined positions: they constituted, first, as of old, the senate of the bishop, and subordinated to him; and, secondly, they were independent corporations. The secularization of 1803 deprived this latter position. The reorganization of the Church in Germany makes the chapter simply an episcopal council. The papal see has resolutely fought against all pretensions to binding the bishop to the consent of the chapter.

Presbytery is (1) the place in the choir of a church in which the bishop is placed; the name is sometimes extended to the whole choir. See CHANCEL. It is (2), in Scotch law, an ecclesiastical division of the country, as well as a court. (On the Continent this is known as the classic.) In its local sense it includes a bishopric, with its cathedral city and the coadjutor bishopric, and the general assembly of the Church of Scotland has power to vary the size. — Chambers, a. v. See SCOTLAND, CHURCH OF. The presbytery is composed of the teaching elders of the churches of a given geographical.
Presbytis

Prescience (presbytis). This word, in the various forms presbytis, presbytera, presbyterian, is of frequent occurrence in ancient writers, and denotes either the wife of a presbyter or a deaconess in the Church. Sometimes it denotes the matron of a cloister, and an abbess. See Deaconess.

Prescience (Lat. praecipio, to know before it happens) is an attribute of God popularly known under the term Foreknowledge, and ascribed to him in different degrees and extent by Arminians and Calvinists. The doctrine is deduced from the perfection of God's nature. But it must be noted that analogical figurative expressions, if they are possible, and not impossible, for us to conceive of God's prescience. Man's knowledge of what is future is so obscure and inferential that it is in vain to fathom God's beholding of all things. Yet in the attempt made there arises the great question, how to reconcile the prescience of God with the liberty of man; and hence the doctrine becomes of vast importance to theologians of both the Arminian and the Calvinian schools.

1. False Theories. Three leading theories have been resorted to in order to evade the difficulties which are supposed to be involved in the opinion commonly received.

1. Chevalier Ramsey (Philosophical Principles of Natural and Revealed Religion (Glasiog, 1748, 2 vols. 4to)), among his other speculations, holds it a matter of choice in God to think of finite ideas, and similar opinions, which have been accepted, whether true or false. In substance these opinions are, that though the knowledge of God be infinite as his power is infinite, there is no more reason to conclude that his knowledge should be always exerted to the full extent of its capacity, than his will is to the development of his omnipotence; and that if we suppose him to choose not to know some contingencies, the infiniteness of his knowledge is not thereby impugned. To this it may be answered (1) that the infinite power of God is in Scripture represented, as in the nature of things it must be, as an infinite capacity, and not as infinite in act; but that the knowledge of God is never represented to us as a capacity to acquire knowledge, but as actually comprehending all things that are and all things that can be. (2) That the notion of God's choosing to know some things and not to know others supposes a reason why he refuses to know any class of things or events, which reason, it would seem, can only arise out of their nature and circumstances, and therefore supposes at least a partial knowledge of them, from which the reason for his not choosing to know them arises. The doctrine is therefore somewhat contradictory. But (3) it is fatal to this opinion that it does not at all meet the difficulty arising out of the question of the consistency of divine prescience and the free actions of men, since some contingent actions—for which men have been made accountable, we are sure—have been foreknown by him as the cause by his Spirit in the prophets they were foretold; and if the freedom of man can in these cases be reconciled with the prescience of God, there is no greater difficulty in any other case which can possibly occur.

2. A second is this: the church states that contingent events being in its own nature impossible, because it implies a contradiction, it does no dishonor to the divine Being to affirm that of such events he has, and can have, no prescience whatever, and thus the prescience of God as to moral actions being wholly denied, the difficulty in question is got rid of. To this the same answer must be given as to the former. It does not meet the case so long as the Scriptures are allowed to contain prophecies of rewardable and punishable actions. The great fallacy in the argument that the certain prescience of a moral action destroys its contingent nature lies in supposing that contingency and certainty are the opposites of each other. It is, perhaps, unfortunate that a word which is of figurative etymology, and which, consequently, can only have an ideal application to such subjects, should have grown into common use in this discussion, because it is more liable, on that account, to present itself to different minds under different shades of meaning. If, however, the term contingent in this controversy has any definite meaning at all, as applied to the moral actions of men, it must mean freedom, and stand in the same relation to certainty, but to necessity. A free action is a voluntary one; and an action which results from the choice of the agent is distinguished from a necessary one in this, that it might not have been, or have been otherwise, according to the self-determining power of the agent. It is with reference to the particular occasion that the term contingency is used: it might have been otherwise—in other words, it was not necessitated. Contingency in moral actions is, therefore, their freedom, and is opposed, not to certainty, but to constraint. The very nature of the term presupposes freedom; and this is precisely the meaning of the term. The question is not, in point of fact, about the certainty of moral actions—that is, whether they will happen or not—but about the nature of them, whether free or constrained, whether they must happen or not. Those who agree that the care not about the certainty of actions simply considered, that is, whether they will take place or not: the reason why they object to a certain prescience of moral actions is this: they conclude that such a prescience renders them necessary. It is the quality of the action for which they conclude, not that they will not. If contingency meant uncertainty, the sense in which such theorists take it, the dispute would be at an end. But though an uncertain action cannot be foreseen as certain, a free, unceesitated action may, for there is nothing in its nature that should in any way affect its nature. Simple knowledge is in no sense a cause of action; nor can it be conceived to be causal, un-
connected with exerted power: for mere knowledge, therefore, an action remains free or necessitated, as the case may be. A necessitated action is not made a voluntary one by its being foreknown: a free action is not made a necessitated action by being foreknown: it will no longer be free, therefore, cease to be contingent. But how stands the case as to their certainty? Precisely on the same ground. The certainty of a necessary action foreknown does not result from the knowledge of the action, but from the operation of the necessitating cause, and, in like manner, the certainty of a free action does not result from the knowledge of it, which is no cause at all, but from the voluntary cause—that is, the determination of the will. It alters not the case in the least to say that the voluntary action might have been otherwise. Had it been otherwise, the knowledge of it would have been otherwise; but as the will which gives birth to the action is not dependent upon the previous knowledge of God, but the knowledge of the action upon foresight of the choice of the will, neither the will nor the act is controlled by the knowledge, and the action, though foreseen, is still free or contingent. The foreknowledge of God has then no influence upon either the freedom or the certainty of actions, for this plain reason, that it is knowledge, and not influence; and actions may be certainly foreknown without their being rendered necessary by that knowledge. But if it is said, "But the result of an absolute contingency be certainly foreknown, it can have no other result, it can happen otherwise." This is not the true inference. It will not happen otherwise; but it may be asked, Why can it not happen otherwise? Can an expression of potentiality—it denotes power or possibility. The objection is that it is not possible that the action should otherwise happen. But why not? What deprives it of that power? If a necessary action were in question, it could not otherwise happen than as the necessitating cause should make it so. And if it is said, if God, in order to prevent the necessitating cause solely, and not from the prescience of the action, which is not causal. But if the action be free, and it enters into the very nature of a voluntary action to be unconstrained, then it might have happened in a thousand other ways, or not have happened at all; the foreknowledge of it no more affects its nature in this case than in the other. All its potentiality, so to speak, still remains, independent of foreknowledge, which neither adds to its power of happening otherwise nor diminishes it. But then we are told that the prescience of it is not the cause, that it happens of itself. But anyone can prove that the divine prescience is unable to dart through all the workings of the human mind, all its comparison of things in the judgment, all the influences of motives on the affections, all the hesitations and halting of the will; it is final cause; such knowledge is too wonderful for us, but it is the knowledge of him "who understandeth the thoughts of man afar off." "But if a contingency will have a given result, to that result it must be determined." Not in the least. We have seen that it cannot be determined to a given result by mere recognition, for we have evidence in our own minds that mere knowledge is not causal to the actions of another. It is determined to its result by the will of the agent; but even in that case it cannot be said that it must be determined to that result, because it is of the nature of freedom to be unconstrained: so that here we have an instance in the case of a free agent that he will act in some particular manner, but it by no means follows from what will be, whether foreseen or not, that it must be.

3. The theory amounts, in brief, to this: that the foreknowledge of God must be supposed to differ so much from anything of the kind which we perceive in ourselves, and from any ideas which we can possibly form of that property of the divine nature, that no argument respecting it can be grounded upon our imperfect knowledge of things; for if we take any subject connected with it is idle and fruitless. But though foreknowledge in God should be admitted to be something of a "very different nature" from the same quality in man, yet as it is represented as something equivalent to foreknowledge, whatever that something may be, since it is a kind of shadow, as a "map of China is to China itself," remains in full force. The difficulty is shifted, but not removed.

II. Extent of Prescience.—It may, therefore, be certainly concluded, if, at least, the Holy Scriptures are to be our guide, that the omniscience of God comprehends his certain prescience of all events, however contingent: and if anything more were necessary to strengthen the argument above given, it might be drawn from the irrational, and, above all, the unscriptural consequences which would follow from the denial of this doctrine. These are forcibly stated by President Edwards: "It would follow from this notion (namely, that his mighty doth not foreknow what will be the result of future contingencies) that as God is liable to be continually repenting what he has done, so he must be exposed to be constantly changing his mind and intentions as to the events which are to happen in the world; relinquishing his old designs, and forming new schemes and projects. For his purposes, even as to the main parts of the scheme (namely, such as belong to the state of his moral kingdom), must be always liable to be broken through want of foresight, and he must be continually putting his system to rights, as it gets out of order, through the contiguity of the actions of moral agents: he must be a Being who, instead of being absolutely immutable, must necessarily be the subject of infinitely the most numerous acts of repentance and changes of mind which are to happen in the world, and for this reason, that his vastly extensive charge comprehends an infinitely greater number of those things which are to him contingent and uncertain. In such a situation he must have little else to do but to mend broken links as well as he can, and be rectifying his disjointed frame and disordered movements in the best manner the case will allow. The supreme Lord of all things must needs be under great and miserable disadvantages in governing the world which he has made and has the care of, through his being utterly unable to find out things of which he is the chief inventor, and act, in your phrase, which, if he did but know, he might make reasonable provision for. In many cases there may be very great necessity that he should make provisions in the manner of his ordering and disposing things for some great events which are to happen in the world, and endless consequences to the universe, which he may see afterwards, when it is too late, and may wish in vain that he had known beforehand, that he might have ordered his affairs accordingly. And it is in the power of man, on these principles, by his devices, purposes, and actions, to dispose of himself and all his measures, make him continually to change his mind, subject him to vexation, and bring him into confusion."

III. Speculations on the Subject.—Some of the ancient philosophers denied that God could foreknow events depending on free will (see Cicero, De Diut. et vol. 4, 5; answered by Augustine, De Civitate Dei, v. 9, 10). Socinian (Proœct. Theol. c. 8-11) and his early followers would not allow that God possesses any knowledge of future contingencies. The schoolmen, in reference to this species of knowledge in God, invented the word "scientia memo" (see also Foxe, Acta Molitor, Mme), which they define as "that by which God knows, and condition, of men or angels will do according to the liberty which they have when they are placed in these or those circumstances, or in this or that order of things." It was said that these comments found that his opinion concerning the object of reprobes.
tion was dogged with this absurdity—that it made God to be the author of Adam’s sin—he very astutely took refuge in this conditional foreknowledge, and in his corrected theses on predestination, published after the death of Arminius, he describes it as “that by which God, through the infinite light of his own knowledge, foreknows in every event what is to come, and not what is to be placed under a certain condition.” Walaeus, the celebrated antagonist of Episcopius, had recourse to the same expedient. This distinction has been adopted by very few of those who espouse the doctrines of general redemption, and to show that every event is conclusive as to the creature, he adduces an argument with respect to God, certainly foreknown. An old English divine thinks that “in the sacred Scriptures certain not obscure vestiges are apparent of this kind of knowledge of things that will happen thus or otherwise, on the supposition of the occurrence of this or that circumstance. Omitting the well-known example of David in Keilah (1 Sam. xxiv, 12), and of Chorazin and Bethsaida (Matt. xi, 21; Luke x, 13), consult, among other sayings of the same description, Christ’s answer to the chief priests and scribes who asked him, ‘Tell us, and he said unto them, ‘If I tell you, ye will not believe.’ In the subsequent verse he adds, ‘If I also ask you, ye will not answer me, nor let me go’ (Luke xxii, 67, 68). You have here three events specified which yet will not occur even on the supposition of Christ our Lord—His own death, the resurrection of his apostles and others—and yet all these will be included in that of scientia visionis, because the latter ought to include, not what God will do and what his creatures will do under his appointment, but what they will do by his permission as free agents, and what he will do, as a consequence of this, in his character of Governor and Lord. But since the presedentarians had confounded scientia visionis with a predestination decree, the scientia media well expressed what they had left quite unaccounted for, and which they had assumed did not really exist—the actions of creatures endowed with free will and the acts of Deity which from eternity were consequent upon them. If such actions do not take place, then men are not free; and if the rectorial acts of God are not consequent upon the actions of the creature in the order of the divine intention, and the endowments of the creature is consequent upon the foreordained rectorial acts of God, then we reach a necessitating eternal decree, which, in fact, the predesentarian contends for; but it unfortunately brings after it consequences which no subtleties have ever been able to shake off—that the only actor in the universe is God himself, and that the only distinction that exists is that one class is brought to pass by God directly and the other indirectly, not by the agency, but by the mere instrumentality of his creatures.—Watson. See also Watson, Theol. Institutes, i, 672; ii, 507, 429; Works, vii, 298, 300; Pope, Compendium of Christian Theology (London 1875), p. 145–149, 191 sqq.; Raynond, Systematic Theology (see Index in vol. ii); Knapp, Theology, § 22; Fletcher, Works; Presbyterian Confession; Church Remembrances (Jan. 1856); Bulletin Theol. (Oct. 1868), pp. 26 sq.; Hodges, System of Theology; Clarke, Dyer Lectures for 1703; King, Sermons on the Divine Providence; Tillotson, Sermons; Waterland, Works, vol. vi; Haag, Histoire des Dogmes (see Index in vol. ii); Graves, Works, vol. iv; Bib. Sacra, July, 1868, p. 555; Neander, Dogma, p. 588 sqq.; Callisen, Essay with a View to bring into Harmony the Doctrine of the Omniscience of God and the Freedom of Man, in Schmidt u. Schwarz, Theol. Bibliothek, vol. viii; Reid, On the Active Powers, essay iv, ch. xi; Pye Smith, First Lines of Christian Theology, p. 148, 149. See also the authors cited in the above notes.

Prescription. I. This expression, borrowed from the civil law, has in the Roman Catholic Church a canonistic meaning. In order to put limits to the contests about mine and thine in rights, obligations, and possessions, that Church has fixed terms which invest with

legality the possession of rights and goods, unless proof be produced that these rights or goods are of an alienable kind, or have been acquired by illegal means (usurpation or theft time does not consecrate). If the lawful term be elapsed, the possessor is confirmed in the possession of said rights or goods, and he who is bound by the same obligation to the same cannot contest it, but he who has no exception. The term of prescription varies with the nature of the object: movable property prescribes quicker than immovable, the property of adults quicker than that of minors, the property of those present quicker than that of absentees; ecclesiastical property is prescribed only after forty years. According to the rubric in the diocesan and, the possessor of an ecclesiastical office, after a three-years’ possession, if it be not obtained by violence or simony, cannot be lawfully expelled from it. There is prescription in his favor.

If. Tertullian transplanted this expression to the theological domain by his work on prescriptions against heretics, a kind of argument against erroneous doctrine. This is what he means: The Catholic Church enjoys, in her doctrines and discipline, the right of prescription; what she teaches, what she practices at the present hour she has taught and practiced from times immemorial. She has taught it from the apostles, as the apostles learned from Christ, as Christ had it from the Father. The catholic doctrine is the true one, because it is the old and original one, and rests on the divine revelation; the doctrines of heretics and others—these may sometimes be true; but they have not been revealed by the Lord, because new, because they have not prescription in their favor, and consequently are not founded on divine revelation. Irenæus taught similarly. It is easy to see that this proof by prescription is much the same as the proof by tradition, and that this mode of arguing can have no acceptability in Protestantism, where the Bible alone is regarded as the true test, and the apostolic or early Church practices have only an advisory influence, not authority. Of course, High-Churchmen, by their ritualistic tendency, can hardly be said to come under the full influence of Protestantism, and are therefore not to be considered as included in the exponents of evangelical Christianity. See Elliott, Delimitation of Roman Catholicism, p. 61, 65, 407. See also Authority.

Prescription is also a law adopted in Presbyterian churches. If a scandal is not noticed for five years after it happens, it cannot be revived, but is then said to be prescribed.

Presence means, in canonical law, the uninterrupted personal residence of every regularly ordained ecclesiastical at the seat of his office; a duty emphatically imposed on him by the laws of the Church. It means also the personal attendance at the common choral prayer, to which the laws of the Church obligate all members of a monastic community, as well as the canons and choir-vicars of the cathedral and collegiate congregations.

Presence-money is the small daily payment in specie made by Roman Catholics to the canons for their presence in the choir at definite cathedral or collegiate churches. It is the diocesic and monastic life of those ecclesiastics, the bulk of the revenue of the chapters was divided into individual portions, to be distributed partly as daily stipends, called distributiones quotidiana, or quotidiana stipendia, in opposition to the prebends, which went by the name of fructus grossi or annuit. The purpose of this daily stipend was to induce the canons to a stricter obedience to the law of residence, and to more assiduous attendance to the public choir-prayers, as only those canons came in for their share who were either present in the choir or were officially during the service. Yet there were some grounds on which their absence could be excused without loss of their share. (These legal exceptions are formulated in the canonical regulations in De cler. agr. iii, 6; De cler. non resid. iii, 8; Conc. Trid. sess. xxii, c. 3, and sess. xxvi, c. 8 fin. De rcf). The Council of Trent
directed that in those cathedral or collegiate congregations where there existed no presence-money, or where it reached but an insignificant amount, a third of the whole revenue of the chapter should be set apart and used for such distributions (Cose. Trid. sect. xxi, c. 3, De ref.). The personal claims of the canons absent without reasonable excuse were to be divided among the members present pro rata, or given to the fabric of the church, if it stood in need of such help, or employed for any pious purpose the bishop might devise (Cose. xxii, c. 3, De ref.). It was not always the negligence of the canons, but the hardness and partly abusive composition of the chapters, which was the cause that their members so frequently dispensed with personal service in the choir, and were represented in it by simple vicars. The personal obligation of the canons has been insisted on by the most ancient canonic rules, by the Council of Trent, and by the last circumscriptum bull for the reorganization of the German bishoprics. Special presence-money is no more in use; for as the donation of the restored bishoprics and chapters is not founded on immovable property, as the prebends flow, in the future, or distant times, out of the public revenue, the division of the Council of Trent that a part of the revenue should be set apart and used for such distributions is not acted upon. See Schmidt, Theaum. jur. Eccles. iv. 155 sq.

**Preseu, Real. See Transubstantiation.**

**Present. See Gift.**

**Presentation, in ecclesiastical law, is I., in the state-established churches, one of those forms of canonical collation of the prebends by which the rights of the bishop are limited, inasmuch as he cannot himself nominate an occupant to the vacant office, but must be content with confirming the nominee of the patronus beneficis. The right of presentation is therefore the right of the patron to designate to the bishop the successor elected by the council of the beneficary, the bishop being obliged to confirm the candidate if he be worthy, capable, and proposed according to canonical rules. This right of presentation is the first and most important of all patronal rights. The patron, in the exercise of his right, is bound by the general conditions of a canonical provision: he has to propose a capable and worthy person gratuitously, and within the legal limits of time. If the patronate be an ecclesiastical or a mixed one, the time is six months; if it be a worldly one, four months: yet there are departures from this rule. In Austria the patron can choose his nominee out of a list drawn up by the patronate; if he be at home, within six months; if he be abroad, within three months, from the day of the receipt of the list. In Prussia six months are allowed to the lay patron, as well as to the ecclesiastical patron, from the day of the vacation of the office; or, if the beneficiary die abroad, from the day on which the news of his death is received. In Baden the time is limited to three months, except in the case of insurmountable hindrances. If the right of presentation belong to several persons individually, they can agree upon a common choice, or cast each his own card in the hat, leaving the choice to the bishop; or the matter may be decided by the majority of the votes; and in case of an equality of votes in favor of each candidate, the decision may be left again to the bishop. The same rules obtain when the right of a patron has been transmitted to the heirs, in which case, of course, the heirs of one patron can give only one vote. If the right of presentation belong to a college or a juridical person, the case is settled by the statutes of the corporation; or if regulations on the subject be wanting, by a collegiate vote. In the remainder, the right of the patron is unlimited: he can propose his nearest relation, but not himself, although he could, "via gratiam," present a request for his own admission (gratiaem petere admissione). He can submit several candidates to the choice of the bishop; if he be a layman, he can, so long as the legal term is not elapsed and the canonical collation has not taken place, propose successively several other names. This jur. riendii is not allowed to an ecclesiastical patron. Here the first presentation, according to the principle "Tempore prior potior iure," makes null and void all subsequent nominations, providing the latter is not a representation, or if the presentation has not been made gratuitously, the nomination in that case is lost to the patron, and belongs exclusively to the collator. The same happens when an ecclesiastical patron wittingly proposes an unworthy subject, while the lay patron is allowed another trial of his right. But if the patron, whether layman or ecclesiastic, has unwittingly proposed an unworthy candidate, he obtains a new term of four or of six months. The Prussian law allows, after the expiration of the primitive term, only a supplementary term of six weeks. In Baden the patron, if his proposition have been rejected by the ordinariate, is allowed another presentation, to be made in the space of four weeks, and the same term is allowed him a second time, but not further. The presentation is made by letter, for which many ordinaries prescribe a fixed form. The document contains the names of the persons about the patronal rights are, according to decretal law, subject to the ecclesiastical courts; but modern legislation has almost everywhere added it to the competency of the worldly tribunals. If the patronal right itself be not granted, but the actual possession of the "munus presentandi," and the nomination resulting from the use he makes of it is not invalidated by his being afterwards defeated in the lawsuit. But if the right to hold the goods with which the patronate is connected should itself be questioned, then the right of presentation is suspended, and the bishop in this case enjoys a free right of collation. The winner of the suit may then, to ensure his privilege, confirm the nomination made by the bishop; but if he should refuse his consent, this can have no influence on the situation of the nominee. See Schlatter, V. Theaum. jur. Civ., 194 sq.; Martini, Codicil. i. 288 sq.; Richter, Kirchenrecht, § 128; Gerlach, Das Präsentationerecht (Regensburg, 1855). II. In the Established Church of Scotland the minister intended for a living by a patron must be presented to the presbytery for inquiry into his qualifications and for induction if these are satisfactory. If the patron fail to present within six months, the right then devolves on the presbytery, tanquam iure devoluto. See Jus Devolutum. When a presented is objected to by the major part of the presbytery, whether by reason of the "nominatio debita," the General Assembly of the Church formerly claimed the right to declare that he should not be inducted or entitled to the benefice. This declaration was contained in an act of Assembly, dated 1685, called the Veto Act. But after the decision by the courts of law that such Veto Act was ultra vires and void, and this decision led to a succession of many ministers and people from the Established Church, and to the formation of a new dissenting Church, called the Free Church (q. v.). The law is now settled so far as it is, leaving the choice to the people, who are to judge of the reasonableness of any objections made to the presenter, for which purpose reasons and objections are heard on both sides, and a wide discretion is exercised by the presbytery. If the presbytery dissolves the objections, they then have with or without the trial and induction (q. v.) of the presenter. The following is the form of a Scotch presentation, and is a copy, indeed, of the one which led to the disputes and processes that ended in the disruption of the Scottish Church:

"The right honorable Thomas Robert Drummond Hay, Earl of Selkirk, dread patron of the church and parish of Auchterarder, lying within the presbytery of Auchterarder and sheriffdom of Perth, considering that the said parsonage of Auchterarder, vacated by the late Mr. James Paton, is now vacated by his late death, and become vacant by a gift and presentation by and through the depth of the Rev. Charles Stewart, late minister of the Geopel at the
PRESENTATION OF THE VIRGIN FEAST of the English dean's deputy, usually the senior residential or vice-dean, who in his absence corrects offences, besides acting as president in chapter (q.v.), and choragus, or director of the services, when there is no dignitary; also the precentor.

Presiding Elder. The name given in the Methodist Episcopal Church to an officer whose functions are those of a superintendent within limited jurisdiction. These elders serve under the bishops, and, together with them, constitute in their respective conferences a cabinet, in which resides the appointing power over the membership of itinerant preachers. The office is one of very great responsibility and far-reaching influence. Within the territory over which such an elder presides every minister is amenable to this officer, who visits the different charges three or four times during the year, usually at what is called the holding of the Quarterly Conference (q.v.). He has full power and authority over all the business of the charge disposed of. He also presides at the District Conferences, where literary and ecclesiastical culture is aimed at, and the licensing of candidates for the ministry takes place. Usually the territory of an elder is that of the Conference or the bounds of the Conference, and corresponds somewhat in extent to the average county in an Eastern state.

The office of presiding elder was created in the early history of Methodism in this country, and appears to have originated with John Wesley, who in 1739 was its origin. The bishops whom John Wesley employed as helpers. He had what we might call junior preachers at the circuits or districts into which he divided his work, and an assistant in charge of the whole. These assistants were then invested with nearly the same authority over the help which the great founder of Methodism himself exercised, and hence they had an authority akin move to the bishopric of American Methodism. When, in 1784, Mr. Wesley caused the election of Ashbury and Coke as superintendents or bishops, there were several assistants in office thus made subject to two great superintendents. The question has arisen whether the twelve elders who were elected at the Christmas Conference of 1784 were simply travelling elders or assistants of the superintendents. See METHODISM.

As the presiding elders are now episcopal appointees, the answer to this query becomes important. There are two opinions. One party, advocating the elective eldership, insist that these twelve men were then elected by the Conference for the assistants work, and base their opinion on Dr. Emory's interpretation. He says, in his History of the Discipline, p. 125, "All elders were elected at first as presiding elders and 'travelling elders' was not made until 1792. Section v. of 1789, it would seem, proves the correctness of Dr. Emory's statement. The following is a part of the section on elders:

"Ques. 2. What is the duty of an elder?
"Ans. 1. To visit his general district.
"2. To administer baptism and the Lord's Supper, and perform all other services of the church.
"3. In the absence of a bishop to take charge of all the deacons, travelling and local preachers, and exhorters.
"4. To administer communion or suspend members.
"5. To direct the transaction of the spiritual business of his circuit.
"6. To take care that every part of our discipline be enforced.

"7. To aid in public collections.
"8. To attend his bishop when present, and give him, when absent, all necessary information by letter of the state of his district.

That every elder, in the absence of the bishop, was equal in point of supervisory office and duty is evident also from the fact that the third duty in this section gives an elder no authority to take charge of elders, but simply of deacons travelling, and local preachers, etc., seeing they were equal in authority. It was not until 1792 that a distinction was made between presiding elders and travelling elders, and those were then put under the charge of presiding elders. It was at this date that presiding elders were chosen by the bishop from the body of elders, and those elders not chosen by the bishops were disrobed of office as presiding elders, and placed for the first time under the care of presiding elders (see p. 126, 1792).

"Ques. 6. By whom are the presiding elders chosen?
"Ans. 6. By the bishop. Among the duties of the presiding elder, one is to take charge of all the elders, deacons, etc., of his district.

At this date, there was a made a distinction between presiding elders and travelling elders, and not before. All the elders previous to 1792, therefore, were elected and appointed to the office and duties of presiding elder by the Conference, and each had equal authority in charge in the absence of the bishop.

Against this position, those who approve of the existing practice of the appointing of presiding elders by the bishop urge, first, that from 1760 to 1792 there were such elders, as travelling elders; secondly, that the presiding elders were appointed to their districts, and that the appointment was by the bishop; and, thirdly, that if the bishops did appoint elders to preside over other elders, the Conferences not calling the bishops to account convenient to the change, and thereby made it valid; and that it was the practice of the Church from 1784 to 1792, notwithstanding the disciplines required otherwise (see letter by Dr. D. Sherman in Zion's Herald, March, 1876); and that Dr. Emory and others interpreted the letters of the early Methodist Church in America (comp. Stevens, Hist. of the M. E. Church, ii, 222, 224). The presiding duties which made of an elder a presiding elder did not, in the practice of the Church, belong to this new order in the ministry as soon as it was constituted. They belonged to the assistants, and were gradually trans-
ferred to the elders; and when, after the practice of nearly two years, they were actually transferred, the custom was legalized, the office of assistant was abolished, and the word disappeared from the minutes (see the Minutes and Discourses, A.D. 1786). The idea of this transfer originated in the mind of bishop Asbury, who found, after the eldership was instituted, as he says in his Notes on the Discipline, "that this order was so necessary" that he would make them rulers. Even his idea of the presiding eldership was not contemporaneous with the institution of the order of elders, but came, as he says, when he "afterwards found that" they would be useful in ruling (see Notes on the Discipline, by Coke and Asbury). His idea was not put in practice until the Annual Conferences of 1785, when, as Lee (History, p. 120) states, the presiding eldership originated, but only in an inchoate form. This was months after the order of elders had been instituted. When, in 1786, the first law was made relative to the presiding eldership, it was made possible by the Discipline for every elder to become a presiding elder, as far as the duties were concerned, and here is where Emory and others have been misled. But as the bishop always appointed the ruling or presiding elders from the order of elders (Lee, History, p. 150), the practice was never to make all the elders ruling or presiding elders. Hence, from 1785 to 1792, the law of the Discipline never entirely agreed with the practice in the appointments, for there were hosts of elders who were never presiding elders. In the Conference of 1792, however, the law was made to harmonize with the practice. In the ancient Church the chieftains (monarchoi) filled an office which must have given Mr. Wesley the suggestion for the assistant for the bishop called into office. See Emory, Hist. of the Discipline, p. 136 sq.; Sherman, Hist. of the Discipline, p. 153; Bingham, Eccles. Antiquities, i, 56, 68; Porter, Compendium of Methodism; Math. Quot., Book vi, art. iv; April, 1872, National Repository, May, 1876, Editor's Study. See also Rural Deans, in the article Dean of this Cyclopaedia, ii, 711.

Press (πρῆσς, parás; καπνός). Among the Israelites this was a large trough, usually hewn out of stone (Isa. vi, 2; Matt. xxi, 33: comp. Nonnii, Dionys. xii, 220). In the earth and walled up (Harmar, iii, 117). The text is usually translated as a trench or a gully below. This trough was called goth, גות (in the Talmud also גותש), or parash, παράση (Isa. lixii, 3); and in the grapes were trodden by men (usually five work together in Persia still; Kämpfer, Ann. p. 577). Hence the phrase to tread the wine-press (Job xxvi, 11; Lam. i, 15; Isai. ii, 9). The juice (Heb. terah, תרָה) flowed through the opening into a vat, usually in the earth (called yakh, יַחָך; Gr. χαράμμα, Isa. vi, 2; or υδρονυμῖος, Isa. xvi, 10; Mark xii, and simply λαος, Matt. xxi, 33; Lat. leane mansueta, Column, xii, 18; in Job xxvi, 11; this word means, however, the trough or press itself). From this it is taken for fermentation in earthen vessels. These presses, which are still common in the East and the Levant (Aristeus iv, 272 sq.; Kämpfer, ut supra), were the method of the tribe of Simeon in the vineyards or on mountains (Zech. xiv, 10; Isa. vi, 2; Matt. xxi, 38; Mark xii, 1; Rev. xiv, 20). The slaves must usually trodden the press, as it was hard labor (Isa. lixii, 1 sq.). They were cheered in it by singing and music (see Isa. xvi, 10; Jer. xxv, 50; Judg. ix, 15; 27; xvi, 31; 2 Chr. xxxi, 4; 2 Esdr. ii; Itp. Heb. vi, 14 sq., in his Thesaur. xxxii). See Oll. Wink.

Presby. Ebenezer Erskine, D.D., a Presbytery divine, was born near Cedar Spring, Abbeville District, S. C., in 1808. His parents, of the good old Scotch-Irish stock, were remarkable for their piety and intellectual attainments. He was early dedicated to the work of the Christian ministry. He pursued his pre-

Pressly, John T., D.D., a Presbyterian minister, died July 26, 1860. Dr. Pressly was a man of more than ordinary talent, and a good general scholar. In the position of president of the college he was greatly beloved by his pupils. Possessed of excellent executive ability, and of special aptness to teach, much of the success of the college and seminary, in the early periods of their history, was traceable to his influence. Though an interesting writer, he had a singular aversion to appearing before the public as an author, and hence he never published anything except an occasional sermon. See Wilson, Pref. Hist. Almanac, 1861, p. 276. (J. L. S.)

Pressly, John B., a Presbyterian minister, noted also as a classical teacher, was born in Abbeville District, S. C., in 1794. His means for acquiring the rudiments of a Latin education were very limited, and, when he was only five and a half the manhood of manhood he had not enjoyed very fully the advantages of the common school. In 1812, however, he moved to the State of Ohio, and during a stay of three years in the Northwestern States he underwent much cultivation and hard labor in his endeavor to acquire knowledge. About the close of the year 1815 he was prostrated on a bed of suffering with a painful illness; a kind Providences brought him the medical services of Dr. Joseph Gilberis, who, on his recovery, suggested to him the desirability of a classical education, and proposed to furnish him with the necessary books. Thus encouraged, and accepting the doctor's kind offer, he entered Church Hill Academy June 19, 1816; in 1819 he entered South Carolina College, and spent two years there. In 1822 his career as a classical teacher began, and in this field of usefulness he has been an author, during the balance of his life, he attained an inviable reputation. His first charge was Union Academy, in the southern part of Abbeville District, S. C. Among his pupils here were the late Rev. E. E. Pressly, D.D. Rev. J. T. Pressly, D.D., Hon. T. C. Perrin, and J. A. Cathron, Esq. In 1835, he was called at Cambridge to serve as coadjutor to the latter in Laurens District. In 1838 he took charge of Church Hill Academy, but his labors there were soon interrupted by his being elected to the State Legislature of South Carolina by the people of Abbeville District. In 1835, at the close of his political career, he was invited to take charge of the high school at Due West, S. C., just founded by the Associate Reformed Synod of the South, where he continued to labor till 1859 with great success. At last released from all engagements connected with teaching, he turned his attention to the study of Philology; attended one session in the seminary of the Associate Reformed Church at Oxford, Ohio; was licensed in 1840; and after attending during the ensuing session in the Associate Reformed Seminary at Alleghany City, Pa., he was employed until 1842 as a presbyterian schoolmaster in the vicinity of the bounds of the synod. Subsequently he was settled for five years as pastor of Bethel and Ebenezer churches, Ga.; the remainder of his life until 1851 was spent in teaching and missionary work. He died June 1, 1863. Mr. Pressly as a man was social and companionable: as a teacher he was a splendid disciplinarian, and skill in imparting classical knowledge had few superiors. See Wilson, Pref. Hist. Almanac (1867), p. 396. (J. L. S.)

Presbyly, John T., D.D., a Presbyterian minister,
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noted as a professor in divinity and an author, was born in Alberville District, S. C., in 1808. He studied for the ministry at the Theological Seminary in New York under Dr. John Mason. His first pastorate was in his native village, from which he was called to a professorship in the Theological Seminary, and the charge of the First Associate Reformed (now United Presbyterian) Church in Allegheny, Pa., both of which stations he filled with distinguished ability and success for nearly forty years. He died at Allegheny Aug. 13, 1870.—Appleton's An-

PRESSY, FRANÇOIS-JOSEPH-GASTON DE PARTE DE, a French prelate, was born in 1712 at the castle of Écure (diocese of Boulogne). He was one of the most distinguished pupils of Saint-Sulpice. He was called, Dec. 25, 1742, to the episcopal see of Boulogne. He ad-

ministered his diocese during nearly forty-seven years with unwremitting zeal, and spent considerable sums for the ransom of the Christians captive among the Mo-

hammedans, and for the expansion of the faith by foreign missions. In 1752 he joined a protestation addressed to the king (June 11), by twenty-one bishops, against par-

liamentary encroachments on ecclesiastical authority. A mandement which he subsequently published on the subject was suppressed. He died at Boulogne Oct. 8, 1789. His principal writings are, Statuta synodala (1746, 4to);—a collection of Instructions pastorales and Désertations théologiques (2 vols. 1737, 4to);—Le Rite du Docteur Boulogne (Boulogne, 1780, 4to); and a.pray-
er-book in French, under the title of Heures (Lille, 1829, 8vo). See Gallia Christiana, t. v.; Gazette de France, 1742-89; Fisquet, France Postfiscale (not published);—


Prestre, JOHN. See John, Prestre.

PRESTON, John, D.D., a noted English Puritan divinity, was born at Heyford, Northamptonshire, in 1587, and educated at King's College, Cambridge; University of Cambridge, was made fellow and tutor of Queen's College, and finally became chaplain to Prince Charles. In 1622 he was appointed preacher of Lin-

coln's Inn, and subsequently lecturer in Trinity Church, Cambridge. He became so celebrated as a speaker that the towns-people went to his lectures on week-days as he would to his sermons on Sunday, and he was com-

plained of by those who looked with envy upon his fast-
growing reputation. He also became noted as an able advocate of Calvinism, and in a controversy with the fami-

ly, was thought to have set them the example, and to have been the occasion of the rise of the famous Geneva theory with much adroitness and boldness. He was cer-

tainly a man of great leaning, a popular preacher, and a powerful writer. He died in 1628, greatly lamented not only by Calvinists, but by all lovers of the good cause. He was himself out with work; and when his

friends would remonstrate, his answer was always, "Our

life, like iron, consumes with rust, as much without as by

employment; that every one cannot be said to have lived long that is old, as seven years in the life of some men are as much as seventy in others; and therefore the question is not so much How long have I lived as How I have lived." He was naturally reserved, and only

figured in public because his zeal for the doctrines of Calvin would not suffer him to go unanswering those who maintained the opposite theories. Of his works (pub. by five persons) only one is collected, an abridgment by William Tennent was published in 1658 (1648 also [7]), 12mo. The best-known of his publica-

tions are, The New Covenant, fourteen sermons (Lond. 1629, 4to; ninth ed. 1638, 4to; again in 1655, 4to);—The Bread of Life, eighteen ser-

mons (1630, 4to; 5th ed. 1634, 4to);—Life Eternal, eighteen sermons (1631, 4to; 4th ed. 1634, 4to):—The Saint's Daily Exercise, five sermons on Prayer (1635, 4to; 9th ed. 1635, 4to):—The Saint's Qualifications, ten sermons on Humiliation, nine on Sanctification, and the life of Benjamin Serluus (1637, 4to);—

Four Treatises (sermons): 1. Consecrations; 2. Spiritu-

"nal Death and Life (separate in 1633, 4to); 3. Self Den
dial (separate in 1632, 4to); 4. Lord's Supper (to-

gether in 1635, 4to; 4th ed. 1636, 4to):—Sermons before his Majestie, etc. (5th ed. 1637, 4to);—Sinners Over-

try, or More than Meant (1631, 4to);—Remains (three treatises): 1. Judas his Repentance; 2. Saint's Spiritual Strength; 3. Paul's Conversion and Ser-

mons, etc. (2d ed. 1637, 4to):—The Golden Serp
cure, etc. (1638, 4to):—Doctrines of the Saints’ Intermediaries, a ser-

mon (1638, 4to);—A Lively Life, a sermon (4th ed. 1641, 4to);—A Funeral Service for Us, etc. (1640, 4to):— Divine Love of Christ, five sermons (1640, 4to): Two Treatises (1641, 4to):—Thesis de Gratia Converse mutatione Irresistibilis (1639, 8vo; in English, 1634):—Riches of Mercy to Men in Misery (1638, 4to). See Dr. R. Sibbs's preface; Midleton, Evangel. Bibl. ii. 400 sq.; Perry, Hist. Ch. of England (see Index); Clark, Lives; Neal, Hist. of the Puritans; Burnet, Own Times; Fuller, Worthies; Darly, Cyclop. Bibl.; Jonathan Edwards, Works; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s. v. (J. H. W.)

Preston, William, D.D., an eloquent American divine and educational author, was born in Montgomery, Mass., May 29, 1765, was educated at Brown University, where he graduated in 1806. After having studied law and practiced in that profession for a few years, he studied for the ministry, and was in 1811 ordained and became pastor of a church at Providence, R. I., where he preached until 1825, when he was chosen president of the University of Vermont. In 1829 he removed South for the benefit of his health, and in 1831 accepted the pastorate of the Presbyterian Church in Savannah, Ga., and there remained until his death in 1866. He published, Farewell Sermon at St. Albens, Mass. (1811);—Ser-

mons (1817).—Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Au-

thors, s. v.; Drake, Dict. of Amer. Biogr. s. v.

Prescription, as it relates to the mind, is a sup-

position formed before examination. As it relates to the conduct or moral action, it implies arrogance or ir-

reverence. As it relates to religion in general, it is a bold and daring confidence in the goodness of God, with-

out obedience to his will.

Presumptuous sins must be distinguished from sins of infirmity, or those failings peculiar to human nature (Eccl. vii, 20; 1 John i, 8, 9); from sins done through ignorance (Luke xii, 48); and from sins into which men are hurried by sudden and violent temptation (Gal. vi, 1). The ingredients of guilt under such an accusation are knowledge (John xv, 22), deliberation and contriv-

ance (Prov. vi, 14; Psa. xxxvi, 4), obstinacy (Jer. xlv, 16; Deut. i, 13), inattention to the remonstrances of conscience (Acts vii, 51), opposition to the dispensations of Providence (2 Chron. xxxvii, 22), and repeated com-

mission of the same sin (Psa. lxxiii, 17). Presump-

tuous sins are numerous, such as profane swearing, per-

jury, theft, adultery, drunkenness, Sabbath-breaking, etc. These may be more particularly considered as pre-

sumptuous sins, because they are generally committed against a known law, and are so often repeated. Such sins are most heinous in their nature and most pernicious in their effects. They are said to be a reproach to the Lord (Numb. xvi, 3); they harden the heart (1 Tim. iv, 2); draw down judgments from heaven (Numb. xxxi, 51); and even when repentent of, they are seldom pardoned without some visible testimony of God's displeasure (2 Sam. xii, 10). As respects professors of religion, one

observes, they sin presupsumptiously (1) when they take up a profession of religion without principle; (2) when they profess the high and holy duties of religion, yet pass over the forbidden courses; (3) when they do not take religion as they find it in the Scriptures; (4) when they make their feelings the test of their religion, without consid-

ering the difference between animal passion and the operations of the Spirit of God; (5) when they run into sin with such a quick and free spirit; (6) when they indulgently suppose their confidence and self-complacency; (7) when they bring the spirit
of the world into the Church; (8) when they form apologies for that in some which they condemn in others; (9) when professing to believe in the doctrines of the Gospel, they live licentiously; (10) when they create, magnify, and pervert their troubles; (11) when they arraign the conduct of God as unkind and unjust.


PRETAS, sprites or hobgoblins among the Buddhists in Ceylon. They are believed to inhabit a hell called Lokanatarika. In appearance they are extremely attenuated, like a dry leaf. There are some pretas that haunt the places near which they once lived as men; they are also found in the suburbs of cities, and in places where four ways meet. Their bodies are represented as being twelve miles high, and they have very large nails. On the top of the head there is a mouth about the size of a needle's eye. They continually think with sorrow on their fate, from not having acquired merit in former births; they are now tormented without ceasing by hunger and thirst, and have not the power of obtaining merit.

Preternatural stands generally for supernatural, because we suppose that that which is preter naturam is also supernatural. Yet the former is sometimes used for unnatural, preter naturam being the synonym of contra naturam. Neither preternaturale nor supernaturale, or, as some say, supranaturale, is a good Latin word. They are, at least, not to be found in the classics.

Pretextatus, Sr., a Gallic prelate of the 6th century, occupied towards 550 the metropolitan see of Rouen, and as such devoted himself to Monreos, the second son of Chilperic. Towards 576 Bruneaud, the widow of Sigebert, was exiled to Rouen by Chilperic, who was under the influence of Frédegunde. Monreos, who was in that city, fell violently in love with the charms of the queen of Austria, his aunt, and Pretextatus was induced to grant a dispensation for their union, and married them. At this intelligence Chilperic repaired to Rouen, transported with wrath, and ordered the bishop to be arrested. A council assembled at Paris in 577, and in spite of the exertions of Gregory of Tours, who ventured alone to defend Pretextatus, was compelled by the vote of forty-four prelates. He was banished to the island of Jersey, where he devoted his time to prayer and study. In the meantime a creature of Frédegunde, the Gaul Melantius, was established in the episcopal see of Rouen. In 581, Pretextatus was recalled, and in 584, a deputation of the clergy and people of Rouen repaired to Jersey to request Pretextatus to resume the administration of his diocese. On the 5th of May an assembly of Frankish noblemen, held at Rouen, pronounced his rehabilitation. Frédegunde, who lived in a kind of retirement at Louviers, went often to Rouen; she found herself frequently face to face with the bishop, whom she accused of not showing her much deference. In her wounded pride she once let escape some threatening allusions to the past: Pretextatus improved the occasion to exhort her to repentance and reformation. The enraged queen avenged herself in a manner worthy of her past life. She, Melantius, and an archdeacon of the cathedral, gave two hundred gold dollars to one of the serfs of the domain of the church, and promised him his own emancipation and that of his wife and children, for the murder of Pretextatus. On the Monday-Sunday, while in prayer at the foot of the altar, he was stabbed, and died an hour afterwards in a chamber contiguous to the church, whither a few of the faithful had carried him, and where Frédegunde, in the company of the duke, received the body. Thus expired the pious, and her last moments, April 14, 566. Pretextatus had attended the third Council of Paris in 557, the second Council of Tours in 566, and the second Council of Mâcon in 568. During his exile he composed some writings, which have not reached us. His name is inscribed in the Martyrology under the date of the 27th of February, although he did not shed his blood for the faith. See Gallia Christiana, t. xi.; Pomeroyre, Hist. des Archevêques de Rouen; Fiéquet, France Pontificale (not published).—Hoederus, Notre. Bioe. Générale, s. v.

PREVOST, Matia, called il Calabrese, a painter of the Neapolitan school, was born in 1613 at Tavurna, in Calabria. His brother Gregorio, about whom very little is known, who was honored in his life-time with the title of prince of the Academy of St. Luke, was Mattia's first master; subsequently he studied with Lanfrance and Guerino. Previt took from Caravaggio those dark and violent hues which impair the charm of his compositions. He delighted in retracing martyrdoms, murders, and other reenes of desolation. He painted with prodigious rapidity: a contemporary says that to see him handle the brush one would have thought that he was drumming. He painted the frescoes of the Church of St. John in Modena, which are in a very good state of preservation. In 1657 he returned to Rome, but was compelled to flee, having killed one of his rivals. At Naples, again, whither he repaired, he killed a soldier who had stopped him on some forbidden ground, and was ordered for his punishment to paint the patron saint of Naples on the doors of the city. From Naples he went to Malta, where his works were rewarded with the title of knight and the commandery of Syracuse. In his last years he worked only, but with unremitting diligence, for the church. He died at Malta in 1669. His works are not with in great number in Italy. The Louvre has his Martyrologium of St. Andrew, St. Paul, and St. Anthony the Hermit; the Museum of Dresden the Martyrologium of St. Bartholomew, the Incrédulity of St. Thomas, and the Deliverance of St. Peter; the Pinkothen of Munich a Repenting Mephistopheles; the Museum of Vienna an Incrédulity of St. Thomas, etc. See Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, s. v. (J. H. W.)

PRETORIUM. See Pretorium.

Prevent (some form of Perver, παραφέρω, both meaning to precede or anticipate) is understood, in our translation of the Scriptures, only in the old Latin sense, as denoting. 1. To come before one is expected or sought (Job xxx, 27); 2. To go before, or be sooner (Psa. cxxix, 147). One is happily disappointed when favors come unsought (Job iii, 12; Psa. xviii, 18), or unhappily, when snares and afflictions come unexpectedly (2 Sam. xxii, 6).

Prevention is an ecclesiastical term denoting the right of a superior dignitary of the Church to interfere with the business of the congregation, or to control the acts of the clergy, according to the right of the pope, in the nomination to ecclesiastical offices, to pass over the proper collator and give away the benefices himself. The Gallican Church has never recognised this papal prerogative. See Provosts.

PREVOST, Claude, a French monk, was born at Auxerre Jan. 22, 1628. He taught Gregory of Tours in the abbey of Sainte-Geneviève, and the care of the library was afterwards intrusted to him. In this employment, which he retained to the end of his life, he made use of the knowledge which he had acquired in the Greek, Italian, and English languages, and collected abundant materials, which he did not, however, publish. They were prepared for the instruction of Louis, duke of Orleans, son of the regent, who lived at the abbey of Sainte-Geneviève. The principal MSS., which this monk has left concerning the history of the Old and New Testament, are, Library of Regular Canons:—Liber of Holy Canons, both Secular and Regular:—and History of all the Houses of Regular Canons. His last work was A History of the Abbey of Sainte-Geneviève. It is from this last work that the following paragraphs are taken. All that they have said of this house in vol. vii. of the new Gallia Christiana. Prevost furnished the material
to the abbot Lebeuf, his countryman, for the catalogue of the writers of Auxerre inserted in The History of Auxerre.—Hoefler, Novum. Biogr. Generale, s. v.

Prevost, Pierre Robert de, a French pulpit orator of some note, was born at Rouen in 1675. From his youth he displayed a marked propensity for preaching, and in 1719 he applied himself after the model of celebrated orators. Sought after with eagerness in the city, he was no less a favorite at court, where he preached statelyly from Advent from 1714 to 1727, and in 1718 during Lent. At this last date he was provided with a canonship at Chartres. The reciters of sermons, published by Lottin (Paris, 1765), contains those of the cardinal of Fürstenberg (of which Fletcher speaks with eulogy); of Godet of Maillas, bishop of Chartres; of Louis XIV and of the duke of Berri; sermons, and a panegyric of St. Louis. He died in 1736 at Chartres.—Hoefler, Nouv. Biogr. Generale, s. v. See Vinet, French Lit. p. 116 sq.

Price, Henry, a minister of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Ireland, was born in Dromore, Antrim County, Ireland, Jan. 30, 1802; was converted at seventeen, was made a local preacher about the year 1821, and entered the itinerant ministry at the Conference of 1823. He was an able and judicious preacher; "he was mighty in the Scriptures," reasoning out of them, and having a remarkable talent for apposite and convincing quotations from Holy Writ. He was a zealous and effective advocate for Christian missions, a section of evangelical efforts, and Irish Methodism, paying more attention and devoting more labor than does any other Christian Church. While Mr. Price adored the Gospel of God's favour in all things, there were especially noticeable, in his childlike simplicity, a transparent sincerity, an uprightness which scorned to countenance of the funerary and low or mean, charity "which thinketh no evil," and an unselshness "which seeketh not its own." Sweeping revivals occurred on many of the circuits on which he was stationed. He was specially attentive to the sick and afflicted, and his visits to them were frequent. Sympathizing, and consoling. He was truly "a brother beloved," and his brethren in the ministry manifested their high appreciation of his character and talents by electing him repeatedly to fill the highest offices in their gift, and on all occasions he proved himself worthy of their esteem and confidence. He was active and practical, always ready to carry out every arrangement intrusted to his care with punctilious exactness. Never had Irish Methodism a more faithful son, or a minister of more perfect singleness of aim, purity of intention, or exemplary fidelity. Mr. Price died in the sixty-eighth year of his age.

Price, John (1), an English scholar of much renown, was born about the year 1600, and was educated at Christ Church, Oxford. He was of Protestant parentage, but after leaving college he joined the Romanists and went to Italy during the civil wars, as he found himself the object of much hatred and persecution. He settled in Florence, after having resided for a while in Paris; but when a professorship was offered him at Pisa, he removed thither, and there lived for some time. He subsequently retired to the St. Augustine convent at Rome, where he died in 1676. He was the author of the following works: Notae et Observationes in Apologia L. Apuleii Mardianus Philosphi Pallontae (Paris, 1635, 4to; very rare, but republished in the Gouda ed. of Apuleius, 1650, 8vo);—Mathesou ex Sacra Pagana, Sanctus Patriarch, etc., illustratus (Paris, 1646, 8vo);—Adnotationes in Epist. Jacobi (1646, 4to);—Additiones in Sacra Pagana, etc., illustrata (1647, 8vo);—Commentarii in Novi Testamenti Libros; hoc acceptus Adnotationes in Psalmorum Librum (London, 1660, fol. The notes on the New Testament, or some of them, had been published before separately [supra], and Orme says that those on the Psalms had also appeared before). Price brought to his expositions of the Scriptures an extensive knowledge of classical literature, and, imitating Grotius's method, frequently illustrated by profane authors, especially the Greek and Roman. See Orme, Bibl. Biblicar., s. v.; Gris. Sueci, vol. v; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s. v.

Price, John (2), D.D., an English clergyman, flourished in the second half of the 17th century, and was chaplain to general Monk during the civil wars. Dr. Price published, Serm. of Thanksgiving for the Success of General Monk (London, 1660, 4to);—Serm. on Matt. (1661, 8vo);—Serm. on Matt. (1661, 16vo);—Serm. on Eccles. xvi, 17 (1661, 8vo);—Serm. on Heb. xiii, 16 (1661, 8vo);—Serm. on Phil. iv, 5 (1663, 4to);—The Mystery and Method of his Majesty's Happy Restoration laid open to Publick View (London, 1660, 8vo).

Price, Jonathan D., a physician and missionary to Burmah in the first half of this century, was ordained in Philadelphia May 20, 1821, and immediately set out for his field of labor. He arrived early in the next year at Rangoon. When his medical knowledge became known at court, he was ordered to repair to Ava, the capital, where he was introduced to the king, who gave him a special commission when the British invaded Burmah. He and Mr. Judson were thrown into prison June 8, 1824. He was confined and subjected to dreadful sufferings till February or March, 1826, when he was released and employed to negotiate a treaty with the British, who had advanced near to the capital. After the war he resided at Ava, Upper Burma, for a time, and then returned to Rangoon. He spoke the Burmese language very well and wrote several native works, and by his lectures hoped to shake the foundation of Buddhism. He fell a victim to pulmonary consumption Feb. 14, 1828, dying in the hope of that precious Gospel he wished to impart to the Burmese. See Bp. Mgr. Burm. Soc. Ser. Bpt. Mag.; Memoir of Mrs. Judson; Allen, Biog. Dict. s. v.

Price, Rice. See Price, Thomas.

Price, Richard, D.D., an eminent English divine, noted for his scholarly attainments, his philosophical and mathematical contributions, his general devotion to truth in its highest forms, and a most consistent life, was born at Tynton, Glamorganshire, Wales, Feb. 23, 1725. His father, of whose second marriage Richard was the sole offspring, was a rigid Calvinistic minister, remarkable for his intolerance, who spared no pains to impute his son with sound Calvinistic doctrine. Richard, however, began early to claim the privilege of thinking for himself, and by his scrupulosity, and by the anger of his parent. The latter died in 1739, and by his will the bulk of the property, which appears to have been considerable, came into the possession of one son; the widow and six other children being left in straitened circumstances to provide for their own maintenance. The widow and her eldest son lived, however, only a few months longer, and shortly after their death Richard, then in his eighteenth year, set out for London in the hope of qualifying himself for the clerical profession. The heir of his father's fortune provided him with both house and servant as far as Cardiff, but left him without the means of performing the rest of the journey except on foot or in a wagon. He chose the former as the most ready means, and thus made his way to the metropolis of England. His education during his father's lifetime had been superintended by several Dissenters of his persuasions, but Richard, after reaching London, was obtained, through the kindness of a paternal uncle, admission to a Presbyterian academy, where he pursued studies in mathematics, philosophy, and theology. In 1748 he was engaged as chaplain and companion to the family of Mr. Streathfield, of his mother's brothers, who resided for thirteen years, the death of his employer only terminating the engagement, but not without a recognition of faithful service rendered. In the disposition of Mr. Streathfield's property Price came in for a share, and by this aid and his appointment as morning preacher of the chapel at Newington-Green, he was
placed in independent circumstances. He had previously been made pastor of a congregation at Hackney, but he preferred the appointment at Newington Green, married in 1757, and lived there until the death of his first wife, 1760. Meanwhile his life had been one of considerable literary and scientific activity. His Review of the Principal Questions and Difficulties in Morals was somewhat heavy, and designated by Brown as "very elaborate, very tedious, and not very clear," seems to have established his reputation as a metaphysician and a moralist. It is considered the ablest defence of the system of Hudgell and Clarke. It is an attempt to revive the intellectual theory of moral obligation, which seemed to have fallen under the attacks of Butler, Hutcheson, and Hume, and was made before that of Smith. Sir J. Mackintosh has briefly noticed it in his Preliminary Dissertation to Encyclop. Brit. (re-published in his Works [ed. 1834.] i, 158, 159).

In 1789 Price published his Treatise on RecreationalPayments; this was followed by the compilation and publication of the celebrated Northampton Mortality Tables, and various other works relating to life-assurance and annuities, forming most valuable contributions to the branch of science to which they refer. In 1776 appeared the Observations on the Civil Liberty of the Protestant Dutch and People of the West Indies. This work 60,000 copies are said to have been sold in a few months. So greatly it was admired in the United States that, in 1778, the American Congress, through Franklin, communicated to him their desire to consider him a fellow-citizen, and to receive his assistance in regulating their finances—an offer declined principally on the ground of age. On the termination of the war with the colonies, Mr. Pitt sought Mr. Price's advice as to the best mode of liquidating the British national debt, the result of which, it is said, was the adoption of the sinking fund. When the French revolution broke out, the doctor distinguished himself by a sermon, "On the Love of Country," in which he hailed that event as the commencement of a glorious era. This drew upon the preacher some strong animadversions from Mr. Burke in his celebrated Reflections. Besides many papers in the Transactions of the Royal Society, of which he was a fellow, he published sermons and pamphlets, which established his character as a sound advocate for civil liberty and a profound master of financial calculation. He died April 18, 1791. One of his most interesting and popular readers is his Four Dissertations on Providence, Prayer, the State of Virtuous Men after Death, and Christianity (1766-68). His views respecting the Son of God were what called Law or semi-Arian. Mr. Price was a believer in the immortality of the soul, holding, according to the teaching of the Sacred Scriptures, it remains in a dormant state between death and resurrection; and because of these opinions he was led into a controversy of some celebrity with his friend Dr. Priestley, maintained by correspondence in 1778, and given to the public by the latter under the title of A Free Discussion of the Doctrine of Materialism and Philosophical Necessity. This friendly controversy shows how decided were his views on the philosophical aberration of the age, and how earnestly he desired to place moral and metaphysical truth upon a deeper and truer foundation. "Almost the only writer," says Morell, "of this (the rationalistic) school whose works are likely to form a part of our standard philosophy is Dr. Richard Price." In this high estimate of the merits of Price's philosophical writings, Mr. Morell is not alone. Price investigated with acuteness and ability many important questions relative to morals, and controverted the doctrine of a moral sense as irreconcilable with the unalterable character of moral ideas, which, as well as those of substance and cause, he maintained to be eternal and objectively independent of the divine will" (Tennemann). "If, in England, you only look at London in the 18th century, you will doubtless see little else than sensuality. But even at London you would find, by the side of Priestley, Price, that ardent friend of liberty—that ingenious and profound economist, who renewed and finally sustained the Platonistic idealism of Cudworth. I know that Price is an isolated phenomenon at London, but the whole Scotch school is more or less spiritualistic" (Cousin). But Mackintosh (ut sup.) by no means shares in this enthusiasm; he even says, in his Life of John Locke, that Sir James's estimate of the characteristics of Price will be found in the Edinburgh Review, June, 1815, p. 171, 172. See also The London Mon. Rev. lxxiii, 77; and Boston Christ. Disciple, ii, 194. Dr. Price's moral character appeared to have been a statistically beautiful one. "Simplicity of manners," says Dr. Priestley, "with such genuine marks of perfect integrity and benevolence, diffused around him a charm which the forms of politeness can but poorly imitate." See also in Morgan, Memoirs of the Life of Richard Price, D.D. (London, 1815); Hook, Eccles. BIoq. viii, 162; Stephen, Hist. of Engl. Thought (1877, 2 vols. 8vo), vol. i and ii, especially ii, 3 eq.; Leckey, Hist. of the 18th Century (1878, 2 vols. 8vo), vol. ii. See also Tennemann, Hist. of Phiio. (Johnson's trans. 1829) p. 80; canv; and, Hist. of Phiio. (Wright's ed. 1840) p. 182; Morin, Hist. of Mod. Phiio. (2d ed. 1848) i, 215; Blayke, Hist. of the Phiio. of Mind (1850) iii, 318-10; Blackwood's Magazine, xxiii, 903.

Price, Thomas, one of the most distinguished Welsh scholars of his age, was born Oct. 2, 1787, at Penoserel, in the parish of Llanfawr, near Builth, in Brecknockshire. His father, the Rev. Rice Price, originally a stonemason, at the age of seventeen formed an attachment to Mary Bower, the descendant of a long line of clergymen; acquired, by incessant diligence and frugality, the means of attending the college-school at Brecknock; and finally obtained a benefice from the bishop of St. Davids, and, in 1784, the hand he sought, after a courtship of twenty years. He was so fortunate as afterwards to be presented to three livings; but his income, like that of some other Welsh pluralists, was never believed to exceed forty pounds a year. He had two sons, both of whom were brought up to the Church, the elder taking his degree at Oxford, while the second, Thomas, was obliged to finish his studies at the college of Brecknock. Welsh was the language that he first heard composed in rhyme; English they acquired at their second school; the elements of Latin and Greek were learned subsequently; and, from some French officers who were prisoners of war at Brecknock, Thomas acquired an excellent knowledge of French. In 1812 he received holy orders, and in 1825, after performing for thirteen years the duties of various curacies near Crickhowel, he was appointed to the vicarage of Cwmdu. This was his last preferment. The rest of his life was passed in historical and archaeological studies of his country. He was regarded by his countrymen as one of the most accomplished champions of the Welsh language and literature. He died at Cwmdu Nov. 7, 1848. His writings are not of special interest to theological readers. Many of his English compositions are collected under the title of Literary Remains of the Rev. Thomas Price, with a Memoir by Jane Williams (London, 1848, 2 vols. 8vo). A memoir of Price is found in the Lond. Gentleman's Mag. Feb. 1849, p. 212; see also Engl. Cyclop. p. v.

Pricked Song is, in music, a term applied to a composition used in ecclesiastical service. It is divided into desant, pricksong, counterpoint, and faburden, the last being a stemma distinguished key.

Pricket, an ecclesiastical term designating a spike on which candles were fixed. There are specimens from Kirkstall Abbey in the collection of the Society of
PRIDEAUX

PRICKETT, MARMADUKE, an English clergyman, was born about the year 1603. He was educated at Cambridge University, and held the appointment of one of the Fellows of Peterhouse College, which he stepped up in 1639. He published, Some Account of Barnwell Priory, in the Parish of St. Andrew the Less (Camb, 1637, 8vo);—An Historical and Architectural Description of the Priory Church of Bridlington (Lond, 1631, 8vo; 1846, 8vo). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s. v.

PRICKS (Numb. xxxiii, 56; Acts ix, 5). See GOAD, Thorne.

PRIDGEN, JOHN, an English clergyman, was born in the year 1758 in London, and was educated at Queen's College, Oxford. After filling various appointments, he finally became rector of St. George's, Botolph Lane, London. He died in 1825. His publications are of a peculiar character only, and those interested may consult Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, ii, 1861.

Pride is inordinate and unreasonable self-esteem, attended with insolence and rude treatment of others. 1. "It is sometimes," says a good writer, "confounded with vanity, and sometimes with dignity; but to the former passions, resembling pride, and many circumstances it differs from the latter. Vanity is the parent of loquacious boasting, and the person subject to it, if his pretences be admitted, has no inclination to insult the company. The proud man, on the other hand, is naturally silent, and wrapped up in his own importance, seldom speaks but to make his audience feel their inferiority." Pride is the high opinion that a poor, little, contracted soul entertains of itself. Dignity consists in just, great, and uniform actions, and is the opposite to meanness. 2. Pride manifests itself by raising our selves, adoring our persons, attempting to appear before others in a superior light to what we are; contempt and slander of others; envy at the excellences others possess; disuse to gain applause; distress and rage when slighted; impatience of contradiction, and opposition to God himself. The evil effects of pride are beyond computation. It has spread itself universally in all nations, among all characters; and as it was the first sin, as some suppose, that entered into the world, so it seems the last to be conquered. It may be considered as the parent of discontent, ingratitude, covetousness, poverty, presumption, passion, extravagance, bigotry, war, and persecution. In fact, there is hardly an evil perpetrated but pride is connected with it in a proximate or remote sense. 4. To suppress this evil, we should consider what we are. "If we could trace our own history," says the Sermon, "we should find all slaves to come from princes, and all princes from slaves. To be proud of knowledge is to be blind in the light; to be proud of virtue is to poison ourselves with the antidote; to be proud of authority is to make our rise our downfall." The imperfection of our nature, our scanty knowledge, contracted powers, narrow conceptions, and moral inability are strong motives to excite us to humility. We should consider, also, what punishments this sin has brought on mankind. See the cases of Pharaoh, Haman, Nebuchadnezzar, Herod, and others; how particularly it is prohibited (Prov. xvi, 18; 1 Pet. v, 5; James iv, 6; Prov. xxix, 23); what a torment it is to its possessor (Esther v, 13); how soon all things of a sublunary nature will end; how disgraceful it renders us in the sight of God, angels, and men; what a barrier it is to our felicity and communion with God; how fruitful it is of discord; how precludes our usefulness, and renders us really contemptible. Comp. Blackie, Morals, p. 244; Eldridge, Works; Robert Hall, Works; Butts, Works; the Philosopheries of the Mind; West. Mag. 1846, p. lxxi.; 1847, p. 548 sqq; Malcom, Theol. Index, s. v. See the pl. 86; thimideaux, Humphrey, D.D., a learned English divine, noted as a historian, was born at Padstow, in Cornwall, May 8, 1648. He was educated first at Westminster School and later at Christ Church, Oxford, where he took his degree in 1672. While at the university he published an ancient inscription from the ancient Chersonesian Greek marble, under the title of Sarcófago Ossenisea, which recommended him to the patronage of the lord-chancellor Finch, afterwards earl of Nottingham, who gave him in 1679 a living near Oxford, and afterwards a prebend in Norwich cathedral. While there he became engaged in some severe contests with the Roman Catholics, the result of which was the publication of his work The Validity of the Orders of the Church of England made out (1688). He also took an active part in resisting the arbitrary proceedings of James II which affected the interests of the Established Church. In 1688 he was promoted to the archdeaconry of Suffolk; but it was not without much consideration that he could bring himself to take the oath of allegiance to William and Mary. But when once decided, he acted in good faith, and treated all non-jurors with a kindness and respect. In 1691, upon the death of Dr. Pococke, the Hebrew professorship at Oxford was offered to Dr. Pridaeux, but he refused it, though he afterwards repented of his refusal. In 1697 he published The Life of Mahomet, which he had received three editions of it before the first edition. This Life was only a part of a greater work which he had long designed to write, and that was A History of the Saracens Empire, and with it The Decay and Full of Christianity in the East; but, for certain reasons, he dropped this design, and only published that part which contained The Life of Mahomet, to which he annexed A Letter to the Deists, wherein he undertook to prove the truth of Christianity by contrasting it with the impostures of Mohammedanism. In 1702 he was made dean of Norwich. He died Nov. 1, 1724. He published, The Original Right of Tythes,—Directions for Churchwardens, and other small pieces for the service of the Church; also two tracts of Maimonides, with a Latin version and notes, under the title of De Jure Pauperis et Pergrinis apud Judaeos, as an introduction for Hebrew students to Rabbinical language. But Dr. Pridaeux's great work was The Connection of the History of the Old and New Testament, the first part of which was published in 1716, the second in 1718. Both parts were received with the greatest approbation, and were translated into eight editions in French, Latin, and three or three in Dublin, before the end of 1720. The best of the many excellent editions which have appeared of this work since the death of its author are probably the 22d, with An Account of the Rabbinical Authorities by Rev. A. M'Caul, D.D. (1845, 2 vols. 8vo), and the 25th, which, with an Account, contains an Account of the Text and analysis, and Introductory Review by J. Talboys Wheeler (Lond. 1856, 2 vols. 8vo). The last named is by far the most desirable of all, as it contains, in addition to the excellent work done by the M'Caul, the notes, etc., by Wheeler, who also edited Shute's Connection of Sacred and Profane History (1858, 2 vols. 8vo) and Russell's Connection of Sacred and Profane History (1865, 2 vols. 8vo), the three embracing the entire period from the Creation to the time of Christ. Prideaux's Connection was translated into French (Ams. 1728, 8 vols. 12mo), and, with John Diebold's annotations, into Dutch. Le Clerc published a critical examination of it, which appeared in English (Lond. 1722, 8vo). "The Connection," says Orme, "contains a large mass of erudition, and accurate information on every topic of Jewish history and antiquities, and all the links which connected that peculiar people with the surrounding nations. It is indispensable to the Biblical and interesting to the general scholar.... Le Clerc's exceptions are not of great importance" (Bibl. Bib., s. v.). This history was the affair of many years, and occupied all the other Eastern nations, as well as of the Jews; and likewise those of Greece and Rome, so far as was neces-
ary for giving a distinct view of the completion of the prophecies which relate to the times comprehended in it. The author has also set in the clearest light some passages of profane history which before lay dispersed and buried in confusion, and there appears throughout the whole work such an amiable spirit of sincerity and candor as sufficiently atones as well for the few mistakes which escaped his diligence as for some weaknesses arising from his individual temperament. About three years before his death he presented his collection of Oriental books, more than three hundred in number, to the library of Clare Hall, Cambridge. Several of his posthumous Tracts and Letters, with a Life of Dr. Prideaux, were published in 1748 (8vo). Dr. Prideaux was tall, well-built, and of a strong and robust constitution. His qualities were very good, solid rather than lively, and his judgment excellent. He possessed great moral worth, and more ardent piety than was usual in his generation. As a writer he is clear, strong, intelligent, and learned. See, besides the works above mentioned, Biog. Brit. s. v.; Gentleman's Magazine, vol. lxx.; and especially the excellent article in Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, ii, 1681, 1692.

Prideaux, John, D.D., an English prelate of much note, was born of humble parentage at Stowford, near Ivybridge, in Devonshire, Sept. 17, 1758. While yet in his boyhood he was a candidate for the office of parish-clerk at Ugborough, a neighboring village; but he did not succeed, and to his failure he attributed his early death. He led a pious and virtuous life. In 1795, a notice appeared in a local paper of a lady of the parish, who, seeing that a boy of only common educational training attempted so much, felt persuaded that he would surely rise if given greater facilities; and she supported him at school till he had acquired a knowledge of Latin, and was ready to go to Oxford, where he was admitted a poor scholar at Exeter College in 1596. He was elected probationer fellow of his college in 1602, being then a B.A. In the following year he received holy orders, and, having become noted for his profound knowledge of divinity as well as his great learning in general, he was elected rector of his college upon the death of Dr. Thomas Holland in 1612. In 1615 he succeeded Dr. Robert Abbott, then promoted to the see of Salisbury, as regius professor of divinity, canon of Christ Church, and rector of Ewelme. He afterwards held the office of vice-chancellor for several years.

“The rectorship of his college,” says Wood, “he carried himself so winning and pleasing by his gentle government and fatherly instruction that it flourished more than any house in the university with small expense. As a great as of many foreigners that came purposely to sit at his feet to gain instruction.” He no less distinguished himself in the divinity chair, which he occupied for twenty-six years. Although he maintained his decided convictions against the Socinians and Arminians, and was a most stout defender of the Calvinistic tenantry, he was yet popular with all his hearers, and none failed to do him reverence, however widely they might differ from him. Though the university was agitated deeply by the controversy of those times, Prideaux happily escaped all partisan imbroglio, and in 1641 was elevated to the bishopric of Worcester. On account of his adherence to the king, he found his dignity neither pleasant nor profitable. He became so impoverished as to be compelled to sell his books, and so was, as Dr. Gower in his lives of the learned calls him, ‘veneris liberorum hollus.’ Having continued Wood’s, first, by indefatigable studies, digested his excellent library into his mind, he was afterwards forced again to devoul his books with his teeth, turning them, by a miraculous faith and patience, into bread for himself and his children, to whom he left his books, except a paper on Peter (2 Pet. 1:12, 13), and a father’s prayers.” He died at Bredon, in Worcestershire, July 12, 1650. He was a man of most unsparing and gentle manners; of excellent conduct, and great integrity and piety of mind; quite regardless of worldly concerns, and careless and often imprudent in worldly matters. He was an excellent linguist, possessing a wonderful memory, and so profound a divine that some have called him “Columna Fidei Orthodoxo et Maleus Hereticorum,” “Patrum Pater,” and “Ingenia Scholae et Academiae Oraculum.” His works were as much esteemed as his learning. They were numerous, and mostly written during a long residence in Paris, on bodily health, politics, theology, and other subjects. Some of these works were also printed in Latin, and had a great sale.

Prieur de Sancerre was a French cardinal, born in 1451, of a noble family. He was successively, by the favor of cardinal George D'Amboise, his cousin, grand archdeacon of Bourges, archdeacon of Blois, dean of St.-Hilaire-de-Poitiers, apostolic prothonotary, abbot commendatory of Landais, of Saint-Aubin, of Beaune, of Oloron, of Landun, etc., and, at last, almoner to the king. He was raised to the bishopric of Bayeux, on the express recommendation of Louis XII, Sept. 17, 1498. He was shortly after sent to Spain to subscribe to the treaty concluded in 1499 with Henry VII, king of England. He accompanied, a little while after this, Louis XII in his expedition against the Genevese, and was promoted to the cardinalate by Julius II (May 17, 1500). When that pope took up arms against Louis XII, he prevented de Prie from leaving Rome, under pain of being deprived of his livings (1500). In spite of the pontifical inquisition, the cardinal quitted Rome, and, together with some other prelates attached to the interests of France, opened at Pisa (Nov. 1, 1511) a council against Julius II, who, on Oct. 24, had declared him deposed from the cardinalate. In the interval he had been raised to the archbishopric of Limoges (1510), and two years after he was provided with the bishopric of Lectoure. Seeing the chair of Limoges contested, de Prie made an arrangement with his competitors (Aug. 16, 1513) by which he relinquished his rights to the bishopric of Lectoure to William of Mornay, who in his turn resigned the bishopric of Limoges to Foucaud de Bonnivial, then obtained the bishopric of Soissons. René de Prie, who had in the meantime been created cardinal by pope Leo X, celebrated at St. Denis the funeral ceremonies of Anne of Brittany (Jan. 29, 1514); then witnessed the marriage of Louis XII and Mary of England (Sept. 14); held at Bayeux a diocesan synod, where he published the laws (April 15, 1515); and resigned his two bishoprics of Limoges and of Bayeux Sept. 18. While at Milan, in 1512, when the Council of Pisa had been transferred, the University of Paris declared against him in a work of Thomas de Vio (cardinal Cajetan), On the Authority of the Pope, wherein the doctrine of Gerson was attacked, which he had espoused. Cardinal de Prie died at Lyre Sept. 9, 1519.—Hofler, Nouv. Biog. Générale, s. v.

Prie-Dieu is a term in ecclesiastical architecture designating a small lectern (q. v.), or book-deck, which was introduced in the 15th century.

Prierias, Sylvester, a Roman Catholic theologian of the time of the Reformation, and noted for his antagonist views on the new movement, was born in 1440. His family-name was Masolino, but he was called de Prieria, surnamed Petria, Prieria, Prieres, and Prieri, and a father's prayers. He died at Bredon, in Worcestershire, July 12, 1650. He was a man of most unassuming and gentle manners; of excellent conduct, and great integer
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and ready exposition, he was surrounded by a crowd of pupils at the Gymnasium of Bologna, of which he had become the director. At the request of the Senate of Venice he was called up for a few years to be professor of theology at Padua, and was then prior at Milan, Verona, and Como. In 1508, in an assembly of the members of his order from both Lombardy, held at Mantua, he was elected vicar-general; two years later he was elected prior at Bologna. His resolution and the commission of Doctor Hallerius, bishop of Ponte, induced pope Julius II to call him to Rome in 1611 as public lecturer on theology. Upon the death of the Magister Sacri Palutii, Frater Joannes de Raffanella (generally called De Ferraria), in 1515, Priarisa was promoted to the vacant dignity. He was stationed in Florence, Gen. xii (4), 22, xxi, 20) while others remain afar off, and is applied accordingly, for the most part, to the sons of Aaron, as those who were alone authorized to offer sacrifices. In some remarkable passages it takes a wider range. It is applied to the priests of other nations or religions, to the Levites (Lev. xiii, 12, 21), with whom it is buried in the church of St. Mary ad Minervam. He was the first non-German theologian who took up the pen against Luther. In 1518 he published Dialogus in praesumptuosa Martini Lutheri conclamatione de potestate Pau- pe and his Replicas in Lutherum; then in the following years his Errata et Argumenta Lutheri recutita, detecta- tata, et copiosaissima trito, and his Epistola Responsionis ad eundem Lutherum. The style is quite scholastic, and his defense of the papal primacy not without ability from a Romanist standpoint. But Luther, in his blunt and personal attacks, shows the weaknesses of his papal pretension as to make the defence of Priarisa contemptible. The pope himself saw the inferiority of his defender in the contest, and admonished Priarisa to silence; though he appointed him one of the judges of Leibnizius, what he uttered false- ly to Priarisa are the works of a later magister of the order, Franciscus Sylvester. After his death appeared under his name some satires, composed after the fashion of the Epistola obscura.—vix, Modus solusam et auctilicicos ad quos libenter et consensumus Luthemus caiul nece- ssarium, et le Tractatus de arte et modo inservendi karectios. See Echard and Quetif, Bibliotheca Fruadrica- torum; Pressel (in Herzog), Real-Encyclopädie, for the Protestant, and Asbach, Kirchen-Lexikon, for the Rom- Catholic estimate of this man. See also Fisher, Hist. of the Reformation, p. 96; Alzog, Kirchengesch. ii, 282. (J. H. W.)

HEBR. hên', hên, iepiscos, webase the first article upon the Scriptural information, with important additions from other and more modern sources.) See also SACRED ORDER.

I. General Considerations.—1. The Name. (1.) The English version of the word in the Sept. and of the Test. term presbyter (πρεσבύτερος, elder), the meaning of which is, however, essentially different from that which was intended by the ancient terms. It would come nearer if derived from προτερήματα or προσπέρασμα, "to be before," etc. It would then correspond to Artio- tistius's definition of a priest, "presiding over things relating to the gods" (Polit. iii, 14), and with the very similar one in Heb. v, 1: "Every high-priest taken from among men is constituted on the behalf of men, with respect to their concerns with God, that he may present both gifts and sacrifices for sins." It would then adequately represent the iepiscos (ἐπισκόπος) of the Greeks, and the sacerdos (σακσιοイς) of the Latin. See PRIESTS.

(2.) It is unfortunate that there is nothing like a comprehensive interpreters as to the etymology of the above Hebrew word hên'. Its root-meaning, uncertain as far as Hebrew itself is concerned, is referred by Gesenius (Thesaurus, a. v.) to the idea of prophecy. The hên' delivers a divine message, stands as a mediator between God and man, represents each to the other. This meaning, however, belongs to the Hellenic, not to the Hebrew form, and Ewald connects the latter with the verb הוּלָלָה (hên'), to array, put in order (so in Isa. xli, 10), seeing in it a reference to the primary office of the priests as arranging the sacrifice on the altar (Aller- thum, p. 272). According to Saalschütz (Archdol. der

Hebr. c. 78), the primary meaning of the word is to minister, and he thus accounts for the wider application of the name (as below). Bähr (Symbolik, ii, 15) connects it with an Arabic root = כֹּל, to draw near.

Of these etymologies, the last has the merit of answering most closely to the received usage of the word. In the prescription of the law, it is used of one who may "draw near" to the Divine Presence (Exod. xix, 22; 33, 20) while others remain afar off, and is applied accordingly, for the most part, to the sons of Aaron, as those who were alone authorized to offer sacrifices. In some remarkable passages it takes a wider range. It is applied to the priests of other nations or religions, to the Levites (Lev. xiii, 12, 21), with whom it is buried in the church of St. Mary ad Minervam. He was the first non-German theologian who took up the pen against Luther. In 1518 he published Dialogus in praesumptuosa Martini Lutheri conclamatione de potestate Pau- pe and his Replicas in Lutherum; then in the following years his Errata et Argumenta Lutheri recutita, detecta- tata, et copiosaissima trito, and his Epistola Responsionis ad eundem Lutherum. The style is quite scholastic, and his defense of the papal primacy not without ability from a Romanist standpoint. But Luther, in his blunt and personal attacks, shows the weaknesses of his papal pretension as to make the defence of Priarisa contemptible. The pope himself saw the inferiority of his defender in the contest, and admonished Priarisa to silence; though he appointed him one of the judges of Leibnizius, what he uttered falsely to Priarisa are the works of a later magister of the order, Franciscus Sylvester. After his death appeared under his name some satires, composed after the fashion of the Epistola obscura.—vix, Modus solusam et auctilicicos ad quos libenter et consensumus Luthemus caiul nece- ssumum, et le Tractatus de arte et modo inservendi karectios. See Echard and Quetif, Bibliotheca Fruadrica- torum; Pressel (in Herzog), Real-Encyclopädie, for the Protestant, and Asbach, Kirchen-Lexikon, for the Rom- Catholic estimate of this man. See also Fisher, Hist. of the Reformation, p. 96; Alzog, Kirchengesch. ii, 282. (J. H. W.)

HEBR. hên', hên, iepiscos, webase the first article upon the Scriptural information, with important additions from other and more modern sources.) See also SACRED ORDER.

I. General Considerations.—1. The Name. (1.) The English version of the word in the Sept. and of the Test. term presbyter (πρεσβύτερος, elder), the meaning of which is, however, essentially different from that which was intended by the ancient terms. It would come nearer if derived from προτερήματα or προσπέρασμα, "to be before," etc. It would then correspond to Artio- tistius's definition of a priest, "presiding over things relating to the gods" (Polit. iii, 14), and with the very similar one in Heb. v, 1: "Every high-priest taken from among men is constituted on the behalf of men, with respect to their concerns with God, that he may present both gifts and sacrifices for sins." It would then adequately represent the iepiscos (ἐπισκόπος) of the Greeks, and the sacerdos (σακσιοίς) of the Latin. See PRIESTS.

(2.) It is unfortunate that there is nothing like a comprehensive interpreters as to the etymology of the above Hebrew word hên'. Its root-meaning, uncertain as far as Hebrew itself is concerned, is referred by Gesenius (Thesaurus, a. v.) to the idea of prophecy. The hên' delivers a divine message, stands as a mediator between God and man, represents each to the other. This meaning, however, belongs to the Hellenic, not to the Hebrew form, and Ewald connects the latter with the verb הונלא (hên'), to array, put in order (so in Isa. xli, 10), seeing in it a reference to the primary office of the priests as arranging the sacrifice on the altar (Aller- thum, p. 272). According to Saalschütz (Archdol. der
the Sept. gives ἱππής. It is noticeable that this use of the title is confined to the reigns of David and Solomon, and that the synonym "the king's hand" of 1 Chronicles 6:42, and "the hand and priest" and priests are considered as synonymous. Yet by this the specific object of the priesthood, in contradistinction to the two other theocratic offices of prophet and king, is by no means sufficiently expressed. The prophet is also a mediator between God and man, since he speaks for the latter in the name of the former; while the king is the mediator of the judicial and executive power of God among his people, acting in the name of Jehovah. The priest also was clothed with representative power (Deut. xvi, 5); but this power was mainly directed to represent the people as a holy people in the presence of Jehovah, and to prepare a way by which they themselves might approach God.

Israel was the full-grown family of God, and the domestic priesthood was to become a nation of priests, a royal priesthood (1 Pet. ii, 9; 1 Pet. ii, 5; Num. xvi, 3). But that Israel was chosen to be the royal priesthood with respect to other nations, like many other things, was only expressed in idea, and not actually realized in fact. Israel was incapacitated by its natural infirmities, and its ignorance and transgressions of the very law through the fulfilment of which it was to be sanctified, to penetrate into the immediate presence of God (Exod. xix, 21). Hence the necessity of the nation having individual representatives to mediate between them and Jehovah. As a separate element the priesthood represented the nation as yet unfit to approach God. The people offered their gifts to God by means of a separated class from among themselves, and in connection with the propitiatory sacrifices this was calculated to keep alive the consciousness of their estrangement from God. The very place assigned to the priests in the camp was expressive of this idea, that they keep "the charge of the sanctuary for the charge of the children of Israel" (Num. iii, 88).

The insufficiency of the priesthood was expressed by the fact that the king being excluded from the most holy place. Only the high-priest, in whom the idea of this typical institution concentrated, could penetrate thither; and he only as the type of the future Mediater who was absolutely to lead us into the most holy of the world of spirits. Because the priests were not altogether removed from men, the people, even the chiefpriest, had access only once a year to the most holy, and that just on the day when the entire guilt of the nation was to be atoned for. He had on that occasion to confess his own sin, and bring a sin-offering; to lay aside his magnificent robes of office, and to officiate in a plain linen garment. Moreover, when he entered the dark, narrow space of the most holy, the cloud of incense was to cover the mercy-seat "that he die not" (Lev. xvi, 13).

The idea of mediation between God and the people is expressed by the priest presenting the atonement for the congregation, and the gifts of a reconciled people (2 Chronicles xix, 17; Lev. xvi, vii); Num. vii, 1; Deut. vii, 5). Again, he brings back from God's presence the blessing of grace, mercy, and peace (Lev. ix, 27, etc.; Num. vi, 22-27). In the earliest families of the race of Shem the offices of priest and prophet were undoubtedly united; so that the word originally denoted both, and at last the Hebrew idiom kept one part of the idea and the Arabic another (Genenium, Hebräisches und Chaldäisches Handwörterbuch [Leips., 1893]). It is worthy of remark that all the persons who are recorded in Scripture as having legally performed priestly acts, but who were not strictly sacerdotal, come under the definition of a prophet, viz.

persons who received supernatural communications of knowledge generally, as Adam, Abraham (Gen. xxv, 7), Isaac, Jacob, Moses, Job, Samuel, Elijah (comp. Luke i, 70). The relations of Ahasaph and the sacerdotal may be sufficiently comprehensive: A man who officiates or transacts with God on behalf of others, statedly, or for the occasion.

1. Ahasaph or ahasaph, (as in Exod. xvi, 22, for the Sept.) signifies "prophesying" under their head or father, and of the relation of Asaph himself to David in the choral service of the Temple.

2. Essential Idea of the Hebrew Priesthood.—This may be called mediation; hence the fact that in the epistle to the Hebrews [6:1-20] God and his office are considered as synonymous. Yet by this the specific object of the priesthood, in contradistinction to the two other theocratic offices of prophet and king, is by no means sufficiently expressed. The prophet is also a mediator between God and man, since he speaks for the latter in the name of the former; while the king is the mediator of the judicial and executive power of God among his people, acting in the name of Jehovah. The priest also was clothed with representative power (Deut. xvi, 5); but this power was mainly directed to represent the people as a holy people in the presence of Jehovah, and to prepare a way by which they themselves might approach God.

Israel was the full-grown family of God, and the domestic priesthood was to become a nation of priests, a royal priesthood (1 Pet. ii, 9; 1 Pet. ii, 5; Num. xvi, 3). But that Israel was chosen to be the royal priesthood with respect to other nations, like many other things, was only expressed in idea, and not actually realized in fact. Israel was incapacitated by its natural infirmities, and its ignorance and transgressions of the very law through the fulfilment of which it was to be sanctified, to penetrate into the immediate presence of God (Exod. xix, 21). Hence the necessity of the nation having individual representatives to mediate between them and Jehovah. As a separate element the priesthood represented the nation as yet unfit to approach God. The people offered their gifts to God by means of a separated class from among themselves, and in connection with the propitiatory sacrifices this was calculated to keep alive the consciousness of their estrangement from God. The very place assigned to the priests in the camp was expressive of this idea, that they keep "the charge of the sanctuary for the charge of the children of Israel" (Num. iii, 88).

The insufficiency of the priesthood was expressed by the fact that the king being excluded from the most holy place. Only the high-priest, in whom the idea of this typical institution concentrated, could penetrate thither; and he only as the type of the future Mediater who was absolutely to lead us into the most holy of the world of spirits. Because the priests were not altogether removed from men, the people, even the chiefpriest, had access only once a year to the most holy, and that just on the day when the entire guilt of the nation was to be atoned for. He had on that occasion to confess his own sin, and bring a sin-offering; to lay aside his magnificent robes of office, and to officiate in a plain linen garment. Moreover, when he entered the dark, narrow space of the most holy, the cloud of incense was to cover the mercy-seat "that he die not" (Lev. xvi, 13).

The idea of mediation between God and the people is expressed by the priest presenting the atonement for the congregation, and the gifts of a reconciled people (2 Chronicles xix, 17; Lev. xvi, vii); Num. vi, 1; Deut. vii, 5). Again, he brings back from God's presence the blessing of grace, mercy, and peace (Lev. ix, 27, etc.; Num. vi, 22-27). In the earliest families of the race of Shem the offices of priest and prophet were undoubtedly united; so that the word originally denoted both, and at last the Hebrew idiom kept one part of the idea and the Arabic another (Genenium, Hebräisches und Chaldäisches Handwörterbuch [Leips., 1893]). It is worthy of remark that all the persons who are recorded in Scripture as having legally performed priestly acts, but who were not strictly sacerdotal, come under the definition of a prophet, viz.

persons who received supernatural communications of knowledge generally, as Adam, Abraham (Gen. xxv, 7), Isaac, Jacob, Moses, Job, Samuel, Elijah (comp. Luke i, 70). The relations of Ahasaph and the sacerdotal may be sufficiently comprehensive: A man who officiates or transacts with God on behalf of others, statedly, or for the occasion.

3. Origin of the Sacerdotal Order.—The idea of a priesthood connects itself, in all its forms, pure or corrupted, with the conscience of more or less cleansed sin. Men feel that they have broken a law. The power above them is holier than they are, and they dare not approach it. They crave for the intervention of some one of whom they can think as likely to be more acceptable to the one to whom they render prayers, thanksgivings, sacrifices. He becomes their representative in "things pertaining unto God." He may become also (though this does not always follow) the representative of God to man. The functions of the priest and prophet may exist in the same person. The reverence which men pay to one who bears this consecrated character may lead them to acknowledge the priest as being also their king. The claim to fill the office may rest on characteristics belonging only to the individual man, or confined to a single family or tribe. The conditions of the office may demand the continuous presence of the priests, as they are among the most conspicuous facts of all religions of the ancient world, so do they occupy a like position in the history of the religion of Israel.

No trace of a hereditary or caste priesthood meets us in the worship of the patriarchal age. (For its occasional appearance in a general form, see § iii.) Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob perform priestly acts, offer sacrifices, "draw near" to the Lord (Gen. xii, 8; xviii, 22; xxvi, 25; xxvii, 20). To the eldest son, or to the favored son exalted to the place of the eldest, belongs the "goodly raiment" (xvii, 15), the "coat of many colors" (xxvii, 8), in which we find perhaps the earliest trace of a sacerdotal vestment (comp. Blunt, Script. Ceremon. i, 1; Ugelino, xiii, 189). Once, and once only, does the word kōhēn meet us as belonging to a ritual earlier than the time of Abraham. Melchizedek is "the priest of the most high God" (xiv, 18). The argument of the Epistle to the Hebrews has a historical foundation in the fact that there are no indications in the narrative of Gen. xiv of any one preceding or following on that office. The special divine names which are connected with him as the priest of "the most high God, the possessor of heaven and earth," render it probable that he rose, in the strength of those great thoughts of God, above the level of the other inhabitants of Canaan. In him Abraham recognized a faith like his own, a life more entirely consecrated, the priestly character in its perfection. See Melchizedek. In the worship of the patriarchs themselves, the chief of the family, as such, acted as the priest. The office descended with the birthright, and might apparently be transferred with it. As the family expanded, the head of each section probably stood in the same relation to it. The thought of the special consecration of the first-born was recognized at the time of the Exodus (see below). A priesthood of a like kind must continue to exist in other pastoral tribes. The Book of Job, whatever may be its date, ignores altogether the institutions of Israel, and represents the man of Uz as himself "sacramentary" his sons, and offering burnt-offerings (i, 5). Jethro is a "priest of Midian" (Exod. ii, 16; iii, 1). Balak himself offers a bullock and a ram upon the seven altars on Pisgah (Nums. xxiii, 2, etc.).

In Egypt the Israelites came into contact with a priesthood of another kind, and that contact must have been for a time a very close one. The marriage of Joseph with the Egyptian wife (Gen. xli, 45) and that of Joseph to Asenath (Gen. xxxvii, 46) which we may infer from her name, of the goddess Neith—(Gen. xii, 45) [see Asenath] the special favor which he showed to the priestly caste in the years of famine
The training of Moses in the palace of the Pharaohs, probably in the colleges and temples of the priests (Acts vii, 22)—all this must have impressed the constitution, the dress, the outward form of life upon the minds of the lawyer and his contemporaries. Little as we know of the life of Moses during this remote period, the stereotyped fixedness of the customs of that country warrants us in referring to a tolerably distant past the facts which belong historically to a later period, and in doing so we find coincidences with the ritual of the Israelites too numerous to be looked on as accidental, or as the result of forces which were at work independent of each other, but taking parallel directions. As circumcision was common to the two nations (Herod. ii, 37), so the shaving of the whole body (ibid.) was with both part of the symbolic purity of the priesthood, once for all with the Levites of Israel (Numb. viii, 7), peace-offerings (xxiv, 5) either as the first-born or as representing in the freshness of their youth the purity of acceptable worship (comp. the analogous case of "the young man the Levite" in Judges, xvii, and Ewald, Alterthümer, p. 278). On the principle, however, that difference of title must not be made, it must not be assumed that it appears more probable that the "young men" were not those who had before performed priestly acts, but were chosen by the lawyer to be his ministers in the solemn work of the covenant, representing, in their youth, the stage in the nation's life on which the people were then entering (Keil, ad loc.). There are signs that the priests of the older ritual were already dealt with as belonging to an obsolescent system. Though they were known as those that "come near" to the Lord (Exodus xix, 22), yet they are not permitted to approach the Divine Presence on Sinai. They cannot "sanctify" themselves enough to endure that trial. Aaron alone, the future high-priest, but as yet not known as such, enters with Moses into the thick darkness. It is noticeable also that at this transition-stage, when the old order was passing away, and the new was not yet established, there is the proclamation of the truth, wider and higher than both, that the whole people was to be "a kingdom of priests" (ix, 6). The idea of the life of the nation was that it was to be as a priest and a prophet to the rest of mankind. They were called to a universal priesthood (comp. Keil, ad loc.). As a result, they had to submerge discipline before they could make the idea a reality. They drew back from their high vocation (Exodus xx, 18-21). As for other reasons, so also for this, that the central truth required a rigid, unbounding form for its outward expression, a distinctive priesthood was to be to the nation what the nation was to mankind. The position given to the ordinances of the priesthood indicated with sufficient clearness that it was subordinate, not primary, a means and not an end. Not in the first proclamation of the great acts of God's eternal covenant (Deuteronomy xx, 1-17), nor in the application of the chief contingencies of the people's life in the wilderness, does it find a place. It appears together with the ark and the tabernacle, as taking its position in the education by which the people were to be led towards the mark of their high calling. As such we have to consider it.

II. Personal Characteristics of the Hebrew Priesthood.

1. Consecration.—The functions of the High-Priest, the position and history of the Levites as the consecrated tribe, have been fully discussed under those heads. It seems to us, however, that the place connected with "the priests, the sons of Aaron," as standing between the two. Solemm as was the subsequent designation of the other descendants of Levi, that of the priests involved a yet higher consecration. A special word (קֹדֶשׁ, kadish) was appropriated to it. Their old garments were laid aside. Their bodies were washed with clean water (Exodus xxix, 4; Lev. viii, 6) and anointed with the perfumed oil, prepared after a prescribed formula, and to be used for no lower purpose (Exodus xxix, 7; xxx; xxxiii, 2). The sons of Aaron, it may be noticed, were simply sprinkled with the precious oil (Lev. viii, 30). Over Aaron himself it was poured till it went down to the skirts of his clothing (Lev. viii, 12; Psal. cxxxxiii, 2). The new garments belonging to their office were then put on them (see below). The truth that those who intercede for men themselves have been reconciled was indicated by the sacrifice of a bullock as a sin-offering, on which they solemnly laid their hands, as transferring to it the guilt which had been attached to them (Exodus xxix, 10; Lev. viii, 10). The total sacrifice of no priest was permitted by the ram slain as a burnt-offering, "a sweet savour" to Jehovah (Exodus xxix, 18; Lev. viii, 21). The blood of these two was sprinkled on the altar, offered to the Lord. The blood of a third victim, the ram of consecration, was used for another purpose. With it Moses sprinkled the right ear, that was to be open to the di-
vine voice; the right hand and the right foot, that were to be active in divine ministrations (Exod. xxix, 20; Lev. viii, 23, 24). Lastly, as they were to be the exponents, signers, and witnesses of the nation's life, but of the praise and thanksgiving, Moses was to "fill their hands" with cakes of unleavened bread and portions of the sacrifices, which they were to present before the Lord as a wave-offering. This appears to have been regarded as the essential part of the consecration; and the Heb. "to fill the hand" is accordingly used as a synonym for "to consecrate" (Exod. xxix, 9; 2 Chron. xiii, 9). The whole of this mysterious ritual was to be repeated for seven days, during which they remained within the Tabernacle, separated from the people, and not till then were they to "set things in order" (Exod. xxvii, 19), that is, the meaning of all these acts. Bahr. Symbolik, vol. ii, ch. 2, § 2). Moses himself, as the representative of the Unseen King, is the consecrator, the sacrificer throughout these ceremonies; as the channel through which the others receive their office, he has for the time a higher priesthood than that of Aaron (Selden, De Synedr. 1, 16; Ugolino, xii, 3). In accordance with the principle which runs through the history of Israel, he, the ruler, solemnly divests himself of the priestly office and transfers it to another. The fact that he had been a priest was merged in his work as a law-giver. It is only in the time of a later period, that word kohèm applied to him (Psa. cxix, 6).

The consecrated character thus imparted did not need renewing. It was a perpetual inheritance transmitted from father to son through all the centuries that followed. We do not read of its being renewed in the case of any individual priest of the sons of Aaron. Only when the line of succession was broken, and the impiety of Jeroboam intruded the lowest of the people into the sacred office, do we find the reappearance of a like form (2 Chron. xiii, 9) of the same technical word. The previous history of Jeroboam and the character of the worship which he introduced make it probable that, in that case only, the ceremonial was, to some extent, Egyptian in its origin. In after-times the high-priest took an oath (Heb. vii, 23) to bind him, as the Jews say, to a strict adherence to established customs (Mishna, Yoma, 1, 5).

Dress. The "sons of Aaron" thus dedicated were to wear during their ministrations a special apparel—attire at other times apparently worn the common dress of the people. The material of the sacred garments was to be linen, and not wool (Exek. xli, 17; Lev. xxvi, 1-10); but Ewald (Alterthümer, p. 917), Josephus (Ant. iv, 8), and the rabbits (Mass., Kläim, p. 9) maintain that the holy garments were made of a mixture of wool and linen, called ἕττον (shaturn); and a typical meaning is found in this by Braun (Vest. Soc. Hebr. § 80), as if it was to signify the imperfection of the Levitical priesthood; while Ezek. xli, 17, which restricts the material to linen, was considered significant of the simplicity of the New Test. See HETEROGENEOUS. The prohibition in Lev. xix, 19; Deut. xxii, 11 against the people generally wearing any garments of such "mingled" material was hence explained by Josephus that they might not assume what was characteristic of the priests (Ant. iv, 11). But the more satisfactory and natural view is that the priests only wore linen, and that the Israelites were prohibited from wearing the mixture to teach them that even in garments they should avoid all needless artificiness, and to respect the creation of God in the simplicity of the material. See LINEN. It is well known that the Roman poets speak of the Egyptians as the inordinately the wearers of linen (Juvenal, Sat. 6; Ovid, Met. i). The reason for fixing on this material is given in Ezek. xli, 18; but the feeling that there was something unclean in clothes made from the skin or wool of an animal was common to other nations. Egypt has already been mentioned. The Arab priests in the time of Mohammed wore linen only (Ewald, Alterthümer, p. 289). As there were some garments common both to the priest and the high-priest, we shall begin with those of the former, taking them in the order in which they would be put on. See HOLY MANUSCRIPTS.

(1.) The first was ἄμμος ἱματία, "linen breeches," or drawers (Exod. xxviii, 42; Sept. περιτόμην ἑλεά; Vulg. feminula lina). These extended from the loins to the thighs, and were to "cover their nakedness." The reverence of the Hebrew ritual in this and in other places (Exod. xx, 25; xxviii, 42) was probably a protest against some of the fouler forms of nature-worship, as e.g. in the worship of Peor (Maimonides, Moreh Nêtochim, iii, 45; Ugolino, xiii, 385), and possibly, also, in some Egyptian rites (Herod., ii, 60). According to Josephus, whose testimony, however, of course relates only to his own time, they reached only to the middle of the thigh, where they were tied fast (Ant. iii, 7, 1). Such drawers were worn universally in Egypt. In the sculptures and paintings of that country the figures of workmen and servants have no other dress than a short kilt or apron, sometimes simply bound about the loins and lapping over in front; other figures have short loose drawers; while a third variety of this article, fitting closely and extending to the knees, appears in the pictures of some idols, as in the cut. This last sort of drawers seems to have been peculiar in Egypt to the gods, and to the priests, whose attire was often adapted to that of the idols on which they attended. The priests, in common with other persons of the upper classes, wore the drawers under other robes. No mention occurs of the use of drawers by any other class of persons in Israel except the priests, on whom it was enjoined for the sake of decency. See BREECHES.

Fig. 1. Ancient Egyptian Drawers and Girdle.

(2.) Over the drawers was worn the "coat of fine linen" (בֵּין פְּלִיל, kethîmeth shêkâ, tunica linaria), Exod. xxxix, 27), a close-fitting shirt or casacker, such as was worn by men in general (Gen. xxxvii, 3), also by women (2 Sam. xiii, 18; Cant. v, 3), next to the skin. It was white, but with a diamond or chevron pattern on it (Bahr, Symbolik, vol. ii, ch. iii, § 2). This came nearly to the feet (τὸ γαλατάνιον χιτών, Josephus, Ant. iii, 7, 1), and was to be worn in its garment-shape (not cut out and then sewed together), like the χιτών ἐπεκτείνος of John xix, 23, in which some interpreters have even seen a token of the priesthood of him who wore it (Ewald, Gesch. v, 177; Ugolino, xiii, 218). Here also modern Eastern customs present an analogy in the woven, seamless thrones worn by the Mocce pilgrims (Ewald, Alterthümer, p. 299). Josephus further states that it sat close to the body, and had sleeves, which were tied fast to the arms, and was girded to the breast a little above the elbows by a girdle. It had a narrow aperture about the neck, and was tied with certain strings hanging down from the edge over the breast and back, and was fastened above each shoulder (Ant. iii,
7, 9, 17). But this garment, in the case of the priests and high-priest, was to be broidered (Exod. xxviii, 4), "a broidered coat," by which Gesenius understands a coat of cloth worked in checkers or cells. Braun compares it to the reticulum in the stomach of ruminant animals (De Vestit. i, 17). The Sept. gives χιτών ἐν ζωικοβάρτι, and seems to refer to the tassels or strings; Vulg. laceri stricto, which seems to refer to its close fitting.

(5.) The whole tunic was gathered at the waist by the "girdle" (σακάτη, ουδή, Exod. xxviii, 40; Sept. ليذ, Vulg. iudae, comp. Ezek. ii, 29). This was also worn by magistrates (Iam. xxii, 21). The girdle for the priests was to be made of fine twined linen, and blue and purple and scarlet of needlework (xxix, 29). Josephus describes it as often going round, four fingers broad, but so loosely woven that it might be taken for the skin of a serpent; and that it was embroidered with flowers of scarlet red, purple, and blue, but that the warp was nothing but linen. The beginning of its circumference was at the breast, and when it had gone round it was there tied, and hung loosely down to the ankles while the priest was not engaged in any laborious service, for in that position it appeared in the most agreeable manner to the spectators; but when he was obliged to assist at the offering of sacrifices and to do the appointed service, in order that he might not be hindered in his operations by its motion, he threw it to the left hand and bore it on his right shoulder (A. n. iii, 7, 2). The mode of its hanging down is illustrated in Fig. 4, where the girdle is also richly embroidered, while the imbricated appearance of the girdle (ギοδανάς ἐν ζωικοβάρτι) may be seen very plainly in Fig. 1. The next cut (Fig. 8) of a priestly scribe of ancient Egypt, offers an interesting specimen of both tunic and girdle. See Girdle.

(4.) Upon their head they were to wear a turban (ギοδανάς, migbédh; Exod. xxviii, 40; Sept. ι καταρα ὑπερ βαρε, Vulg. tiera; A. V. "cap or" bonnet," which two words are there synonymous) in the form of a cup-shaped flower, also of fine linen (xxix, 28). In the time of Josephus it was circular, covering about half the head, something like a crown, made of thick linen swathes doubled round many times and sewed together, and surrounded by a linen cover to hide the seams of the swathes, and sat so close that it would not fall off when the body was bent down (A. n. iii, 7, 3).

These garments they might wear at any time in the Temple, whether on duty or not, but they were not to sleep in them (Josephus, War. v, 5, 7). When they became soiled they were not washed or used again, but torn up to make wicks for the lamps in the Tabernacle (Selden, De Synedr. xiii, 11). In Ezek. xiii, 14; xlv, 17-19, there are directions that the priests should take off their garments when they had ministered, and lay them up in the holy chambers, and put on other garments; but these directions occur in a visionary representation of a temple, which all agree has never been realized, the particulars of which, though sometimes derived from kingly customs, yet at other times copied over from them widely. The garments of the inferior priests are to have been kept in the sacred treasury (Ezra ii, 69; Neh. vii, 70). They had besides them other "clothes of service," which were probably simpler, but are not described (Exod. xxxi, 10; xxi, 14). In all their acts of ministration they were to be barefooted. This is inferred (a) from the absence of any direction as to a covering for the feet; (b) from the later custom; (c) from the universal feeling of the East. Shoes were worn as a protection against defilement. In a sanctuary there was nothing that could defile. Then, as now, this was the strongest recognition of the sanctity of a holy place which the Oriental mind could think of (Exod. iii, 5; Josh. v, 15), and throughout the whole existence of the Temple service, even though it drew upon them the scorn of the heathen Jews. Sat. vi, 15, especially affected this view of the priests (Ugolinus, viii, 976; xiii, 405), it was scrupulously adhered to.

The dress of the high-priest was precisely the same with that of the common priests in all the foregoing particulars; in addition to which he had (1) a robe, γαλατή, mell (Exod. xxviii, 4, νοθήμ, tunica). This was not a mantle, but a second and larger coat without sleeves; a kind of surplice worn by the lity, especially persons of distinction (Job i, 20; ii, 12, by kings; 1 Sam. xv, 27; xxviii, 4; xxiv, 5-12). This garment, when intended for the high-priest, and then called "the robe of the ephod," was to be of one entire piece of woven work, all of blue, with an aperture for the neck in the middle of the upper part, having its rim strengthened and adorned with a border. The hem had a kind of fringe, composed of tassels, made of blue, purple, and scarlet, in the form of pomegranates; and between every two pomegranates there was a small golden bell, so that there was a bell and a pomegranate alternately all round (Exod. xxviii, 31-35). The use of these bells may have partly been that by the high-priest shaking his garment at the time of his offering incense on the great day of expiation, etc., the people without might be apprised of it, and unite their prayers with it (comp. Ezech. xiv, 19; Luke i, 10; Acts x, 4; Rev. viii, 8, 9, 3). Josephus describes this robe of the ephod as reaching to the feet, and consisting of a single piece of stuff parted where the hands came out (John xix, 23). He also states that it was tied round with a girdle embroidered with the same colors as the former, with a mixture of gold interwoven (A. n. iii, 7, 4). It is highly probable that this garment was also derived from Egyptian usage. There are instances at Thebes of priests wearing over the great-coat a loose sleeveless robe, which exposes the sleeves of the inner tunic. The fringes of bells and pomegranates seems to have been the priestly substitute for the fringe bound with a blue ribbon, which all the Israelites were commanded to wear. Many traces of this fringe occur in the Egyptian remains. The use assigned to it, "that looking on this fringe they might remember the Lord's commandments," seems best explicable by the supposition that the Egyptians had connected some superstitious ideas with it (Numb. xv, 37-40). (2.) The ephod, τό έφοδος, τούτοις, superhumeralia (Exod. xxviii, 4). This was a short cloak covering the shoulders and breast. It is said to have been worn by Samuel while a youth ministering before the Lord (1 Sam. ii, 18); by David while engaged in religious service (2 Sam. vi, 14); and by inferior priests.
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Fig. 4. Ancient Egyptian Priestly Robe, Ephod, and Girdle.

(1 Sam. xxii, 18). But in all these instances it is distinguished as a linen ephod, and was not a sacred but an honorary vestment, as the Sept. understands it in 2 Sam. vi, 14, ἐκλύγαν Ἠσσάλων. The ephod of the high-priest was to be made of gold, of blue, of purple, and scarlet, and fine twined linen, with cunning work, ἡσσάλων. Though it probably consisted of one piece, woven throughout, it had a back part and a front part, united by shoulder-pieces. It had also a girdle; or, rather, strings went out from each side and tied it to the body. On the top of each shoulder was to be an onyx stone, set in sockets of gold, each having engraved upon it six of the names of the children of Israel, according to the precedence of birth, to memorialize the Lord of the promises made to them (Exod. xxviii, 6-12, 29). Josephus gives sleeves to the ephod (Ant. iii, 7, 5). It may be considered as a substitute for the leopard-skin worn by the Egyptian high-priests in their most sacred duties, as in Fig. 4, where the ephod appears no less plainly. In other figures of Egyptian priests, the shoulder-pieces were equally apparent. They are even perceptible in Fig. 1. The Egyptian ephod is, however, highly charged with all sorts of idolatrous figures and emblems, and even with scenes of human sacrifices. The Sept. rendering of ἡσσάλων, "cunning work," is ἱρακνή ἐφαντο πουειλτοφ, a woven-work of the embroiderer, a word which especially denotes a manufacturer of tissues adorned with figures of animals (Strabo, xviii, p. 574, Sieh.). In the earlier liturgical costume, the ephod is mentioned as belonging to the high-priest only (Exod. xxviii, 6-12; xxxix, 2-5). At a later period it is used apparently by all the priests (1 Sam. xxii, 18), and even by others, not of the tribe of Levi, engaged in religious ceremonial (2 Sam. vi, 14). See Ephod. Then came (3) the breastplate, ἄμμωτος, ἁδάκης (Sept. περιαργατής, ἄμμωτος; Vulg. rutilus); a gorget ten inches square, made of the same sort of cloth as the ephod, and doubled so as to form a kind of pouch or bag (Exod. xxix, 9), in which were to be put the Urim and Thummim, which are also mentioned as if already known (xxviii, 80). The external part of this gorget was set with four rows of precious stones—the first row a sardius, a topaz, and a carbuncle; the second, an emerald, a sapphire, and a diamond; the third, a figure, an agate, and an amethyst; and the fourth, a beryl, an onyx, and a Jasper—set in a golden socket. Upon each of these stones was to be engraved the name of one of the sons of Jacob. In the ephod, in which there was a space left open sufficiently large for the admission of this pectoral, were four rings of gold, to which four others at the four corners of the breastplate corresponded; the two lower rings of the latter being fixed inside. It was confined to the ephod by means of dark-blue ribbons, which passed through these rings; and it was also suspended from the onyx stones on the shoulder by chains of gold, or, rather, cords of twisted gold threads, which were fastened at one end to two other larger rings fixed in the upper corners of the pectoral, and by the other end going round the onyx stones on the shoulders, and returning and being fixed in the larger ring. The breastplate was further kept in its place by a girdle, made of the same stuff, which Josephus says was sewed to the breastplate, and which, when it had gone once round, was tied again upon the seam and hung down. Here is another adaptation and correction of the costume of the higher Egyptian priests, who wore a large, splendid ornament upon the breast, often a winged scarabaeus, the emblem of the sun, as in the cut, Fig. 5, which ex-

Fig. 5. Ancient Egyptian Priestly Breastplate.

hibits the connecting ring and chain to fasten it to the girdle. (4.) The remaining portion of dress peculiar to the high-priest was the mitre, πεπρωθόν, semeléth (Sept. κύδασος; Vulg. cædastis, Exod. xxviii, 4). The Bible says nothing of the difference between this and the turban of the common priests. It is, however, called by a different name. It was to be of fine linen (ver. 29). Josephus says it was the same in construction and figure with that of the common priest, but that above it there was another, with swaths of blue, embroidered; and round it was a golden crown, polished, of three rows, one above another, out of which rose a cup of gold, which resembled the calyx of the herb called by Greek botanists hyoecyamus. He ends a most labored description by comparing the shape of it to a poppy (Ant. iii, 7, 6). Upon comparing his account of the bonnet of the priests with the mitre of the high-priest, it would appear that the latter was conical. The cut, Fig. 6, presents the principal forms of the mitres worn by the ancient priests of Egypt, and affords a substantial resemblance of that prescribed to the Jews, diversified of idolatrous symbols, but which were displaced to make
way for a simple plate of gold, bearing the inscription, "Holiness to Jehovah." This plate (יווה, tis; Sept. περαστος; Vulg. lumen) extended from one ear to the other, being bound to the forehead by strings tied behind, and further secured in its position by a blue ribbon attached to the mitre (Exod. xxvii, 36-39; xxxix, 30; Lev. viii, 9). Josephus says this plate was preserved to his own day (Ant. iii, 5, 8; see Reuben, De Spod. Templi, p. 132). Such was the dress of the high-priest: see a description of its magnificence in corresponding terms in Exod. 1, 5-16.

Fig. 5. Ancient Egyptian Priestly Mitres.

Josephus had an idea of the symbolical import of the several parts of the pontifical dress. He says that being made of linen signified the earth; the blue denoted the sky, being like lightening in its pomegranates, and in the noise of its bells resembling thunder. The ephod showed that God had made the universe of four elements, the gold relating to the splendor by which all things are enlightened. The breastplate in the middle of the ephod resembled gold, and, excepted, was the middle place of the world. The girdle signified the sea, which goes round the world. The sardonyxes declare the sun and moon. The twelve stones are the twelve months or signs of the zodiac. The mitre is heavy, because blue (Ant. iii, 7, 7). He appears, however, to have had two explanations of some things, one for the Gentiles, and another for the Jews. Thus in this section he tells his Gentile readers that the seven lamps upon the golden candlesticks referred to the seven planets; but to the Jews he represents them as an emblem of the seven days of the week (War, vi, 5, 5; Whiston's notes ad loc.). It was not always worn by the high-priest. It was exchanged for one wholly of linen, and therefore white, though of similar construction, when on the day of expiation he entered into the holy of holies (Lev. xvi, 4, 25); and neither he nor any other priest wore their appropriate dress, except when officiating. It was for this reason, according to some, that Paul, who had been long absent from Jerusalem, did not know that Aanias was the high-priest (Acts xxiii, 5). Bahr (Symbolik, vol. ii, ch. iii, § 1, 2) finds a mystic meaning in the number, material, color, and shape of the priestly vestments, discusses each point elaborately, and dwells in § 3 on the differences between them and those of the Egyptian priesthood. According to Fairbairn (Typol. of Scrip.), the garments represent the office, and the person who was officially invested was to have them sprinkled with a mixture of oil and sacrificial blood (Kurtz, Opfercurius, p. 292). These garments, which were first worn at the consecration, and which were preserved in the Temple when not actually required, were not allowed except to such as were legally consecrated for service, though they belonged to the house of Aaron. These garments were "holly garments" (Exod. xxviii, 4), made "for glory and for beauty;" but they were not only for a glorious ornament, for the whole of the vestments bore a symbolical meaning; and the inscription on the golden plate who addressed the words of the high-priest, "Holiness to Jehovah," might be properly applied to all the holy garments. The four pieces of the priestly attire were each and all of them required, none was to fail; nor was it permitted to wear more than was prescribed; and the warning "that he die not" (ver. 46, 48) seems to have been upon an omission of the divine command in this, no less than in other things. The shining white of the linen garments typified that the servants of him who covers himself with light as with a garment (Psal. cii, 2; Dan. ii, 22; vii, 9), and who dwelteth in light which no man can approach unto (1 Tim. vi, 16), are clothed typically in light (Exod. xxxiv, 29); so that the ministers should minister in the earthly sanctuary in the same livery as his ministers wear in the heavenly sanctuary (Dan. xii, 6; Ezek. x, 2, 7; Matt. xvii, 2; xxviii, 5; Acts x, 9). But light (consequently white, as the most perfect reflection of light) is universally the type of salvation (Job xviii, 5, etc.; Psal. xxvii, 1; Isa. lix, 9), of righteousness (Psal. xxxvii, 6; Mal. iv, 2), of purity and holiness (1 John i, 5, 7); just as darkness, black, is the type of wickedness, uncleanness, etc. (Isa. v, 20; Lam. iv, 7, 8; John iii, 19; Rom. iii, 12; 2 Cor. vi, 14). It is not without meaning that the priests, like the angels, are specially called the holy ones.

5. Regulations.—The idea of a consecrated life, which was thus asserted at the outset, was carried through a multitude of details. Each probably bore a symbolic meaning of its own. Collectively they formed an education by which the power of distinguishing between things holy and profane, between the clean and the unclean, and so ultimately between moral good and evil, was awakened and developed (Ezek. xliii, 20). Before they entered the tabernacle the priests were to wash their hands and their feet (Exod. xxx, 17-21; xl, 80-82). During the time of their ministration they were to drink no wine or strong drink (Lev. x, 9; Ezek. xliii, 21). Their function was to be more to them than the ties of friendship and of blood, and, as the nearest relationships (six degrees are specified, Lev. xxvi, 1-5; Ezek. xliii, 25), they were to make no mourning for the dead. The high-priest, as carrying the consecrated life to its highest point, was to be above the disturbing power of human sorrow even in these instances. Public calamities seem to have been an exception, for Josias the high-priest, and the priests, in such circumstances, ministered in sackcloth with ashes on their mitres (Judith iv, 15; comp. Joel i, 18). Customs which appear to have been common in other priestly orders were probably forbidden by this ordinance to them. They were not to shave their heads. They were to go through their ministrations with the serenity of a reverential awe, not with the orgiastic wildness which led the priests of Baal, in their despair, to make cuttings in their flesh (Lev. xix, 28; 1 Kings xvii, 39), and carried those of whom Arys was a type to a more terrible mutilation (Deut. xxxi, 1). The same thought found expression in two other forms affecting the priests of Israel. The priest was to be one who, as the representative of other men, was to be physically as well as liturgically perfect. The idea of the perfect body, as symbolizing the holy soul, was, as might be expected, wide-spread among the religions of heathenism. "Sacerdos non integrus corporis quasi maius omnis res vitanda est" (Seneca, Contr. iv, 2). As the victim was to be without blemish, so also was the sacrificer (comp. Bahr, Symbolik, vol. ii, ch. ii, § 8). The law specified in broad outlines the excluding defects (Lev. xxi, 17-21), and these were such as impaired the purity, or at least the dignity, of the ministrant. The morbid casuistry of the later rabbins drew up a list of not less than 144 faults or infirmities, which were excluded by the ceremony of twenty-two which involved temporary deprivation from the priestly office (Carpenz. App. Crit. p. 92, 93; Ugo- lino, xii, 54; xiii, 908); and the original symbolism of the principle (Philo, De Vic. and De Monarch. ii, 5) was lost in the pruriens minuteness which, in later times, often makes the study of rabbinic literature a
somewhat repulsive task. If the Christian Church has sometimes seemed to approximate, in the conditions it laid down for the priestly character, the rules of Judaistic law, it was from a desire to reject the Jewish principles, and to rest its regulations simply on the grounds of expediency (Comm. Apos. 77, 78). The marriages of the sons of Aaron were, in like manner, hedged round with special rules. There is, indeed, no evidence for what has sometimes been asserted, that either the high priest (Philos, De Monarch. ii, 11; ii, 229, ed. Mang.; Ewald, Alterth. p. 302) or the other sons of Aaron (Ugolino, xii, 62) were limited in their choice to the women of their own tribe, and we have some distinct instances to the contrary. It is possible, perhaps, that the priest's daughter was more or less intimated, and it is certain that they were forbidden to marry an unchaste woman, or one who had been divorced, or the widow of any but a priest (Lev. xxii, 7, 14; Ezek. xlv. 22). The prohibition of marriage with one of an alien race was assumed, though not enacted in the law; and hence the reforming zeal of a later time compelled all who had contracted such marriages to put away their strange wives (Ezra x, 18), and counted the offering of a priest and a woman taken captive in war as illegitimate (Josephus, Ant. iii, 10, x, 4; c Apion, i, 7), even though the daughter was his own child and born under the same circumstances of Captivity (Ugolino, xii, 924). The high-priest was to carry the same idea to a yet higher point, and to marry none but a virgin in the first freshness of her youth (Lev. xxii, 18). Later casuistry fixed the age within the narrow lines of twelve and twelve, or rather twelve and a half (Carmov. Appo. Crit. p. 88). It followed, as a matter of necessity, from these regulations, that the legitimacy of every priest depended on his genealogy. A single missing or faulty link would vitiate the whole succession. To those genealogies, accordingly, extending back unbroken for 2000 years, the priests could point, up to the time of the destruction of the Temple (Josephus, c. Apion, i, 7). In later times, wherever the priest might live—Egypt, Babylon, Greece—he was to send the register of all marriages in his family to Jerusalem (ibid.). They could be referred to in any doubtful or disputed case (Ezra ii, 62; Neh. vii, 64). In them was registered the name of every mother as well as of every father (ibid.; comp. also the story already referred to in Suidas, a. v. Iosepic). It was the distinguishing mark of a priest, not of the Aaronic line, that he was imnirup, dumb. (Hab. ii, 14.) The law knew no other than the lawful father or mother named as the head of his title. The age at which the sons of Aaron might enter upon their duties was not defined by the law, as that of the Levites was. Their office did not call for the same degree of vigilance, and nor was help other than fire recorded in the ritual of the Tabernacle (Numb. viii, 24 and 28) and in that of the Temple (1 Chron. xxiii, 27) the appointed age for the latter, the former were not likely to be kept waiting till a later period. In one remarkable instance, indeed, we have an example of a yet earlier age. The boy Aristobulus at the age of seventeen ministered in the Temple in his pontifical robes, the admiral of all observers, and thus stirred the treacherous jealousy of Herod to remove so dangerous a rival (Josephus, Ant. xv, 3, 8). This may have been exceptional, but the law of the rabines indicates that the special consecration of the priest's life began with the opening years of manhood. As soon as the down appeared on his cheek the young candidate presented himself before the Council of the Sanhedrim, and his genealogy was carefully inspected. If it failed to satisfy his judges, he left the sanctuary clad in black, and had to seek another calling; if all was right so far, another ordeal awaited him. A careful inspection was to determine whether he was subject to any one of the 144 defects which would invalidate his priestly acts. If he was found free from all blemish, he was attired in the white garments of the priests, and entered on his ministrations. If the result of the examination was not satisfactory, he was relegated to the half-miental office of separating the sounding wood for the altar from that which was decayed and worm-eaten, but was not deprived of the emoluments of his office (Lightfoot, Temp. 251, ch. xii). It is, therefore, more capable of expansion—altered, as it has been shown [see Levities], from age to age; and those of the priestes continued throughout substantially the same, whatever changes might be brought about in their social position and organization. The duties described in Exoduses and Levities are the same as those recognised in the ritual of Chronicles, the vision of the prophet-priest Ezekiel sees in his vision of the Temple of the future. They, assisting the high-priest, were to watch over the fire on the altar of burnt-offerings, and to keep it burning evermore both by day and night (Lev. vi, 19; 2 Chron. xiii, 11); to feed the golden lamp outside the vail with oil (Exod. xxvii, 20, 21; Lev. xxiv, 2); to offer the morning and evening sacrifices, each accompanied with a meal-offering and a drink-offering, at the door of the tabernacle (Exod. xxix, 38-44). These were the fixed, invariable duties; but their chief business was to attend the sacrifice, to do the priest's office for any guilty, or penitent, or rejoining Israelite. The worshipper might come at any time. If he were rich and brought a bullock, it was the priest's duty to slay the victim, to place the wood upon the altar, to light the fire, and stoke the air with the blood (Lev. i, 6). If he were poor and brought a pigeon, the priest was to wring its neck (i, 15). In either case he was to burn the meal-offering and the peace-offering which accompanied the sacrifice (ii, 5; 9; iii, 13). After the birth of every child, the mother was to come with her sacrifice of turtle-doves or pigeons (Lev. xii, 6; Luke ii, 22-24), and was thus to be purified from her uncleanness. A husband who suspected his wife of unfaithfulness might bring her to the priest, and it belonged to him to give her the water of jealousy as an ordeal, and to pronounce the formula of execration (Numb. v, 11-31). Leper were to come, day by day, to submit themselves to the priest's inspection, that he might judge whether they were clean or unclean, and when they were healed perform for them the ritual of purification (Lev. xiii, xiv; comp. Mark i, 41). All the numerous acts of the priest at his ministrations or sins of ignorance had to be expiated by a sacrifice, which the priest of course had to offer (Lev. xv, 1-30). As they thus acted as mediators for those who were laboring under the sense of guilt, so they were to act as the representatives of the congregation and the season, the higher standard of a consecrated life. The Nazarite was to come to them with his sacrifice and his wave-offering (Numb. vi, 1-21). In the final establishment at Jerusalem it belonged to the priests to act as sentinels over the holy place, as to the Levites to guard the wider area of the precincts of the Temple (Ugolino, xiii, 1052). Other duties of a higher and more ethical character are hinted at, but were not, and probably could not be, the subject of a special regulation. They were to teach the children of Israel the statutes of the Lord (Lev. x, 11; Deut. xxxiii, 10; 2 Chron. xiv, 8; Ezek. xlv, 28, 24). The "priest's lips" (in the language of the last prophet looking back upon the ideal of the order) were to "keep knowledge" (Mal. ii, 7). Through the whole history, with the exception of the periods of national apostasy, these acts, and others like them, formed the daily life of the priests who were on duty. The three great festivals of the year were, however, their seasons of busiest employment. The pilgrims who came up by tens of thousands to keep the feast came each with his sacrifice and oblation. As the festival went on, on some occasions at least, beyond the strength of the priests in attendance, and the Levites had to be called
to help them (2 Chron. xxxix, 84; xxxv, 14). Other acts of the priests of Israel, significant as they were, were less distinctively sacerdotal. They were to bless the people and pronounce blessings. As the acts of this part of their office never fall into dispute, a special formula of benediction was provided (Numb. vi, 22-27). During the journeys in the wilderness it belonged to them to cover the ark and all the vessels of the sanctuary with a purple or scarlet cloth before the Levites might approach them (iv, 5-10). As the people started on each day's march they were to blow "an alarm" with long silver trumpets (x, 1-8)—with two if the whole multitude were to be assembled, with one if there was to be a special council of the elders and princes of Israel. With the same instruments they were to proclaim the commencement of all the solemn days, and days of gladness (x, 10); and throughout all the changes in the religious history of Israel this adhered to them as a characteristic mark. Other instruments of music might be used by the more highly trained Levites and the schools of the prophets, but the trumpets belonged only to the priests. They blew them (but in that case the trumpets were of rams' horns) in the solemn march round Jericho (Josh. vi, 4), in the religious war which Judah waged against Jeroboam (2 Chron. xiii, 12), when they summoned the people to defend Jerusalem (fast Josh. ii, 1, 15). In the service of the second Temple there were to be never less than twenty-one or more than eighty-four blowers of trumpets present in the Temple daily (Ugolino, xiii, 1011). The presence of the priests on the field of battle for this purpose, often in large numbers, armed for war, and sharing in the actual conflict (1 Chron. xii, 23, 27; 2 Chron. xx, 21, 29), led, in the later periods of Jewish history, to the special appointment at such times of a war-priest, deputed by the Sanhedrim to be the representative of the high-priest, and standing next but one to him in the order of precedence (comp. Ugolino, xiii, 1081 [De Sacerdote Cas- trensi]; xiii, 871). Jos. (Judeut., i, 158) regards the war-priest as belonging to the ideal system of the later rabbins, not to the historical constitution of Israel. Deuteronomy xx, 2, however, supplies the germ out of which such an office might naturally grow. Judas Maccabaus, in his wars, does what the war-priest was said to do (1 Macc. iii, 56).

Other functions are intimated in Deuteronomy which might have given them greater influence as the educators and protectors of the people. They were to xiix (whether individually or collectively does not distinctly appear) as a court of appeal in the more difficult controversies in criminal or civil cases (Deut. xvii, 8-13). A special reference was to be made to them in cases of undying enmity, where they were thus to check the vindictive blood-feuds which it would otherwise have been likely to occasion (xiii, 5). It must remain doubtful, however, how far this order kept its ground during the storms and changes that followed. The judicial and the teaching functions of the priesthood remained probably for the most part in abeyance through the ignorance and vices of the priests. Zealous reformers kept this before them as an ideal (2 Chron. xvii, 7-9; xiii, 8-10; Ezek. xlv, 24), but the special stress laid on the attempts to realize it shows that they were exceptional. The teaching functions of the priest have probably been unduly magnified by writers like Michaelis, who aims at bringing the institutions of Israel to the standard of modern expediency (Comm. on Laws of Moses, i, 55-59), as they have been unduly depreciated by Saalschütz and Jastrow.

At first Aaron was to burn incense on the golden altar every morning when he dressed the lamps, and every evening when he lighted them, but in later times the common priest performed this duty (Luke i, 8, 9); to offer, as the Jews understand it, daily, morning and evening sacrifices, and the priestly blessing (Num. vi, 21), of his consecration (Exod. xxxix); to perform the ceremonies of the great day of expiation (Lev. xvii); to arrange the shewbread every Sabbath, and to eat it in the holy place (xxv, 9); but he must abstain from the holy things during his uncleanness (xxix, 1-3); also if he became leprous, or by reason of the sin of ignorance. If he committed a sin of ignorance, he must offer a sin-offering for it (iv, 3-18); and so for the people (ver. 12-23). He was to eat the remainder of the people's meal-offerings with the inferior priests in the holy place (vi, 10); to judge of the leprosy in the human body (xii, 1), to adjudicate legal questions (Deut. xvii, 12). Indeed, when there was no divinely inspired judge, the high-priest was the supreme ruler till the time of David, and again after the Captivity. He must be present at the appointment of a new ruler or leader (Num. xxvii, 18), and ask counsel of the Lord for the ruler (ver. 21). Eleazar, with others, distributes the spoils taken from the Midianites (Numb. xxxi, 21, 26).

To the high-priest also belonged the appointment of a maintenance from the funds of the sanctuary to an incapacitated priest (1 Sam. ii, 36, margin). Besides these duties, peculiar to himself, he had others in common with the inferior priests. Thus, when the camp set forward, "Aaron and his sons" were to take the tabernacle to pieces, to cover the various portions of it in blasts of various colors (iv, 6-15), and to appoint the Levites to their place in the service (xvi, 19), and to number the people in the form prescribed (vi, 23-27), to be responsible for all official errors and negligences (xviii, 1), and to have the general charge of the sanctuary (ver. 5).

5. Ministration.—Functions such as these were clearly inimical to the common activity of the chief (whether first the small number of the priests must have made the work almost unintermittent, and, even when the system of rotation had been adopted, the periodical absences from home could not fail to be disturbing and injurious, had the priests been dependent on their own labors. The serenity of the priestly character would have been disturbed had they had to look for support to the lower industries. It may have been intended (see above) that their time, when not liturgically employed, should be given to the study of the law, or to instructing others in it. On these grounds, therefore, a distinct provision was made for them. The later rabbins enumerate no less than twenty-four sources of emolument. Of these the chief only are given here (Ugolino, xiii, 1124). They consisted, (1) of one tenth of the tithes which the people paid to the Levites—i. e. one per cent, on the whole amount of the produce of the soil, and paid as a special tithe every third year (Deut. xiv, 29; xxvi, 12). (8.) Of the redemption-money, paid at the fixed rate of five shekels a head, for the first-born of man or beast (Num. xix, 14-19). It is to be noticed that the law, by recognizing the sanctity of the birthright, kept the first-born, and ordering payment only for the small number of the latter, in excess of the former, deprived Aaron and his sons of a large sum which would otherwise have accrued to them (Num. iii, 44-51). (4.) Of the redemption-money paid in like manner for men or things specially dedicated to the Lord (Lev. xxvii). (5.) Of spoil, captives, cattle, and the like, taken in war (Num. xxxiii, 25-47). (6.) Of what may be described as the perquisites of their sacrificial functions, the shewbread, the flesh of the burnt-offerings, peace-offerings, trespass-offerings (Num. xvi, 8-14; Lev. vi, 20, 29; vii, 6-10), and, in particular, the heave-shoulder and the wave-bread (Lev. x, 12-15). (7.) Of an undefined amount of the first-fruits of corn, wine, and oil (Exod. xxiii, 19; Lev. ii, 14; Deut. xxxvi, 1-10). Of some of these, as of most holy place but the priests were to take (Lev. vi, 29). It was lawful for their sons and daughters (x, 14), and even in some cases for their home-born slaves, to eat of others (xxii, 11). The stranger and the hired servant were in all cases excluded (xxii, 10). (8.) On their settlement in Canaan the levites are sometimes placed in the third cities of the "suburbs" or pasture-grounds for their flocks (Josh. xxii, 13-19). While the Levites were scattered over all the
conquered country, the cities of the priests were within the tribes of Judah, Simeon, and Benjamin, and this concentration was not without its influence on their ascendant history. See Lev. xvi. 15. These provisions were obviously intended to secure the religion of Israel against the dangers of a caste of pauper-priests, needy and dependent, and unable to bear their witness to the true faith. They were, on the other hand, as far as possible removed from the condition of a wealthy order. Even in the ideal state contemplated by the book of Deuteronomy, the Levite (here probably used generically, so as to include the priests) is repeatedly marked out as an object of charity, along with the stranger and the widow (Deut. xii, 12, 19; xiv, 27-29). During the long period of national apostasy, tithes were probably paid with even less regularity than they were in the more orthodox period that followed the return from the Captivity (Neh. xiii, 10; Mal. iii, 8-10). The standard of a priest's income, even in the earliest days after the settlement in Canaan, was miserably low (Judg. xvii, 10). Large portions of the priesthood fell, under the kingdom, into a state of abject poverty (comp. 1 Sam. ii, 86). The clinging evil throughout their history shows not that they were too powerful and rich, but that they sank into the state from which the law was intended to prevent it. The tithes were the principal source of the Levitical revenue (Neh. x, 11; comp. Saalschütz, Archäologie der Hebräer, ii, 844-855).

It will be noticed that neither the high-priest nor common priests received "any inheritance" at the distribution of Canaan among the several tribes (Num. xix, 20; Deut. xviii, 1, 2), but were maintained, with their families, upon certain fees, dues, perquisites, etc., arising from the public services, which they enjoyed as a common fund. Perhaps the only distinct prerogative of the high-priest was a tenth part of the tithes assigned to the Levites (xviii, 29; comp. Neh. x, 86); but Josephus represents this also as a common fund (Ant. iv, 4, 4).

6. Classification and Statistics.—The earliest historical trace of any division of the priesthood and corresponding cycle of services belongs to the time of David. Jewish tradition indeed recognizes an earlier division, even during the life of Aaron, into eight houses (Gem. H.iers. Taanith, in Ugolino, xiii, 878), augmented during the period of the Shiloh-worship to sixteen, the two families of Eleazar and Ithamar standing in both cases on equal footing. It is hardly conceivable however, that there could have been any rotation of service while the number of priests was so small as it must have been during the forty years of sojourn in the wilderness, if we believe Aaron and his linage descendants to have been officiating. The real difficulty of realizing in what way the single family of Aaron were able to sustain all the burden of the worship of the tabernacle and the sacrifices of individual Israelites may, it is true, suggest the thought that possibly in this, as in other instances, the Hebrew idea of a kinsman by adoption may have extended the title of the "Sons of Aaron" beyond the limits of linage descent, and, in this case, there may be some foundation for the Jewish tradition. Nowhere in the later history do we find any disproportion like that of three priests to 20,000 Levites. The office of supervision over those that "kept the charge of the sanctuary," intrusted to Eleazar (Numb. iii, 92), implies that some others were subject to it besides Ithamar and his children, while these very keepers of the sanctuary are identified in ver. 58 with the sons of Aaron who are encamped with Moses and Aaron on the east side of the tabernacle. The allotment of not less than thirteen towns and there is a list of the cities of those who bore the name, within little more than forty years from the Exodus, tends to the same conclusion, and at any rate indicates that the priesthood were not intended to be always in attendance at the tabernacle, but were to have houses of their own, and therefore, as a necessary consequence, fixed periods only of service. Some notion may be formed of the number on the accession of David from the facts (1) that not less than 8700 tendered their allegiance to him while he was as yet reigning at Hebron over Judah only (1 Chron. ii, 39); (2) that the wages were sufficient for all the services of the state and more frequented worship which he established. To this reign belonged, accordingly, the division of the priesthood into the four-and-twenty "courses" or orders (Sept. επιστολοι, ἕμπωσις, 1 Chron. xxiv, 1-19; 2 Chron. xxiii, 8; Luke i, 5), each of which was to serve in rotation for one week, while the further assignment of special services during the week was determined by lot (Luke i, 5) under a subordinate prefect (2 Kings xxi, 6). The numbers are taken from the great festivals (2 Chron. v, 11). The first of these courses was that which had Jehoiarib at the head of it. It was reckoned the most honorable. Josephus values himself on his descent from it (Life, § 1). Mattathias, the father of the Maccabees, descended from it (1 Macc. ii, 1). Abijah was the head of the eighth course, to which Sacheriah, the father of the Baptist, belonged (Luke i, 5). Each course appears to have commenced its work on the Sabbath, the outgoing priests taking the morning sacrifice, and leaving that of the evening to their successors (2 Chron. xxv, 14, 16). Abijah, however, the two great priestly houses did not stand on an equality. The descendants of Ithamar were found to have fewer representatives than those of Eleazar (a diminution that may have been caused partly by the destruction of the Temple, and partly of the daughters of Phinehas [Psa. lxxix, 64]), partly by the massacre at Nob, and sixteen courses accordingly were assigned to the latter, eight only to the former (1 Chron. xxiv, 4; comp. Carpzov, App. Crit. p. 98). The division thus instituted was confirmed by Solomon, and continued to be recognized as the typical number of the priesthood. It is to be noted, however, that this arrangement was to some extent elastic. Any priest might be present at any time, and even perform priestly acts, so long as he did not interfere with the functions of those who were officiating in their course (Ugolino, xiii, 881), and at the great solemnities of the year, as well as on special occasions like the opening of the Temple, they were present in great numbers. On the return from the Captivity there were found but four courses out of the twenty-four, each containing, in round numbers, about a thousand (Ezra xi, 52); but the number at the great festivals the twenty courses were reconstituted, bearing the same names as before, and so continued till the destruction of Jerusalem (Josephus, Ant. viii, 14, 7). If we may accept the numbers given by Jewish writers as at all trustworthy, the proportion of the priesthood to the population of Palestine during the century of their existence as an order must have been far greater than that of the clergy has ever been in any Christian nation. Over and above those that were scattered in the country and took their turn, there were not fewer than 24,000 stationed permanently at Jerusalem and 12,000 at Jericho (Gemar. H.iers. Taanith, fol. 67, in Carpzov, App. Crit. p. 100). It was a Jewish tradition that it had never fallen to the lot of any priest to offer incense twice (Ugolino, xiii, 18). Oriental statistics are, however, always open to some suspicion, those of the Tal- mud not being the less, and it is not among the number, the computation of Josephus, who estimates the total number of the four houses of the priesthood, referring apparently to Ezra ii, 86, at about 20,000 (c. Apion. ii, 7). Another indication of number is found in the fact that a "great multitude" of their own, and all the "sect of the Nazarenes" (Acts vi, 7), and so have cut themselves off, sooner or later, from the Temple ser-
VICES, without any perceptible effect upon its ritual. It was almost inevitable that the great mass of the order, under such circumstances, should sink in character and reputation. Poor and ignorant, despised and oppressed by the more powerful members of their own body, often robbed of their scanty maintenance by the caprice of the high-priests, they must have been to Palestine what the clergy of a later period has been to Southern Italy—a dead weight on its industry and strength, not compensating for their unproductive lives by any services rendered to the higher interests of the people. The rabbinic classification of the priesthood, though belonging to a somewhat later date, reflects the contempt into which the order had fallen. There were (1) the heads of the twenty-four courses, known sometimes as apsugpeis; (2) the large number of reputable officiating but inferior priests; (3) the plebeii, or (to use the extreme formula of rabbinic scorn) the “priests of the people of the earth,” ignorant and unlettered; (4) those that, through physical disqualifications or other causes, were non-efficient members of the order, though entitled to receive their tithes (Ugolino, xii, 19; Jost: Judenk. i, 150).

Prideaux (Connexion, i, 129), following the Jewish tradition, affirms that only four of the courses returned from Babylon—Jedidiah, Immer, Pashur, and Harim (for which last, however, the Babylonian Talmud has Josephus because these were not only enumerated in Ezra ii, 36-39; Neh. vii, 39-42. He accounts for the mention of other courses, as of Joarib (1 Mac. ii, 1) and Abia (Luke i, 5), by saying that these four courses were subdivided into six each, so as to keep up the old number of twenty-four, which took the names of the original courses, though not really descended from them. But this is probably an invention of the Jews, to account for the mention of only these four families of priests in the list of Ezra ii and Neh. vii. However difficult it may be to say with certainty why only these four courses are mentioned in that particular list, we have the positive authority of 1 Chron. ix, 10, and Neh. xi, 10, for asserting that Joarib did return; and we have two other lists of courses, one of the time of Nehemiah (Neh. x, 2-8), the other of Zerubbabel (xii, 1-7); the former enumerates twenty-two, the latter twenty-two courses; and the latter naming Joarib as one of them, and adding, at ver. 19, the name of the chief of the course of Joarib in the days of Joakim. Thus there can be no reasonable doubt that Joarib did return. The notion of the Jews does not receive any confirmation from the statement in the Latin version of Josephus (c. Apion. ii, 8) that there were four courses of priests, as it is a manifest corruption of the text for twenty-four, as Whiston and others have shown (note to Life of Josephus, § 1). The preceding table gives the three lists of courses which returned, with the original list in David's time to compare them by. The courses which cannot be identified with the original ones, but which are enumerated as existing after the return, are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Serah.</td>
<td>Serah.</td>
<td>Serah (7).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azariah</td>
<td>Azariah</td>
<td>Azariah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerem.</td>
<td>Jerem.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pashur.</td>
<td>Pashur.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hattush.</td>
<td>Hattush.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malch.</td>
<td>Malch.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obadiah</td>
<td>Obadiah.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel.</td>
<td>Daniel.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gideon.</td>
<td>Gideon.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ginethon.</td>
<td>Ginethon.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baruch.</td>
<td>Baruch.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meshullam.</td>
<td>Meshullam.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shemaiah.</td>
<td>Shemaiah.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salim.</td>
<td>Salim.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amok.</td>
<td>Amok.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilkiah.</td>
<td>Hilkiah.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jedidiah</td>
<td>Jedidiah.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For some account of the courses, see Lewis, Orig. Hebr. ok. ii, ch. vii.

III. Historical Review of the Hebrew Priesthood.——1. In Patriarchal Times.—(1.) We accede to the Jewish opinion that Adam was the first priest. The divine institution of sacrifices, immediately after the fall, seems connected with the event that “the Lord God made coats of skins to Adam and his wife, and clothed them” (Gen. iii, 21)—that is, with the skins of animals which had been offered in sacrifice, for the permission to eat animal food was not given till after the Deluge (comp. i, 29; ix, 3)—expressive of their faith in the promise of the victorious yet suffering “seed of the woman” (ver. 15); and judging from the known custom of his immediate descendants, it is probable that Adam, who became the head and ruler of the woman (ver. 16), officiated in offering the sacrifice as well on her behalf as his own. Judging from the same analogy, it seems further probable that Adam acted in the same capacity on behalf of his sons, Cain and Abel (and possibly of their children), who are each said to have "brought" his respective offering, but not to have personally presented it (iv, 3-5). The place evidently thus indicated would seem to have been the situation of “the cherubim,” at the east of the garden of Eden (iii, 24), called “the face” (iv, 14), and “the presence of the Lord” (ver. 16; comp. Hebrew of Exod. xxxix, 24; Lev. i, 5), and from which Jehovah conferred with Cain (Gen. iv, 9): circumstances which, together with the name of their offering, זָכָר, which, sometimes at least, included bloody sacrifices in after-times (1 Sam. ii, 17; xxvi, 19; Mal. i, 11, 14), and the appropriation of the flesh of the offerer (comp. Lev. vii, 8), would seem like the rudiments of the future Tabernacle and its services, and when viewed in connection with many circumstances incidentally disclosed in the brief fragmentary account of things before the Exodus—such as the Sabbath (Gen. i, 2, 3), the distinction observed between his burnt-offerings upon the altar of clean and unclean beasts (viii, 20), the prohibition of blood (ix, 4), tithes (xiv, 20), priestly blessing (ver. 19), consecration with oil, and vows (xxviii, 18-22), the Levirate law (xxxviii,
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8), weeks (xxix, 27), distinction of the Hebrews by their families (Exod. ii, 1), the office of elder during the bondage in Egypt (iii, 16), and a place of meeting with Jehovah (v, 22; comp. xxv, 22)—would favor the supposition that the Mosaic dispensation, as it is called, was but an authoritative re-arrangement of a patriarchal Church instituted at the fall. The fact that Noah officiated as the priest of his family, upon the cessation of the Deluge, is clearly recorded in Gen. viii, 20. Whenever we have an altar built, the ceremonial distinctions in the offerings already mentioned, and their propitiatory effect, "the sweet savor," all described in the words of Leviticus (comp. i, 9; xi, 47). These acts of Noah, which seem like the resumption rather than the institution of an ordinance, were doubtless continued by his sons and their descendants, as heads of their respective families. Following our arrangement, the next glimpse of the subject is afforded by the instance of Job, who "sent and sanctified his children" after a feast they had held, and offered burnt-offerings, "according to the number of them all," and "who did this customally," either constantly, or at every feast (i, 5).

A direct reference, possibly to priests, is in our translation of xii, 19, "he leadeth princes (ὤντες τῶν ἀρχιτεχνῶν); Sept. ἀρχηγοί; Vulg. sacerdotes; a sense adopted in Dr. Lee's Translation (London 1837) away spoiled." May not the difficult passage, Job xxxiii, 23, contain an allusion to priestly duties? A case is there supposed of a person divinely chastised in order to improve him (xix, 22), "If then there be a messenger (τὸν ἀναθηματισμόν), which means priest, Ezech. v, 6; Mal. ii, 6 with him," an "interpreter" (τὸν ἀναθηματισμόν), or mediator general; 2 Chron. xxxi, 9; Isa. xlii, 27, one among a thousand, or of a family, Judg. vi, 15, "my family," literally "my thousand," comp. Numb. i, 16, "to show to man his uprightness," or, rather, "duty," Prov. xiv, 2, part of the priest's office in such a case, Mal. ii, 7; comp. Deut. xxiv, 8), then such a man "in general" is "gracious," or mercy, will supplant for him, and withal, "Deliver him from going down into the pit," or grave, for "I have found a ransom," a cause or ground in him for favorable treatment, namely, the penitence of the sufferer, who consequently recovers (xxv, 29). The case of Abraham and Abimelech is very similar (Gen. xx, 9-17), as also that of Job himself, and his three misjudging friends, whom the Lord commands to avert chastisement from themselves by taking to him bullocks and rams, which he was to offer for them as a burnt-offering, and to pray for them (xli, 28), 40, 41, "sent the elders of Abram in a historical order, who, upon his first entrance into Canaan, attended by his family, "built an altar, and called upon the name of the Lord" (Gen. xii, 7, 8). Upon returning victorious from the battle of the kings, he is congratulated by Melchizedek, the Canaanitish king of Salem, and "priest of the most high God" (xix, 18). For the ancient union of the royal and sacerdotal offices, in Egypt and other countries, see Wilkinson's Monuments and Customs of the Ancient Egyptians (London 1842), i, 245. Abram next appears entering into covenant with God as the head and successor of his seed. For occasion these creatures only are slain which were appointed for sacrifice under the law (Gen. xv, 9). Isaac builds an altar, evidently as the head of his family (xxvi, 25); his younger son Jacob offers a sacrifice, τῷ ἁμαρτωλῷ (xxxi, 54), and "calls his brethren to eat of it" (comp. Lev. vii, 15); builds an altar at Shalem (Gen. xxxiii, 20), makes another, his head and evidences as the head of his household, at Bethel (xxxv, 1), and pours a drink-offering, τῷ ἁμαρτωλῷ (comp. Numb. xxv, 7, etc.), upon a pillar (ver. 14).

(2.) We next find Jethro, priest of Midian, the father-in-law of Moses, probably a priest of the true God (Exod. iii, 1), and possibly his father also (ii, 16), in the same capacity. Exod. v, 1, 4; 15, the whole nation of the Israelites represented as wishing to sacrifice and to hold a feast to the Lord. The first step, though very remote, towards the formation of the Mosaic system of priesthood was the consecration of the first-born, in memory of the destruction of the first-born of Egypt (Exod. xiii, 2), and also as the penalty of these, God afterwards took the Levites to attend upon him (Num. iii, 19). As to the popular idea, both among Jews and Christians, that the right of priesthood was thus transferred from the first-born generally to the tribe of Levi, or, rather, to one family of that tribe, we consider, with Patrick, it is utterly groundless (Commentary on Exod. xii, 22; Num. iii, 12; see Vitringa, Observations Sacrae, ii, 33; Outram, De Sacrificiis, i, 4). The substance of the objections is that Aaron and his sons were consecrated before the exchange of the Levites for the first-born; that the Levites were afterwards given to minister unto them, but had nothing to do with the priesthood; and that the peculiar right of God in the first-born originated in the Exodus. The last altar, before the giving of the law, was built by Moses, probably for a memorial purpose only (Exod. xvii, 15; comp. Jos. xxii, 26, 27). At this period the office of priest was so well understood, and so highly valued, that Jehovah promises as an inducement to the Israelites to keep his covenant, that they should be "a kingdom of priests" (Exod. xix, 6), which, among other homely and simple allusions and designations belonging to the Jews, is transferred to Christians (I Pet. ii, 9). The first introduction of the word priests, in this part of the history, is truly remarkable. It occurs just previous to the giving of the law, when, as part of the cautions against the too eager curiosity of the people, lest they should break through unto the Lord and gaze" (Exod. xix, 21), it is added, "and let the priests which come near unto the Lord sanctify themselves, lest the Lord break through upon them" (ver. 22). Here then, priests are incomprehensibly spoken of as an ancient order, which was to be abolished and remodeled. Nor is this the last reference to these antecedent priests. Selden observes that the phrase "the priests of their sons of Levi" (Deut. xvii, 9) and "the priests of the sons of Levi" (xxi, 5), and even the phrase "the Levites alone" (xxvii, 6; comp. i), are used to include all others who had been priests before God took the sons of Aaron peculiarly to serve him in this office (De Synod. ii, 8, p. 2, 8). Aaron is summoned at this juncture to go up with Moses unto the Lord on Mount Sinai (Exod. xiii, 24). Another remarkable circumstance is then recorded, when Moses, now acting as the law-giver, and ended with an extraordinary commission, builds an altar under the hill, and sends "young men of the children of Israel, who offered burnt-offerings, and sacrificed peace-offerings of oxen unto the Lord" (xxiv, 5). Various instructions are given to the phrase "the young men," but, upon a view of all the circumstances, we incline to think that they were young Levites, purposely selected by Moses for this act, in order to form a complete break between the former priesthood and the new, and that the recommencement and re-arrangement of the priesthood under Aaron and his sons, according to the preceding regulations (Lev. viii). At their first sacerdotal performances (ix) the divine approbation was intimated by a supernatural fire which consumed their burnt-offerings (ver. 24). The general satisfaction of the people with these events was, however, soon dashed.
by the miraculous destruction of the two elder sons of Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, for offering strange fire (x, 1), probably under the influence of too much wine, since the prohibition of it to the priests when about to enter the holy place had been repeated to them at this early date (ver. 9). Moses forbade Aaron and his sons to uncover their heads, or to rend their clothes on this occasion; but the whole house of Israel were permitted to bewail the visitation (ver. 6). The inward grief, however, of Ezekiel and Isaias caused an irregularity in their sacramental duties, which was forgiven on account of the occasion (ver. 16-20). Aaron now appears associated with Moses and the leading men of the several tribes in taking the national census (Numb. i, 5, etc.), and on other grand state occasions (xxvi, 2, 3; xxxi, 18-26; xxxii, 2; xxxvii, 2; xxxix, 17). The high-priest appears ever after as a person of the highest consequence. The dignity of the priesthood soon excited the emulation of the ambitious; hence the penalty of death was denounced against the assumption of it by any one not belonging to the Aaronic family (ver. 10), and it was soon after miraculously inflicted for this crime. This instance proves that the Aaronic line did not establish itself without a struggle. The rebellion of Korah, at the head of a portion of the Levites as representatives of the first-born, with Dathan and Abiram as leaders of the second-born, and Amnon, the first-born of Joachim (Numb. xvi, 11), showed that some looked back to the old patriarchal order rather than forward to the new, and it needed the witness of "Aaron's rod that budded" to teach the people that the latter had in it a vitality and strength which had departed from the former. It may be that the exclusion of all but the sons of Aaron from the service of the Tabernacle drove those who would not resign their claim to priestly functions of some kind to the worship (possibly with a rival tabernacle) of Moloch and Chem (Amos vi, 25, 26; Ezek. xx, 16). The death of Aaron introduces a transition in his succession which appears to have simply consisted in arranging him in his father's pontifical garments (Numb. xx, 28). Thus also Jonathan the Amonite contented himself with putting on the high-priest's habit, in order to take possession of the dignity (1 Macc. xii, 21; comp. Josephus, Ant. xiii, 2, 3). The high estate in which the priesthood was held may be gathered from the fact that it was promised in perpetuity to Phinehas and his family as a reward for his zeal (Numb. xxx, 18). Prominent as was the priesthood by the priests daily march and the hosts of Israel (Numb. x, 8), in the passage of the Jordan (Josh. iii, 14, 15), in the destruction of Jericho (vii, 12-16), the history of Micah shows that within that century there was a strong tendency to relapse into the system of a household instead of an hereditary priesthood. The frequent conquests during the period of the Judges must have interfered (as stated above) with the payment of tithes, with the maintenance of worship, with the observance of all festivals, and with this the influence of the priesthood must have been kept in the background. If the descendants of Aaron, at some unrecorded crisis in the history of Israel, rose under Eli, into the position of national defenders, it was only to sink in his sons into the lowest depth of sacrificial corruption. For a time the prerogative of the line of Aaron was in abeyance. The capture of the ark, the removal of the Tabernacle from Shiloh, threw everything into confusion, and Samuel, a Levite, but not within the priestly family [see Samuel], sacrifices, and "comes near to" the Lord; his training under Eli, his Nazaritical life, his prophetic office, being regarded independently as a spiritual consecration (comp. Augustine, c. Faust. xii, 83; De Civ. Dei, xvii, 4). For the priesthood, as for the people generally, the time of Samuel must have been one of a great moral reformation; while the expansion, if not the foundation, of the schools of the prophet, at once gave to it the support and influence which had been missing under the corruption of the ark, and opposed to the idolatry and paganism of the still persevering Canaanites. The Levites did not form a tribe like that of Levi, for the consecration of a
whole tribe is without a parallel in history (Vatke, *Bibl. Theol.* i, 222). Deuteronomy, assumed for once to be older than the three books which Precede it, represents the Levites as holding the same position as the Levites, standing on the same footing, and the distinction between them is therefore the work of a later period (George, *Die älteren jud. Fest.* p. 45, 51; comp. Bähr, *Symbolik*, bk. ii, ch. ii, § 1, whence these references are taken). It is hardly necessary here to do more than state these theories.

(2.) Middle Period.—The position of the priests under the monarchy of Judah deserves a closer examination than it has yet received. The system which has been described above gave them for every week of service in the Temple twenty-three weeks in which they had no ministerial duties. It is intended that they should be idle during this period? Were they actually idle? They had no territorial possessions to cultivate. The cities assigned to them and to the Levites gave scanty pasturage to their flocks. To what employment could they turn? 1. The more devout and thoughtful found, probably, in the schools of the prophets that which satisfied them. The history of the Jews presents numerous instances of the union of the two offices. See LEVITE. They became teaching-priests (2 Chron. xv, 3), students, and interpreters of the divine law. From numerical data, it may be supposed that the more zealous kings to instruct the people (xxvii, 8), or to administer justice (xxxix, 8). 2. Some, perhaps, as stated above, served in the king's army. We have no ground for transferring our modern conceptions of the peacefulness of the priestly life to the remote past of the Jewish people. Priests, as we have seen, were with David at Hebron as men of war. They were the trumpeters of Abijah's army (xiii, 12). The Temple itself was a great armory (xxxi, 9). The heroic struggles of the Maccabees were sustained chiefly by their kindred of the same family (vii, 1). A few chosen ones might enter more deeply into the divine life, and so receive, like Zechariah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, a special call to the office of a prophet. We can hardly escape the conclusion that many did their work in the Temple of Jehovah with a divided allegiance, and acted at other times as priests of the high-places (Ewald, *Gesch.* iii, 704).

Not only do we read of no protests against the sins of the idolatrous kings, except from prophets who stood forth, alone and unsupported, to bear their witness, but the priests themselves were sharers in the worship of Baal (Jer. ii, 7, of the house of Omri (viii, 1, 2). In the very Temple itself they "ministered before their idols" (Ezek. xiv, 12), and allowed others, "uncircumcised in heart and uncircumcised in flesh," to join them (ibid. 7). They ate of unclean things and polluted the Sabaths. There could be no division of the true idea of the priesthood than a general degradation. Those who ceased to be true shepherds of the people found nothing in their ritual to sustain or elevate them. They became as sensual, covetous, and tyrannical as ever the clergy of the Christian Church became in its darkest periods; conspicuous as drunkards and adulterers (Isa. xxxvii, 7, 8; lv, 10-12). The prophetic order, instead of acting as a check, became sharers in their corruption (Jer. v, 31; Lam. iv, 13; Zeph. iii, 4). For the most part, the few efforts after better things are not the result of a spontaneous reformation, but of conformity to the wishes of a reforming king. In the one instance in which they do act spontaneously—their resistance to the usurpation of the priest's functions by Zedek—their protest, however right in itself, was yet only the compensation for a wrong at the hands of the office which they claimed as belonging exclusively to themselves (2 Chron. xxvi, 17). The discipline of the Captivity, however, was not without its fruits. A large proportion of the priests had either perished or were content to remain in the land of their exile; but those who remained were in the utmost need of restoration. Under Ezra they submitted to the stern duty of re-

puditating their heathen wives (Ezra x, 18, 19). They took part—though here the Levites were the more prominent—in the instruction of the people (iii, 2; Neh. x, 31). In the work of revising the Scriptures the Levites, standing on the same footing, and the distinction between them is therefore the work of a later period (George, *Die älteren jud. Fest.* p. 45, 51; comp. Bähr, *Symbolik*, bk. ii, ch. ii, § 1, whence these references are taken). It is hardly necessary here to do more than state these theories.

The priests of the time of Malachi required payment for every ministerial act, and would not even "shut the doors" or "kindle fire" for naught (Mal. i, 10). They "corrupted the covenant of Levi" (ii, 8). The idea of the priest as the angel, the messenger, of the Lord of Hosts was forgotten (ibid. 7; comp. Eccles. v, 6). The inevitable result was that they again lost their influence. They became "base and contemptible before all the people" (Mal. ii, 9). The office of the priest was recognized as a sacred duty, but it was not the priest but the Levite of the Lord of Hosts was forgotten (ibid. 7; comp. Eccles. v, 6). The inevitable result was that they again lost their influence. They became "base and contemptible before all the people" (Mal. ii, 9). The office of the priest was recognized as a sacred duty, but it was not the priest but the Levite (Exod. vi, 8; 9, 7; vii, 24; Josephus, *Ant.* xii, 8). The degree to which this recognition was carried was expressed in the immediate successors of Alexander was shown by the work of restoration accomplished by Simon the son of Onias (Eccles. 1, 12-20); and the position which they thus occupied in the eyes of the people, not less than the devotion with which he zeal inspired them, prepared them to make the great struggle which was coming, and in which, under the priestly Maccabees, they were the chief defenders of their country's freedom. Some, indeed, at that crisis were among the apostates. Under the guidance of Jason (the heathenized form of Joshua) they forsook the customs of their fathers, and they who as priests were to be patterns of a self-respecting purity left their work in the Temple to run naked in the circus which the Syrian king had opened in Jerusalem (2 Macc. iv, 13, 14). Some, at an earlier period, had joined the schismatic Onias in establishing a rival worship (Josephus, *Ant.* xii, 3, 4). The majority, however, were true-hearted; and the Maccabean struggle which left the government of the country in the hands of the high priests, and at once the conquest, with a certain measure of independence, must have given to the higher members of the order a position of security and influence. The martyr-spirit showed itself again in the calmness with which they carried on the ministries in the Temple, when Jerusalem was besieged. They were rescued from the temple by the ruse of sacrificing (Josephus, *Ant.* xiv, 4, 8; War, i, 7, 5). The reign of Herod, on the other hand, in which the high-priesthood was kept in abeyance, or transferred from one to another at the will of one who was an alien by birth and half a heathen in character, must have tended to depress them.

(3.) Closing Period.—It will be interesting to bring together the few facts that indicate the position of the priests in the New-Test. period of their history. The division into four-and-twenty courses is still maintained (Luke i, 5; Josephus, *Life*, 1), and the heads of these courses, together with those who have held the high-priesthood (the office no longer lasting for life), are "chief priests" (ἀρχιερεῖς) by courtesy (Carpov. *App. Crit.* p. 102), and take their place in the Sanhedrin. The number assigned to each of the courses is very small. Of these the greater number were poor and ignorant, despised by the more powerful members of their own order, not gaining the respect or affection of the people. The picture of cowardly selliness in the priest of the parable of Luke x, 31 can hardly be thought of as representative in the order, indicating the estimate commonly and truly formed of the
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character of the class. The priestly order, like the nation, was divided between contending sects. The influence of Hyrcanus, himself in the latter part of his life a Sadducee (Josephus, Ant. xii. 310, 8), had probably made the tenets of that party popular among the wealthier and better educated classes, and had led the Pharisees of the first Gospels and the Acts, the whole ἀρχιερεύοντα γίγνο
(Acts iv. 1, 6; v. 17), were apparently consistent Sadducees, sometimes combining with the Pharisees in the Sanhedrin, sometimes thwarted by them, in persecuting the followers of Jesus because they preached the resurrection of the dead. The great multitude (δι' ὁλοκτονίας) on the other hand, who received that testimony (vi. 7) must have been free from or must have overcome Sadducean prejudices. It was not strange that those who did not receive the testimony which would have raised them to a higher life should sink lower and lower into an ignorant and ferocious fanaticism. Few stranger contrasts meet us in the history of religion than that presented in the life of the priesthood in the last half-century of the Temple—now going through the solemn sacrificial rites and joining in the noblest hymns, now raising a fierce clamor at anything which seemed to them a profanation of the sanctuary, and rushing to dash out the brains of the bold or incautious intruder, or of one of their own order who might enter while uncalled. This change is due to a half-terrifying, half-in-teresting setting fire to the clothes of the Levites who were found sleeping when they ought to have been watching at their posts (Lightfoot, Temple Service, ch. i.). The rivalry which led the Levites to claim privileges which had hitherto belonged to the priests has already been noticed. See Lev. vi. In the scenes of the last tragedy of Jewish history the order passes away, without out, "dying as a fool dieth." The high-priesthood is given to the lowest and vilest of the adherents of the frenzied Zealots (Josephus, War, iv. 8, 6). Other priesthoods are all confounded. It is from a priest that Titus receives the lamps, and gems, and costly raiment of the sanctuary (ibid. vi. 8, 3). Priests report to their conquerors the terrible utterance "Let us depart" on the last Pentecost ever celebrated in the Temple (ibid. vi. 5, 5). It is a priest who fills up the degradation of his order by dwelling on the fall of his country with a cold-blooded satisfaction, and finding in Titus the fulfillment of the Messianic prophecies of the Old Test. (ibid. vi. 5, 4). The destruction of Jerusalem deprived the order at one blow of all but an honorific surname. The Levitical families must have altogether lost their genealogies. Those who still prided themselves on their descent were no longer safe against the claims of pretenders. The jealousies of the lettered class, which had been kept up under the restrictions as long as the temple stood, now fell full play, and the influence of the rabbins increased with the fall of the priesthood. The position of the priest in mediaval and modern Judaism has never risen above that of complimentary recognition. Those who claim to take their place among the sons of Aaron are entitled to receive that portion of the money of the first-born, to take the law from its chest, and to pronounce the benediction in the synagogues (Ugolino, xii. 48).

IV. Relation of the Jewish Priesthood to the Christian Ministry.—The language of the New-Test. writers in relation to the priesthood ought not to be passed over. They recognise in Christ the first-born, the king, the Anointed, the representative of the true primeval priesthood after the order of Melchizedek (Heb. vii., viii), from which that of Aaron, however necessary for the time, is now seen to have been a deception. But there is also a connection with the new Christian society, bearing the name and exercising functions like those of the priests of the older Covenant. The synagogue, and not the Temple, furnishes the pattern for the organization of the Church. The idea which pervades the teaching of the Epistles is that of the universal priesthood. All true believers are made kings and priests (Rev. i. 6; 1 Pet. ii. 9), offer spiritual sacrifices (Rom. xii. 1), may draw near, may enter into the holiest (Heb. x. 19-22), as having received a true priestly consecration. They, too, have been washed and sprinkled as the sons of Aaron were (x. 22). It was the thought of the apostles that a succeeding generation of old and cloddered to the world should be succeeded by others clad in the Priest, priest, and Levites was reproduced in the bishops, priests, and deacons of the Christian Church. The history of language presents few stranger facts than those connected with these words. Priest, our only equivalent for ἱερέας, comes to us from the word which was chosen because it excluded the idea of a sacerdotal character. Bishop has narrowly escaped a like perversion, occurring as it does constantly in Wiclif's version as the translation of ἀρχιερεύοντας (e.g. John xviii. 15; Heb. vii. 1). The hat which was thus expressed, it is true, on Priester, on the broad analogy of a threefold gradation, and the terms "priest," "altar," "sacrifice," might be used without involving more than a legitimate symbolism; but they brought with them the inevitable danger of reproducing and perpetuating in the history of the Christian Church many of the feelings which belonged to Judaism, and ought to have been left behind with it. If the evil has not proved so fatal to the life of Christendom as it might have done, it is because no bishop or pope, however much he might exaggerate his character as a law-giver and as the one desired of making the Christian priesthood hereditary. We have probably reason to be thankful that two errors tend to neutralize each other, and that the age which witnessed the most extravagant sacerdotism was one in which the celibacy of the clergy was first exalted, then urged, and at last enforced.

V. Literature.—For the similarity in the religion of ancient Greece, see Potter, Archaeologia (Lond. 1775), i. 202; of ancient Rome, Adam, Antiquités (Edinb. 1791), p. 298, § Ministri Sacrorum. For the resemblances between the two religions, see id. vi. 8. It is from a priest that Titus receives the lamps, and gems, and costly raiment of the sanctuary (ibid. vi. 8, 3). Priests report to their conquerors the terrible utterance "Let us depart" on the last Pentecost ever celebrated in the Temple (ibid. vi. 5, 5). It is a priest who fills up the degradation of his order by dwelling on the fall of his country with a cold-blooded satisfaction, and finding in Titus the fulfillment of the Messianic prophecies of the Old Test. (ibid. vi. 5, 4). The destruction of Jerusalem deprived the order at one blow of all but an honorific surname. The Levitical families must have altogether lost their genealogies. Those who still prided themselves on their descent were no longer safe against the claims of pretenders. The jealousies of the lettered class, which had been kept up under the restrictions as long as the temple stood, now fell full play, and the influence of the rabbins increased with the fall of the priesthood. The position of the priest in mediaval and modern Judaism has never risen above that of complimentary recognition. Those who claim to take their place among the sons of Aaron are entitled to receive that portion of the money of the first-born, to take the law from its chest, and to pronounce the benediction in the synagogues (Ugolino, xii. 48).

At last the Christian Church was to be established, and the functions of the priest seem to have commonly been discharged by the head of each family; but, on the expansion of the family into the state, the office of priest became a public one, which absorbed the duties as well as the name of the private priest of the Jewish community, and hence the change in the separate families or communities. It thus came to pass that in many instances the priestly office was associated with that of the sovereign, whatever might be the particular form of sovereignty. But in many religious and political bodies, also, the orders were maintained in complete independence, and the priests formed
a distinct, and, generally speaking, a privileged class. See EGYPT; HINDUISM. The priestly order, in most of the ancient religions, included a graduated hierarchy; and to the head of whatever order was the title, were assigned the most solemn of the religious offices intrusted to the body. Compare the preceding article.

In the Christian Church the word has been used in place of the two Greek words (1) μέντοιος, which really signifies an elder, and (2) ἰπτσίς, which corresponds to the Latin sacerdos, i. e. one who offers sacrifice—words which are exceedingly dissimilar in meaning, but, used in this indiscriminate manner, convey a false idea as to the respective offices of priest and preacher. The Christian preacher or minister answers rather to the ancient prophet than to the Old-Testament priest. As ἰπτσίς means one who offers sacrifices, and as sacrifices have been abolished since the offering of the one perfect and all-sufficient Sacrifice, it follows that, in the strict and official sense, there are no "sacrificers" under the New-Testament or Christian dispensation. If, therefore, the claims of the ministers of the Church are made to rest upon a precise analogy to those founded upon the priestly functions of an abrogated dispensation, it surely becomes the advocates of such claims to prove from the Christian Institute that the conceived analogy exists there. There is not a single passage in "the book" of apostles and evangelists to support the assumption. Nowhere are the ministers of the Gospel represented as "sacrificers;" nowhere is provision made for such a succession, as in any respect similar to the Levitical, and still less the Aaronical priesthood. To the prophets, and rulers of the synagogue it is admitted that there are allusions descriptive of ministerial duties; for the work of instruction was the appropriate business of these ecclesiastical functionaries, and not performing the services of a prescribed ritual. But ecclesiastical dignities are nowhere ascribed to Christian presbyters.

The priesthood, as a religious order, perished with Judaism. The priesthood was the shadow, and disappeared when the substance came. As a mediator, Jesus Christ is the only priest; as a servant of God, whose duty it is to consecrate his full time and energies and thoughts to the divine service, every Christian is a "priest unto God." The New Testament, therefore, contains no hint of any priest, nor of any officer answering to a priest, in the early Church; and, on the contrary, contains frequent passages which more or less directly and distinctly that the priesthood of the class is merged in the priestly character of Jesus Christ and that of the whole discipleship (comp. Heb. ii, 17; iii, 1; iv, 14; v, 5-10; vii, 27, 28; x, 11, 12; Rev. v, 10). It is very clear that the apostles, when they so plainly asserted the abolition of sacrifices since the offering of the one perfect and all-sufficient Sacrifice, could never intend to institute such an order as a sacrificing priest. When they use the term, they apply it to Christ alone. The office of a Christian pastor is not to ordain, but to preach the atonement. In Rom. xvi, 16 the application of the term by the apostle Paul is figurative. The modern minister answers rather to the ancient prophet than to the ancient priest. At least this is the universal opinion of nearly all Protestant Christendom, though some relics of the old priestly idea of a special priestly order, with peculiar privileges and prerogatives, and possessing peculiar holiness, still linger in the Church.

The advocates of hierarchical claims, whether Romish, Greek, or Protestant Christians, assume that ministers are entitled to be regarded as succeeding to the same relations in the Church with that which was sustained by the priesthood under the Jewish economy. Hence the terms and offices peculiar to the ancient priests are conceived to be analogous to the functions and designations of the Christian ministry. On this assumption, it is contended that the duties performed and the authority exercised under the direct sanction of the Most High are now transferred to those who are duly qualified, by a certain order of succession, to discharge the offices of the ministry under the present dispensation. In the grades of the hierarchy the priestly order is second in order only to that of bishop. Bishops and priests possess the same priestly authority, but the bishop has the power of transmitting it to others, which an ordinary priest cannot do. The priest is regarded as the ordinary minister of the Eucharist, whether as a sacrament or as a sacrifice; of baptism, penance, and extreme unction; and although the contracting parties are held in the modern schools to be themselves the ministers of marriage, the priest is regarded by all schools of Roman divines as at least the normal and official witness of its celebration. The priest is also officially charged with the instruction of the people and the direction of their spiritual concerns, and, by long-established use, special districts, called parishes (q. v.), are assigned to priests, within which they are intrusted with the care and supervision of the spiritual wants of all the inhabitants. The holy order of priesthood can only be conferred by a bishop, and he is ordinarily assisted by two or more priests, who, in common with the bishop, impose hands on the candidate. The rest of the ceremonial of ordination consists in investing the candidate with the sacred instruments and ornaments of his order, anointing his hands, and reciting certain prayers significant of the gifts and the duties of the office. Deus defines the priesthood as "a sacred order and sacrament, in which power is conferred of consecrating the body of Christ, of remitting sins, and of administering certain other sacraments." Accordingly, at the consecration of a priest, after unction and prayer, the chalice, with wine and water, and the patten upon it with the host, are given to him, with these awful words, "Receive power to offer the sacrifice of God, and to celebrate mass for the living and the dead." Moreover, he receives formally the power to forgive sins. The distinguishing vestment of the priest is the chasuble (Lat. planeta). In Roman Catholic countries, priests wear even in public a distinctive dress.
Prayer-book to designate the clerical office. Says Flyder: "The Greek and Latin words which we translate 'priest' are derived from words that signify holy; and so the title of the officiant signifies him whose mere charge and function are about holy things, and therefore seems to be a most proper word to him who is set apart to the holy public service and worship of God, especially when he is in the actual ministation of holy things. If it be objected that, according to the usual acceptation of the word, it signifies him that offers up a sacrifice, and therefore cannot be allowed to a minister of the Gospel, who hath no sacrifice to offer, it is answered that the ministers of the Gospel have sacrifices to offer (1 Pet. ii, 5): 'Ye are built up into a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices of prayer, praises, thanksgiving,' etc. In respect of these, the ministers of the Gospel may safely, in a metaphorical sense, be called priests; and in a more eminent manner than other Christians, because they are taken from among men to offer up these sacrifices for others. But besides these spiritual sacrifices mentioned, the ministers of the Gospel have another sacrifice to offer, viz. the unbloody sacrifice, as it was anciently called, the commemorative sacrifice of the blood of Christ, which does as really and truly show the interest of the Church in those sacrifices under the law did; and in respect of this sacrifice of the Eucharist, the ancients have usually called those that offer it up 'priests.'" See Kilren, Ancient Church, p. 644; Martensen, Dogmatics; Fairbairn, A History of the Reformation, p. 167; Stratten, Book of the Priesthood; Howitt, On Priestcraft; Dwight, Theology; Schall, Hist. of the Apostol Church; Elliott, Definition of Romanism (see Index); Summer, Principles at Stake (Lond. 1668, 8vo), ch. iii; Christian Quarr. April, 1673, art. iv; Meth. Quarr. Res. July, 1673, art. iii; Studien u. Kritiken, 1862, No. i; Bept. Quarr. Oct. 1870; Christian Monthly, Feb. 1865, p. 188. See BISHOP; CLERGY; PREAMBLES.

Priestley, Joseph, LL.D., one of the most noted of the English divines of the 18th century, and a scientist of great celebrity, was born of humble but honorable parentage at Fieldhead, March 13, 1733, old style. His mother dying when he was six years of age, he was adopted by a paternal aunt, Mrs. Keighley, by whom he was sent to a free grammar-school in the neighborhood, where he was taught the Latin language and the elements of science; he was vacated and devoted to the study of Hebrew under a dissenting minister; and when he had acquired some proficiency in this language he commenced and made considerable progress in the Chaldee, Syriac, and Arabic. Ill-health, however, led him to forsake his classical studies and devote himself to mercantile pursuits. Though obliged to leave school, he yet continued his studies. Without the aid of a master, he acquired some knowledge of French, Italian, and German. At the age of nineteen (1752) he resumed work as a theological student in the dissenting academy at Darwen. His parents, who were both of the Calvinistic persuasion, as well as his aunt, had omitted no opportunity of inculcating the importance of the Calvinistic doctrine. At the academy he found both the professors and students greatly agitated upon most theological questions which were deemed of much importance, such as liberty and necessity, the sleep of the soul, etc., and kindred articles of orthodoxy and heresy. These were the topics of animated and frequent discussions. The spirit of controversy thus excited was in some measure fostered by the plan for regulating their studies by the Doctrine and Catechism. Certain works on both sides of every question which the students were required to peruse and form an abridgment of for their future use. Before the lapse of many months Priestley conceived himself called upon to re-examine the underlying principles of philosophical and metaphysical opinions which he had imbibed in early youth, and thus, he himself observes, "I came to embrace what is generally called the heterodox side of the question; . . . but notwithstanding the great freedom of our debates, the extreme of heresy among us was Aruanism, and no such rascals as we are, excepting those who are less, or less qualified, of the doctrine of the Atonement." His waywardness did not interfere with his graduation, and in 1756 he became assistant minister to an Independent congregation at Needham-Market, in Suffolk. Here he made himself unpopular by renouncing the doctrine of the Atonement, and in three years left, in rather bad repute because of his heresy. He found a temporary engagement at Nantwich, in Cheshire, but was again unpopular, and next engaged in teaching with some success, and was finally chosen professor of belles-lettres in Warrington Academy. During the ten years following he produced half a dozen thoughtful works on widely varying subjects—which works of themselves would have given him enduring fame. He busied himself in politics, too, and became known as a vigorous lecturer. He was still poor, but by dint of strict economy he had secured an air-pump and a machine, and had already begun his scientific researches.

While at Needham he composed his work entitled The Scripture Doctrine of Remission, which shows that the Death of Christ is no proper Sacrifice nor Satisfaction for Sin without the removal of a Righteous Account of a Personal Repentance of the Sinner. It was published in 1761. He seems to have rejected all theological dogmas which appeared to him to rest solely upon the interpretation put upon certain passages of the Bible by ecclesiastical authority. It does not, however, appear that these doctrinal errors produced any preventable evil results. A visit to the metropolis was the occasion of his introduction to our own celebrated countryman, Dr. Franklin, Dr. Price, and others. To the first of these he communicated his idea of writing a historical and critical work on the discoveries of electricity, and the requisite books. These Dr. Franklin undertook to procure, and before the end of the year in which Priestley submitted to him the plan of the work he sent him a copy of it in print, though five hours of every day had been occupied in public or private teaching, besides which he had kept up an active philosophical correspondence. The title of this work is The History and Present State of Electricity, with Original Experiments (1767; 2d ed. 1775). By his devotion to learning and his persistent scrutiny of nature, Priestley now unraveled the mysteries of the elided mysteries. He was now in the prime of his career and making the most valuable discovery in science of the last century; but as he drew nearer natural truth, he became more and more, though perhaps unconsciously, estranged from revealed truth, and by a hot temper and hasty utterance, he made manifest the conflict between the trustees and professors of the academy led to his relinquishing the appointment at Warrington in 1767. His next engagement was with a large congregation at Mill-Hill Chapel, Leeds, where his theological inquiries were resumed, and several works of the kind were composed, chiefly to counteract the character. The vicinity of his dwelling to a public brewery was the occasion of his attention being directed to pneumatic chemistry, the consideration of which he commenced in 1768, and subsequently prosecuted with great success. His first publication on this subject was a pamphlet on Improving Water with Fixed Air (1772); the same year he communicated to the Royal Society his Observations on Different Kinds of Air, to which the Copley medal was awarded in 1778. He originated other modes of investigation now pursued, and, indeed, nearly all that is known of the subject is due to the discoveries he made. He discovered oxygen gas, nitrous gas, nitrous oxide gas, nitrous vapor, carbonic oxide gas, sulphurous oxide gas, fluoric-acid gas, muriatic gas, and ammoniacal gas. The discovery of oxygen alone rivaled the most important discovery in science by invention by Newton in the preceding century. The pneumatic trough, a vessel by means of which chemists col-
ject gas, was also in good part invented by Priestley. He experimented untroublingly, and gave to the world a detailed account of almost every observation he made. For a time he was the idol of men of science. All Europe did him honor. At the height of his reputation he became companion to the earl of Shelburne, with whom he travelled extensively on the Continent. He remained with the earl for only a short time, but he was, in 1789, receiving a pension, he settled in Birmingham, where he proceeded actively with his philosophic and theological researches, and was also appointed pastor to a dissenting congregation. Having been told by certain Persian savans that he was the only man they had ever met who could read their language, and who had not believed in Christianity, he wrote, in reply, the *Letters to a Philosophical Unbeliever* (1786), and various other works containing criticisms on the doctrines of Hume and others.

His public position was now rather a hard one; for while laughed at in Paris as a believer, at home he was thrown away as a scaband, and was very easy about the consequences." While it was a source of wonder to the savans of the Continent that such a man could believe in a God at all, his want of belief shocked the better class of his countrymen, who, although at the time sadly lax in morals, were scrupulous in their adherence to orthodoxy. But he did not confine himself to dealing with churchmen: his object was to obtain for the dissenters what he considered to be their rights, and in the pursuit of which he published about twenty volumes. He attacked certain positions relating to the dissenters in Blackstone's *Commentaries* with a vigor and acumen which seems to have surprised his adversary. At the same time he was avowedly partial to the French Revolution, and as he was a man of strong speech and stinging pen, he soon excited the hatred of the High-Church and Tory party. The agitation of the populace had already found vent in riots, and in the month of July Dr. Priestley's house, library, manuscripts, and costly apparatus were committed to the flames by an angry mob. His papers, torn in scraps, carpeted the roads around his desolated home, and he was exposed to great personal danger. He moved Birmingham for safety, where he became the successor of his deceased friend Dr. Price (q. v.), and so far as money could restore what he had lost, it was liberally given. But his sentiments were unchanged, and he was none the less outspoken because of the tempest of which, in 1791, receiving a pension, he settled in Birmingham, where he proceeded actively with his philosophic and theological researches, and was also appointed pastor to a dissenting congregation. Having been told by certain Persian savans that he was the only man they had ever met who could read their language, and who had not believed in Christianity, he wrote, in reply, the *Letters to a Philosophical Unbeliever* (1786), and various other works containing criticisms on the doctrines of Hume and others.

His public position was now rather a hard one; for while laughed at in Paris as a believer, at home he was thrown away as a scaband, and was very easy about the consequences." While it was a source of wonder to the savans of the Continent that such a man could believe in a God at all, his want of belief shocked the better class of his countrymen, who, although at the time sadly lax in morals, were scrupulous in their adherence to orthodoxy. But he did not confine himself to dealing with churchmen: his object was to obtain for the dissenters what he considered to be their rights, and in the pursuit of which he published about twenty volumes. He attacked certain positions relating to the dissenters in Blackstone's *Commentaries* with a vigor and acumen which seems to have surprised his adversary. At the same time he was avowedly partial to the French Revolution, and as he was a man of strong speech and stinging pen, he soon excited the hatred of the High-Church and Tory party. The agitation of the populace had already found vent in riots, and in the month of July Dr. Priestley's house, library, manuscripts, and costly apparatus were committed to the flames by an angry
moral as correct without austerity and exemplary without ostentation. These estimates are certainly diverse, but possibly they are equally near the truth. Priestley was much more of an experimentalist than a philosopher. In religion as well as in science he sought not for the one thing only, or caprice, as his caprice was as noticeable as his positiveness, and his logical inconsistencies were gross. A queer instance of this is found in his adherence to the theory of "philogeny"—the supposed principle of inflammability, or the matter of the fire in composition with other bodies—the absurdity of which was shown by his own discovery of oxygen. In theology, as we have seen, while maintaining the immortality of the soul, he denied its immateriality. He was never widely trusted as a religious leader; although, because of his ability and unimpeachable morality, and his eminence in science, his pulpit services were eagerly sought. His fame rests principally on his pneumatic inquiries. But he was encyclopedic in the range of his writings, which tend to extend to seventy and eighty volumes. Among them are works on general and ecclesiastical history and biography, on language, on oratory and criticism, on religion and metaphysics. Although many of his opinions were fanciful and manifestly erroneous, there was hardly a subject touched by his pen that was not the brighter and shapelier because of his genius. It is not now, however, that first and last remains that the mistakes are best fitted for prosecuting the labors of experimental philosophy are by no means those from which we expect light to be cast into the more obscure region of metaphysical analysis. "Priestley's mind was objective to an extreme; he could fix his faith upon nothing which had not the evidence of sense in some way or other impressed upon it. Science, morals, politics, philosophy, religion, all came to him under the type of the sensational. The most spiritual ideas were obliged to be cast into a material mould before they could command the judgment or consent. (His intellect) was rapid to an extraordinary degree; he saw the bearings of a question according to its principles at a glance, and embodied his thoughts in volumes, while many other men would hardly have sketched out their plan. All this, though admirable in the man of action, was not the temperament to form the solid metaphysician; nay, it was precisely opposed to that deep, reflective habit, that sinking into one's own inmost consciousness, from which alone speculative philosophy can obtain light and advancement."

As a man of science, he has left his mark upon the intellectual history of the world, in so far as he was a being of a man, science, he aimed at being a metaphysician, a theologian, a politician, a classical scholar, and a historian. With an amazing intrepidity he plunged into tasks the effective performance of which would have demanded the labors of a lifetime. With the charge of thirty youths on his hands, he proposes to write an ecclesiastical history, and soon afterwards observes that a fresh translation of the Old Testament would "not be a very formidable task" (Rutt, Life, i, 42). He carried on all manner of controversies upon their own ground with Horsley and Badcock, with his friend Price, with Beattie and the Scotch philosophers, with Gibbon and the sceptics, and yet often labored for hours a day at his chemical experiments. So discursive a thinker could hardly do much thorough work, nor really work out or co-ordinate his own opinions. It would be in vain, therefore, to anticipate any great force or originality in Priestley's speculations. At best he was a quick reflector of the current opinions of his time and class, and able to run up hasty theories of sufficient apparent strength to keep his party in support of some temporary reaction or midst the storms of conflicting elements. With such tendencies of mind, therefore, and living in an age the whole bearing of which was away from the ideal to the sensational, it is not surprising that Priestley entered with energy into those principles of Hartley from which he hoped to reduce all mental science to a branch of physical investigation.

VIII.-19*
Christianity has been corrupted. Priestley includes among the corruptions the Trinitarian doctrines, which, as he argues, showed themselves, though in a comparatively undeveloped state, among the earliest of the apostolic writers. He concludes the attack upon the authority of the Church fathers, as begun by Daille, and which had then been recently carried on by Midleton and Jortin. He makes Christ a mere man, and places the writers of the New Testament on the same level with Thucydides and Tacitus, while he still believes in the miracles, and quotes texts after the old unhistorical fashion. He is compelled, moreover, to accept the Protestant theory that there was in the earliest ages a body of absolutely sound doctrine, though, in the effort to identify this with Unitarianism, he is driven to great straits, and forced to discover it in obscure sects, and to make inferences from the negative argument of silence rather than from positive assertions. Though he makes free with the reasoning of the apostles, he cannot give up their authority; and, accepting without question the authenticity of the Gospels, labors to interpret them in the Unitarian sense. He did not see that the real difficulty is the admission of supernatural agency, and that to call a miracle a very little one is only to encounter the whole weight of rationalistic and of orthodox hostility. Priestley explains in his work to which he refers, "what circumstances in the state of things" (notice this alphabod style), "and especially of other prevailing opinions and prejudices," favored the introduction of new doctrines. He hopes that this "historical method will be found to be one of the most satisfactory modes of argumentation." (Corruptions, vol. i, Preface, p. xiv.)

Priestley asserts that corruptions appeared, but in practice seems to attribute them to perverse chances rather than to the influence of contemporary opinion, which he professes to trace. Thus in discussing theories of grace, he says, "It is not easy to imagine a priori what could have led men into such a train of thinking" (Ibid. i, 284), as is exhibited in the speculations about grace, free will, and predestination. After some vague handling of the problem, he remembers that the "principal parts of the system were first suggested in the heat of controversy" (Ibid. p. 285)—an explanation which seems to him to throw some light upon the question. Obviously, a writer thus incompetent to appreciate the bearings of the most vital doctrines of Christianity was not a very competent historian of thought. Priestley, however, professed to be influenced by the work of men who were most palatable to his mind. That Platonism had played a great part in the development of Christian dogma. The Platonists, he tells us, "pretended to be no more than the expositors of a more ancient doctrine;" which he traces through Pythagoras, the Cynics, Orpheus, to the secret places of the Egyptian priests. Another stream of tradition had reached the Romans from their Trojan ancestors, who had received it from Phrygia, where it had been planted by Dardanus as early as the 9th century after Noah's flood. Dardanus brought it from Samothrace, where the Three Mansions were worshiped under the name of the Cabirim. Thus the Platonic Trinity, and the Roman Jupiter, Juno, and Minerva, were shown to be simply faint reflections of an early revelation communicated to the patriarchs before the days of Moses (Horsley, Tracts, p. 43-45). See, besides the works above referred to, Brougham, Lives of Philosophers of the Time of George III, p. 83 sq.; De Quincy, Philosophical Writers, ii, 262; Mackintosh, Miscell. Works, iii, 170; London, Gentleman's Magazine, April, 1804, p. 375 sq.; Horsley, i, p. 130 sq.; Newton, Views of Christian Truth, Piety, or Religion, 1st ed. (12mo); London, Qu. Rev. Dec. 1812, p. 430; Lindsey, Vindiciae Priestleyanae (1748, 2 vols. 8vo); Christian Examiner, xii, 257 sq.; Stevens, Hist. of English Thought in the 18th Century, i, 428 sq.; Leckey, Hist. of Rationalism, and his History of Modern Ideas in England (2 vols. 8vo); Hagenback, Hist. of Doctrine, ii, 444 sq.; N. Y. Christian Advocate, 1877; Perry, Hist. of the Church of England, iii, 432-434; Blakey, Hist. of the Philosophy of Mind, iii, 280 sq., 802 sq.; Cousin, Hist. of Modern Philosophy, lect. xiii, xiv.

Priestley, Thomas, an English divine of the Independent body, flourished near the close of the last century. He was the brother of Joseph Priestley, but their theological tenets differed widely. Thomas was the editor of the Christian Magazine, and published, Evangelical Bible, or Paraphrase, Exposition, and Commentary, with copies Notes and suitable Reflections (1791, fol.); Also—Mr. Scott's Life and Death (1791, 8vo)—a Funeral Sermon (1791, 8vo)—Family Exercises (1792, 8vo; 1793, 8vo).

Priests, Marriage of. The obligation of perpetual virginity imposed by the Church of Rome upon those who receive higher orders has been spoken of in another article. See Celibacy. In the ancient Church married men (but no bigamists) were sometimes received into priesthood, without dissolution of their matrimony; but it was never allowed to one who had received higher orders to marry. If such a case occurred, the service of the Church had to be renounced. In the West we find, in the middle of the 19th century, that the ordination of married men was not prohibited. The Council of Trent (sess. xxiv, can. 9) repeated the same declaration, in its view the marriage of the clergy (can. 4, l. c.), punts the orders again into the number of the dissolving impediments to a marriage. The same council decreed, further, that sons of clergymen cannot discharge a clerical function in a place where their father is or was in office (see. xxi, cap. 15, De ref.). The Greek Church imposes celibacy on the higher dignitaries—the bishops—but not on the priests and lower functionaries of the Church. The latter cannot, it is true, marry after receiving the orders, but are allowed to continue in the matrimonial relations contracted before ordination. In many countries this is still the case. The Russian Church, however, refuses ordination to her priests as long as they are unmarried, i.e. ordains only married men. If the priest becomes a widower, he retires to monastic life. In the Greek Oriental Church there are a few exceptions in the persons of the death of their wives, unless they prefer to marry again. In Greece married priests are distinguished from the unmarried ones by their head-gear: the former wear very low round hats. See Les, Sacerdotis Celibatis (Index, under Marriage).

Priests' Rooms. The chaplains in Great Britain have always kept chambers over porches or sacristies, as at St. Paul's, Cornhill, East Oxford; in London, over the vault of the church, as at Cashel, Millhollin, Holy Cross, and Kilkenney; in Scotland, at Inns, over the ailes.

Prikaszky, John Baptist, a learned Hungarian Jesuit, was born at Priezse March 16, 1709, and, after attaining to the doctorate in philosophy and theology, taught in several colleges his order. He was for five years chancellor of the University of Turyn. He died after 1773. He wrote, Acta Sanctorum Hungarum (Turyn, 1743-44, 8vo); Notitia Sanctorum Petri et Paulo antiquorum Sanctorum (Ibld. 1759); Acta et Scripta S. Gregorii Neo-Caesareiuni, Domini et Regis (Turyn, 1764, 8vo); Acta et Scripta S. Irenaei (Castiass, 1765, 8vo); Acta et Scripta S. Gregorii Neo-Caesareiuni, Domi-
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yri Alexander et Methodii Lycii (ibid. 1766, 8vo.)—

PRIMACY is the office held (1) by him who is the pope of Rome, and therefore highest in the Christian Church, and (2) by him who is next in rank to the patriarch (q.v.). See PRIMACY.

The primacy of Peter, as the pope's office is sometimes styled, Romanists claim to be of divine appointment. They assert that the apostle Peter, by Christ's authority, had a primacy of sovereign authority and jurisdiction over the other apostles. Since the Godman Jesus the Christ, they say, has himself willed the continuance of the Church and her fundamental unity, Peter and his successors were also established by the will of God. The power to bind and to loose [see KEYS, Power of the] was given to the apostles in a body (Matt. xviii, 8); but, in order to preserve their power and unity, Peter was put at their head and endowed with higher honors (Matt. xvi, 16-18; xvii, 4, etc.). He became the primus inter pares, not so much for his own sake as for a precedent; "for it would be unreasonable," says Sauter, "to consider the primacy be held to have died with him, in view of the end for which Christ had appointed him to it. It appears, on the contrary, that Christ instituted the primacy more in view of the necessities and requirements of the apostolic times, when the personal purity of each of the apostles rendered such a measure less necessary" (Fundamenta juris ecclesiastici Catholicorum [3d ed. Rotwille, 1825], § 62; see also Zeitschrift für Phil. und kath. Theologie [Cologne, 1852], iv, 121, 122).

By the example of Peter, Christ showed, in a general way, that some one of the bishops was always to be considered as primate by the others; but, add those who put a literal interpretation on the Romish assertion of supremacy, it is by no means clear from the writings of the Church that the primacy is attached to a particular see or bishop. Circumstances favored Rome, whose bishop was acknowledged by the other bishops as the successor of Peter (in the primacy). The bishops of Rome cannot have the primacy by divine appointment, but in a mediante manner, so that, when the good of the Church demands it, it can be transferred to another of the bishops (Sauter, § 68, 64). But the Ultramontanes maintain that by the same authority by which Peter was set apart for the supremacy his own successors were also established. Peter, it is true, founded the Romish Churches and provided them with bishops, yet no other can be considered as his true successor than he who succeeded him after his death, and this is the bishop of Rome. The Roman bishop had, by his Roman episcopal dignity, a right similar to that in virtue of which the next relation succeeds in worldly principalities, and the Ultramontanes assert that Peter himself chose for his successor, in all his dignities, the same Linus mentioned by Paul in his Second Epistle to Timothy, iv, 21 (Phillips, Kirchenrecht, i, 146). This system of ideas, so simple in appearance, has only by degrees developed the practical and obtained dogmatic sanction in the Latin Church. It is based on facts which have been variously appreciated, and on decisions which have by no means received the same interpretation at all hands. The whole deduction is founded on arbitrary declarations, in as much as the bishops were, and are still, party and judges in the same cause; they, whose title is in question, claim the exclusive right of explaining words and facts, and consider any one who doubts their assertions as being disobedient to Christ and to God. Impartial thinkers of the Roman Church have long been aware that before the middle of the 3d century there was no primacy perceptible in the Church (see Möhler, Die Einheit der Kirche, oder das Prinzip des Katholicismus, dargestellt im Geiste der Kirchenverfassung der dreif Jahrhunderte [2d ed. Tübingen, 1843]); while others, by arbitrary arrangement of historical facts, arrive at the conclusion "that the Roman bishops not only claimed the highest authority in all ecclesiastical matters since the first centuries of Christianity, but that these pretensions, founded on Christ's declarations, were acknowledged by the successors of the apostles" (see Phillips, Kirchenrecht, p. 156). This is not the place to show, by the history of the Roman bishops of the first centuries, how indefensible such an assumption must appear: we must leave this to the special articles of this work, containing ourselves with calling the attention of the reader to the principal features of the development of the primacy.

Among the numerous works written on the subject, we mention in favor of it: Bibliotheca maxima Pontifici, in qua authores melioris notae qui habetens pro S. Romani antiquis terrae, successores continetur, promoventur. Fr. H. Tom. de Roccalerti (Rome, 1689, 21 vols. fol.); A. Duade, Majestas Hierarchic et. Summi Pontificis (Bamb. 1761, 2 vols. 4to); Pet. Ballerini, De Vi de Eccl. Pontificis, etc. (Augsb. 1770, 2 vols. 4to; ed. nov. by Westhoff); J. Roskowagn, De Primatu Romani Pontificis episcopi Juribus (ibid. 1844, 8vo); Rotheneuse, Der Primat des Papstes in allen Jahrhunderten, herausgegeben von Rass und Weiss (Mainz, 1836, 4 vols. 8vo).

Against it: Eiendorg, Der Primat der römischen Päpste (Darmst. 1841 and 1846, 2 vols. 8vo); Barret, Du Pape et ses Dots (Paris, 1841, 2 vols. 8vo); A. H. Oder, Das Papsttum (ibid. 1820); Gosselin, Pours le Pape au Moyen âge (Louvain, 1845, 2 vols. 8vo). These and other works have been extensively used by Phillips in his Canon Law, the fifth volume of which (Ratisbon, 1857) is entirely devoted to the subject of primacy.

Generally the testimony of Ireneus (d. 202) and of Cyprian (d. 258) are especially invoked to show that the primacy of the Roman bishops was accepted in the 2d century. But the former (Adversus Heres. lib. iii, cap. iii), in order to demonstrate the truth of the Catholic doctrine, refers to the Roman bishop's title, which is acknowledged by the apostles; for Italy and the West, he names especially Rome as being the only Occidental see of undisputed apostolic foundation. The potest principalis mentioned by Ireneus designates the political situation of the city, which could not fail to enhance its ecclesiastical importance. In the same way, Constantine, at a later period, took the second place in the hierarchy, as being a second Rome (Concil. Constant. ann. 381. can. 3; comp. Bickell, Geschichte des Kirchenrechts, i, 209 sq.). The ideas of Cyprian are interesting in reference to the relations of the apostles by an apostolic see, and of the first metropolitan of the Roman empire, gave at an early period a great importance to the see of Rome; but the same importance is attributed to the bishop of Alexandria and of Antioch, in the 3d canon of the Council of Nice, in 325. At that council the Roman bishop did not exercise any authority other than the other bishops. This is clearly shown by the acts of the council, signed by two prelates, "instead of our pope," i.e. bishop (see Aneclet Neronii—fragments relating to the Council of Nice—by Harris Cowper [London and Edinburgh, 1857]). It was at a later period attempted to give can. 6 Nic. Conc. another form than the primitive by adding at the beginning the words "Quod ecclesia Romana semper habuit primatum" (see Geseler, Kirchengeschichte, i, § 91). The struggle for the maintenance of the orthodox doctrine was extremely severe, as between the bishops of Rome, and the Council of Sardica (343) emphasized most decidedly the pre-eminence of the Roman see in the Western Church: the Oriental bishops on that occasion protested and left the assembly. The resolutions of Sardica were not at once accepted even in the Western Church. At the request of the bishop Damascus, and of a Roman
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SYNOD OF 378, the emperor Gratian issued a rescript in favor of Rome (Tischler, L. E. § 92, n. 1). In 445 an edict of Valentinian III proclaims the primacy of the bishop of Rome over the whole Church—a primacy which, besides the higher rank over the bishops, includes a supreme ecclesiastical legislation and jurisdiction. The significance of this pronouncement on the primacy of Peter ("sedis apostolicae primatum, sancti Petri merition, qui princeps est episcopat corone"), on the political importance of Rome ("Romaei dignitatis civilis"), and on the Synod of Sardica ("sacra synodi auctoria") (comp. Richter, Kirchengeschichte [6th ed., § 22, 23]). But the Church of the East was by means subordinated to the Roman see; the Council of Chalcedon, 451, in can. 28, declares that the see of Constantinople has the same privileges in the Eastern Church which in the Western Church belong to Rome (vid. 1, sec. 17, 18). If, in later times, the first place in the Roman empire is acknowledged to belong to Rome (c. 7, pr. c. 8, C. de Summo Trinitate [1, 1]; Justini- 

nian, a. 533, No. ix, cxxxi, c. 2, a. 535, 545, etc.), this was only a distinction of honor without any practical advantage for Constantinople was also the highest instance (c. 29, C. de Episcope. Auctuaria [i, 4], a. 530, No. cxxxvii, c. 5, a. 564, etc.). The ecclesiastical authority of Rome was not contested after that, but its relation to the worldly powers was often a source of friction. Its concur- rence with the newly founded Germanic churches was at first prevented by their Arianism, but became the closer after their conversion to the orthodox faith. The Roman principles about the relations of the Church to the apostolic see prevailed in the Frankish empire by the exertions of Boniface, although their practical consequences were impeded by the independent exercise of the rights of the State in Church mat- ters. With Charlemagne the pope was nothing but the first metropolitan, over whom the emperor had jurisdiction. The king is the supreme judge and legislator, a protector and ruler given to the Church by God, who corrects or approves the resolutions of the synods, and issues himself ecclesiastical ordinances, after taking the advice of the clergy. The proof of this is afforded by a large number of capitulaires. Under the weak suc- cessors of the great emperor there was a change, which the decreets of Pseudo-Isidore turned to the advantage of Rome. It was in conformity with these principles that Nicholas I administered the Church (from 858). The German kings of the house of Saxon not only restored the Roman bishop but were again subor- dinated to the primacy of honor. We see the German bishops, under Otto I, appointed by the emperor him- self, governing their dioceses independently, and the episcopate, in their synods, presided over by the em-peror, exercise jurisdiction over the Roman bishop (deposition of John XII, in 965, by the Roman council). These principles were in force until the middle of the 11th century. The bishop of Rome was then subor- dinated to the emperor and to the body of the episcopate (in 1054 at the Synod of Sutri, by which Benedict VIII, Sylvester III, and Gregory VI were deposed). Under Gregory VII a reaction took place, and the papacy was enabled to obtain the whole extent of authority which Pseudo-Isidore claimed as its own. The hierarchical system of popacy was completed by this Gregory and his successors—Alexander III (1159-1181), Innocent III (1198-1216), Gregory IX (1227-1241), Innocent IV (1243-1254), and Boniface VIII (1294-1303). The so-called Dictatus Hildebrandini, the authenticity of which is proved by the regesta of Gregory VII (comp. Gramont, Regesta, etc., p. 47), contains the following decrees: "Dictatus Gregorii VII registro enendate [Regiment, 1858], p. 5", and the decreets of the popes mentioned, contain the propositions peculiar to this system, the most es- sential of which are: The bishop of Rome is the vicar of Christ on earth ("Romanus Pontifex vicarius Jesus Christi, quod non puri hominis, sed veri Dei vicem gerit in terris" [Innoc. III, in c. 2, 3, x, De Translat. Episcop. i, 7]), the universal bishop ("solus universalia" [Gregorii Dict. No. 2]), to whom alone belongs the title of pope ("quod unicum est nominem in mundo" [ibid. c. 11]). He is possessed of full powers, and he grants part of the temporal dominion to the bishop of Rome ("quia daretur nostris potestas regni terrae," i.e., the dominion over the states). He is to install his bishops ("Quia daretur nostris potentia instituisse episcopos") and to excommunicate ("Quia peccatum sancitum excommunicat") them, as well as to give them their pastoral letters ("Quia episcopos instituit: Cunctum episcopatum in terris"").

It is, of course, his own business how he chooses his assistants; the rights of appointing, deposing, permitting bishops belong to him exclusively; he can draw every cause before the apostolic see, judge it himself, or take it back from the local authority. He has, even, the right to declare a council, to his personal lieutenant, a legate, who, of course, has pre-eminence over all other dignitaries ("Quod illis solus potest deponere episcopos vel reconci- liare... Quod legatus ejus omnibus episcopis prae sit in peccato vel concilio, et praecepit ut omnes...""). Its connection with the newly founded Germanic churches was at first prevented by their Arianism, but became the closer after their conversion to the orthodox faith. The Roman principles about the relations of the Church to the apostolic see prevailed in the Frankish empire by the exertions of Boniface, although their practical consequences were impeded by the independent exercise of the rights of the State in Church mat- ters. With Charlemagne the pope was nothing but the first metropolitan, over whom the emperor had jurisdic- tion. The king is the supreme judge and legislator, a protector and ruler given to the Church by God, who corrects or approves the resolutions of the synods, and issues himself ecclesiastical ordinances, after taking the advice of the clergy. The proof of this is afforded by a large number of capitulaires. Under the weak suc- cessors of the great emperor there was a change, which the decreets of Pseudo-Isidore turned to the advantage of Rome. It was in conformity with these principles that Nicholas I administered the Church (from 858). The German kings of the house of Saxon not only restored the Roman bishop but were again subor- dinated to the primacy of honor. We see the German bishops, under Otto I, appointed by the emperor him- self, governing their dioceses independently, and the episcopate, in their synods, presided over by the em-peror, exercise jurisdiction over the Roman bishop (deposition of John XII, in 965, by the Roman council). These principles were in force until the middle of the 11th century. The bishop of Rome was then subor- dinated to the emperor and to the body of the episcopate (in 1054 at the Synod of Sutri, by which Benedict VIII, Sylvester III, and Gregory VI were deposed). Under Gregory VII a reaction took place, and the papacy was enabled to obtain the whole extent of authority which Pseudo-Isidore claimed as its own. The hierarchical system of popacy was completed by this Gregory and his successors—Alexander III (1159-1181), Innocent III (1198-1216), Gregory IX (1227-1241), Innocent IV (1243-1254), and Boniface VIII (1294-1303). The so-called Dictatus Hildebrandini, the authenticity of which is proved by the regesta of Gregory VII (comp. Gramont, Regesta, etc., p. 47), contains the following decrees: "Dictatus Gregorii VII registro enendate [Regiment, 1858], p. 5", and the decreets of the popes mentioned, contain the propositions peculiar to this system, the most es- sential of which are: The bishop of Rome is the vicar of Christ on earth ("Romanus Pontifex vicarius Jesus Christi, quod non puri hominis, sed veri Dei vicem gerit in terris" [Innoc. III, in c. 2, 3, x, De Translat. Episcop. i, 7]), the universal bishop ("solus universalia" [Gregorii Dict. No. 2]), to whom alone belongs the title of pope ("quod unicum est nominem in mundo" [ibid. c. 11]). He is possessed of full powers, and he grants part of the temporal dominion to the bishop of Rome ("quia daretur nostris potestas regni terrae," i.e., the dominion over the states). He is to install his bishops ("Quia daretur nostris potentia instituisse episcopos") and to excommunicate ("Quia peccatum sancitum excommunicat") them, as well as to give them their pastoral letters ("Quia episcopos instituit: Cunctum episcopatum in terris").

The papal system, a product of feudalism, according to which all authority rests in the sovereign, involves, in its last consequence, the political domination. The Dictatus Gregorii contain the following declarations: "Quod solus Papa posit ut imperialis insignis" (No. 8); "Quod solus Papa pedes omnes clericis decernat" (No. 9); "Quod illi libet imperatores depone" (No. 12); "Quod a fidelitate iniquorium subjectos posit abolvere" (No. 27). Boniface VIII, trying to set up to these principles, involved himself in a terrible conflict with Francis, which ended in the defeat of the Roman see. Now, however, Gregory or Berengaria of Burgundy, again of the principles which had prevailed before Gregory VII, on the relations of the Church, and the council which represents her, to the bishop of Rome, and the old principles were reinstated in vigor. The result of the war which has since been waged over the quarrel and vicissitudes, between the pope and the bishops is a modification and practical attenuation of the strict papal or curial system; yet the latter has been victorious, and is now generally acknowledged. The relations of the Roman Catholic Church to the State, the right of granting royal titles (Phillips, L. c. v, 684 sq.), and other prerogatives, by which the rights of sove- reigns were limited or even denied, have long disap- peared from practice; yet the pope never retracted the
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sate and authentically interpret; and in virtue of the same he orders the resolutions of the provincial synods to be reconsidered and approved by the Congregatio Concilii (Benedict XIV, De Synodo Diocesana, lib. xii, cap. 3, No. 6).

(3) The Highest Ecclesiastical Supervision.—Reports from all dioceses are regularly sent to the pope. The bishops of each diocese, who before their consecration, are bound to appear in person ("Limina apostolorum singulis annum aut me aut me per centum numinis visitabo, nisi—absolvam"); but the visitatio liminum can be replaced by a relatio status dioecesis, which must take place in conformity with an instruction of Benedict XIV, De Synodo Diocesana, lib. xii, cap. 3, No. 6.

(4) The Highest Ecclesiastical Administration (Regimem Ecclesiæ).—It comprises the decision in the causa ardua ac majores. To these belong the causa episcoporum—namely, the confirmation of elected, the admission of postulated bishops; the consecration, ordination, deposition; acceptance of resignations; appointment of coadjutors; foundation, division, fusion, dioceses; collation of the pallium; confirmation and suppression of clerical orders and ecclesiastical institutions; beatification and canonization; the acknowledgment of relics; the permission of general and alumni feasts; the right of decision in reserved cases. In virtue of his supremacy, the pope has also a right, in case of insufficient, faulty administration of the clerical dignities, to take the government in his own hands, and do every other thing which is wanted. On the right of administration is also founded the right of imposing ecclesiastical taxes.

II. Primacy of Honor.—(1) The pope has not only preeminence over the clerical dignitaries, but is tradition ally recognized even by the worldly powers. The political authorities, in their conventions with him, allow his name to stand first. (2) The title and the qualifications connected with it underwent some changes. The name of pope belongs, since Gregory VII's time, exclusively to the bishop of Rome; likewise the designation of Summus Pontifex. Pontifex Maximus was only at a later period reserved for him. Gregory I declined the title of Patriarcha Universalis (see cap. 4, 5, dist. xci), and preferred being called Servus Servorum Dei, a designation which has since become official (comp. Thomasin, Vetus ac Novi Ecclesiae Doctrina, lib. i, cap. 4, 50, No. 14; Ferrari, Biblioth. Canonici, lib. x, v.; Papi, art. ii, Nos. 33-35; Phillips, l.c. 599 sq.). The qualification of sanctus is also, in early times, specially applied to the Roman bishops. In the Dictatus Gregorii VIII, No. 23, we read, "Quod Romanum Pontifex, si captae sacerdotium dignitatis constitutam, sanctum sanctior ecclesiae sanctitatem et lumen sanctitatem sanctitatem, testante S. Eundomii Iapiensi Episcopo, ei multis SS. Patribus favoribus, sicut in decreta B. Symmachii P. continuetur." Therefore the usual address is "sancissime pater" (holy father). (For the homage formerly paid him and his pastoral insignia, see the art. see SUPRAM; for the supremacy of the pope over councils, see SUPRAM; for the relation of the papacy to temporal possessions, see TEMPORAL. POWER OF THE POPE; see also ROMANISM.)

In answer to the Roman Catholic doctrine of the primacy we here subjoin the heads of Barrow's famous argument against it in his treatise On the Supremacy (Works [Lond. 1841], vol. iii). He says there may be "a primacy of worth or personal excellency; a primacy of reputation; a primacy of order or bare dignity and precedence; a primacy of power of decision; a primacy of jurisdiction. 1. The first—a primacy of worth—we may well grant to Peter, for probably he did exceed the rest of his brethren in personal endowments and capacities. 2. A primacy of repute, which Paul means when he speaks of those who had a special reputation, of those who seemed to be pillars in the spiritual government of the Church (Gal. ii. 6, 9; 2 Cor. xi. 5; xii. 11). [This advantage cannot be refused him, being a necessary consequence of those eminent qualities resplendent
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In him, and of the illustrious performances achieved by him beyond the rest. This may be inferred from that renown which his Church was given to enjoy, and likewise from his being so constantly ranked in the first place before the rest of his brethren. 3. As to a primacy of order or bare dignity, importing that commonly, in all meetings and proceedings, the other apostles did yield him the precedence, it may be questioned; for this does not seem suitable to the gravity of such persons, or their condition and circumstances, to stand upon ceremonies of respect; for our Lord's rules seem to exclude all semblance of ambition, all kind of inequality and distance between his apostles. [But yet this primacy of precedence, as being established as probable by the apostles' accounts of use and convenience; it might be useful to preserve order, and to promote expedition, or to prevent confusion, distraction, and dilatory obstruction in the management of things.] 4. As to a primacy importing a superiority in command, power, or jurisdiction, this we have great reason to deny upon the following considerations: 1. For such a power it was needful that a commission from God, its founder, should be granted in absolute and perspicuous terms; but no such commission is extant in Scripture. 2. If so illustrious an office was from the very beginning given to our Saviour, it is strange that nowhere in the ecclesiastical or apostolical history there should be any express mention of that institution. [3. If Peter had been instituted sovereign of the apostolical senate, his office and state had been in nature and kind very distinct from the common office of the other apostles, as the chief of the flock from the other members of the flock; and probably would have been dignified by some distinct name, as that of arch-apostle, arch-pastor, the vicar of Christ, or the like; but no such name or title was assumed by him, or was by the rest ascribed to him.] (4.) There was no office above that of an apostle known to the apostles or primitive Church (Ephes. iv. 11; 1 Cor. xii. 28). (5.) Our Lord himself declared against this kind of primacy, prohibiting his apostles to affect, to seek, to assume, or admit a superiority of power, one above another (Luke xxii. 14-25; Mark ix. 40). (5.) We do not find any peculiar administration committed to Peter, nor any privilege conferred on him which was not also granted to the other apostles (Matt. xx. 23; Mark xvi. 15). (7.) When Peter wrote two catholic epistles, there does not appear in either of them any intimation or any pretence to such arch-apostolical power. (8.) In all relations which occur in Scripture about controversies incident to doctrine or practice, there is no appeal made to Peter's judgment or utilisation of it as decisive, no argument is built on his authority. (9.) Peter now found himself totally dependent on governors or captains, as the only men of rank for consultation, and for judging in such cases [yet where he does himself deal with herdics and disorderly persons, he proceeds not as a pope, decreeing, but as an apostle, warning, arguing, and persuading against them.]. (10.) The considerations of the apostles proceeding in the conversion of people, in the foundation of churches, and in administration of their spiritual affairs will exclude any probability of Peter's jurisdiction over them. [They went about their business, not by order or license from Peter, but according to special direction of God's Spirit.] (11.) The nature of the apostolic ministry—their not being fixed in one place of residence, but continually moving about the world—the state of things at that time, and the manner of Peter's life, render it unlikely that he had such a jurisdiction over the apostles as some assign him. (12.) It was indeed most requisite that every apostle should have a complete, absolute, independent authority in managing the duties and concerns of the office, that he might not anywise be obstructed in the discharge of them, not clogged with a need to consult others, not hampered with orders from those who were at a distance from them. (13.) But Paul, and beloved of Paul towards Peter are evidence that he did not acknowledge any dependence on him, or any subjection to him (Gal. ii. 11). (14.) If Peter had been appointed sovereign of the Church, it seems that it should have been requisite that he should have outlived all the apostles; for otherwise the Church would have sought a head, or them must have been an inextricable controversy who that head was. But Peter died long before John, as all agree, and perhaps before divers others of the apostles. [From these arguments we must see what little ground the Church of Rome has to derive the supremacy of the pope from the supposed primacy of Peter. See Pol.]

Primas. See Primacy.

Primat, Claude-François-Marie, a French prelate, was born at Lyons July 26, 1747. He studied, at the expense of the Chapter of St. John, at Lyons, and entered the brotherhood of the Oratorians. From the college at Marseilles he went to that of Dijon, where he became professor of rhetoric and theology. At the age of twenty-eight he was ordained a priest, and became a successful preacher. In 1786 he was made curate of St. James at Douai. During the revolutionary agitation he gave his support to the republican cause by taking the required oath. He was made constitutional bishop of the North March 27, 1791, and established the seat of his episcopacy at Cambrai. He resigned office Nov. 13, 1796, and had even the weakness to return to the convention his letters of priesthood. But this step did not prevent him from presiding over a diocesan synod held at Lille in 1797. He assisted at the council held at Vitré at the beginning of that year, and was one of the thirty who accompanied his associates to the bishopric of Rhone and Loire Feb. 1798. At this time he composed a paper to justify his oath of hatred to royalty, which was found in the actions of that council. After the Concordat, he was chosen, April 9, 1802, archbishop of Toulouse, where by his mild measures he triumphed over all obstacles. As primat he was present at the coronation of Napoleon I, and the pallium was conferred upon him Jan. 16, 1805. He was finally chosen senator and count of the empire May 19, 1806; and during the Hundred Days he was called to a seat in the Chamber of Peers, June 4, 1815. He died at Toulouse Oct. 16, 1816. — Hoefer, Nov. Hist. Générale, s. v.

Primatre (Lat. primas; Fr. primat, first) is the title of a grade in the hierarchy immediately below the rank of patriarch (q.v.). In point of jurisdiction the primacys was, historically, developed out of the episcopate by papal decrees or canon rights. The primacies, in this sense of the word, are more particularly an institution of the West; for although the Greek denomination ἐνωπος is generally translated by primas, there are unmistakable differences. The archbishops of the Holy Roman Empire were not officiating bishops, or governors, or paramount in such cases [yet where he does himself deal with herdics and disorderly persons, he proceeds not as a pope, decreeing, but as an apostle, warning, arguing, and persuading against them.]. The primacies, as such, were metropolitanos who enjoyed a pre-emience of jurisdiction over the other bishops of a country. This pre-emience was founded on their right of consecrating the other metropolitans and bishops, of convoking councils, and of confirming all appointments. Originally this dignity was connected with the nomination to a pontifical vicariate, as was the case with the bishop of Arles, and it rested, in general, on an explicit appointment by the pope. There was one exception to that in the person of the bishop of Carthage, who, not assuming the pontifical title, exerts all the rights implied by it in Africa. The relation in which the primacy almost everywhere stood to the national interests, which obliged its bearers, as the first bishops of the State, to take some share in the political concerns, exercised a detrimental influence, and it was soon asserted overbearing pretensions contrary to the authority of the head of the Church. The importance of the primacy has melted away in the course of time, and in
most cases nothing remains of it but some exterior dis-
tinctions. The chief priestly sees of the West were in
Spain—Seville and Tarragona (forwards united in
Toledo); in France—Aries, Ibiema, Lyons, and Rouen
(among whom the archbishop of Lyons claims the title of
primatus des primatis, “primate of the primates”); in
England—Canterbury; in Germany—Mainz, Salzburg,
and Breslau; in Ireland—Armagh, and in the Pal, Dublin;
in Scotland—St. Andrews; in Hungary—Gran; in
Poland—Gnesen; and in the Northern kingdoms—Lund.

In the Church of England the archbishop of Canter-
bury is styled primate of all England; the archbishop of
York, primate of England. In Ireland, the archbish-
shop of Armagh is primate of all Ireland, and the arch-
bishop of Dublin, primate of Ireland. The title of
primate in England and Ireland confers no jurisdiction
beyond that of archbishop. The name primus is applied in
the Scottish Episcopal Church to the presiding bishop.
He is chosen by the bishops out of their own number,
without their being bound to give effect to seniority of
consecration or precedence of diocese.

Prime (Lat. prima, the first—i. e. hour), the first of
the so-called “lesser hours” of the Roman Breviary
(q.v.). It may be called the public morning prayer of
that Church, and corresponds in substance with the
matins and lessons of the other ancient liturgies, allow-
ance being made for Latin peculiarities. Prime com-
mates with the beautiful hymn of Prudentius, Jam
lucam orto sidere, which is followed by three and occa-
sionally four psalms (xxii, xxxvi, liv, cviii); but the
last portion consists of the opening verses of the 118th
(psalm) in the A.V. the cxix, 1-92) psalm, which is contin-
ued throughout the rest of the “lesser hours.” Prime
concludes with prayers appropriate to the beginning of
a Christian’s day. See Procter, Commentary on the Book
of Common Prayer, p. 167. See Canonical Hours.

Prime, Ebenezer, a Presbyterian minister, was
born in Conn., July 21, 1700; graduated at Yale College
in 1718, and at the age of nineteen was assist-
ant of the Rev. Eliphalet Jones, pastor at Hunting-
ton, L. I., whose colleague he became four years after.
He remained in charge of this congregation until his
death, Sept. 25, 1778 (according to another account,
Oct. 3). For a period of nearly seven years, from 1766
to 1773, he had an assistant, but during the troubled
times of the Revolution the whole charge rested with
him, and he was even obliged at one time to flee from
his dwelling, and live in retirement for a season in a
small house of his own congregation. He is the
progenitor of a family of eminent Presbyterian divines.
Mr. Prime published a Discourse on the Nature of
Ordination. See Sprague, Amida of the Amer. Pulpit, iii,
30 sq.

Prime, John, an English divine of some note,
flourished in the second half of the 18th century. He
was educated at Oxford University, and held at one
time a fellowship. He published, The Sacrements
(Lond. 1862, 8vo):——Nature and Grace (ibid. 1568,
8vo):——Sermons (Oxon. 1568, 8vo):——Exposition
and Observations upon St. Paul to the Galatians (Lond.
1567, 8vo):——The Confessions of D. David, a sermon on
Psa. xxiii, 4 (ibid. 1568, 8vo):——Sermons (ibid. 1568, 8vo).
Prime, Nathaniel Scudder, D.D., an American
divine, was born at Huntington, L. I., April 21, 1755,
and educated at Princeton, where he graduated in 1804.
He was licensed to preach in the following year in the
Presbyterian Church, and was subsequently stationed
at Sag Harbor, Fresh Pond, Smithtown, Cambridge,
New York, and other places. He also acted as principal
of literary institutions at Cambridge, Sing Sing, and New-
burgh, and gained distinction as a teacher. He died sud-
ddenly at Mamaroneck, N. J., March 3, 1856, Dr. Prime
published a collection of Sermons (1811, 1817, 1850), an
Address (1815), and a Charge to the Rev. Samuel Irenaeus
Prime (1887), many statistical and other articles in pe-
riodicals, and the two following works, Familiar Illus-

is employed with this specific meaning in Chorleegang's rule, and in the statutes of Amalarius, confirmed by the Synod of Aix-la-Chapelle in 817, where the primicerius appears at the head of the capitulary register, immediately after the archdeacon and archbishop'sler. The functions of the primicerius were strictly to instruct the deacons, subdeacons, and minorits in the choral song, sometimes in the comparable, in the liturgy, and in the functions of the Church; to inform the canons of the order of the office in the choir; to explain to the younger ones the management of the Breviary, etc. There is a very circumstantial enumeration of the duties of the Primicerius in the De Officiis of Isidore of Seville.

When the archdeacons, in the progressive extension of their importance, obtained the lower jurisdiction over the priests and archpriests, the primicerius obtained also the full disciplinary power over the minorits. His situation in the chapter was therefore one of importance; it is sometimes called a dignitas (De canon. i, 4), sometimes a persona (De conc. i, 2), sometimes it is placed among the offices (officium nudo). There was, in general, no uniform distribution of ranks in the different chapters. When the institution of the Minorits was suppressed, the office of the primicerius was also extinguished.

Primus, Prelates. Primus is, with the ancient pagans, the name given to the first-fruits of the field and garden, which were annually brought as offerings to the temples or abodes of the priests. We find this custom among almost all nations of antiquity, and among the Israelites. Like many other religious customs and institutions of the Jews, the study of their exterior worship, considered as a tribute of gratitude for God's blessings, was adopted by the Christian Church, and urgently recommended by the fathers, the kind and quantity of the gifts being left to be determined by the pious feelings of the individual: "Non erat speciali nomine diffinitus, sed offerentium arbitrio dexteretur" (De decim. et prim. iii, 30). They certainly bore the character of free offerings, while the tithe—with the Jews always, since Moses' time; with the Christians at least since Charlemagne's reign—represents a strict right; for, that the ministers of the new religion should live on the same existing diet, and not exceed a fourth of the complete harvest, is only an approximate indication, to be found in Jerome, Comment. in Ezech. c. xvi. With the more general and stricter execution of the laws about the tithe, in the Christian age, the privilege disappeared, little by little, or were preserved only in part, and in a changed form.

Primitive Christianity is the religion of the New Testament as first exemplified after the establishment of the new faith by that ecclesiastical organization called the Church, under State patronage. See Primitive Church. In distinction from this, we have apostolic Christianity, the period that immediately succeeded the labors of the founder of the New Testament dispensation. See Apostolic Church; Christianity.

Primitive Church. An expression used to denote the condition of the Church, as respects doctrine and discipline, in the early steps of its history. Though this term is employed with little precision by ecclesiastical writers, it most frequently refers to the Church of the first three centuries. See Church.

Primitive Doctrine. It is the opinion of some persons that there is a "primitive doctrine," independent of Scripture, "always to be found somewhere in the Catholic and primitive Church," by which Christians, in their infancy, were taught; they seem to suppose that some part of the oral teaching of the apostles might, though in an unwritten form, be yet in the possession of the Church, so that the Church might at any time declare a doctrine not opposed to Scripture, on what is called the unanimous consent of antiquity, to have come down by successive oral delivery from the apostles. The opponents of such views consider that they are incapable of ascribing the text of our liturgies, because it is not possible for us, at this distance of time from the days of the apostles, to know what they did or did not teach orally, or how far what they really did teach may not since have been corrupted. They contend, therefore, that the ancient apostolical writings alone can warrant us for the use of the Epitola in Iudaeorum, the De Officis of Isidore. See Doctrine; Tradition.

Primitive Methodist Connection is the name of a Wesleyan body of believers principally in England and the British colonies.

During the first decade of the present century stirring reports flooded across the Atlantic of the power of God marvellously displayed in the camp-meetings of America. The practice of holding religious services in the open air had much declined among British Methodists, as in all the large towns and many of the villages they now had commodious chapels, and the days of puerile gatherings in Western forests renewed the memory of the days of Wesley and Whitefield. This renewed interest was increased by the visits of Lorenzo Dow to England and Ireland. On the threshold of this movement, a young and studious hand named Hugh Bourne, was suffering intensely through an agonizing conviction of sin. From his sixth to his twenty-sixth year, he seldom went to bed without a dread of being in hell before morning; and morning brought him no relief, for he thought he would be in hell before night. He read the Bible with an intense zeal, but nowhere in his learning did he find saving knowledge. In 1799, when twenty-seven years of age, there fell in his way a volume containing the Life of Fletcher, some of Wesley's Sermons, Alleine's Alarm, and Baxter's Call to the Unconverted. In one of Wesley's sermons he found "more real light than in anything else he had ever read." It taught him that "opinion is not religion . . . even right opinion is as far from religion as east is from west." The time of his redemption drew nigh. As he read Fletcher's letters, his heart was touchèd. The tidings of redemption "rang . . . in my ears with such an intensity as to make me wish to be an instrument of the salvation of the rough lumbermen who were in his employment. On May 31, 1807, Mr. Bourne, assisted by Messrs. William Clowes, Thomas Cotton, and others afterwards prominent in the Primitive Methodist Connection, held a camp-meeting at Mow Cop, a mountain on the border-line between Staffordshire and Cheshire. Though the Connection did not really exist till three years later, this is looked upon as the initial point in its history, and its annalists delight to quote the lines,

"The little cloud increases still Which first began upon Mow Hill."
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likely to be productive of considerable mischief; and we disclaim all connection with them." This declared jealousy has naturally much weight with the societies in general, and most of the leading Methodists held aloof from the camp-meeting movement. Bourne and a few others, however, held firm, having their meetings recognised by civil authority, and taking precautions for preserving order.

Matters now came to a crisis. The Church authorities felt they could no longer bear with such contumacy, and Bourne and Clowes were expelled from the Connection. The untrammelled of these men from Church bonds, so far from silencing them, had rather the effect of lifting them to a more active level. In this time they lived in Cheshire an old man, named James Crawford, "noted as a man of extraordinary piety and faith." He believed himself called to the ministry, and had prayed and watched for the leading of Providence. In 1805 Hugh Bourne and his brother James hired him to preach in neglected places, for three months, at a salary of ten shillings a week. "This is generally looked upon as the commencement of the Primitive Methodist ministry." In the spring of 1810 several persons were converted in meetings held by Hugh Bourne, and formed into a class which was added to the Cheshire Circuit (Wesleyan); but as they declined to accept them unless they pledged to sever their connection with Hugh Bourne, and as they respectfully declined according to this demand, their application was refused." Bourne then in his charge was formed a distinct society, and the formation of this class may be considered the birth of the Connection. The camp-meeting agency was now more extensively employed, and numerous societies were formed. In September, 1810, there were 10 preachers, 15 preaching places, and 190 members.

In that first general meeting was held, composed probably of preachers and leaders. This conference resolved that money should in future be regularly collected in the societies, in order to meet the necessary expenses; and if this should prove insufficient, recourse should again be had to the benevolence of private individuals. The two travelling preachers, Moures, Crawfoot and Clowes, were to receive their salaries from the societies, and Mr. James Steele was appointed the circuit steward, the first officer of that kind in the Connection. In 1812 theConnection, then employing 10 preachers, formally took the title of Primitive Methodist, and in two years later a comprehensive code of rules was for the first time adopted. From that time till the present the increase of the denomination has been very rapid, being from 1851 to 1872, in the 108 towns of Great Britain, ever increasing.

The three following extracts, from John Angell James, Dr. Beaumont, and Dr. Campbell, respectively, explain the peculiar genius of this denomination:

"In cottages, in barns, and in theaters; in public houses, in market-places, in streets. In lobbies, and by en act, they (the Primitive Methodist preachers) held meetings for prayer and exhortation. They were nourished by personal visits. The first peril of their life; but they persevered, in meekness and in gentleness, and have conquered by their passive power." The "Primitive Methodists are a laborious, and not an idle community; they are a plain, and not an artificial community; they are a useful community." "Every day serves but to confirm us that it is less talents, less culture, less intelligence than required than a thorough and perfect acquaintance with the Word of God—simplicity, affection, fervor, activity, tact, and facility, in adapting actions to circumstances, and employing them in these imply the".

The latest statistics of the Connection are, 17,000 ministers and local preachers, 10,000 class leaders, 59,000 Sunday-school teachers, and 180,000 Church members. They publish several periodicals.

The doctrine of the Connection may be said to be identical with that of other Methodist churches. The form of Church government is substantially Presbyterian, but with a larger mixture of the lay element than is found in Presbyterian or in other Methodist denominations. The official business is transacted by the leaders' meeting, composed of the class-leaders, the society steward, and the travelling preachers of the circuit. No such meeting can be legally held without the presence of the minister or travelling preacher, extraordinary cases excepted." As in other Methodist bodies, there are travelling and local preachers. The latter usually follow some occupation for a maintenance, and preach on the Sabbath as an opportunity to earn a livelihood. They do not receive any pecuniary remuneration for their services. They are chosen to their office by the representatives of the societies which they minister; and their labors prove acceptable to the people generally, their services being "paid." In the transaction of the business of the circuit's quarterly meeting, travelling and local preachers are equal. Between the quarterly meetings, the ordinary business of the circuit is transacted by the "circuit committee," composed of such local preachers, class-leaders, or stewards as are appointed by the preceding quarterly meeting to represent the respective societies. The travelling preachers are ex-officio members of this court. Circuits are sometimes divided into branches, each having its own officials and its regular meetings for business, but subordinate to the circuit committee. "Places visited through missionary labors, and united in one station, are called a 'mission,'" most of which are under the control of the general missionary committee. A "district" consists of a number of circuits, branches, and "missions." The general conference is held at an annual session. It is composed of one delegate from each circuit, the circuits sending a travelling preacher one year and a layman the two following years, so as to secure, as nearly as possible, two laymen to one travelling preacher. This meeting receives statistical reports of all the circuits, inquires into the state of each, and stations the travelling preachers within the district, "subject, however, to appeals from the stations or preachers, and to alterations at conference."

The 'conference' is a yearly meeting of delegates from all the districts in the Connection, of twelve permanent members, and of four persons appointed at the preceding conference, in the proportion of two laymen to one travelling preacher. This is the highest court in the Connection, from whose decisions there is no appeal. A "general committee," composed of ministers and laymen, holding its sessions in London, is appointed to transact the business of the Connection in the intervals of the sessions of conference. A district committee, subordinate to the general committee, is appointed for each district, subject to orders submitted to its examination by the stations within the district.

The Connection is represented in the United States by two conferences, Eastern and Western, having, for the last six years, only fraternal relations with the parent Conference in Great Britain. There are also separate conferences in Canada, Australia, and New Zealand, strictly associated with England. The statistics for the American Conferences for 1876 are as follows:

The Connection has its full share of Methodist zeal in foreign missions. From the report of 1876 we glean the following statistics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Missionary Members</th>
<th>Canada</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>(No return.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Queensland</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New South Wales</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Afrikan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Native Missionaries</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The foreign work is chiefly in British colonies and among English-speaking people. The missionary income for the year was £45,234. The most striking peculiarities of the Connection are—first, the vast amount of unpaid labor performed by laity; 2d, the influence of the laity in Church government; 3d, the devoted and zealous attention paid by the people. In the United States, the Primitive Methodist Connection has established itself, and has especially near the borders of Canada and in the Eastern States, gained a strong footing, so that the American Church is about of equal strength with the Canadian. They support a paper called the Primitive Methodist and the Christian Patriot, a semi-monthly journal. See Petty, History of the Primitive Methodist Connection; Church, History of the Primitive Methodists (8d ed., revised and enlarged); Herod, Sketches of Primitive Methodist Preachers: Memorial of the Centenary of Hugh Bourne; Bar- ran, Gallery of Deceased Ministers; Articles by Rev. W. H. Harrow, in Primitive Methodist Record for 1877.

**Primitive Wesleyan Methodist Church of Ireland**

This body was formed in 1816, and was the result of a division in the Wesleyan Methodist Connexion in Ireland. In that year the Irish Conference, by a major and a minority of forty-six in a house of ninety, and eighty, resolved to authorize the preachers of the Connexion to administer the sacraments. As a result of this decision, most of the minority separated from the parent body, and, being followed by a large section of the lay members, organized the Primitive Weslyan Methodist Connexion. Until a few years ago they did not assume to be a Church, but merely a society composed of members of the Established Church of Ireland. The great changes produced by the disestablishment of this Church in 1870, together with an increasing desire on the part of the society for the administration of the sacraments at the hands of their own preachers, led to a complete change in the constitution of the body, and the members have now the option of partaking of the ordinances from their own ministers in their churches. The statistics printed in the Conference minutes of 1876 are, 58 effective ministers, 13 superannuants, 144 churches, and 7,518 members of society. An annual missionary income of £70,000 in gold is now devoted to the support of the ministers on the poorer circuits. Over £7,500 is invested in funds for the support of superannuated ministers. Negotiations are at present in progress to effect a union with the Wesleyan Methodist Church of Ireland, the constitution of the two churches being now almost identical.

**Primogeniture** (denoted in Heb. by יִשְׁמַעֵל; Sept. πρωτότοκος, Gen. xxv, 31, 34; xxvii, 26; Deut. xxvi, 17; 1 Chron. v, 1; in the New Test. only in Heb. xii, 16; A. V. "birthright"). Πρωτότοκος, always rendered "first-born" in the English version, is found in the Sept. in Gen. iv, 4; Deut. xxi, 17, and several other passages of the Old Test., as the representation of the Hebrew יִשְׁמַעֵל, signifying "one who openeth the womb," whether an only child, or whether other children follow. "Primogenitus est, non post quem ali- sed ante quem nullus alias genus" (Pareus). Πρωτό- τοκος is found nine times in the New Test.—viz. Matt. i, 25 (if the passage be genuine, and not introduced from the parallel passage in Luke); Luke ii, 1; Rom. viii, 29; Col. i, 15, 18; Heb. i, 6; xiv, 28; xii, 23; Rev. i, 5. Except in the Gospels, and Heb. vi, 28, the word always stands here as a mark of the New Test., being generally synonymous with keir από της γένεσις and having, in Heb. i, 6, an especial reference to our Lord's Messianic dignity. In Heb. xii, 23, "as the assembly of the first-born," it seems to be synonymous with "elect," or "dearly beloved," in which sense it is also used on one occasion in the Old Test. (Jer. xxxi, 9).

In the 4th century, Helvidius among the Latins, and Eunomius among the Greeks, wished to attach a signification to πρωτότοκος in Matt. i and Luke ii, different from the Old-Test. usage, maintaining, in order to support their hypothesis—viz. that Joseph and Mary had children after the birth of their Lord—that the word πρωτότοκος, as used in the Old Testament, could not be applicable to an only child. Jerome rejected the former by appealing to the usage of the word in the Old Test. (Acts. Helvid. in Matt. i, 9). The assertion of Eunomius was equally refuted by the Greek fathers Basil (Hom. in Nat., viii); Theophylact (in Luc. ii); and Damascenus (De Fide orthodoxa, l. iv). In response to this controversy, Dusius (Ad difficilia loca Nema- c. 6) observes: "Sic sane Chris tus vocatur Πρωτότοκος, licet mater ejus nullus alios postea liberos habuerit. Notet hoc juvantesproper Helvidium, qui ex eae voce in errorem ducere vult Christians naturam pluris filios suscipisse." "Those entitled to the prerogative" (viz. of birthright), observes Campbell (On the Gospels), "were invariably denominated the first-born, whether the parents had issue afterwards or not." Eunomius further maintains, from Col. i, 15, that our Lord was "a creature;" but his arguments were replied to by Basil and Theophylact. Some of the fathers referred this passage to Christ's pre-existence, others to his baptism. In Is. xiv, 30, the "first-born of the poor" signifies the poorest of all; and in Job xcviii, 13, the "first-born of death"—many more words of terrible of death. It is noteworthy that in our Lord's genealogy the line is frequently carried through a younger son (Seth, Shem, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Judah, David, Solomon, Nathan, etc.). See First-Born.

**Primum Mobile**, the primitive moveable element, is, in its proper signification, the original matter of the world (prime materia). The ancients understood by it the exterior hollow sphere which was supposed to include and put in motion the remainder of the universe (fixed stars and planets): a quite arbitrary supposition. Primal mover would be the principle of all motion, or the first moving cause. According to Aristotle, this cause is God, who, while motionless himself, puts all the rest in motion, and is therefore called by the philo- sophers ο Πρώτο το Δημοσιονομος. See Aristotle, Phys. viii, 5; De gener. et corrupt. i, 7; ii, 7.

**Prince** is the rendering of several Heb. and Gr. words in the A. V.

1. Sār, מֶלֶךְ הָאָדָם (to rule, to have dominion); Sept., Βασιλεύς, Βασιλιάς (kings), the chief of any class, the master of a company, a prince or noble; used of Pharaoh's chief butler and baker (Gen. xl, 2 sq.); of the taskmasters set over the Israelites in Egypt (Exod. i, 11): even of chief herdsmen (Gen. xlviii, 6). It is frequently used for military commanders (Exod. xviii, 21 ["rulers"]; 2 Kings i, 9 ["captain"]; Isa. iii, 3, etc.), and for princes both supreme and subordinate (1 Sam. xix, 3; Job xxxii, 1, 9; Isa. xlix, 7; Jer. ii, 59, etc.).

In Dan. vii, 11 God is called מֶלֶךְ הָאָדָם (Sar kath- tänd). Prince of the host; and in ver. 25 the title מֶלֶךְ הָאָדָם (Sar sarim), Prince of princes, is applied to the Messiah. The "princes of the provinces" (מֶלֶךְ הָאָדָם, seray ham-menithah, 1 Kings xx, 14) were probably the district magistrates who had taken refuge in Samaria during the invasion of Benhadad, and their "young men" were their attendants. The title מֶלֶךְ הָאָדָם (Barzai, a word of uncertain meaning) (1 Kings xvi, 14) was probably the term usually applied to the princes, and the title מֶלֶךְ הָאָדָם (Barzai, a word of uncertain meaning) (1 Kings xvi, 14) was probably the term usually applied to the princes, and the doctrine of tutelary angels of different countries seems to be countenanced by several passages of Scripture (Zech. iii, 1; vi, 5; Jude 9; Rev. xii, 7). Michael and Gabriel were probably the tutelary angels of the
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Jews. These names do not occur in any books of the Old Test. that were written before the captivity; and it is suggested by some that they were borrowed from the Chaldeans, with whom and the Persians the doctrine of the general administration and superintendence of angels over empires and provinces was commonly received. See ANGEL.

2. Nəfūš, from נפש, to be in front, to precede; Sept. ἄρχων or ἄρχομαι; Vulg. dux); one who has the precedence, a leader, or chief, used of persons set over any undertaking, superintending any trust, or invested with supreme power (1 Kings xiv, 7; Psal. lxxvi, 18; 1 Chron. xvi, 24 ["ruler"]); 1 Sam. ix, 16 ["captain"]; etc. In 1 Kings xiii, 25 it is applied to the Messiah; and in xix, 22 to Helem Philometor, king of Egypt.

3. Nādīb, נדיב (from נדיב), which in Hi. signifies to volunteer, to offer voluntarily or spontaneously—chiefly in poetry; Sept. ἀρχως; Vulg. princeps), generous, noble-minded, noble by birth (1 Sam. ii, 8; Psal. xlix, 10; civ. 40; cxxii, 8; cxxiii, 9; Prov. xxvii, 7, etc.). This word is the converse of the preceding; נדיב means primarily a chief, and derivatively what is morally noble or excellent; נדיב means primarily what is morally noble, and derivatively one who is noble by birth or position.

4. Naši, נashi (from נشاشة, to lift up, Niph. to be elevated; Sept. ἀρχως, ἡγούμενος, ἡγεῖται, βασιλεύς; Vulg. princeps, dux), one exalted; used as a general term for princes, including kings (1 Kings xi, 24; Ezek. xxi, 10, etc.), heads of tribes or families (Numb, i, 44; iii, 24 [A. V. "chief"]; vii, 10; xxxiv, 18; Gen. xxvi, 20; 1 Chron. vii, 40, etc.). In the A. V. it is often rendered "ruler" or "captain." In Gen. xxi, 6 Abraham is addressed by the sons of Heth as נאשיה נאשי (nashi Ekoim), a prince of G, i. e. constituted, and consequently protected, by God [A. V. "mighty prince"]. This word appears on the coins of Judas Maccabaeus (Gemini, Theban, p. 917).

5. Nasik, נסיק (from נסיק, to pour out, moint); Sept. ἀρχως; Vulg. princeps; Psal. lixiii, 11; Ezek. xxi, 80; Dan. xi, 5; "duke," Josh. xiii, 8; "principal," Mic. v, 5.

6. Kuita, קיתו (from קיתו, to cut, to decide; Sept. ἀρχως; ἄρχομαι; Vulg. princeps; Prov. xxv, 13; Dan. xiii, 18; Mic. iii, 1, 9; elsewhere "captain," "guide," "ruler").

7. Rab, רָבָה (usually an adj. "great"); Sept. ἄρχως, ἡγεῖται; Vulg. optimus); only occasional; but used in compounds, e. g. Rab-mag, Rab-saris (q. v.). So its Chald. reduplication Rabboin, רַבַּבִּים, in the pl. (Dan. v, 2; 3; elsewhere "lords").

8. Rozen, רוֹזֶן (participle of רוֹזָן, to rule; Sept. ἀρχέω, ἔχων; Vulg. princeps, legum conditor), a poetical word, used in psalms and in other compositions, e. g. Rab-mag, Rab-saris (q. v.). So its Chald. reduplication Rabboin, רַבַּבִּים, in the pl. (Dan. v, 2; 3; elsewhere "lords").

9. Shkikh, שְׂכָה (apparently from שְׂכָה, three; only Ezek. xxi, 12; elsewhere "captain" [q. v.]).

10. Achaashaphayyad (Chald. plur. נַחֲשַׁפְּתַּיָּהּ; Dan. iii, 2, 3; 27, v, 1-7; Sept. פָּרָאוֹר), a Persian word. Those mentioned in Dan. vi, 1 (see Esth. i, 1) were the predecessors, either in fact or in place, of the satraps of Darius Hystaspis (Herod. iii, 89). See SATRAP.

11. Chashmanim, חֲשָׁמַנִים (plur. literally rich, only in the xviti, 19).

12. Sipawni (a Persian word, used only in the plur. Isa. xi, 25; elsewhere "rulers").

13. Portemis, only in the plur. בְּרַפַּה (another Persian word, Dan. i, 8; elsewhere "rulers").

14. ἄρχων, which in the Sept. appears as the rendering of all the Hebrew words above cited, in the New Test. is used of earthly princes (Matt. xx, 25; 1 Cor. ii, 6), of Jesus Christ (Rev. i, 5), and of Satan (Matt. xxv, 8; xii, 24; Mark iii, 22; John xii, 31, 40; xvi, 11; Eph. ii, 2). On the phrase "prince of the power of the air" in this last passage, see ART.

15. ἀρχοντος, which in Theodotion is the rendering of נוֹיִי (Numb. xiii, 8; xvi, 2); and in the Sept. is the rendering of צִבְי (Judg. v, 15; Neh. ii, 9; Isa. xxx, 4), in the New Test. is applied only to our Lord (Acts iii, 15; v, 81; Heb. ii, 10 [A. V. "captain"]; xii, 2 [A. V. "author"]).

16. "Prince" is used (Matt. ii, 6) in a general sense for a chief or ruler. See GOVERNOR; KING; RULER.

Prince, John (1), an English divine, was born at Axminster, Devonshire, in 1648; was educated at Bransenoe College, Oxford, and became successively curate of Bideford, minister of St. Martin's Church, Exeter, vicar of Totnes, and vicar of Berry-Pomeroy. He died in 1722. He published, Sermons (Lond. 1674, 4to):—The Beauty of God's House, a Discourse on Ps. lxxvi, 1 (1710, 4to)—Dambanuei Orientalia Illustra (1810, 4to)—Sermons on Ps. cxxvi, 1 (1712, 8vo).

Prince, John (2), an American minister of the Congregational Church, was born at Boston, Mass., in 1751; was educated at Harvard College, where he graduated in 1773, and ordained minister of the Congregational Church in Salem, Mass., in 1779, and retained that post until his death in 1836. He published, First Sermon (Salem, 1736)—Sermon before a Charitable Society (1806)—Sermon on the Death of Dr. Barnard (1814)—Sermon before the Bible Society, where he was ordained (1816). See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, viii, 128 sq.; and for other references, Allibone, Dict. Brit. and Amer. Auth. a. v.

Prince, Nathan, an American clergyman of the Church of England, was a native of Massachusetts, and was born about the beginning of the last century. He was educated at Harvard College, where he graduated in 1719, in 1723 was made a tutor in his alma mater, in 1727 fellow, and held that honor until 1742. Subsequently he took orders in the Church of England, was sent as a missionary to the Mosquitoes, and died in the island of Rastan, Bay of Honduras, in 1748. Dr. Chauncey, in his Sketches of Eminent Men in New England, says that "Prince deserves a place among the great men in this country." He is the author of an Essay to Solve the Difficulties attending the several Accounts given of the Resurrection, etc. (Boston, 1794, 4to). See Elliot, Biog. Dict. ii, 483; Report of the Nat. Hist. Soc. x, 165; Pierce, Hist. of Harvard University, p. 191-196; Allibone, Dict. Brit. and Amer. Auth. a. v.

Prince, Thomas (1), an American Congregational minister, was born May 15, 1687, at Sandwich, Mass. He graduated at Harvard College in 1707, and after travelling for some years in Europe, during which time he preached in England and was invited to take a station, he returned home in 1717, and was ordained, Oct. 1, 1718, colleague pastor of the Rev. Joseph Sewall at the Old South Church, Boston, where he remained until his death, Oct. 22, 1756. He was an eminent preacher, for his sermons were rich in thought, perspicuous, and devotional, and he inculcated the doctrines and duties of religion as one who felt their importance. In private life he was amiable and exemplary. It was his constant endeavor to imitate the perfect example of his Master and Lord. He was ready to forgive injuries and return good for evil. He published, An Account of the First Appearance of the Aurora Borealis:—A Chronological History of New England in the Form of Annals (1736)—Ditto, vol. ii, Nos. 1, 2, 8 (1755)—Account of the English Ministers on Martha's Vineyard (1749); The Development of the Doctrine of Earthquakes, containing an Historical Summary of the most remarkable Earthquakes of New England (1755)—The New England Psalm-book, revised and improved (1756):—and a number of occasional Sermons; besides which
there were six Sermons published from his MSS. by Dr. Erskine of Edinburgh (1783); and twenty-nine single Sermons which Prince published from 1717 to 1756. For an extended notice of his publications, see Sewall, Funeral Discourse. A large portion of his most valuable library is now in the Boston Public Library. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 1, 304; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, a. v.

Prince, Thomas (2), an American writer and editor, son of the preceding, was born in 1722, and was educated at Harvard College, where he graduated in 1740. He edited the earliest American periodical, The Christian History, containing Accounts of the Religious and Moral State of British and America for 1743 (Boston, 1744-45, 2 vols. 8vo), which was published weekly. He died in 1748. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, a. v.

Princes Sacerdotum (chief of priests). This is a title sometimes applied by Tertullian, Augustine, and others to a bishop, but used in the same sense as archbishop, pontifex maximus, that is, high-priest. See Bishop; Priest.

Princess (πριγκίπισσα, sarßa) occurs but seldom in the Scriptures (1 Kings xi, 3; Lam. i, 1; elsewhere "lady." See also Sarah); but the persons to whom it alludes, the daughters of kings, are frequently mentioned, and often with the expression of their spiritual state. Thus we read of Tamar's "garment of divers colors" (2 Sam. xiii, 18), and the dress of the Egyptian princess, the wife of Solomon, is described as "taiment of needlework," and "clothing of wrought gold" (Ps. xlv, 13, 14). See Embroidery.

Princeton Theology. See PRESBYTERIANISM; THEOLOGY.

Principalities and Powers. See Power.

Pringle, Francis, a minister of the Associate Presbyterian Church, was a native of Ireland, and was born about the year 1750. He came to this country some time near the close of the last century, and died in New York City in 1833. He preached a Sermon on the Qualifications and Duties of the Ministers of Christ before the Associate Synod of Ireland (1758), which was published in Ireland and America; and a sermon of his on Prayer for the Prosperity of Zion appeared in the Religious Monitor after his death. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, ix, 64 sq.

Pringle, Sir John, a Scotch philosopher and physician, was born in Roxburghshire in 1747. He settled in Edinburgh about 1734, and after 1748 resided in London, where he distinguished himself greatly, and became president of the Royal Society in 1773. He was for a time professor of pneumatics and ethical philosophy in Edinburgh University. He died in 1782. He divided pneumatics into the following parts: 1. A physical inquiry into the nature of such subtle and material substances as are imperceptible to the senses, and known only from their operations. 2. The nature of immaterial substances connected with matter, in which is demonstrated by natural evidence, the immortality of the human soul. 3. The nature of immaterial created beings not connected with matter. 4. Natural theology, or the existence and attributes of God demonstrated from the light of nature. Ethos, or moral philosophy, he divided into theoretical and practical parts, in treating of which the author, he chiefly uses are Cicero, Marcus Antonius, Puffendorf, and lord Bacon. Carlyle describes him as "an agreeable lecturer, though not master of the science he taught." "His lectures were chiefly a compilation from lord Bacon's works; and had it not been for Puffendorf's small book, which he made his text, we should not have been instructed in the rudiments of the science." Nevertheless, we see that he discussed topics which must issue, sooner or later, in a scientific jurisprudence and political economy. See M'Cosh, Scottish Philosophy, p. 109.

Pringle, William, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Perth, Scotland, in 1750. His parents paid great attention to his early culture, and, after a successful study at the best schools and at the Academy in Perth, he finished his collegiate studies at the University of Edinburgh. He then studied medicine, and, as soon as admitted to practice, emigrated to the United States in 1787, concluding not to practice, he returned to Scotland, studied theology in Glasgow under the Rev. John Dick, D.D., was licensed April 15, 1823, and entered upon his labors as a probationer, and as such preached for some time in Scotland, when he again left his native land, and came to the United States in the year 1837, and soon after joined the Associate Presbytery of Cambridge. In June, 1830, he was ordained and installed pastor of the Associate Congregation of Rye Gate, Vt. He labored faithfully in behalf of this his only charge, and when his health failed him he resigned June 21, 1852, after a ministry of twenty-two years. He died Dec. 14, 1858. Mr. Pringle was a good writer, and some of his sermons bear marks of scholarly attainments. He was engaged during the last few years of his life upon a work called The Cosmography of Scripture. See Wilson, Pred. Hist. Almanac, 1860, p. 159. (J. L. S.)

Prior, Prioressa, are, according to the constitution of several ecclesiastical orders, the heads of their monasteries and nunneries. The prior is either the first or sole authority in the monastery, or he is subordinate, as second leader, to a higher officer of the same monastery, the abbot (q. v.). The latter case happens when the abbess makes use of his right to appoint in his place an assistant, a temporary vicar (q. v.), who is trusted with part of the prelate's attributes. Sometimes the statutes of the order prescribe that the prior shall be, as the second head of the monastery, elected by the monks, resolving him a peculiar, more or less independent (De Stat. Monast. iii, 35). In other orders, as in that of the Benedictines, and even in some regular congregations, we find only one, or a few, principal monasteries—the mother abbey, to which others owe their origin, or whose subsequent reform they have adopted—subject to the direction of abbots or prelates, i. e. local superiors of the first rank, while the inferior monasteries are administered by priors: the latter exercise the regular jurisdiction over the monks, and are bound only in important matters to obtain the consent of the abbot of the mother abbey. The same distinction subsists in the nunneries—Weiter u. Wehle, Kirchen-Lex. a. v.

Prior, Matthew, an English poet, writer of verse both sacred and profane, whose period of authorship was contemporary with the last years of Dryden and the earliest stage of Pope, was possessed of little vigor or originality, but was remarkable for his skill in versification and his gay and easy grace of imagery and diction. His occasional epigrams, and his lively but indecent tales, are his best productions; though there is merit, also, in his semi-metaphysical poem Alma, or the Progress of the Soul, and in his attempt at religious poetry in an allegory which has been compared to Pope's Essay on Man. It was greatly preferred to Pope's poem by John Wesley, because more consistent with the orthodox theory of human corruption. The design is certainly more poetical, because less tending to the argumentative, than the inferior execution has prevented Prior from attaining the occasion which was the same Redeems parts of Pope's poem from oblivion. Prior's poems were only the recreations of a man actively engaged in public life. He was born July 21, 1664, and was the son of a joiner in London. Accident having directed him to the art of laying out small plots, education was procured for him; and, on leaving Oxford, he distinguished himself, under the government of king William, as a dexterous diplomatist in several foreign missions. Deserting his political party, like so many men of higher rank in that slippery time, he
PRIORY

PRIOR

PRIOR is a religious house occupied by a society of monks or nuns, the chief of whom is termed a prior (q.v.) or prioress; and of these there are two sorts: first, where the rule is the same as that of the church by the common governors as in the deaconesses; such were the cathedral priors, and most of those of the Augustinian order. Secondly, where the priory is a cell subordinate to some great abbey, and the prior is placed or displaced at the will of the abbot. There was a considerable difference in the institution of these two classes of priories at different times; for some were altogether subject to their respective abbeys, while others consisted of a stated number of monks, under a prior sent to them from the superior abbey; and those priories paid a pension yearly, as an acknowledgment of their subjection, but acted in other matters as independent bodies, and had the rest of the revenues for their own use. The priories or cells were always of the same order as the abbey on which they depended; sometimes they inhabited parts of a different sex; it being usual, after the Norman Conquest, for the great abbeys to build nunneries on some of their manors, which should be subject to their visitation.

Alien priories were cells, or small religious houses, in one or more combustibles on large religious monasteries. When manors or tithes were given to distant religious houses, the monks, either to increase the authority of their own order, or perhaps rather to have faithful stewards of their revenues, built convenient houses for the reception of their small fraternities of their body, who were deputed to reside at and govern these religious houses.---Hook, s.v.

In the fourth year of Henry V, during the war with France, all the alien priories (that is, those cells of the religious houses in England which belonged to foreign monasteries) which were not conventional were dissolved by act of Parliament and granted to the Crown. About the year 1540 the cathedrals founded for priories were turned into deaneries and prebends.

Priscilla (2 Tim. iv. 19). See Priscilla.

Priscilla (Πρίσκα, dim. from Priscia, Lat. ancien), the wife of Aquila, and probably, like Phoebe, a deaconess. She shared the travels, labors, and dangers of her husband, and is always named along with him (Rom. xvi. 3; Acts xiv. 19; 1 Cor. xvi. s. 1 Cor. xvi. 19; Acts xvi. 54). The name is Priscilla (Πρίσκα) in 2 Tim. iv. 19, and (according to the true reading) in Rom. xvi. 8, and also (according to some of the best MSS.) in 1 Cor. xvi. 19. Such variation in a Roman name is by no means unusual. We find that the name of the wife is placed before that of the husband in Rom. xvi. 2; 2 Tim. iv. 19, and (according to some of the best MSS.) in Acts xvii. 26. It is only in Acts xviii. 2 and 1 Cor. xvi. 19 that Aquila has unequivocally the first place. Hence we should be disposed to conclude that Priscilla was the more energetic character of the two; and it is a particular to be noticed that she took part, not only in her husband's exercise of hospitality, but likewise in the theological instruction of Apollos. Yet we observe that the husband and the wife are always mentioned together. In full phrase it may be said that Priscilla is the example of what the married woman may do, for the general service of the Church, in conjunction with home duties, as Phoebe is the type of the unmarried servant of the Church, or deaconess. Such female ministration was of essential importance in the state of society in the many churches in the early Christian days. Two main humanities were thus formed. The marks of archdeacon Evans on the position of Timothy at Ephesus are very just. "In his dealings with the female part of his flock, which, in that time and country, required peculiar delicacy and discretion, the counsel of the experienced Priscilla would be invaluable. Where, for instance, could he obtain more prudent and faithful advice than hers in the selection of widows to be placed upon the eusemasy list of the Church, and of deaconesses for the ministry?" (Script. Bioth, ii. 296). It seems to more of our purpose to lay stress on this than on the theological learning of Priscilla. "De Prisca non dixit Virgilio, sed Priscilla, Aquisu usor, tunquam feminarum et genti Judaeic æruditam specimine, g. G. Zeltner (Altorf, 1709). See Aquila.

Priscillian, the noted originator or propagator of a heretical body of Christians who bore his name, was the first heretic who was executed after the establishment of Christianity by the Roman state. He was a native of the Iberian peninsula, and of noble birth. He flourished in the second half of the 4th century, possessed much wealth, had great reputation for learning, and was generally revered for his severe austerity. What his early occupation was is not known. He first figures in history as the propagator of the heretical dogmas which a certain Egyptian called Marcus, from Memphis, came to Spain to teach there. Priscillian, by his personal influence, succeeded in spreading them through all Spain, even to Africa, and even to Spain, making a number of proselytes of the female sex, convincing many priests, and even some bishops; among others, two bishops, Instantius and Salvianus, who became zealous defenders of the imported doctrines, which were substantially those of the Apollinarianism (q.v.). He taught the doctrine of Dualism and the Docetism of that sect, and it is charged that he adopted the strictest ascetic austerities in regard to celibacy, etc., by which he had rendered himself obnoxious to the civil authorities in the East and in Africa. There is some doubt as to the precise doctrines which Priscillian taught. As reported, his dogmas are a strange mixture of Gnostic and Manichaean absurdities combined with allegorical interpretations and mystical rhapsodies. He was also Sabellian in tendency in his rejection of a personal distinction in the Godhead, for he denied the reality of Christ's birth and incarnation. Among other things, he maintained that the visible universe was not the production of the Supreme Deity, but of some demon or malignant principle who derived his origin from chaos or darkness; he adopted the doctrine of emol, or emanations from the divine nature; he considered human bodies as compounded according to the twelve signs of the zodiac, and as prisons formed by the author of evil to enslave the mind; he also condemned marriage, and denied the resurrection of the body. This was the true heresy which the Priscillianists adopted was so rigid and severe that the charges of dissolute conduct brought against them by their enemies appear to be groundless. That they were guilty of dissimulation, and deceived their adversaries by cunning stratagems in order to accomplish what they deemed a sacred purpose, is true. Their doctrine was, according to St. Augustine, that deception is allowed to hide one's faith, and to simulate Catholic belief ("jura, perjura, secretum prodere nolit"). Neander (C. Hist. H., 711) observes that the reproach of impious fraud is thrown upon them, but is an abuse which he denies. It is, however, a fact that at least a part of the Priscillianists were addicted to unnatural turbidities, to which such a system must logically lead; but there is no evidence that they avowed that lying and perjury were lawful under all circumstances.

The bishop Hyginus of Cordova was the first to enter the lists against this heresy, and he strove, although without success, to gain back to the orthodox Church the bishops Instantius and Salvianus. Hyginus apprised Iacutus, the bishop of Merida, of the Priscillianic disorder that had arisen, and the hot-blooded zeal of this prelate was still more unsuccessful, and so were the efforts of all the other Catholic bishops. The boldness of the heretics increased every day, and bishop Hyginus himself, displeased with the severe measures inaugurated against them, became their protector. To arrest their progress,
A synod was held in October, 380, at Saragossa, to which Instantius, Salvinianus, Kilpaldius, and Priscillianus were also invited. The heresiarchs failed to appear. The synod condemned their doctrines and resolved upon measures to stop their expansion. Catholic witnesses were summoned from amongst the Priscillianist meetings; fasting on Sundays was interdicted; the anathema was launched against such as stayed from Church during the forty days of Lent and the three weeks of Epiphany, or received the Eucharist in the Church without participating at some of the sacraments; the name any man who was proscribed against those who should assume the name and functions of teachers without episcopal approbation; and every clerk who should, out of pride and vanity, clothe himself in the monastic garment, was put under ban. The execution of the decrees against Priscillianists was committed to the bishop Ithacius of Osuna. No worse choice could possibly have been made. He was a mere volupturny, and utterly destitute of all sense for spiritual things.

Excluded from the Church, the Priscillianists now took more decided measures for establishing themselves, and they had the boldness even to cause the consecration of Priscillian as their bishop of Avilla by the bishops Instantius and Salvinianus. Of course, by this step the Spanish Catholic prelates were greatly imbittered, and the Iadicius above mentioned, together with the divine Ambrose, was represented by Sulpicius Severus as a troublesome zealot, was dispatched to the emperor Gratian for the purpose of obtaining an order of banishment against Priscillian, Instantius, and Salvinianus. Gratian having issued the rescript thus demanded, the three heresiarchs repaired to Rome, in order to vindicate themselves before pope Damasus. But the pope refused to justify them. Salvinianus died at Rome, and his two companions went to Milan, where they tried, as unsuccessfully, to persuade St. Ambrose of their innocence. However, they afterwards were induced by one Onisius, called Macedonius, who obtained for them an imperial decree which allowed them to return to Spain and take possession of their sees, and ordered Volventius, vicar of Spain, to examine further into the matter. Priscillian and Instantius returned to Spain, as in triumph; and Ithacius, now in turn accused as a disturber of the public peace, was driven out of Spain. The latter was even on the very point of being arrested in Treves, where he had established himself, and of being transported back to the peninsula for trial, when Maximus, bishop of Treves, under the emperor Maximus, a different aspect. As soon as this new Cæsar arrived at Treves, Ithacius appeared before him against the Priscillianists. Maximus, who desired the whole matter to be disposed of as a purely ecclesiastical affair, ordered a synod to be held, in 384, at Bordeaux, to which the heresiarchs were summoned. Instantius was deposed by the vote of the assembly, and Priscillian, foreseeing a similar fate, tried to prevent it by appealing to the emperor. This step was the cause of his ruin. The emperor now took the matter in hand: Priscillian and his associates were brought to Treves, where Maximus resided at the time, and the most violent adversities of the sect, Iadicius and Ithacius, appeared as accusers. The latter of these two prelates, if Sulpicius Severus is to be trusted, suspected of Priscillianism any man whom he saw studying and fasting much; and, against all precedents, appeared as an impassioned accuser, before a worldly tribunal, in a religious affair. St. Martin, bishop of Tours, a truly pious man, also at the time in the imperial court, held it to be an outrage upon that august and holy man that such a matter should be tried by a secular court—that heretics should become liable to punishment with torture and death—and besought the emperor to leave the affair in the hands of the bishop, or, at least, to decide it without bloodshed. As long as Martin was present, the trial was delayed; on his departure, Maximus promised there should be no bloodshed, but he was induced by Ithacius and two other Spanish bishops, Rufus and Magnus, to break his word. The prefect who tried the case probably employed tortures to obtain avowals. Priscillian, the rich widow Euchochria, and several other members of the bishops were also condemned, not only as false teachers, but also as violators of the civil laws. They were either beheaded or punished with confiscation and exile (365).

The execution of Priscillian by the sword, and of several of his associates, did not run the sect, but seemed rather to give it new life and vigour. The Priscillianists got possession of the bodies of their dead, and brought them to Spain, where Priscillian was honored as a martyr. People swore by his name. The most distinguished bishops, Martin of Tours, St. Ambrose, Theognostus, and pope Stilicho, sternly blamed the cruelty with which Ithacius and his friends had treated the heretics, and marked their abhorrence of the cruelty by separating from the communion of Ithacius and the other bishops who had approved the death penalty for heresy in the Christian Church. But the emperor Maximus went on until his death (387) persecuting the Priscillianists as criminal Manicheans, and was even on the point of sending to Spain a military commission with unlimited powers to pursue the accused and punish the guilty with confiscation and death; and only abandoned the enterprise on the eve of his death.

The gravity of the measures adopted for the punishment of heresy at the time to which we refer obliges us to turn aside to remark (1) that heresy was declared against by the State for the first time under Theodosius the Great, the first emperor who was baptized in the Nicene faith. He was determined to put an end to the Arian interregnum, and therefore proclaimed the exclusive authority of the Nicene Creed, and at the same time enacted the first rigid penalties not only against the pagan idolatry, the practice of which was permitted by the emperor Theodosius, but also against all Christian heresies and sects. The ruling principle of his public life was the unity of the empire and of the orthodox Church. In the course of fifteen years this emperor issued at least fifteen penal laws against heretics (comp. Cod. Theodos. xvi, tit. v, leg. 6-33), by which he gradually deprived them of all right to the exercise of their religion, excluded them from all civil offices, and threatened them with fines, confiscation, banishment, and in some cases (as the Manicheans, the Auliani, and even the Quartodecimans) with death. The passage that dates the State-Church theory of the persecution of heretics and the embodiment of it in legislation. His primary design, it is true, was rather to terrify and convert than to punish the refractory subjects (so Soccone amminta, Hist. Ecclesiæ, lib. vii, c. 12). From the theory, however, to the practice was a single step; and this step his rival and colleague, Maximus, took when he inflicted capital punishment on Priscillian and some of his followers. This was the first shedding of the blood of heretics by a Christian prince for religious opinions. (2) We wish to note also that, while the execution of the Priscillianists is the only instance of the bloody punishment of heretics in this period, as it is the first in the history of Christianity, the propriety of violent measures against heresy was thenceforth vindicated even by the best fathers of the Church (see on this point Augustine's position as marked out by Neander, Ch. Hist. ii, 217 sq.; Schaff, Ch. Hist. ii, 144, 145), and soon none but the persecuted parties were heard to protest against religious persecution. We need hardly add that the attitude of the Church, and especially of the Emperor Leo the Great, as its first and clearest representative, became the advocate and executioner of the death penalty for heresy. See HERESY; INQUESTION; ROMANISM.

After the death of Maximus, the emperor Theodosius ordered a synod to be held in 389, to settle the difficulties that had arisen among the bishops of Gaul,
In Egypt it is plain both that special places were used as prisons, and that they were under the custody of a military officer (Gen. xi. 3; xiii. 17). During the wandering in the desert we read on two occasions of confinement "in a ward" (Deut. xx. 13; 1 Sam. xiv. 44); but as imprisonment was not directed by the law, as we hear of none till the time of the kings, when the prison appears as an appendage to the palace, or a special part of it (1 Kings xxii. 27). Later still it is distinctly described as being in the king's house (Jer. xxxix. 2; xxxvii. 11). In the Nehemiah period (Neh. xii. 26) we have the case also at Babylon (2 Kings xxxv. 27). But private houses were sometimes used as places of confinement (Jer. xxxviii. 15), probably much as Chardin describes Persian prisons in his day, viz. houses kept by private speculators for prisoners to be maintained there at their own cost (Voy. vi, 100). Public prisons other than these, though in use by the Canaanitish nations (Judg. xvi. 21, 25), were unknown in Judaea previous to the captivity. Under the Herods we hear again of royal prisons attached to the palace, or in royal fortresses (Luke iii. 20; Acts xii, 4, 10; Josephus, Ant. xviii. 5, 2; Macherus). By the Romans Antonia was used as a prison at Jerusalem (Acts xxiii. 10), and at Cæsarea the praetorium of Herod (ver. 35). The sacerdotal authorities also had a prison under the superintendence of special officers, as at Antioch (1 Macc. iv. 27), and as at Jerusalem (ver. 10). The royal prisons in those days were doubtless managed after the Roman fashion, and chains, fetters, and stocks were used as means of confinement (see xvi. 24, and Job xii, 27). One of the readiest places for confinement was a dry, or partially dry, well or pit (see Gen. xxxviii. 24, and Jer. xxxviii. 6-13); but the usual place appears, in the time of Jeremiah, and in general, to have been accessible to visitors (Jer. xxxviii. 5; Matt. xi. 2, xxv. 36, 39; Acts xxiv, 26).—Smith. From the instance of the Mamertine Prison at Rome (q. v.), in which the same twenty places were sometimes occupied by one prisoner, many have rashly assumed that the Roman prisons generally were subterranean; but at Thessalonica at least, even "the inner prison" (Acts xvi. 24) seems to have been on the ground-floor ("doors," ver. 26; "spring in," ver. 29). See DION. 

PRISON. ECLERICAL. A bishop was required to have one or more prisons for criminals in 1261. That of the bishop of Chichester remains over his palace gate; and the bishop of London's gate-house stood at the west side of Westminster Abbey. The southeastern prison, in western Europe (c. 1657); Hefele, Concil. eccl. i. 719; ii. 27 sq.; iii. 18 sq.; Milman, Lat. Christianity, i. 276-78; Pusey, Hist. of the Councils A.D. 51-381 (1875); Alzog, Kirchengesch. i. 872 sq.; Neander, Ch. Hist. ii. 710, 718.

PRISON is represented in the A. V. by the following Heb. and Gr. words: 1. קֹשׁ, רקז, for πεύρα, a "chain," is joined with גָּזַע, and rendered a prison (Sept. οἶκος διώρων; Vulg. carcere). 2. נָבִּים, נָבִים, and נָבִים, with גָּז (Sept. οἶκος φυλακής; Jer. xxxvii. 16). 3. שׁוֹדֵד, from פָּרַד, "burn," or "twist," the stocks (xx. 2). 4. בַּקֵּשׁ, בַּקֵּשׁ, and בַּקֵּשׁ; φυλακή; carcere (Genesis, Theur. p. 879). 5. בְּלַחְצָה; δέχομαινον; carcere. 6. פֶּלֶשׁ; φυλακή; custodia; also intens. οἶκος τῆς φυλακῆς. 7. רַבָּא; αἰσθανόμενοι; carcere. 8. פֶּלֶשׁ; φυλακή; custodia; also intens. οἶκος τῆς φυλακῆς. 9. רַבָּא; διώρω; carcere: properly a tower. 10. מִיִּדְנָה; מִיִּדְנָה; מִיִּדְנָה. 11. מִיִּדְנָה is sometimes "prison" in the A. V. as Gen. xxxix. 20. 11. מִיִּדְנָה; מִיִּדְנָה; carcere; probably the "stocks" (as in the A. V.) or some such instrument of confinement, perhaps understood in the Sept. as a sewer or underground passage. 12. In the N.T. λαβάριον, οἰκεία, θύρα; usually φυλακή.
**Prison Reform.** Prison discipline has in recent times become a matter of so much moment that its consideration is forced upon every philanthropist, especially the believer of the new dispensation—the law of love. Under the ancient discipline, torture; the exposure in the pillory, and other like dedications of the offender to public vengeance have long been abandoned as barbarous practices. Death—punishment has been much narrowed in its application; and transportation, apart from any question of effectiveness, has been rendered impracticable, except within a very narrow compass.

The movement for the alleviation of the horrors of imprisonment by physical and moral improvement of the conditions of prisoners may be said to be not only Christian, but modern. We get nothing from the prison discipline of our own times, nor from China, nor from the Middle Ages, that accounts for much in the modern systems of prison discipline. In Greece and Rome punishments were inflicted in other ways. It must be borne in mind that among the ancients the institution of slavery rendered the prison system unnecessary. It kept the functions of punishing ordinary criminals from the public administration of the affairs of a state, and placed it in private hands. Hence there was no criminal law, properly speaking. The corpus juris, so full of minute regulations in all matters of civic ritual and law, has very little to do with criminal law, by reason of the criminals became slaves, and ceased to be objects of the attention of the law. In the Roman empire there were houses, called ergastula, for the incarceration of criminals and refractory slaves. The feudal barons had towers in their castles, called dojones (whence our word dungeon), for the confinement of their captive foes or refractory retainers. Sometimes the prison vaults were cut in the solid rock below the surface of the earth.

When imprisonment became a function of the State in the administration of justice, it was often carelessly, and occasionally, exercised. One of the practical cases of awarding it as a punishment arose more rapidly than the organization for controlling its use. In the 15th and 16th centuries the Society of the Brothers of Mercy in Italy paid much attention to the incarcerated unfortunate transgressors of society, and so greatly alleviated their forlorn condition that many of the Brothers of Mercy are reterently spoken of to this day. St. Carlo Borromeo and St. Vincent de Paul are to be especially mentioned. But the earliest instance of a prison managed on any principles of policy and humanity seems to be that of the Castle of La Santé, an example which was soon followed by some of the German towns, especially Hamburg and Bremen. In England, on several occasions, grave abuses have been exposed by parliamentary inquiries and otherwise in the practice of prison affairs. It is well known that the real impulse to prison improvement was first communicated by the celebrated Howard (q. v.), whose sufferings, when taken by a privateer and imprisoned at Brest, during the Seven Years' War are said to have first directed his attention to this subject. The fruits of his observations in his repeated visits of kindness of Europe were given to the world partly in his publications and partly on examination before Parliament. Howard's exertions, and those of Mrs. Fry and other investigators, awakened in the public mind the question whether any practice in which the public interest was so much involved should be left to something like mere chance—to the negligence of local authorities and the personal disposition of jailers. As in other reform movements, so in this, our own country has been most progressive, and Europe has willingly taken lessons from America. The experiences of our prison system by the Freeman's visitors, Messrs. Beaumont and De Tocqueville (in 1834), De Metz and Houtet (in 1837), Dr. Juliens (sent from Prussia), and Mr. Crawford (from England), have certainly contributed very largely to the present state of public opinion on the subject. In 1834, inspectors were appointed to report annually on the state of English and Scottish prisons—a measure which had been earlier adopted with reference to Ireland; and their reports may be consulted with advantage.

The tendency lately has been to regulate prison discipline throughout the world, for the plain reason that too much pain is bestowed on it—that criminals are not worthy of having clean, well-ventilated apartments, wholesome food, skilful medical attendance, industrial training, and education, as they now have in this country. There are many arguments in favor of criminals being so treated, and the objections urged against such treatment are held by those who are best acquainted with the subject to be invalid; for it has never been maintained by any one that a course of crime has been commenced and pursued for the purpose of enjoyment in the scenes of imprisonment. Perhaps those who chiefly promoted the several prominent systems expected from them greater results, in the shape of the reformation of criminals, than have been obtained. If they have been disappointed in this, it can, at all events, be said that any prison in the now recognized system is no longer like the old prisons, an institution in which the young criminals advance into the rank of proficients, and the old improve each other's skill by mutual communication. The system now received is that of separation, so far as it is practicable. Two other systems are: the employment system, and the solitary system. The former imposed entire silence among the prisoners even when assembled together; the latter endeavored to accomplish their complete isolation from sight of or communication with their race. By the separate system, the criminals are prohibited from communicating with each other; but they are visited by persons whose intercourse is more likely to elevate than to degrade—as chaplains, teachers, Scripture-readers, the superior officers of the prison, and those who have the external control over it." See PENITENTIARY.

The history of the American prison is rich in illustration of the principle that the State, and is regarded as the most perfect organization of the kind in the world. According to the annual report, the objects of this society are threefold: 1. Human attention to persons arrested, protecting them from legal sharpers, and securing their impartial trial. 2. Encouragement and aid of discharged convicts. 3. Careful study of prison discipline, observation of the causes of crime, and inquiry as to the proper means of its prevention. The last is considered the most important of its objects. The statistics of the work of the society during the year 1873 showed among the following figures under the first object named above: 98,560 friendless persons visited in the detention prisons of New York and Brooklyn, all of them counseled, and many of them assisted; 25,250 complaints carefully examined; 6148 complaints withdrawn at the instance of the society as trivial, or found on mistake or petition; 7922 persons discharged by the courts on recommendation of the society, who were young, innocent, committed their offenses under mitigating circumstances, or were evidently penitent; a total of 133,922 cases in which relief of discharged convicts was procured. Among the prisoners of New York city, and 3649 provided with permanent situations; a total of 22,448. Aid has also been extended to thousands of persons connected with the families of the prisoners. For some years a few hundred dollars have been annually distributed on New-year's-day among insipient families. By its act of incorporation it is made the duty of the Prison Association to visit, once by the President of the society, every year, the prisons of the State of New York, and annually report to the Legislature their condition." In 1876 the fourth National Prison Reform Congress was held in New York City, and very advanced ground was taken. Those especially interested in this subject will do well to peruse the minutes of these proceedings, and the reports of the congress. This is the situation in German railways: the engines are considered the souls of the trains; the drivers are regarded as the protectors of the public.
PHRITU

Peru. In 1870 he was appointed presiding elder of the Lincoln district, and at the next annual conference he was appointed presiding elder of the Nebraska district.

At the Convention of 1877 he presided, and at the next two annual conventions, 1877, p. 142; N. Y. Christian Advocate, April 19, 1877.

Pritchard, Samuel, a Wesleyan missionary, was born in the first quarter of our century. He was converted in 1848, and feeling called of God to preach the glad tidings, he entered the itinerant ranks in 1852, and was sent to Biabou Circuit, in the island of St. Vincent. He was there only two years when he was seized with malignant yellow fever, and died Feb. 28, 1858. During the brief period of his ministerial labors he gained the affectionate regard of the community in which he resided. See Wesleyan Mag. 1855, p. 872.

Prititus is the name of several legendary kings of ancient India. It is, however, especially one king of this name who is the favorite hero of the Puranas. His father was Nimi, his mother Pitikriti, his name endorses were Akshita and Nimi. Vishnu, v. v.) Vishnu passed through his wickedness: for when he was inaugurated monarch of the earth, he caused it to be everywhere proclaimed that no worship should be performed, no oblations offered, and no gifts bestowed upon the Brahmins. The Rishis, or Saints, hearing of this proclamation, entreated the king to revoke it, but in vain; hence they fell upon him and slew him. But the kingdom now being without a king, as Vena had left no offspring, and the people being without protection, the sages assembled, and consulted how to produce a son from the body of the dead king. First, then, they rubbed his thigh; from it, thus rubbed, came forth a being called Nisháda; and by this means the wickedness of Vena having been expelled, they proceeded to rub the right arm of the dead king, and by this fiction engendered Prititus, who came forth resplendent in person, and in his right hand appeared the mark of the discus of Vishnu, which proved him to be a universal emperor, one whose power would be invincible even by the gods. The mighty Prititus soon removed the grievances of the people; he protected the earth, performed many sacrifices, and made gifts to the Brahmins. On being informed that in the interval in which the earth was without a king all vegetable products had been withheld, and that consequently the people had perished, he in great wrath marched forward to assail the earth. The earth, assuming the figure of a cow, fled before him, but seeing no escape from the power of the king, at last submitted to him, and promised to renew her fertility, provided he made all places level. Prititus therefore uprooted mountains, levelled the surface of the earth, established boundaries of towns and villages, and induced his subjects to take up their abode where the ground was made level. Then Prititus caused the earth to appear before his throne in the shape she had assumed, and commanded that any one who should apply to her with a wish, and bring a calf with him to milk her, should be granted his wish. This is the celebrated voice which the Brahmins and the Kshatriyas sought such tremendous battles that the gods found it necessary to intervene. Now the earth resumed her former liberality, the people were relieved of their want, and the young god, presented by Pritius to Vishnu and the Kshatriyas, was called the sun-god with an all-illuminating crown, by the sea-god with a parasol trimmed with pearls, walked through the world a conqueror in every battle, bestowing rain or sunshine at his will. He now prepared for invading the empire of Siva, and for the general war a great sacrifice of horses; but when he was going to offer the hundredth, Indra managed to steal
the horse, as the last performance would have secured victory. Prithe's son pursued the robber, who could not otherwise escape him than by changing himself into the form of a penitent friar, wrapped with ashes and bones, and walking with his head bowed down. Indra succeeded in stealing the horse a second time, and only escaped the unerring weapon of his foe by the intervention of Brah. Prithe resigned power in favor of his son, and retired to a solitude, where he was absorbed by the divinity. The legend of Prithe evidently records some historical fact regarding the civilizing influences exerted by a great king of Hindostan antiquity.

Pritz, Johann Georg, a German theologian, was born at Leipzig in 1682. After having been an evangelical minister at Leipzig and at Zerbst, he became superintendent at Schleiz. He was appointed professor of theology at Greifswald, and in 1711 was called to Frankfort-on-the-Main as senior minister. He died in the year 1732. Among his numerous writings we cite the following: De contemptu dictaturn apud antiquos philosophos (Leipsic, 1693, 4to);—De prorogatione sexus masculi et feminei (ibid. 1705, 4to);—De immortalitate hominis contra Aquinatium (ibid. 1700, 4to);—Profeb. de Redissimine (noted for eloquence) (ibid. 1707, 4vo);—Introductio in Novum Testamentum (ibid. 1709, 8vo). He also edited a work of opuscules of St. Macaire, and translated and continued the writings of the fathers in Latin and other English authors.—Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, s. v.

Private Baptism. The Church, even in her most ritualistic times, has always held that, in case of danger or sickness, baptism might be administered at any time or in any place. In Thessaly, when baptism was restricted to Easter, many died without it, and in consequence the old prohibitions were mitigated, the font being hallowed at Easter and Pentecost for occasional use. Children, if in danger, might be baptized on the day of their birth, by a decree of the councils of Gera. 517, and Winchester, 1071; and the Constitutions of Otho. 1288. According to German Catholic teachings, the vessels in which any have been baptized are to be carried to church and there applied to some necessary use, and not to any common purpose, out of reverence to the sacrament (Lancioni's Constitutions, 1223); and the water with which baptism was ministered was to be thrown into the fire (Helfert). The bishop is to give the church to be put into the font. The vessel, Lyndwood says, was to be large enough to permit immersion, and was to be "burned or deputed to the use of the Church," by Edmond's Constitutions of 1256; that is, Lyndwood explains, the vases used in washing the church. Wooden vessels were burned. In England, in the Anglo-Saxon period, children, if sick, were brought to the priest, by Ælfric's Canons, 597, who was to baptize them, from whose district soever they were brought, without delay.

Private Confession. See CONFESION.

Private Judgment is the right the Protestants claimed in the Reformation movement of the 16th century, and has since become the corner-stone of Protestantism (q. v.). The term signifies the right of man to read the Bible for himself and form his own judgment of its meaning under the enlightenment of the Holy Spirit. In the view of Protestantism, man does not only enjoy this privilege, but is bound to exercise it. But, on the other hand, the Romish Church steadfastly denies this right to any man, and holds the Church alone authority and guide in Scripture interpretation. On this point the Council of Trent thus decrees: "In order that men may learn to distinguish between the One mother Church, whose right it is to judge of the true meaning and interpretation of Sacred Writ, or contrary to the unanimous consent of the fathers, even though such interpretation should never be published. If any disobey, let them be denounced by the ordinaries, and punished according to the laws of the Church. For it is evident that the Church holds that her Church alone is entitled to judge of the true meaning and interpretation of Sacred Scripture. To the same effect the creed of pope Pius IV declares: "I also admit the Holy Scriptures according to that sense which our holy mother the Church has held, and does hold, to which it belongs to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Scriptures. Neither will I ever take and interpret them otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the fathers. In opposition to such doctrines as these, the Church of England explicitly teaches that every man is bound to judge for himself of the true meaning of Scripture. Thus I Thess. v. 21, "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good." Acts xvii. 11, "These were more noble than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the Word with all readiness of mind, and searched the Scriptures daily, whether these things were so." Mark xii, 24, "And Jesus answering said unto them, Do ye not yet know, because ye know not the Scriptures, neither the power of God?" Luke xvi. 29, "Abraham saith unto him, They have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them." Dr. Whately shows this in a very striking manner in a passage which he extracts from his Cautions for the Times: "A man who resolves to place himself under a certain guide to be implicitly followed, and decides that such and such a Church is the appointed infallible guide, does decide, on his own private judgment, the one most important point which includes in it all other decisions relative to religion. Thus, by his own showing, he is unfit to judge at all, and can have no ground for confidence that he has decided rightly in that. If, according to his own mind, he will not trust himself, even on this point, but resolves to consult his priest, or some other friends, and be led entirely by their judgment thereupon, still he does in thus resolving exercise his own judgment as to the counsellors he so relies on. The responsibility of forming some judgment is in each person, however, unless we may deem ourselves to bear it, we cannot possibly get rid of, in any matter about which we really feel an anxious care. It is laid upon us by God, and we cannot shake it off. Before a man can rationally judge that he should submit his judgment in other things to the Church of Rome, he must judge, 1. that there is a God; 2. that Christianity comes from God; 3. that Christ has promised to give an infallible authority in the Church; 4. that such authority resides in the Church of Rome. Now, to say that men who are competent to form sound judgments upon these points are quite incompetent to form sound judgments about any other matters in religion is very like saying that men may have sound judgments of their own before they enter the Church of Rome, but that they lose all sound judgment entirely from the moment they hold by the deprival of the Communion, one of the punishments inflicted on offending members of the clerical body during the earlier centu-
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ries. Those punishments included suspension, degradation, pricatio communis, or deprivation, corporal chastisement, and excommunication. Pricatio was of two kinds, namely, a restriction to communio peregrini, or to communio laici. The former had reference to the mode in which strangers were treated who did not bring with them living members of some Christian Church: they were looked upon with suspicion, and till they could clearly themselves were not allowed to come to the Lord's table, nor to receive any temporal support from the Church. In this real complaint, such chymen were treated even in their own Church: they were deprived of means of support, and prevented from officiating or being present at the Lord's Supper. Communio laica was a punishment which required a clergyman to communicate as a layman, and among the lay members of the Church. See COMMUNIO LAICA and COMMUNIO PEREGRINA.

Privation is a philosophical term which, according to Plato, is limitation, imperfection, the inherent condition of all finite existence, and the necessary cause of evil. Leibniz (Cours De, § 62, 72; Étude sur la bonté de Dieu, livre partie, § 29, 31; Sieme partie, § 57, 63), after Augustine, Alcalà, and others, held similar views.

PRIVATION, ECCLESIASTICAL, is one of the vindictive, i.e. positive, penalties (in opposition to the censures) which the ecclesiastical laws inflict in the Church of Rome on prebendaries for grave and repeated offenses against the discipline of the Church. It is the suspension of an ecclesiastic from his office and prebend. It differs from the disciplinary transfer by which the delinquent receives, in place of the prebend which is taken from him, another, though inferior one; it also differs from absolute deposition, by which an ecclesiastic is deprived forever of his office and official income, and is declared unable for any further employment, while the privation does not forbid him the hope of getting some time another prebend. The privation, as long as it lasts, deprives its object of the power of performing the ecclesiastical functions of consecration or jurisdic

The person of the clergyman, of whatever degree, was protected from violence by the penalty of excommunication against the offender; by the latter—in England called "benefit of clergy" (q. v.)—the clergyman was exempted from the ordinary civil tribunals, and could only be tried in the ecclesiastical court.—Chambers, s. v.

This privilege was not to be absolutely abrogated, or at least modified. It comprehended the independent jurisdiction of the clergy (privilegium forti), according to which not only all litigious concerns among the clergy themselves, but all personal, and most of the civil concerns against clerks, were brought before, and decided by, ecclesiastical courts; likewise not only their official transmissions, as functionaries of the Church, but also their civil crimes, were tried and punished by clerical tribunals. To the same class of privileges belongs the benefit of competence, in consequence of which, in matters of debts and subhistoire, the clerical person must be left the means of living according to his station. Finally, the clergy obtained at an early period a number of immunities, which were gradually increased. They were, in consideration of the spiritual than by which they might resort to a priest, exempted from the administration of governmental or communal functions, from tutorships and guardianships, from military and other services to which all other citizens of the State are bound (immunitatem personalitatem). With these was connected the immunity from extraordinary contributions (immunitatem rei publicae), necessary for the building of roads, bridges, channels; from lodging soldiers; from purveyances in times of war (immunitatem militiae). Many of these immunities were granted to the clergy by the emperors Theodosius (Cod. Theod. 2, 8, 11, 14-17, 24, 36, De episc. eccl. et cler. xvi, 2) and Justinian (i, 1, 2, 6, 59, Cod. De episc. et cler. i, 3) in the times of the Roman empire; afterwards by the Frankish kings (Copp. Regg. Franc. lib. vii, c. 165, 290, 467); consolidated by the ecclesiastical legislation (c. 65, c. xii, qu. 2; c. 40, c. xvi, qu. 1; c. 4, 7, x, De tonum, eccl. iii, 49; Sextus, c. 1, 8, cod. cxx, 23; Sextus, c. 4, De consensu, iii, 20; Clem. c. 3, cod. cxxi, 15, etc.), and urgently recommended by the Council of Trent to the worldly rulers (Conc. Trid. sess. xxiv, c. 20, De ref.)

In our times most of the civil legislations impose the same regular taxes on all citizens, without exception, and regardless of former immunities. But in many European states the clergy are unconditionally exempted from communal functions, guardianships, and personal prebend, and are also exempted from military service—Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon.

Privileged Days, those signified by peculiar ceremonies. The following are some of the most important: the first, fourth, and fifth Saturdays in Lent, and Easter Eve, Ash-Wednesday, first and fourth Sundays in Lent, Palm-Sunday, Good-Friday, and Holy Week.—Walcott, Sacred Archaeology, s. v.

Privileged Sundays, those on which, in some churches of mediæval times, "histories" (lessons from Holy Writ) were read.

Privilegium Altariæ is a privilege granted by the pope that masses for the dead said before a certain altar may procure an indulgence to the deceased. For ever and for all days (privilegium perpetuum et quotidianum) this privilege has been granted by Benedict XIII (de date 29 July, 1711, "omnibus ecclesiis") to all patriarchal, metropolitan, and cathedral churches for the said altar. Generally it is granted for seven years only (septennium), running from the day of the grant. The indulgence can be obtained for the dead if a mass of requiem (called sometimes a black mass) be said before the privilege is in force, but if the rite of the votive mass, nor, in consequence, of a requiem (f. e. in fes. duplice, coronam exempta, etc.), the application or intension "pro defuncto" is sufficient, as in such a case no mass of requiem can be said even at the privileged altar. On the Day of All-Souls all priests before altars can use
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Privilegium Canonis. (1) Certain exemptions of the clergy from the State. See Privilegium. (2) That privilege of ecclesiastics which makes a real injury to a member of the clergy punishable by the law of the Church with a punishment equivalent to that of the State. Several former canonists had established the principle that such real injuries must, after examination, be punished with excommunication (for instance, can. Si quis de incursis, 22; De propterferiorum, 23, c. 17, qu. 4), the heresy of belonging to the Church and no one else. The Council of Rheims, in 1131, to sanction that extreme penalty. The canon then decreed, commencing with "Si quis sündente diabolo," was made by Innocent II, in 1139, a general law of the Church; and this is the reason why the privilege mentioned above is called Privilegium canonis. In Gratian's decree this ecclesiastical law is given as can. 29, c. 17, qu. 4. It contains some further dispositions, for it states that it is applicable also to real injuries perpetrated against monks, and that abjuration, except in the dying hour, can only be obtained if the excommunication applies to a person apprehended personally in Rome. This canon has received in the course of time an enlarged interpretation for some cases and a restricted one for others. As a matter of course, the term "ecclesiastic" includes all those who received the tonsure; but the term "work" has also an extensive signification, as it includes every member of an order approved by the Church, even the novice. The law is moreover, applicable to cases where the dead body of a clergyman has been the object of some wanton outrage. On the other side, there are cases where a person, though belonging to the clergy, has no share in the privilege; for instance, the ecclesiastic who is degraded acta especially, when he is sentenced to hard labor; the clergyman who dresses in worldly clothes, or persists in a sinful way of life. The canon Si quis sündente speaks only of that kind of real injury which consists in "assault upon an ecclesiastic," but we have, of course, to take a more extensive view of the case: not only he who strikes, etc., the clergyman is to be punished by excommunication, but also the intellectual originator of such an outrage, or he in whose name it is committed, and who approves of it, or he who, being a witness to it, fails to do what is in his power to prevent it. It is necessary that the delinquent should have acted with the intention of injuring a clergyman: he who, ominino eýjaróndo, strikes another person, ignorant that he is a member of the clergy, is not to be excommunicated, but he who is strikes a layman whom he mistakes for a member of the clergy. If the quarrel originated with the ecclesiastic, the law cannot be applied to the person who is in the case of legitimate defence against him; this is also admitted in favor of a woman who defends her chastity against the assaults of a clergyman. An exception is also admitted in favor of the husband, son, father, or brother of a woman found in criminal conversation with an ecclesiastic. The rule that abjuration must be personally applied for in Rome has been restricted in recent times: it is no longer applicable to women, to monks, and other clerics living in community, when they have assaulted each other, or to sick and ailing persons. A report sent to Rome is sufficient in such cases. Sometimes, when the injury is a trifling one (tecta percussio), the bishop may grant a dispensation. In general the modern practice has become milder: it imposes the voyage to Rome as a penance only for injuries against the offender's own curate or bishop; abjuration is bestowed on his return by the bishop. — Wettw. u. Welle, Kirchen-Lexikon, s. v.

Proba. (Iniže, I Cor. ix, 24) signifies the honor, confidence, and esteem bestowed upon the victors in the public games of the Greeks, such as a wreath, chaplet, garland, etc., and is metaphorically used of the rewards of a future life: "I press," says the apostle, "towards the mark, for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus." (Philipp. iii, 14). See Game.

Proast, Jonas, an English divine, flourished in the closing half of the 17th and the early part of the 18th century. He is noted as a controversialist, and wrote, among other works, Letters to the Irish. After several former canons had established the principle that such real injuries must, after examination, be punished with excommunication (for instance, can. Si quis de incursi, 22; De propterferiorum, 23, c. 17, qu. 4), the heresy of belonging to the Church and no one else. The Council of Rheims, in 1131, to sanction that extreme penalty. The canon then decreed, commencing with "Si quis sündente diabolo," was made by Innocent II, in 1139, a general law of the Church; and this is the reason why the privilege mentioned above is called Privilegium canonis. In Gratian's decree this ecclesiastical law is given as can. 29, c. 17, qu. 4. It contains some further dispositions, for it states that it is applicable also to real injuries perpetrated against monks, and that abjuration, except in the dying hour, can only be obtained if the excommunication applies to a person apprehended personally in Rome. This canon has received in the course of time an enlarged interpretation for some cases and a restricted one for others. As a matter of course, the term "ecclesiastic" includes all those who received the tonsure; but the term "work" has also an extensive signification, as it includes every member of an order approved by the Church, even the novice. The law is moreover, applicable to cases where the dead body of a clergyman has been the object of some wanton outrage. On the other side, there are cases where a person, though belonging to the clergy, has no share in the privilege; for instance, the ecclesiastic who is degraded acta, especially when he is sentenced to hard labor; the clergyman who dresses in worldly clothes, or persists in a sinful way of life. The canon Si quis sündente speaks only of that kind of real injury which consists in "assault upon an ecclesiastic," but we have, of course, to take a more extensive view of the case: not only he who strikes, etc., the clergyman is to be punished by excommunication, but also the intellectual originator of such an outrage, or he in whose name it is committed, and who approves of it, or he who, being a witness to it, fails to do what is in his power to prevent it. It is necessary that the delinquent should have acted with the intention of injuring a clergyman: he who, ominino eýjaróndo, strikes another person, ignorant that he is a member of the clergy, is not to be excommunicated, but he who is strikes a layman whom he mistakes for a member of the clergy. If the quarrel originated with the ecclesiastic, the law cannot be applied to the person who is in the case of legitimate defence against him; this is also admitted in favor of a woman who defends her chastity against the assaults of a clergyman. An exception is also admitted in favor of the husband, son, father, or brother of a woman found in criminal conversation with an ecclesiastic. The rule that abjuration must be personally applied for in Rome has been restricted in recent times: it is no longer applicable to women, to monks, and other clerics living in community, when they have assaulted each other, or to sick and ailing persons. A report sent to Rome is sufficient in such cases. Sometimes, when the injury is a trifling one (tecta percussio), the bishop may grant a dispensation. In general the modern practice has become milder: it imposes the voyage to Rome as a penance only for injuries against the offender's own curate or bishop; abjuration is bestowed on his return by the bishop. — Wettw. u. Welle, Kirchen-Lexikon, s. v.

Price (Jofúsor, I Cor. ix, 24) signifies the honor, confidence, and esteem bestowed upon the victors in the public games of the Greeks, such as a wreath, chaplet, garland, etc., and is metaphorically used of the rewards of a future life: "I press," says the apostle, "towards the mark, for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus." (Philipp. iii, 14). See Game.

Probabilists are those who oppose the doctrine of Probability and assert that man is obliged, on pain of sinning, always to take the more probable side. The Jansenists and the Port-Royalists are of this class. See Probabilism.

Probabilism. The Roman Catholic Church recognizes no standard of ethics except that of her own construction. Protestants look to Scripture and to the rationalist, instead of the Church, for the basis for a legitimate moral decision. The eternal and objective foundations of the moral law are thus exchanged for the subjective view of personal individuals of eminence (see Wutke, Christian Ethics, i, 261-263). Not only is the decision left to the individual, instead of the Church, but that individual whose decision best suits the inquirer (see Sanchez, Op. Mor. i, 9, n. 12 sq.; Laymann, Theol. Mor. [1625] i, 11). Probability is a term used in philosophic parlance, as we may see in the article Probable, but in Christian theology it has become synonymous with Roman Catholic ethics. Though its principal source and advocacy are in the Order of the Jesuits, the whole Church of Rome has by its tacit acceptance of this doctrine become identified with it.

Definition. — Probability designates, in the domain of morals, an object so comprehensive, and including so many different branches, that we shall scarcely be able to delineate it here, even in its fundamental features. In order to define it we must depart from that moral idea which is the centre of the domain in which it moves: this is the certitude and firm conviction of the moral subject about the legitimacy of his acts. It is the opposite of this subjective consciousness which forms the object of all probabilistic questions. As the ground of the doctrine, it is assumed, then, that in human actions and decisions, certainty is not always possible as well as to their lawfulness or unlawfulness. Short of this certainty, the intellect passes through the stages of "doubt" and of "probability." Probability is a state of consciousness intermediate between certitude and incertitude, but approaching more or less to certitude, without reaching it entirely. Consequently, the state of probability, has risen above incertitude. Doubt is a wavering state between two judgments, between negation and affirmation of the goodness or possibility of an action; it excludes every positive approbation, every positive consent, every permanent decision in favor of either term of the moral antithesis. Probability has passed this uncertain wavering; it does not move hesitatingly to and fro; it has found a point of support, though the latter may not be absolutely trustworthy. In consequence, more or less positive decision in favor of one or the other term of the question is possible. Such a decision must not originate in any subjective whim; it must be founded on sufficient objective reasons. This gives us the true idea of the probable conscience: "Probable est id quoque probari potest, hoc est, quod ratione dignum est, ut sit opus conscientiae in matters of conscience thus: it is the decision or consent of conscience in regard to the moral permis-
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sibility of an action, a decision founded on sufficient reasons, but not excluding all misgivings to the contrary. To the probable conscientia, then, corresponds, as its opposite, the probable conscientia (probabilita). An opinion as to the legitimacy or illegitimacy of an action is the more probable the stronger the reasons on which it rests. These reasons are either *intrinsice*, a part of the thing itself and its objective nature, or *extrinsice*, owing their weight to human authorities. The extrinsic probability of an opinion outsets itself with the repute and confidence enjoyed by the authorities which support it, while the intrinsic probability endeavors to conceive the rational foundation of the opinion in question. But whichever of these forms probability may assume, it can never be at variance with the decisions and doctrines of the Church. Absence of intrinsic and extrinsic contradictions is the negative condition of probability. To establish true and real probability (probabilita vera), a positive element is required, to wit, a more or less evident accord with the objective law, either with its spirit or with its more or less clearly expressed dispositions. It results from the nature of opinion that a variety and diversity of opinions be conceived, which, in regard to their legitimacy, are of equal or unequal value. Moreover, in the conflict of views with each other, it is an equal comparative “safety”; that is, the greater or less danger of moral culpability which they involve; and this greater or less moral “safety” of a view may or may not coincide with its greater or less “probability.” Hence the gradual scale of probable opinions, the highest degree being the opinio probabilissima, but the opinion tenius superior, being entirely excluded. The ascending degrees of the concurrent probable opinions are marked by the opinio more probabilia, que probabilia, and probabilia. The doctrine of probabilism is founded upon these distinctions. It is taught, with some variations, by four different schools, all of which agree in professing that it is lawful, in certain cases, to act upon opinions which are merely probable. These four schools of probabilism are called: *Probabilism Simple, Acquisprobabilism, Probabiliorism* (from probabilia, more probable), and Tutiorism (from tutor, more safe). The first holds that it is lawful to act upon any probable opinion, no matter how slight its probability. The second requires that the opinion shall be “solidly probable,” but holds that, provided the action is lawful, it is lawful to act upon it, even though the conflicting opinion should be equally probable. The third narrows much more the limits of what is allowed in the conflict of probable opinions, and only permits action on the more probable of the two; but permits the least reliable of the two opinions, the opinio is the “more safe.” The fourth requires that in all cases the more safe opinion shall be followed, even when the less safe opinion is much the more probable. The extreme rigorism which the last class requires has caused its division into *absolute and modified tutiorism.*

By the certainty of an opinion, says Fuchs, “we are to understand the more or less considerable remoteness of the danger of sin, or of error, or of encroachment on other persons’ rights. The more an opinion removes him who chooses it for his guide from the danger of actual sin, the more certain it is. The opinio tutor is that which declares that an action is not allowed; the opinio minus tuta is that which asserts the legitimacy of the action in question. As being allowed and the not being allowed of an action stand together in the same relation as liberty and law, it may be said that in the first is liberty, in the second law, is favored (libertati favet, legi favet).”

To these probabilistic systems is opposed a system espoused by the more consistent of Romish theologians of the Old Catholic type. It is called *Antiprobabilism,* and is a sort of anti-socially specific system which is not influenced on man’s actions, even to the most probable opinion. It requires that an opinion shall be absolutely morally certain, in order that it may be lawful for a man to act upon it in the light of Christian truth. But this system has been rejected by papal authority, declaring erroneous the not sequi opinensionem vel inter probabilities probabilissimam.”

*History of Probabilism.* — It is commonly said that the system of probabilism is modern; but this is only true of the discussions regarding it, for the doctrine itself, in some of its forms, is as old as the study of ethics, even considered as a moral science. The disputes regarding it arose with the science of casuistry, when men, in the 16th and 17th centuries, began to reduce morals to a system. It formed a leading subject of the controversy between the Jesuits and the Jansenists; but even in its modern form probabilism dates back to the close of the scholastic period. At the Council of Constance, in A.D. 1415, a debate had arisen on the subject of the murder of the duke of Orleans, assassinated in Paris Nov. 28, 1407, at the instigation of his political rival, the duke of Burgundy. The Franciscan Jean Petit had endeavored to justify the assembly of French noblemen held at Paris March 8, 1408; but his proposition had been condemned, at the request of chancellor Gerson, by the university and the bishop of Paris. When the matter was brought before the council in behalf of the duke of Burgundy, tried to prevent any conclusions unfavorable to Jean Petit, asserting that several authorities were in favor of Petit, and that, in consequence, his opinion was at least probable, and ought not to be peremptorily disposed of by way of rejection and condemnation. Germain defended a contrary view of the matter, and the council condemned as heretical the doctrine of the legitimacy of murder committed on the persons of tyrants, and stamped with the name of heretic all those who should pertinaciously maintain it (comp. Mansi, Coll. Conc., xxvii, 705, and xxviii, 869). This resolution left probabilism untouched, and condemned only a false application of its principles in a particular case.

The Dominican Bartolomeo de Medina is considered as the founder of probabilism in its usual signification. Through his commentary on the theological *Summa* of St. Thomas de Aquinas it entered the schools: “Si est opinio probabilis,” he says (quest. 19, art. 6, concl. 8), “licitum est eam sequi, licet opposita probabilior.” Many Thomist theologians adopted this proposition; among them are Lamoignon, Abrahante, and Lopez. Among the Jesuits, the celebrated Vasquez, was the first who (1598) positively took sides with the probabilists, and a number of members of his order followed in his footsteps. From this time forth the Jesuits did not maintain any opposition to the doctrine, and the alterations to which they led. Probabilism came to be synonymous with Jesuitism, so largely were the Jesuits identified with the advocacy of this pernicious dogma. This is, however, easily accounted for. The Jesuits had come on the stage at a time when the Church of Rome was in danger of being broken up, if not of being entirely dismembered. The Reformation had struck her heavy blows, and in some countries she was felled to the ground. Loyola’s order aimed at her recovery and restoration. The bride of Christ they saw endangered, and their mission was the salvation of the Roman Church at any price. In a struggle of life and death, as has been aptly said, one is not very careful in the use of measures; and in all warfare the sentiment holds good, though involving manifold violations of ordinary right, that the end sanctifies the means. The Jesuits were well aware that an essentially new phenomenon of the churchly life—that they stood upon purely human invention and power; it need not surprise us, therefore, that they felt called by their fundamental principles to the development of a new system of morality, a new social code, and the salvation of which is the glory of God through the exaltation of the visible Church, which, of course, is to them the
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Romish Church. The purpose zealously pursued by the Jesuits in the interest of Romish dominion—of becoming soul-guarding fathers and conscience-councelors, especially for men and women of eminence, required, on the other hand, that the Jesuits should acquire for themselves the highest possible repute in ethics—and hence it was requisite that they should become the literary representatives thereof; and, on the other, that this ethics should be moulded in adaptation to this end—should make itself not disagreeable and burdensome, but should become as elastic as possible in view of different wants—should be a "golden net for catching souls," as the Jesuits themselves were wont to call their own pliability. The more ramified and complex the network of casuistic ethics became, so much the more indispensable were the practiced conscience-counsellers, or, more properly, conscience-advocates; the more stairways and back doors they were able to turn attention to in conscience affairs, so much the more prized and influential they became. This explains the great compass and the peculiar character of Jesuitic ethics. They were but too well aware that it did not harmonize with the moral consciousness of the ancient Church, and they hesitated not to admit that they did not recognize earlier Church tradition as a criterion, but they rather would lay the foundations for a new tradition. The sophistical artifices in the doctrine of right and morality were not then first thought out and invented by Jesuitism; but it learned them by listening to weak, corrupt human nature, as others had here and there done before it. Jesuitism, moreover, was the first to set up these sophisms as rules; first, brought them into an organized system of doctrine, and formed them as methods of the Christian doctrine of morals; first scientifically constituted, authorized, and sanctioned them as leading principles of Catholic morality; and—what is not to be overlooked—has first applied them to the allotment of the moral life to the natural weaknesses of the different ranks and classes, in order that "the kingdom of heaven henceforth may suffer no violence."

We will not forget, however, that after the Theatines, in a general assembly of their order, in 1598, had formally denounced probabilism, several members of the Society of Jesus likewise raised their voice against the abuses of the system: we mention among them the Portuguese Ferdinand Rebelle and the Italian Comitolo. Angrily, wrote the latter, in the name of the order, to Mutius Vletesco, expressed similar opinions in a series of writings. We read in one of them: "Nonnullorum ex societate sententia, in rebus presentium ad mores spectantium, plus nimio libere non modo periculorum, sed etiam sanitatum, Deus universae insignia afferat detrimentis. Omne itinere studio periclitat ut qui docent scribuntur minime hac regula et norma in delicto sententiarium utantur: Tuere quis potest, probabilia est, nuncuro non curat. Verum ad eas sententias accedunt quae tutores, quae graviores majorisque nominis doctorum suffragis sunt frequenter stat: quae bonis moribus conducunt magis; quae denique pietatem alere et prodeunt quae, non vastare, non perdere." The Sorbonne, too, opened fire upon the probabilistic aberrations with the condemnation of the Magus director curatorium, incumbratum, et concussum, ex ordinis partibus, to Bishop Milhail, and the clergy of France continued the battle with praiseworthy zeal. The University of Louvain made similar declarations. In 1538 the Dominicans, in a general chapter held at Rome, joined their voice to these authorities. Again, some Jesuits, among others Cardinal Robert de Lorraine, as soon as they were ensured those of their order who were advocates of probabilism. Yet these antagonistic elements within Jesuitism were the exceptions, not the rule. The rank and file of the Society of Jesus were wedded to their new idols: and as the Jesuits, in the end, the chief representatives of Roman Catholic ethics in the 16th and 17th centuries, those who chose to attack Romanism levelled their guns directly at probabilism; while those who favored Romanism, or were themselves its supporters, but desired the downfall of Jesuitism, directly charged on this particular body of proof. The Jesuits themselves, in order to destroy this their enemies the Jesuits. Pascal, the great, if not immortal, advocate of the Port-Royalists, adopted this method. In his Lettres Provinciales he puts together these aberrations of members of the Jesuitic Order; and as he represents the doctrine of probabilism, it is a curious perversion of the principle of authority—the application of it to legitimize doubt and license. He stigmatized probabilism as the "morals of the Jesuits." The great publicity which the Provincial Letters owed was due, not only to their importunity, especially among the educated classes, an inflexible opinion against Jesuits, which continues to this day. A number of refutations of the Provincial Letters appeared, some of them very awkward. The Jesuit Firoz, in his Apologie pour les Cassiers (Paris, 1657), made the following assertion: If on an old principle, it is sure, and can be followed; surely there is no degree, but is indivisible, so far as the moral action connected with a probable opinion is concerned; in consequence, a less probable opinion is as sure as a more probable one. (Apolog. p. 59). Should not the Jesuits Matthew de Moya, Honoré Lefèvre, and Étienne des Champs (Quæst. Facit de Sententia Theologorum Societatis circa Opiniones probabilis, Paris, 1659). The abest refutation, Réponse aux Lettres provinciales de L. de Montale, ou l'Intérieur de Chine, is due to the Jesuit Daniel, the well-known French historian, who gives a very elaborate account of probabilism. He observes that, according to the doctrine of the Jesuits, two conditions are required for the probability of an opinion: first, it can contradict neither the dogmas and truths taught by the Church, nor any evident reason; secondly, it must be founded on sound judgment, and not set up wantonly against the prevailing doctrine of the competent teachers.

Among these tumultuous contests in the domain of Catholic morals, the Apostolic See could not remain silent. The pope condemned the Provincial Letters (Sept. 6, 1657) on one side, and Piero's Apology on the other (August, 1659). Pope Alexander VII declared against the dangerous excesses of probabilism in a decree of Sept. 24, 1665; and his successor, Innocent XI, strictly enquired of his cardinals about the first-mentioned decree commences with these memorable words: "Our most holy father has heard, not without great sorrow, that several opinions, which weaken Christian discipline and prepare destruction to the souls, have been partly revived and partly started for the first time, and that the unbridled license of curiosity and over-eager minds increases every day, whereby a way of thinking has crept into the Church which is altogether at variance with Christian simplicity and the doctrine of the holy fathers, and which, should the believers make it for ruling in their lives, would produce a great moral corruption." Among the moral propositions censured by these two papal decrees, the following concern probabilism: from the first decree, Prop. 27. "Si liber sit alie inusoria etiorni et moderni, debet opinio censuris probabili. debet, non censuris factum seu habendum esse a Sede apostolica tanquam irremissibilium;" from the latter, Prop. 1. "Non est licitum in sacramentis conferre sequi opinionem probabili de valore sacramento, relicita tuore, nisi id vetet lex, conventio aut periculum gravissimum damni incursurum. Hinc sententia probabili tantum candidatur in utendum, quamvis extra utendum sint, doctae aut episcopia." Prop. 2. "Probabiliter existi mo judicium posse uidere justa opinionem etiam minus probabilis." Prop. 3. "Generatim, dum probabilitate sine intrinseca sine extraexsensa, quantumvis tenui, modo certi, dum probabilitas, sine essentiaque extrinseca, semper prudenter agimus." Prop. 4. "Ab infideitate excusabatur infidelis non credens, ducis opinione
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minus probabilis." The antiprobabilistic extreme, represented by the rigorism of the Jansenists, was met by Pope Alexander VIII with the condemnation of the proposition referred to above, a condemnation which is even now not altogether dead in its influence. The first consequence of the papal declarations was a sharper separation of the parties. Probabilism found its most redoubtable adversaries in the Carmelite Henry of St. Ignatius, the two Dominicans Daniel Concina (Della Storia del Probabilismo) and Vincent Patuzzi, and in Franzeo and Pet. Bellarmino. But all these efforts did not annihilate probabilism whether inside or outside the Order of the Jesuits, though it had to submit to many restrictions. In their fifth general assembly the Jesuits only protested against making probabilism the doctrine of their order. Oliva, the general of the order (in a letter of Feb. 3, 1669), speaks plainly enough in favor of probabilism; and while he declares certainly and truly probable opinions fit to engender a certain consciencce (conscientia certa), he asserts, on the other side, that the requirement "sequenti semper in omnibus probabilis re partem" would be too heavy a burden upon mankind. It was shown, however, much more clearly how deeply probabilism was rooted in the Jesuitic Order when the Spaniard Gonzalez, the general of the order, took with great decision, in 1694, the defence of the principle that man, in moral matters, must suffer himself to be guided by a sincere love of truth. Hence he draws the inference that we must always choose what we think to be nearest to truth; if objective truth cannot be obtained, we must at least cling to that which, according to our subjective conviction, is highest to it. For that reason we can follow even the less sure opinion, if we are convinced of its greater probability. The work written from this standpoint, and which the author meant to dedicate to the general of the order, Oliva, found its way into publicity only after many years. Perhaps Gonzalez would not have ventured, even while general of the order, to publish it if the same work which the casuists of the order wished to suppress had not been greatly approved of by Pope Innocent XI. Many of the Jesuits claimed that Gonzalez had, by his disapprobation of probabilism, made himself unworthy of his place, and pronounced him self-deposed. Only the protection of the pope saved him (see Wolf, Gesch. der Jesuiten, i, 173). In his Fundamentum Theologiæ Moræ (Rome, 1707), the most of por narrative of the Jesuitic authority system hitherto so predominant by giving the preference to the ethical province as the more appropriate judgment-seat of the appellate court. Two other theologians followed in his footsteps, Giibert and Camargo, representing the probabilistic tendency. Gisbert, in one of his most important works, still more than in his other books, attacks the principle of probabilism, only its vulgar form. He asserts that we are certain not to sin if we stick to the absolute probability either of law or of liberty; if we judge sensibly that something is allowed, after examining it sufficiently, taking thereunto the circumstances into account, and satisfying ourselves of the soundness of our judgment. While Giibert treated the subject in a more speculative way, Camargo, professor at Salamanca, in his treatise De Recta Homestasia Moralis (Naples, 1792), takes a more historical view of the matter, and shows that modern probabilism has not the testimony of antiquity in its favor, and that since its first appearance the most considerable authorities were against it. While the probabilists continued in their attempts to again turn the scales—we shall only mention the Trachtenberg (Prophetic Relations of Religion under the assumed name of Nicuolaus Pegelutus, Louvain, 1708) and the "Criticisms" of Cardenas (Opp. Corden. Ven. 1710) and while the party of the probabilists grew in strength every day, mediating tendencies appeared. Among them works were written in this spirit, e.g., Natale Mariae Alfonso de Liguori. This distinguished Romanist developed a system of morals which may be described as a kind of practical probabilism, in which, by the use of what are called reflex principles, an opinion which objectively is but probable is made subjectively the basis of a certain and safe practical judgment. Liberty, in his hands, is that which we may choose, as much as possible, in accordance with truth; or at least, in the case of a more probable opinion, as near to truth as possible. If it should appear that of two opinions one is more favorable to liberty, the other to law, the latter being at the same time more probable, it must be admitted without hesitation. Liguori, in the case where equally strong reasons speak for law and liberty, professes a somewhat different opinion from Giibert and the rigid probabilists—he decides for liberty. Liguori starts in his demonstration from the proposition that a doubtful law is not binding ("lex dubia non obligat"). A dubious law, he further says, is an uncertain law, and a law of this description cannot engender any obligation ("lex incerta non potest certam inducere obligationem"). For in such a case of doubt, of uncertainty, liberty is in possession. The consequence has the right on its side, according to the axiom "In dubio melior est conditio possidentis." This is the strongest point of Liguori's argumentation, but also the point with which it stands and falls; here it has to fight a decisive battle against probabilism, or against casuistry defined in its most narrow and strict sense (see, for example, Gaisford's treatise, Lond. 1710), takes a similar stand-point between the contending parties, while Charles Emanuel Pallavicini, in his letters on the administration of the sacrament of penance, claims for the confessors the right to choose between probabilism or probabilism, both with proper restrictions. The maxims of the Jesuits disseminated themselves, like an infectious disease, far beyond the circle of their own order, as is shown by the comprehensive works of the Sicilian Augustinian Diana (Rerum Morale, Antv. 1629-37, 4 volumes fol.; Luxemb. 1657; Venet. 1728), who taught, under the express approval of his ecclesiastical superiors, and also of the Jesuits, the doctrine of probabilism in its worst forms. One may act according to a probable opinion, and disregard the more probable one; man is not under obligation to follow the more perfect and the more certain, but it suffices to follow the simply certain and perfect; it would be an undearable burden were one required to hunt out the more probable opinions (Res. Mor. [Antv. 1657] vol. ii, tract. 18; vol. iv, tract. 14). In the background that the Jesuits taught the same thing. In relation to murder, Diana teaches like Ercobor: I am at liberty to kill even him who assails my honor if my honor cannot otherwise be rescued (Res. Mor. iii, 590; Summa, p. 210, 212). When some one has resolved upon a great crime, then one is at liberty to reclaim (to die for) him, of his own accord, because such advice does not relate absolutely to an evil, but to a good, namely, the avoiding of the worse; for example, if I cannot otherwise dissuade a person from an intended adultery than by recommending to him fornication, in that case it is allowable to recommend this to him; not, however, in so far as it is a sin, but in so far as it prevents the sin of adultery. Diana appeals in this connection to many like-judging Jesuit doctors (Res. Mor. [Antv. 1657] vol. iii, tract. 5, 37). If a priest commissaries Petre to kill Catus, who is weaker than Peter, but nevertheless Peter comes out second best and gets killed himself, still the priest incurring no guilt, and may continue in the administration of his office (ibid. vol. iii, tract. 15, 17). He who resolves upon committing all possible venial sins does not thereby involve himself in any certainty in the judgment of God (ibid. vol. iv, tract. 6, 24). He who, so aliusa justa causu, rents a house to another for purposes of prostitution commits no sin (ibid. vol. iii, tract. 6, 46). To eat human flesh, in case of necessity, he holds, with the majority of the Jesuits. When the matter is within the bounds of what is allowable, he holds the same view (ibid. vol. iii, tract. 6, 45). If a promise of marriage, induces a maiden to yield to him, he is not bound by his promise in case he is of higher
rank or richer than she, or in case he can persuade him- 
self that she will not take his promise in serious earnest (ibid. [Ant.] vol. iii, tract. 6, 81; in the spirit of San- 
chez and Less). This, that rank and social State can be made legitimate by papal dispensation (ibid. vol. iv, 
tract. 4, 94; sanctioned by several Jesuits).
In such moral perversity of view Diana seems only to 
have been surpassed by the Spanish Netherland Cis-
terian Leokokwa (Theol. Mor. 1645, 1652; comp. Fer-
ranz, p. 133 that, that requires the spirit of the missionary field he 
down the moral consciousness, and declares that noth-
ing is evil per se, but only because it is positively for-
bidden; hence God can dispense even with all the com-
mandments (comp. the views of Duns Scotus, p. 34) 
(1626); can e.g., allow whoredom and other like 
sins, for none of these are evils per se. Monks and 
priests are at liberty to kill the female misused by them 
when they fear, on her account, for their honor. This 
writer declares himself expressly and decidedly in favor 
of the views of the Jesuits. Also the Franciscan Order 
became infected with the maxims of the Jesuits, as is 
proved by the very voluminous work of Barthol. Mas-
trius de Mandula (ibid. 1626), which was published un-
der the express sanction of the officers of the order, and 
who justifies restrictiones mentales even in oaths (Hisp. 
imperialis, ed. Venet. 1723)."
Next, also the murder of tyrants (ibid. viii, 27), the murder of the slan-
derer of an important person, castration, and similar 
things (ibid. viii, 25, 28; xi, 110 sq.), as well as proba-
bilism.
Jesuit moral system of the Jesuits is, we grant, not, 
strictly speaking, that of the Romish Church; many of 
their more extreme maxima the Church has con-
demned, and the more recent Jesuita themselves find it 
advise no longer fully to avow their former princi-
pies. Nevertheless, Jesuitism, together with its system 
of morals, is, as has been well said by Wuttke (i, 271, 
272), "the ultimate consequential goal of the Church 
in its turning aside from the Gospel, just as (through 
in other respects widely different therefrom) Talmud-
ism was the necessary goal of Judaism in its rejection 
of the Saviour. The error consists in the placing of 
human discretion and authority in the stead of the 
unconditionally valid, revealed will of God. Even 
as earlier Catholicism had intensified the divine command by 
self-invented, ascetic work-holiness into a seem-
ingly greater severity — had aimed at a higher moral 
perfect, which required by the Jesuits, with like presumption, lowered the moral law, out of 
consideration to temporal relations, to a merest min-
um requirement; contented itself with a much lower 
moral perfection than the divine law calls for, and 
went about cunning means for lightening even this mini-
um."
Probabilism, moreover, is not a merely fortuitously 
discovered expedient, but it is in fact an almost inevi-
table consequence of the historical essence of Jesuitism. The order itself arose neither on the basis of Scripture 
or of ancient Church tradition, but sprang absolutely 
from the daring inventive power of a single man break-
ing through the limits of ecclesiastical actuality. It is 
not therefore at all unnatural that it should make the 
authority of a single spiritually pre-eminent man its high-
est determining power, and subornate to this the his-
torical objective form of the moral consciousness. This, 
then, is the distinguishing characteristic of Jesuitical 
ethics—that in the place of the eternal objective ground 
and criterion of the moral it substitutes subjective opin-
ion and in its place of an unconditional eternal end a 
merely conditionally valid one. Jesuit moral system is 
actual, visible Church against all forms of opposition— 
that in the place of the moral conscience it substitutes 
the human calculating of circumstantial and fortuitous 
adaptation to the promotion of this its highest end; 
this fact, what is actually valid by a wide-reaching isolating of the means, 
and by so doing subordinates morality to the discre-
tion of the single subject. "Though the ethics of the 
Jesuits are lax and quite too indulgent towards worldly, 
sinful propensities and fashions, yet this is only one 
phase of the moral system and Jesuitical moral sys-
ystem, in the usual sense, seems but little applicable to 
the members of a brotherhood the first rule of which is 
a perfect renunciation of personal will and personal 
opinion and self-determination, in a word, unconditional 
obedience to every command of superiors, and which 
has actually been accomplished in the missionary field he 
grandi s deeds, and numbers among its members 
multitudes of heroic martyrs. This lack of strictness 
in one direction rests by no means on mere worldliness, 
on pleasure in the delights of this life, but follows, on 
the one hand, necessity (as also does also the rule of 
obedience), from the subjectively arbitrary presuppo-
sition of the entire order, from the lack of an objective, 
unshaken foundation, and rests, on the other hand, 
strictly on calculation; is itself a cunningly devised 
means to the end; is intended to awaken, especially 
in the great and mighty of the earth (and the masses 
of the people are such under some circumstances), a love 
the Church, to the mild, friendly, indulgent mother."
Jesuitical ethics is the opposite pole of monastic eth-
ics; where the latter requires too much, the former ex-
pects too little. A Jesuit is made for the sinful world, Jesuitical moralitv seeks to win the 
sinful world, not indeed for God, but at least for the 
Church. Monasticism says to God, though not in an 
evangelical sense, "If I have only thee, then I ask for 
nothing else, glory to God and earth." Jesuitism says, 
turns away in indignant contempt from the worldly life 
because the world is immersed in sin; the latter gener-
ously receives the same into itself, and turns attention 
away from guilt by desiring it. It is true the Jesuits 
represent also a monastic order, but this order is also a 
means to an end, and resembles the other nobler orders 
about as much as wily Reynard resembles the pious 
prig; and the well-known hostility of the older orders 
to this brilliantly rising new one was not mere jealousy, 
but a very natural, and, for the most part, moral protest 
against the spirit of the same. See Wuttke, Christian 
Ethics (transl. by Prof. J. P. Lacruix, N. Y. 1874, 2 vols. 
12mo), i, 255, 272, Stix Ullin, Gesch. der Sittenkunde Jes-
ner (Gotting, 1798), i, 441; Schröck, Kirchenrecht, ix, 
343 sq. Cotta, Gesch. der Monast.bewegung, Auf den ge-
amen Prop. Jes. (Heimat. 1864, 4to); De Wette, Christ.
Sittenkunde, II, ii, 834 sq.; Perrault, Moral des Jesuiten 
(1667, 3 vols.); Ellendorf, Die Moral u. Politik der Je-
suiten (1840); Pragmatistische Geschr. der Monarchen-
zeit (1770), vols. 1-2; Deutsches Kirchenrecht, S. 110. 
Review of Guru's Compendium Theologia Moralis, new 
ed. Ratisbon, 1874; one of the worst probabilist advoca-
tes; Mosheim, Eccles. Hist. iv, 250; v, 190; Chris-
Uom Remembrancer, July, 1852, p. 191 sq.; Amer. Quar-
Rev. xi, 478; Edinb. Rev. xxiii, 320; xxvi, art. L
Traditions (Latin probabilitas), a curious technical 
worcl which serves to designate the philosophic dogma 
that anything which does not admit of demonstration may 
em admit the probable as proof, if such a course does 
not involve absurdity or contradiction. "As demon-
stration," says Locke, "is the showing the agreement 
or disagreement of two ideas, by the intervention of one 
or more proofs, which have a constant, immutable, 
and visible connection one with another, so probability is 
nothing but the appearance of such an agreement or 
disagreement by the intervention of proofs whose con-
nection is only apparent and in that apparent connec-
tion not perceived to be so, but is, or appears for the most 
part to be so, and is enough to induce the mind to judge 
the proposition to be true or false, rather than the con-
trary. . . . The entertainment the mind gives this sort 
of proof is in strictness of proposition, not, as is 
which is admitting or receiving any proposition as true upon 
arguments or proofs that are found to persuade us a
receive it as true, without certain knowledge that it is so. And herein lies the difference between probability and certainty, faith and knowledge, that in all the parts of knowledge there is intuition; each immediate idea, each step, has its visible and certain connection; in belief not so. That which makes us believe is something external to us, a thing we believe, not something not evidently joined on both sides to, and so not manifestly showing the agreement or disagreement of, those ideas that are under consideration" (Essay on the Human Understanding, bk. iv, ch. xv; comp. Reid, Intell. Powers, essay vii, ch. iii). "The worse, the probable," says Mr. Stewart, "does not imply any deficiency in the proof, but only marks the particular nature of that proof, as contradistinguished from another species of evidence. It is opposed not to what is certain, but to what admits of being demonstrated after the manner of the mathematicians. This differs widely from the meaning annexed to the same word in popular discourse; according to which, whatever event is said to be probable is understood to be expected with some degree of doubt. 

But although, in philosophical language, the epi-
thesis is the only event that is supposed to evidence knowledge to be certain, it is also applied to events which are called probable by the vulgar. The philosophical meaning of the word, therefore, is more comprehensive than the popular; the former denoting that particular species of evidence of which contingent truths admit; the latter being confined to a small fraction of this evidence as fall short of the highest. These different degrees of probability the philosopher considers as a series, beginning with bare possibility, and terminating in that apprehended infinitality with which the phrase moral certainty is synonymous. To this last term of the series the word probable is, in its ordinary acceptance, plainly inapplicable" (Elements, pt. ii, ch. ii, § 4).

Archbishop Butler, in his treatment of the evidences of Christianity, has had frequent recourse to this theory of the probable, and in consequence has at times laid himself open to severe attacks from the deistical and infidel schools of philosophy. By dwelling exclusively upon the absence of direct contradiction, and sinking the appearance of confirmation, the learned author of the Analogy not unfrequently converts absolute ignorance into the likeness of some degree of positive knowledge. So Campbell, who borrowed from Butler, constructed most ingenious arguments on this paradox. Both these English thinkers seem to have had a confused notion that the improbability is an actual thing which still remains. Thus Campbell, Butler says, e. g., "The chances that a comet will not appear at a given instant in a given place are infinite. The presumption against the statement is therefore as strong as experience can afford; and yet when an astronomer announces the appearance of the comet you unhesitatingly believe him." The object in this statement is to prove that we must depend largely upon testimony built up from experience, and that therefore knowledge is built upon the probable. The result is, of course, a delusive appearance of independent scientific grounds for what is really a partly a priori doctrine. Like methods are now adopted in scientific circles, and what Hume and Condorcet once condemned the theologians for, the latter now have to contend with in the application of scientific querying to the positive in divine laws and institutions. See Usherweg, Hist. of Pithon. (Index in vol. ii); The (Lord) Quar. Rev., Jan., 1873, p. 81 sq.; London Academy, Nov. 15, 1873, p. 455, col. 1; Stephen, Religious Thought in England in the 18th Century, vol. i.

Probation, Ecclesiastical, in the Methodist Episcopal Church and other Methodist bodies, is the period, usually six months, for the candidate for Church membership to determine whether the organization is such as is likely to aid him in his Christian life, and for the Church to determine whether he is a proper person to be received.

VIII—20

Probation, Ministerial, signifies among some English dissenters the state of a student of a minister while supplying a vacant church, with a view, on their approval of his character and talents, to his taking the pastoral oversight of them.

Probation, Monastic, is the year of a novitiate, which a religious must pass in a convent to prove his virtue and vocation, and whether he can bear the severities of the life.

Probation, Moral, is a term used in Christian moralists to denote that state of man in which his character is formed and developed in action preparatory to judgment (q. v.). It is the state antecedent to a state of retribution (q. v.). "More strictly speaking, moral probation is that experimental trial which lays the foundation for approbation or disapprobation, praise or blame, reward or punishment. It involves obligations to obedience, exposure to temptations, commands and prohibitions; promises, on the one hand, to encourage to duty: threatenings, on the other, to deter from sin; and the cause of final retributions according to the character produced under these various means, and visibly proved by the course of action pursued by the individual. This is the state which is denominated moral probation; and in such a state is mankind under the law of God and the mediatorial reign of Christ; or, in the customary language of the New Test., under the kingdom of heaven (Matt. xiii, 10—52)." It is the principal or rather essential doctrine in the independent system of those Christian moralists who wish to prove metaphysically the truth of Christian ethics. It is the favorite basis of Butler in his Analysis. See Butler, Works, i, 109, 128 sqq., 862; Christian Rev. xvi, 541; Harlan, Ethics (see Index). The question whether there be a period of probation after death is more properly a part of the articles Future Punishment and Purgatory, Comp. the Meth. Quart. Rev. April, 1876, p. 355 sq., 857 sq.

Probation is, in the Church of Scotland, a student in divinity, who, bringing a certificate from a professor in a university of his good morals, and his having performed his exercises to approbation, is admitted to undergo several trials before the presbytery, and upon his acquitting himself properly in these, receives a license to preach. See also PROBATION.

Probity: honesty, sincerity, or veracity. It consists in the habit of actions useful to society, and in the constant observance of the laws which justice and conscience impose upon us. The man who obeys all the laws of society with an exact punctuality is not, therefore, a man of probity; for laws can only fix external and definite parts of human conduct; but probity respects our more private actions, and such as it is impossible in all cases to define; and it appears to be in morals what charity is in religion. Probity teaches us to perform in society those actions which no external power can oblige us to perform, and is that quality in the human mind from which we claim the performance of the rights commonly called imperfect.

Probat. See SPRING.

Probos, a Christian martyr under Diocletian and Maximian, in the beginning of the 4th century, was born at Sida, in Pamphylia. He was repeatedly called up before Maximus, the governor of Cilicia, and commanded to sacrifice to the heathen deities. But he invariably refused, and his conduct was marked by the strongest decision. He was on one occasion scourged, both on his back and belly, which only called forth from the inhuman tormentor the remark, "There, my boy, you suffer and lose blood, the more my soul will grow vigorous and be a gainer." After an ineffectual attempt to destroy him by means of wild beasts, he was finally slain by a sword, rejoicing to suffer persecution for righteousness' sake. See Fox, Book of Martyrs, p. 48.

Probos Lector, an Irish monastic, flourishing in
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the Monastery of Slane, Ireland, A.D. 949. His original name was Ceannachair, but, like many Irish scholars and missionaries of that period, he Latinized it. He wrote the first Life of St. Patrick about 600 years after the saint's death. Place had previously written some vernacular lives of St. Patrick, and Muirchru had alluded to him in another work, but the first Life of St. Patrick was from the pen of Probus. He gives no authorities for his statements in this Life, and we know of none then extant that he could have given. He wrote in a dark period of the history of the Church of the Dark Age. He seems to have written from his own fancy, viewing the ecclesiastical affairs of the infant Church of Ireland in the 6th century through the medium of his own times. Bishop Lanigan, the Roman Catholic historian, admits that his facts cannot be distinguished from his fancies. He became a devotee and a high ritualist, and was esteemed in his day a very holy and learned man. When the pagan Danes set fire to the Monastery of Slane, he refused to be separated from the precious MSS. and relics in it, and rushed into the flames and perished with them. His Life of St. Patrick, and still more that of Jocelin, who wrote about 150 years after him, have ever since been the store-house from which the material of every Roman Catholic Life of the Irish saint has been drawn. Jocelin lived in an age of fiction in regard to Ireland, and seems to have written according to his fancy or to the supposed credulity of his readers. He asserted many things about St. Patrick which had never been heard of before and for which he gives no authority, and which intelligent Catholics now indignantly reject. Dr. Colgan, the Irish antiquarian, says that the false of the expulsion of the venomous serpents from Ireland was for the first time put forth by Jocelin. This and similar fabrications being thus boldly and dogmatically asserted in a dark age, and remaining for centuries uncontradicted, thousand and thousand minds received them as historical facts. Dr. Johnson says somewhere, "One may tell a bona-fide lie, and if he shall tell it over ten times, and no one shall contradict him, he will begin to believe it himself." This has been really true in regard to Ireland. Fables and monstrousies remaining thus uncontradicted have been credited by thousands, while others who could not receive them have foolishly and sceptically thrown aside well-attested truths and regarded nearly all Irish history as fabulous. Perhaps the real life and character of no one so long and so thoroughly incorporated in biography as little known as those of St. Patrick. See Moore, Hist. of Ireland; Usher, Religion of the Early Irish. (D. D.)

PROCACCINI, Camillo, an Italian painter who contributed to sacred art, was born in 1546. He received his first instruction in the school of his father, and afterwards visited Rome, where some biographers say that he studied the works of Michael Angelo and Raphael. Procaccini wrought uninterruptedy, and produced paintings at such a rate that his works, though they charm the eye by the simplicity and spirit which characterize them, are greatly deficient in the higher power of impressing the mind and moving the affections. His Deposition from the Cross, exhibited in Dresden, is one of his best works. He died in 1626.

PROCACCINI, Erocle, the elder, was the head of the celebrated family of artists of that name. He was born in 1520 at Bologna, where the greater number of his works still exist. He died about 1591. Authors are divided in opinion respecting his merit: Balthimucci and Il Gesù, its a painter of moderate talent, while Lontazzo esteems him to be a happy imitator of the coloring and grace of Correggio. His design is too minute and his coloring too languid, but he possessed far more taste than most of his contemporaries, and possesses free from mannerism, which eminently qualified him for an instructor of youth. Several eminent artists, among whom were Sannazachini, Sebastiani, Ber- toja, and his own three sons, were his disciples. - Eng. Cyclop. a. v. Those interested in his works may consult Spooner, Bioy. Hist. of the Fine Arts, vol. ii.

PROCACCINI, Giulio Cesare, the best artist of his family, was born in 1548. He renounced sculpture, in which he had made considerable progress, for painting, which he studied in the school of the Caravaggisti. If the works of Correggio were the principal object of his studies, and many judges are of opinion that no painter ever approached nearer to the style of that great artist. In some of his easel pictures and works of confined composition he has been mistaken for Correggio. A Nu- donnica of the Madonna Luigi de' Francioni has been engraved as the work of that master; and some paintings still more closely approximating to this style are in the palace of Savvitali at Rome and in that of Carrega at Genoa. Of his altar-pieces, that in the church of Santa Afera in Brescia is perhaps most like the style of Corre- reggio: it represents the Virgin and Child amid a smil- ing group of saints and angels, in which dignity seems as much sacrificed to grace as in the mutual smile of the Virgin and the Angel in the Nunziata at San Antonio of Milan. He is sometimes blamable for extravagance of attitude and perseverance of San Vincenzo Ferrer. But he is otherwise a picture full of beauties. Notwithstanding the number and extent of his works, his design is correct, his forms and draperies select, his invention varied, and the whole together has a certain grandeur and breadth which he was often required from the Caravaggisti derived from Correggio. He died in 1626. There are many of his works in Milan.

Procedure, Ecclesiastical, or the rules to be followed in the Church of Rome in disciplinary actions. They owe their regulation to Pope Innocent III. Previous to his time, it is true, the official indication had assumed a more definite form in the synodal jurisdiction of the archbishops; but he perfected them, and there are now in the Roman Church five kinds of penal procedures in use: the trial may be instituted in consequence of accusation, inquisition, denunciation, exception, and on account of notoriety. The first and last had existed at an earlier period. There was no need of a formal accusation in the case of notorious transgressions, and the bishop punished them in virtue of his office; of course, after the matter had been sufficiently proved and avowed. The proceedings were not a more formal kind when there was an accusation. Here the proceedings of the Roman law were taken for models. The inquisition or official examination took place when an ecclesiastic was accused of a transgression by a public and plausible rumor, which, acting, as it were, as accusat. To complete the official examination, the judge would, if he thought fit, exact the oath of purgation (purgo- rium ec- onomicum). The former custom of purgation by ordeal now came into disuse. If a plausible denunciation was made, an official examination must take place. If the fault was avowed, the penalty was only a much less severity. Cases of exception were those where a man who was on the point of appearing as a witness or accused, or a person who applied for ordination or for an ecclesiastical office, was stopped by an accusation, which, if proved, unfitted him for bearing witness or office. It is still allowed as occasion for canonical purgation. In these cases punishment was out of the question, and there could only follow an exclusion from the witness-stand, from the right to accuse, from the orders or the function in question. In those parts where the Church has not a superior, the judgment is not to conform to the laws and customs which regulate the penal procedure of the country. See Biener, Bilt. zur Gesch. des Inquisitions-processes (Leips. 1827); Hildbrand, Die Purgorium Econonimae und Cirulis (Munich, 1847); Walter, Kirchenrecht, § 802; Richter, Kirchenrecht, § 211.—Aebach, Kircheen-Lex. a. v.
PROCESS 611 PROCESIONAL CROSS

**PROCESS.** the formal act, instrument, bull, or edict of consecration (q. v.) in the Romish Church.

**Procession.** the Heb. term יָּרָאֵב, halitkh, rendered "going" in Ps. lxxviii, 25, means a religious procession, as described in the context, headed by the phylarchers, who preceded the sacred ark, while the instrumental musicians followed it, and a line of females with timbrels accompanied it on either side. On the general subject see the monographs in Volbeding, Index Fratrum Brev. p. 159. See Proc., p. 148.

**Procession of the Holy Ghost.** that doctrine regarding the Third Person of the Blessed Trinity which teaches that as the Son proceeds (or is born) from the Father, so the Holy Ghost proceeds (or emanates) from the Father and from the Son, but as from one principle. The subject has been fully discussed in its historical relations in the art. Filioque Controversy, and as a theological question in the art. Holy Ghost. But since the writing of those articles the subject has been revived and taken a new historical form — the formation of a new religious body from the ranks of the Romish Church, itself old Catholics (q. v.). At their second annual conference or synod held in Bonn, Germany, in 1875, preparations were made for a "Union Conference" of the Old Catholic, Oriental, and Anglican churches, and such a conference accordingly convened on Bonn on Aug. 12 of that year and lasted five days. Those interested in the schism and nationality of the Church of Rome shelled the attendants will do well to consult the Methodist Quart., Oct. 1875, p. 673-675.

In the last session of that conference a common formula was adopted respecting the doctrine of the Procession, which Westerns and Orientals (q. v.) almost immediately settled, and the controversy is still alive as we write, it is yet a very hopeful sign of an early union of different branches of the Church of Christ which have so little at variance and so much in common. The discussions regarding the subjects were long and animated, and for some time the Orientals held out against the adoption of § 3, but by their final adoption of it an enormous step towards complete understanding has been made. The following are the resolutions:

**PRELIMINARY RESOLUTIONS.**

1. We agree together in receiving the ecclesiastical symbols and the doctrinal decisions of the ancient undivided Church.

2. We agree together in acknowledging that the addition of the Filioque to the Creed did not take place in an ecclesiastically regular manner.

3. We acknowledge on all hands the representation of the doctrine of the Holy Ghost, as it is set forth by the Fathers of the undivided Church.

4. We receive every proposition and every method of expression in which in any way the acknowledgment of two principles or of μονας or of μίας in the Trinity may be contained.

**ON THE PROCESSION OF THE HOLY GHOST.**

5. We accept the teaching of St. John of Damascus respecting the Holy Ghost, as the same is expressed in the following paragraphs, in the sense of the teaching of the ancient undivided Church:

6. The Holy Ghost goes forth out of the Father (κατ' τον πατέρα) as the beginning (αρχή), the Cause (αίτων), the Source (φρύμα) of the Godhead (De recta Sententia, n. 1: Contra Marc. n. 4).

7. The Holy Ghost goes forth not out of the Son (κατ' τον Υιόν), because there is in the Godhead one beginning (αρχή), one Cause (καταλείπη), through which all that is in the Godhead is produced (De Fide orthodox. 1, 6; καὶ τό ὑπέρτων τῆς αὐτοτύχου καταλείπη του κυρίου τοῦ κτίσεως τῆς διανοίας τοῦ πατρὸς, κατ' τον πατέρα), and the same for the Son (κατ' τον Υιόν).

8. The Holy Ghost goes forth out of the Father through the Son (κατ' τον Υιόν) as the cause (καταλείπη) of the beginning (αρχή), by the Son (κατ' τον Υιόν), through which all that is in the Godhead and the Son is produced (De Fide orthodox. 1, 7: καὶ τό ὑπέρτων τῆς αὐτοτύχου καταλείπη του κυρίου τοῦ κτίσεως τῆς διανοίας τοῦ πατρὸς κατ' τον Υιόν), and also in both the Father and the Son (κατ' τον πατέρα κατ' τον Υιόν).

9. The Holy Ghost is the Image of the Father and the Image of the Son, going forth out of the Father and resting in the Son as the force beaming forth from Him (Idem. 1, 7: καὶ τό πατρίτων ὑπέρτων δυναμική καταλείπη καταλείπη καταλείπη τοῦ Υιοῦ, καὶ τό πατρίτων ὑπέρτων δυναμική καταλείπη τοῦ Υιοῦ, κατ' τον πατέρα κατ' τον Υιόν).

10. The Holy Ghost is the personal Production out of the Father, belonging to the Son, but not out of the Son, because he is in the Spirit of the Month of the Godhead, which speaks forth the Word (De Hymno Triung. 26: καὶ τό μονακάταλείπη τοῦ πατρὸς καταλείπη τοῦ Υιοῦ, κατ' τον πατέρα κατ' τον Υιόν).

11. The Holy Ghost forms the mediation between the Father and the Son, and is bound together to the Father through the Son (De Fide orthodox. 1, 9: καὶ τό μονακάταλείπη τοῦ πατρὸς καταλείπη τοῦ Υιοῦ, κατ' τον πατέρα κατ' τον Υιόν).

N. B.—It is to be noted here that the German preposition κατ' (out of) is used rather for origin or source, whereas the word ἀπό (from) is equivalent to out of or off; while διά (through) denotes dia or per, through the instrumentality of it.

Since that conference the Filioque question has been much agitated in England, and it has been asserted, by High-Churchmen especially, that the exclusion of the Filioque from the Creed was created by Dr. Dillingham and Canon Liddon. What was the doctrine as it had to be stated as a follows: It declared, as Bishop Pearson had already admitted, that the Filioque was inserted in an ocumenical creed by an inadequate authority, and therefore irregularly. It formulated certain propositions which might serve to separate the Westerns from the Latins accept the and the Easterns reject the Filioque; they do not differ, as has been generally supposed; since the Latins reject any assertion of two principles or causes in the Godhead, and the Easterns admit a μεταρρία of the Son, in the eternal procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father. Whatever may have been the hopes and fears of individual members of the conference, no proposition was brought forward respecting the exclusion of the Filioque from the Creed of the Western Church. See Schaff, Creeds (Index in vol. iii.); Forbes, Niesse Creed, Eccl. Eastern Church, 1885-1886; Stanley, Eastern Church: Haag, Hist. des Dogmatis (Index in vol. ii.); Martensen, Dogmatik (see Index); Meth. Quart. Jan. and April, 1876; N. y. Eng., July, 1870. See also Fusey's Letter to Liddon On the Clause "And the Son" (Lond. 1876, 8vo).

**Processional.** (Lat. processionale), the service-book which contains the prayers, hymns, and general ceremonial of the different processions. Many ancient books of this class have been preserved. The processional approved for common use is that of Rome, of which many editions have been published.

**Processional Cross, or Cross of the Station** (cruz gestatoria, or stationary), is the cross carried in the ecclesiastical processions spoken of under Processions. It was carried as early as the 4th century and in the 5th century both in the East and in the West. It is mentioned by Socrates, Nicophorus, Cassiodorus, in the Life of St. Porphyry by Durand, and by Baronius under the year 401, and in the Consules of Cleveshoe in 747, when regulating the rotagions. A cross made of ash, silver-plated, engraved or enamelled, without a crucifix, was at an early date, after the introduction of the custom of the churches of Constantinople, carried in processions by the stauroporphors. The evangelistic symbols were usually set at the ends of the arms, which terminated in fleurs-de-lys. In the 4th century it had short handles, and candles were attached to the arms.

Heremus gave authorization to the church of Constantinople at Rome. In the 12th century at Rome a subdeacon (regiornarius) carried down the cross, inclined so that the faithful might kiss it, from the altar to the porch, where he held it upright in his hands during the processions. In England, at Durham, the chief cross was of gold, turned to a silver staff, and the cross used on ordinary days was of crystal. A novice followed it, carrying a benitier. A cross of the 15th century is still preserved in St. John's Lateran; another, of the time of St. Louis, is at St. Denis; a
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third, of silver and beautiful designs, with statuary and
eclesiastics symbols, at Conques; and another at
Burgos. In England, no doubt, many were destroyed
during the War of the Roses and at the Reformation.
At Chichester the abbey for the cross remains.
In England, from Easter to Ascension, the cross was of
crystal or beryl, but in Lent of wood, painted blood-red.
No parish could carry its cross into a monastic church;
and in funerals, in a collegiate church, the cross of the
latter only is set before the bier.

We append an illus-
tration of the cross now usually carried by Romanists
in their processions.

Processional Path (spatium vel via processio-
num ad retro altaria; latus pone chorum; Fr. partour de
chair, i. e. behind a chair). The transverse aisle in
square-ended churches is commonly doubled, as at
Lichfield, or even tripled, as at Winchester and at St.
Mary Overgate, in order to provide room for chapels as
well as a passage for processions. At Hereford this
aisle resembles a low transept. The eastern screens at
Fountains, the Lady chapel of Hexham, and the Nine
Altars of Durham seem to have been further develop-
ments of the same idea, which appears also in the longi-
tudinal new walk of Peterborough. At Canterbury,
pilgrims to the martyrium passed up the south aisle of
the nave, and through the passage under the platform
of the crossing.

Processions. These, as solemn and religious rites,
are of very great antiquity, but evidently of pagan or-
igin. With the Greeks and Romans, they took place
chiefly on the festivals of Diana, Bacchus, Ceres, and
other deities; also before the beginning of the games in
the Circus; and in spring, when the fields were sprinkled
with holy water to increase their fertility. The priests
used to head them, carrying images of the gods and
goddesses to be propitiated, and either started from cer-
tain temples or from the Capitol. The Romans, when
the empire was disturbed, or after some victory, used
constantly to order processions, for several days togeth-
er, to be made to the temples, to beg the assistance of
the gods or to return them thanks. Among the Jews,
processions were introduced for public prayers when the
faithful people went in order to implore the divine help
(Josh. vi, 15; 2 Sam. vi, 16; Ezra ii, 12-30; 1 Kings
viii, 45; Numb. x, 33-80), with a form at setting out
and when halting; or when rendering thanks to God (2
Chron. xx, 21, 27, 28; Matt. xxvi, 9). Certain pro-
cessions around the altar were (and still are to a certain
extent) usual on the Feast of Tabernacles; and from
them the Mohammedans have adopted their mode of
encompassing the sanctuary seven times at Mecca
(q. v.). From this the Musulmans form a prominent part of the Bud-
dhist worship. See Procession.

In the Christian Church the practice was early in-
trduced and has maintained itself to this day among
the Romanists. In the earliest ecclesiastical phraseol-
ogy the word processio denotes merely the act of fre-
quencing a religious assembly, and taking part in public
worship. It is distinguished from private offices of de-
votion, and includes the idea of social worship, but
without any additional idea of public ceremony, pomp,
or the like. Procedure then meant to go to church, and, a,
in short, synonymous with sagrare interesse, sacrum
frequentare. This was the meaning given to the word by
Tertullian (Ad Lzcor. lib. ii, c. 4) and Jerome (Com-
ment. in Ep. 1 ad Cor. c. 11). In many canons and
other ecclesiastical writings we also find the word pro-
cessione, and still more frequently processio, to
mean the act of going to church, and also the sense of a
religious assembly (conventus et concilia populi in ecclesia).
The Greek word εἰσαίζος (as well as εὐ-
αγγελία, σωληνος, conf. Suicer Thesaur.) is translated
sometimes by collecta, sometimes by conventus, and
sometimes προς εἰσαγωγήν. When Christian worship be-
gan to be conducted openly, and churches were publicly
frequented, the meaning of the word processio was ex-
actly equivalent to our term church-going. After the
4th century, especially in later medieval times, the
word was applied to processions usual at funerals, mar-
rriages, baptisms, as well as to the line of communicants
at the Lord's Supper. Processions at festivals and on
other occasions were, in course of time, quite common.
Laws to protect such processions from interruption were
passed, and any persons found guilty of disturbing them
were subject to severe punishment. The first process-
ions mentioned in ecclesiastical history are those set on
foot at Constantinople, in the time of Chrysostom.
The Arians of that city being forced to hold their meetings
without the town, went thither night and morning,
singing anthems. Chrysostom, to prevent their per-
vert the Catholics, adopted counter-processions in
which the clergy and people marched by night, singing
hymns, and carrying crosses and torches. From this
period the custom of processions was introduced both
into the Eastern and Western churches (Chrysost. Or.
Sour. lib. 1, of the Virgin Mary, Ep. 297, al. 62; 40 ad Theodos. n. 14; Augustine, De Civ. Del. i, 22, c. 8;
Rufin. Hist. Ecclec. i, 2, c. 38). Even during the per-
cessions of the emperors there were at least some funeral
Various ceremonies were observed, according to the
objects for which these processions were instituted, the
spirit of the times in which they were celebrated, and
the countries wherein they took place. The clergy
usually attended: if the occasion was one of joy or
thanksgiving, they were attired in the most splendid
vestments. The clergy put on their best attire, and
were adorned with girdles and other ornaments; and
the sound of bells and music was heard through the
whole line. On occasions of mourning or penitence, the
procession was distinguished by plain vestments, bare
feet, deep silence, or sounds of lamentation and prayers,
and sometimes by the exercise of flagellation. Men
and women walked apart; and the line of procession
was ranged with reference to the various ranks and
classes of the persons who composed it. Lighted wax
and tapers were often carried in procession, especially on
the festival of the Purification of the Virgin Mary, which
was hence called festum or missus contemplation (see Ca-
dlemas). Litanies composed for the occasion were
sung in Latin as the procession moved. The peniten-
tial psalms and the psalms of degrees were employed on
the occasion, as well as many Latin hymns.
These processions have always been more common in the Western than in the Eastern Church. The Reformation greatly lessened them even in the Roman Catholic Church. In modern times, processions are less frequent or popular nowadays. They are there either supplicatory processions or cross processions, and are either directed to a certain distant place, to some miraculous image or object, or they are confined to the streets of the cities and the churches. Banners, crosses, and lilies are generally carried in front; the clergy follow; and the people make up the rear, singing hymns or reciting prayers. In some Protestant states they are still permitted, under certain restrictions. The Protestants themselves rarely practice them, excepting the Methodists, who, under the direction of their leaders, carry the crosses, walking immediately before the leader, incense the venerable uninterruptedly with their censers; in this case, also, a baldachin is generally extended over the leader, and borne by four, six, or eight laymen of distinction. It seldom happens that the leader of a non-theophoric procession walks beneath the baldachin: it is then a personal honor, only bestowed on bishops on extraordinary occasions, as on their solemn entrance into a church. In countries where the custom has hitherto existed, it is allowed to spread the baldachin only over the most exalted participants or the sacraments of Christ's passion. The faithful who participate in the procession walk two by two. This may find an analogy in Christ's sending out his disciples two by two to preach the Gospel. Gregory the Great (Hom. 17 in Evang.) declares this to be a symbol of the two loaves, walking immediately before the leader, incense the venerable uninterruptedly with their censers; in this case, also, a baldachin is generally extended over the leader, and borne by four, six, or eight laymen of distinction. It seldom happens that the leader of a non-theophoric procession walks beneath the baldachin: it is then a personal honor, only bestowed on bishops on extraordinary occasions, as on their solemn entrance into a church. In countries where the custom has hitherto existed, it is allowed to spread the baldachin only over the most exalted participants or the sacraments of Christ's passion. The faithful who participate in the procession walk two by two. This may find an analogy in Christ's sending out his disciples two by two to preach the Gospel. Gregory the Great (Hom. 17 in Evang.) declares this to be a symbol of the two loaves, walking immediately before the leader, incense the venerable uninterruptedly with their censers; in this case, also, a baldachin is generally extended over the leader, and borne by four, six, or eight laymen of distinction. It seldom happens that the leader of a non-theophoric procession walks beneath the baldachin: it is then a personal honor, only bestowed on bishops on extraordinary occasions, as on their solemn entrance into a church. In countries where the custom has hitherto existed, it is allowed to spread the baldachin only over the most exalted participants or the sacraments of Christ's passion. The faithf
two acolytes—one to his right, the other to his left—each with a lighted taper in his hand. The carrying of the images, statues, etc., is committed to the care of the brotherhoods, associations, and partly to the young men and girls of the community; the relics are carried by the clergy and those in honor of the relics, by the leader of the procession. The principal crucifix (see PROCESIONAL CROSS) is generally carried (if possible) by a subdeacon; subdeacons also carry the crucifixes before the chapters, the archbishops, and the pope. The crosses are carried before the pope and archbishops in such a way that the image of the crucified one is turned towards those dignitaries. The principal crucifix opens the procession, unless a flag has been preferred, in which case the crucifix follows at some distance. Brotherhoods and corporations are in the habit of having flags carried before them. The most important of these customs are very old. Sozomen (Hist. Eccl. i, 8, c. 8) and the biographer of St. Cesarius of Arles (Sur. 27 Aug.) knew already of the carrying of crosses or crucifixes (during many centuries naked crosses were alone in use) and of lighted tapers. In former times the bishop of the Greek Church was sometimes carried along with the cross (Vit. S. Porphyr. Ep. Surv. 26 Feb.). Flags, which, it must be observed, are not prescribed, but only allowed, are mentioned by Gregory of Tours (Hist. Franc. i, 4, c. 4). Gregory the Great orients the city of Rome to be carried about as early as 590 (Baron. Annal. ad. 590). In the 4th century, we find processions held for the purpose of transferring relics solemnly to the churches (Socrat. Hist. Eccl. i, 8, c. 16; Augustine, Confes., i, 9, c. 7). The Synod of Braga in 572 (ibid. c. 6) calls this a solemn custom (see Conc. Clovis, a. 747, c. 16). The faithful walk (ibid. c. 6) quietly and devoutly. Idle talk, forward looking around, laughing, showy suits, luxury of dress, etc., shock the pious mind. The men walk bareheaded; the clergy and magistrates alone are, with some restrictions, allowed to wear their head-dresses. The clergy wear the chasuble; only on most sacred occasions, as at the procession of the Corporal Christi, we find the custom that at least some of the subdeacons wear the tunics, some of the deacons the dalmatics, several priests the planets, and the eclecticians of higher rank the pluvial. The subdeacons who carry the crosses wear the tunics, besides the amictus, alba, and cinctum. For the laymen there are no longer any rules in this respect. Sozomen (Hist. Eccl. i, 5, c. 8) speaks of all the faithful bearing burning tapers; we hear of them in other places appearing barefooted with the ark and the satchel (Cassian, h. 33); Charlemagne himself, according to the narrative of a monk of St. Gall, set the example of walking barefooted in procession at Ratisbon (Mart. De Anti. Eccles. Rit. i, 4, c. 27, a. 7); but these are things of the past. The purport of the prayers is in accordance with the purpose of the procession. Yet the Church has given some rules. At theophoric processions, especially that of the Corporal Christi, the hymns in honor of the Eucharist must be sung in preference (Pange lingua, Sacris solemnis, Venite, superum prodeunt; special songs are also prescribed for the procession at Candlesmas and on Palm-Sunday; for the litanies of St. Mark's Day and of the Week of Prayer, the litany of All-saints' and the versicles and orations which follow it in the breviary are prescribed. At the funeral procession of full-grown persons, prayers of intercession; at the funerals of children, thanksgiving prayers are in use.

As extraordinary processions are generally undertaken for a purpose that must be submitted to God in special prayers, regulations have been made for these cases. In the Roman ritual mention is expressly made of the procession ad petendum pluviam, the procession ad postumum sementium, the procession in time of famine, in time of epidemic and plague, in time of war, in any other great distress, the thanksgiving procession, and, finally, that for the translation of relics. Originally the people sang psalms on such occasions (Jerome, Ep. 188, al. 27; Gregory, Nasianz. Or. 10; Vit. S. Porphyri. Ep. Surv. 26 Feb.); only when the purpose of the procession was to obtain some favor from God, it was an early custom to exclaim quite frequently, "Kyrie eleison," or recite other prayers of penitence (Chrysost. Ortat. cour.) or to sing the psalm 'Pro permute' (Greg. Th. 4, c. 4). The Roman ritual has hitherto been little by little composed. The common Roman Ordo says: "Omnis in commune 'Kyrie eleison' decantant, et cum cantionibus cordis Dei misericordiam exorant pro peccatis, pro pace, pro peste, pro conservatione frugum et pro ceteris necessitatibus." Mattheson, in his Orgellum (ed. Grégoire) says that a Roman ritual according to which a hundred "Kyrie eleison," a hundred "Christe eleison," and again a hundred "Kyrie eleison" were to be said kneeling, in such a propitiatory procession. As the psalms ceased little by little to be known by heart, rosary-praying, which has become so general use in our day, took their place. The procession comes out of a place of worship, and, its walk performed, returns to it. If (as at funerals) not all the participants, the clergy, at least, with the chanters and the bearer of the principal cross, always return. Even if a bishop or pope it is sometimes the case that to return to the city is customary for the clergy to start from the church and return thither with that high personage. The procession on Candlesmas-day and Palm-Sunday starts at the call of the leader, "Procedamus in pace," and the chanters begin to sing the hymn Sineolia Marci, which is a part of that litany. In processions (which is often the case in rural communities) the litany of All-saints' is not recited in Latin, the procession commences thus: the ecclesiastical leader kneels on the lowest step of the high-altar, begins to say the rosary, and the procession is led to the church, and there, or thither gives the signal for starting. The litany procession stops frequently at one, or two, or even more places of worship. The clergy (or at least the superiors) of the church where it stops receive it in chasuble and stole, with two acolytes, at the gate of the churchyard, or at the portal of the church, and offer holy water to the clerks and distinguished laymen of the procession. In such places of worship it is customary to sing an antiphony, and a vernicle and oration in honor of the patron of the church; sometimes a high-mass, with or without solemn oratory (Ch. 816). The procession is extremely like at such occasions to sing three times the song of triumph and the little doxology. This stopping, which, especially in Milan, is so extensively in use during the rogations celebrated there in the week that follows Ascension that the procession stops on the first day at twelve, on the second at nine, and on the third at eleven churches (comp. Malibii, Lit. Gallic, p. 159), is a custom of great antiquity. The Gallican liturgy mentions it as a well-known matter (Missale Goticum; Missale Gallic. Vet.; Cod. 806). Gregory of Tours speaks of it as an established custom (Hist. Franc. i, 10, c. 1). The abobed procession of Gregory the Great started from seven churches and stopped at the Church of Our Lady (Greg. Tur. Hist. Franc. i, 10, c. 1). The reception by the clergy of the church where the procession stops is also a very old custom (Leo III in Lib. Prov. i; it was called "Occurrere." As processions in such cases, especially in the country, have often to walk an hour or more before they reach another place of worship, the Church has found it necessary, from time to time, to warn the faithful not to make of these intervals an occasion for leisurings and tippling (Rit. Rom.; comp. Conc. Clovis, a. 747, c. 16). When the procession walks inside of the places of worship, or in their immediate neighborhood, the bells of the steeple are rung. This reminds one of the procession which followed the body of St. Anastasius, and at which a noise was produced by
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striking on consecrated woods (Conc. Nim. a. 787, act. 4). Processions of less importance move only inside the walls of the house of worship. Such is the case with all processions in countries where the Catholic religion is still not firmly established. Some are more formal than others. According to the rules, processions should precede the high-mass, but this is practically the case with very few (comp. the Rit. Rom., the Crem. ep. , and the Rubri. cistas).—Aschbach, Kirchen-Lex. a. v.

The origin of processions may have been an imitation of the motion of the heavenly spheres, the courses of the stars, and the revolutions of seasons, and more immediately of ancient religious dances. They were always accompanied by singers, and generally by musicians. Procession is progression, says Durand, when a multitude, headed by the clergy, goes forth in regular order and ranks to implore the divine grace. It represents the pilgrimage of man upon earth on his way to the better land, from the cradle to the grave, as St. Paul says that we are pilgrims and sojourners in this world. Processions found cloisters and cemeteries still more vividly brought before the mind the thought of the last home to which man must come at length, as waters, after the most devious course, are lost in the great sea. In a procession to the altar, in reverse order to that of the procession itself, the cross-bearer, attended on either side by acolytes, carries candles and lighted tapers; then came the censers, or thurifers, the chanters in cope and carrying batons, the subdeacon, deacon, and celebrant; then choir boys, clerks of the second grade, and the more honorable following. In the cathedral the presentor, the sub-chancellor of canons (preambule), and the succesor of vicars (sous-chanteur), each with his chanter's baton, preceded the bishop, carrying his cross, or staff. In the middle of the 15th century the capitular tenants went in procession on St. Peter's Eve at Exeter, preceded by the choristers carrying painted shields of arms.

In England processions were made with litanies and prayers, (1) for the prosperity of the king; (2) for the wealth of the realm; (3) for purity of the air; (4) for the increase of the fruits of the earth. Two processions for the good success of a king were made on Sundays about the church and churchyard, by English canons, in 1339 and 1398. On Ash-Wednesday, after confession in church, there was a solemn procession for ejecting the penitents, who were not readmitted until Maundy-Thursday. The Easter-day was a great procession in memory of the disciples going to meet our Lord in Galilee, and in imitation of it there was a humbler procession on every Sunday. The other great procession was annual, on Palm-Sunday. Bishops were also met with processions of the chapter and vicars, or a convent, at the west door of the church and the cemetery gate, by decree of Honorius III, 1221. In 1471 all curates of the diocese were required to visit the high-altar of Lincoln Cathedral in procession, and make their offerings. In the nave the great processions were arranged. At Canterbury two parallel lines, and at Furness, Lincoln, Chichester, and York two rows of circular processional stones were arranged at proper intervals, and specifically allotted. At Exeter the antiphon was sung daily at the screen, and the procession passed through the north gate of the choir to the vestibule of the Lady Chapel, and then by the south gate of the choir near the throne to the high-altar. It afterwards traversed the nave and cloisters, concluding before the rood-left; and if there was no sermon, the procession returned to the altar. Carpets were strewn all along the way on great feast days. Henry VIII. decreed that he should be buried at Winchester, where the monks stood in procession on Sundays and holydays. These monks, being aggrieved by a bishop, on one occasion went round their cloisters from west to east, out of their usual manner, in order to show that the church of Chichester at Ephesus an image of the Spirit was carried round the church by the dean or senior canon and two vicars.

On WhitMonday the parishioners in the diocese often came to blows about right of precedence, so that bishop Storey made injunctions (1478) for order on this occasion, when the shrine of St. Richard was visited annually. Crosses and long painted rods with which the attending parties had hitherto belabored each other were proscribed, as well as laughing, crowding, and noise. The pilgrims entered by the great south porch and assembled in the choir at 10 A.M. and left the building by it, having duly visited the "chancel and church." In 1584 the primatic conference such dangerous contentions throughout England. As late as 1651 the city companies of London went in procession—the Fishmongers' to St. Michael's, Cornhill, with three crosses, a hundred priests, and the parishioners and members of the guild carrying white rods; and the parish of St. Clement Danes displayed eighty banners and streamers, and was preceded by the city waits. On Easter-Monday at Kinnenal and Wellington the parishioners, adult and children, joined hand-in-hand, surrounded the church and touched it with a general simultaneous embrace, called "clipping the church." They afterwards attended divine service. The procession at Wolverhampton on Monday and Tuesday in Rogation week, in which the children bore poles dressed with flowers and the clergy chanted the "Offertory," only ceased in 1765. At Easter of the Gospel trees or holy oaks where the stations were formed still remain.—Walcott, Sacred Archdeacon a. v. See Middleton, Letters from Rome; Willet, Synops. Pop.; Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon, viii, 603-609; Hartung, Dict. des Antiquités Chré, a. v.; Siegel, Christl. Alterthümer; Riddle, Christian Antiquities p. 757, 758, 771-774, 883; Barnum, Romanism, p. 468.

Prochazka, Francis Faustine, a Bohemian monastic, noted as a writer, was born at Neupaka, Bohemia, Jan. 13, 1749. He studied with the Jesuits of Gieschin and at the University of Prague. In 1767 he entered the Order of Barnabites, where he had for his master the celebrated Durich, who taught him Hebrew and encouraged him in his predilections for the Slavonic literature. When the Barnabites were suppressed in Bohemia (1788), he became successively theological censor, professor and director of the Gymnasia at Prague and library of the university of that city. He published the New Testament in Bohemian with commentaries, an edition of the Bible in that dialect, a reprint of the Chronique de Buzulau:—Commentarius de Securiarum Arieum Liberalium in Moravia Prazi (1784);—Dictionnaire des Littérature (1784, 4vo). This religious man also assisted on the Barnabite Bible, and at the moment of his death was occupied on the valuable Bibliotheca Latina of Durlich. Prochazka died at Prague in 1803.—Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Générale, a. v.

Prochet, Mathieu, a noted modern Italian Protestant theologian, was born in Piedmont in 1806. He was afforded by his Waldensian parents all the educational and religious advantages that might properly fit him for Church service, but on the outbreak of the Franco-Italian-Austrian war in 1859 he took up arms for his country's freedom and greatly distinguished himself by his bravery. In the career of battle he continued his theological studies, and in 1862 was ordained minister in the Church of the Vaudois. He soon rose to positions of distinction, and was repeatedly honored by his ecclesiastical associates in missions to the sister churches of the Continent and of England. He was received to be finally at Geneva in 1873, the second of the Waldensian missions in Italy, and in 1873 was sent to represent his Church in the Evangelical World Alliance at New York. While in this country he spoke frequently and greatly impressed that distinguished body by his piety, simplicity of life, and decision as pastor in Geneva and also professor of theology. On his return voyage from this country he was accompanied
by the much-lamented Carasco, the Spanish convert to Protestantism, who was one of his most intimate friends, and with whom he had planned several important polemical treatises against Romanism and her relations to the State. Proclus has a fine, commanding presence, imposing, but not a figure, broadbased, with a quickness in movement and speech, like much of the best of the South: keen in perception, and accurate in his scholarship. His influence is great not only in Italian Protestantism, but in evangelical Christianity. See Report of the Alliance. (1893), (3d. H. W.)

Procris (Πρόκρις), one of the seven deacons, bearing the third on the list, and named next after Stephen and Philip (Acts vi, 5), A.D. 30. No further mention of him is made in the N. T. There is a tradition that he was consecrated by St. Peter bishop of Comedia (Baron. i, 292). In the Magna Bibliotheca Patrum (Colon. Agrippa, 1618, i, 49-60) will be found a fabulous "Historia Prochori, Christi Discipuli, de Vita B. Joannis Apostoli."

Proclamation (προνάσχω, προφέρω, etc., or some form of προορίζω, as in 1 Kings xv, 22; Jer. i, 29), the edict of any governing power, published in a solemn manner. The laws of Moses, as well as the temporary edicts of Joshua, were communicated to the people by means of the scribes, in the Greek language; but the laws of those who subsequently held the office of kings were proclaimed publicly by criers (Jer. xxxiv, 8, 9; Jonah iii, 5-7), a class of persons mentioned by Daniel (iii, 4; v, 29), under the word προφέρω, kerōzé, which our translators have rendered "herald." (q. v.).

Proclamations, Royal. These documents in former times were almost equal in authority to an act of the constitutional legislature. They were often interfered with religion, and dealt largely in reformation of manners. In 1529 King Henry VII issued a proclamation "for resisting and withstanding of most damnable heresies sown within the realm by the disciples of Luther and other hereticks, preverter of Christes reseygyn." In June, 1530, this was followed by the proclamation "for damning or condemning" of erroneous bokes and heresies, and prohibiting the having of holy scripture translated into the vulgar tongues of English, French, or Dutch. "And that having respect to the malignity of this present tyrne, with the inclination of many people to erroneous opinions, the translation of the newe testament and the old into the vulgar tonge of englyshe, shulde rather be the occasion of contynuance or increase of erres in the said people, then any clementy or commodite to the welthe of their soules." It was therefore determined that the Scriptures should only be expounded to the people as heretoffore, and that these books "be clere exterminate and exiled out of this realm of Englynde for ever." Under Edward VI there is a proclamation against such "as innovate any ceremony," and who are described as "certaine private preachers and other lasmen, who rashely attempt of their own and singular wit and mind, not only to persuade the people from the old and accustomed rites and ceremonys, but also themselves liying in newe and strange orders according to their phantasias. The which, as it is an evident token of pride and arrogancy, so it tendeth both to confusion and disorder." There is a proclamation also to abstrain from flesh on Fridays and Saturdays; enforced on the principle, not only that "men should abstain on those days and forebear the pleasures and the meats which they have more delight, to the intent to sublue their bodies to the soul and spirit, but also for worldly policy."

Charles II issued a proclamation against "vicious, debauched, and profane persons!" i. e. "a sort of men of witchcraft—that is those that spend their time in taverns, tippling-houses, and debauchery; giving no other evidence of their affection to us but in drinking our health, and inveighing against all others who are not of their own dissolute temper; and who, in truth, have more discredited our cause, by the license of their manners and lives, than they could ever advance it by their action or by their reason."

It is clear that the introduction of all persons of honor, or in place and authority, will so far assist us in discomfitting such men, that their discretion and shame will persuade them to reform what their conscience would not; and that the displeasure of good men towards them may supply what the laws have not, and, it may be, cannot well provide against; there being by the license and corruption of the times, and the depraved nature of man, many enormities, scandals, and impieties in practice and manners, which laws cannot well describe, and consequently not enough provide against, which may, by the example and severity of virtuous men, be easily discomfited, and by degrees suppressed." Some parties in Scotland who had no objection to national fasts, or even to the royal recommendation of them, yet objected to royal command and dictation as wrote in the usual form, they being charged to keep the fast "as they tender the favor of Almighty God, and would avoid his wrath and indignation." According to counsel learned in the law, obedience to such mandate is not imperative, for it is affirmed—"1. That in England, where by statute the sovereign is head of the Church, as well as of the State, as well as of the State, that jurisdiction applies only to the clergy and members of the National Church, and does not include those who are not of her communion. 2. That in Scotland—where seceding or dissenting churches (except it be the nonjurors) stand not upon any statute of toleration, but upon the free basis and constitution of the country—no such relation exists, but is excluded by the act of 1690 (c. 5), ratifying the Confession of Faith; whereby an antagonistic principle is established, it being declared that there is nowhere the Church, but there lies the Lord Jesus Christ; and that he, 'as King and Head of the Church, hath therein appointed a government in the hands of church-officers distinct from the civil magistrate, who 'may not assume to himself the administration of the Word and sacrament, or the keys of the kingdom of heaven.' " A. In point of fact, proclamations for the observance of national fasts and thanksgivings in Scotland were, for a considerable period after the date of that act, and until the union between England and Scotland, passed by the three estates of the Church of Scotland, as being the privilege of the foreign alone. And, 4. That no statute can be found authorizing such proclamations in Scotland: and the phraseology used in them seems to have grown out of the practice in England, or to be founded on what appears to be an unwarranted extension of the two statutes cited in the 1690 act. The Union of June, 1690, was exclusive to prayers for royal personages, and apply at most to ministers and preachers of two denominations."

Proclanities (or Proclanists) is the name of the followers of Proclus (q. v.). They were extreme Montanists (q. v.), and were spread more especially in Phrygia, Asia Minor. In the close of the 3rd century they formed a most dangerous sect, and greatly disturbed the peace of the churches.

Proclus, styled Διαδίκας, i. e. the Successor, because he replaced Syrusius (q. v.) as the head of that Athenian school of philosophers who were Neo-Platonists, has been called "the Scholastic among the Greek philosophers." Indeed, according to M. Cousin, Proclus is the Greek Philosopher who best reflects in his work the spirit of all the schools; in whom, says the learned Frenchman, "are combined, and from whom shine forth, in no irregular or uncertain rays, Orpheus, Pythagoras, Plato, Aristotle, Zeno, Plotinus, Porphyry, and Jamblichus," and who "would be sufficiently ashamed of his own mind, and paid them such equal reverence, that he was, as it were, the priest of the whole universe." This is
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a compliment, but a compliment ill warranted and belo-
towed only because M. Cousin perceived in this Neo-
Platonist more of kinship with that extravagant class of
philosophers than he himself is one, whose method consists in putting forth strings of brilliant pro-
positions, careless about either their consistency or co-
herence. Indeed, Cousin's adoration for Proclus shows,
if we may use the words of one of their own class, "what things men will worship in their extreme need!"
(theta 768, 210).

With the beginning of Christianity in its aggressive
movements, the heathen world saw itself faced with
immediate danger of a proscription that could only end
in death. Philo the Jew, anxious to revive the power of
the Old Testament, and the ancients, who saw in the
pagan world a danger to their own existence, the
example in the Son of the Carpenter of Nazareth
and the fishermen of Galilee had reared. What Philo
failed to accomplish, Ammonius Saccas, also of Alex-
andria (near the beginning of the 3rd century), and
aided by Plotinus his pupil, attempted to effect. See Plot-
inus. But both master and pupil left their work ere it
was fairly begun, and though Porphyry (q. v.) zeal-
ously applied himself to bring out the mystical ration-
ality and the religious philosophy of his teachers, of
which these teachings were set forth failed to show even a marked
progress in the work so long attempted, and it remained
for Jamblichus (q. v.) in the 4th and Proclus in the 5th
century to give any appearance whatsoever to the edi-
fications of Neoplatonism, which had been so long in construc-
tion, destining. If we wish to see Neoplatonism in its incipience,
we must go to Philo the Jew. But if we wish to see it in
its ripest growth, we must study it in the writings of
Proclus the Athenian. The Neo-Platonism he presents
us with no longer the outgrowth of Judaism intermixed
with Hellenism, but as an independent philosophy, illumi-
nated by the spirit and light of the Gospel of Christ—whether
with which it was struggling for the empire of the
world (see Ulmann, Der Einfluss des Christentums, in
Studien u. Kritiken, 1832, No. 2).

The bewildering conflict of philosophical theories
which these five centuries had been fostering, had re-
sulted in the growth of scepticism, and left no resting-
place for minds of a religious turn. The Neo-Platoni-
s of the 4th and 5th centuries must naturally have
known their refuge in mysticism, where feeling and intuition
superseded reason. And it was the intolerance of the intellec-
Plotinus was the first to take this refuge. So did it
from this time forth all the successors of the Platoni-
s, of whom Gibbon soeursingly says that "Plato would have
been the teacher of both philosophy and religion, though they claimed to be philosophers. They
played upon the superstitious tendencies of their age
rather than upon the intellectual strength that still
remained. They sought to persuade by the aid of
magic rather than by the clear force of logic. They turned
prophets and seers. Though they took part in the
higher discussions and conclusions of philosophy, they
nevertheless stood opposed to all philosophy, since they
did not even profess to rest upon careful inquiries into
external laws of the Spirit, but claimed to have a reve-
lation from God. Thus exalted above all such investi-
gations, Neo-Platonism became the poetry as well as
the religion of philosophy. It was attached more espe-
cially to the system of Plato, and was professed to be
an explanation and a development of his views, but it
was aimed to bring together the fundamental principles
of all philosophical schools, and the ideas which consti-
tute the basis of all popular religions. It was the work of
man, and, however ambitious the scheme, it failed
absolutely in its mission. Superstition was the centre
and support; magic and sorcery the basis and top-stone of
together, the fundamental principles of all philosophical
and religious faith. And yet it was neither the one
nor the other. "The divinity which it presents is exalted
above all human apprehension, and was called simply
the Self-sufficient One (ro) sw).

From his overflowing fulness proceeded the Divine Intelligenee, and from this
the World-deed, by which the whole universe is pervaded with divine life. Evil is only that which is
imperfect, and is the most distant reflection of Deity upon
matter. The human soul which had been produced by
the Divine Intelligenee fell, in consequence of its long-
ing after earthly things, from its original divine life to
its present temporal existence. It therefore belongs to
the sensual as well as to the intellectual world. But
the souls of the good and wise, even in this world, are
in their happiest moments reunited with the Deity, and
death is to such a complete restoration to their home.
From a pious veneration for an ancestry far back in an-
tiquity, the Grecian gods especially were regarded as
the personal manifestations of the divine life in nature.
Some of them were celestial beings, and some ruled
here on earth. These earthly powers were the national
gods (μπασιοι, Βάσια), subordinate to the Deity, and
exalted above all passion. The mystery of the Gods of
course, to be explained allegorically. The arts of
divination and magic were justified on the ground of the
necessary connection of all phenomena by virtue of the
unity of the world-principle" (Hase, Church Hist.
(1863), ch. 6, § 40). Where Proclus lived he was per-
it was nevertheless a reformation of the old faith.
Though it extended itself over the whole Roman em-
pire, it embraced within itself contradictory elements,
and could maintain its existence only long enough to
be witnessed and understood, and then to perish in the
development of heathenism. The last school to minister to Neoplatonism in these latter
hours was that founded by Proclus.

Life.—Proclus was of Lycian origin, and was born in
Constantinople in 412. He received his first instruction
at Xanthus, in Lycia (where his surname "Lycius"). His
philosophic instruction was obtained at Alexandria,
where he studied under Arion, Leonaras, Hero, and es-
specially under Olympiodorus, with whom he applied
himself chiefly to Aristotelian and Platonic philosophy.
Thence he went to Athens, where a certain Plutarch,
a philosopher, and his daughter, and later Syrusin,
became his instructors. Aeschyleus, a priestess of
Eleusis, instructed him chiefly in theurgic mystery-
tes. The vivid imagination and enthusiastic temper-
ament which in his childhood had led him to believe in
apparitions of Minerva and Apollo, naturally con-
vinced him, in the later part of his life, of the false
religion into which he, (q. v.) were brought to bear upon him, still more of
his immediate and direct intercommunication with the
gods; and he distinctly believed himself to be one of
those through whom divine revelation reaches man-
kind. His philosophical knowledge of Socrates and
Pisistratus the Pythagorean, and, like him, he had the power
to command the elements to a certain extent, to pro-
duce rain, to temper the sun's heat, etc. The Orphic
poems, the writings of Hermes, and all that strangely
mystical literature with which the age abounded, were
to him the only source of true philosophy, and he con-
idered them all more or less in the light of divine reve-
nations. That same cosmopolitan spirit in religious
matters which pervaded Rome towards her end had
spread throughout all the civilized "pagan" world of
those days, and Proclus distinctly laid it down as an
axiom that a true philosopher must also be a hiero-
plant of the whole world. Acquainted with all the
creeds and rites of the ancient Pantheons of the differ-
ent nations, he not only philosophized upon them in an
allegorizing and symbolizing spirit, as many of his con-
temporaries did, but practiced all the ceremonies, how-
ever hard and painful. More especially the practice
of fasting in honor of Egyptian deities, while on the
one hand it flitted him more and more for his hallucina-
tions and dreams of divine intercourse, on the other
hand more and more to a marked degree of ascetic
piety, and eager to win disciples from Christian
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authorities at Athens, who, in accordance with the spirit of religious intolerance and fanaticism which then began to animate the new and successively religious agitations which followed the constant war, besought him from that city. On being permitted to return, he acted with somewhat more prudence and circumspection, and only allowed his most approved disciples to take part in the nightly assemblies in which he propounded his doctrines. He died in 465, in his full vigor, and in the entire possession of all his mental powers, for which he was no less remarkable than for his personal beauty and strength. As a philosopher he enjoyed the highest celebrity among his contemporaries and successors. Minius was not only, but Proclus, completely inspired and to affirm that when he uttered his profound dogmas his countenance shone with a preternatural light. Besides his other philosophical attainments, he was a distinguished mathematician, astronomer, and grammarian.

In style Proclus is much more perspicuous and intelligible than his predecessor Plotinus; indeed, he is on the whole a good writer, and occasionally is almost eloquent. But the matter of his works has not much to recommend it: his propensity to allegorize everything, even the plainest and simplest expressions in the author to which he has recourse, must be largely from his merits as an exponent of other men's thoughts; and but for the interest which attaches to him as the last of a school of philosophy, it is not much to be regretted that his works have slumbered so long in the dust of libraries, and have been either wholly neglected or only carelessly treated. (c. p. 74.)

His Philosophical System. In the writings of Proclus there is collated, arranged, and dialectically elaborated the whole body of transmitted philosophy, augmented by large additions, and the whole combined into a sort of system, to which he succeeded in giving the appearance of strict logical connection. He professed that his design was not to bring forward views of his own, but simply to expound Plato, in doing which he proceeded on the idea that everything in Plato must be brought into accordance with the mystical theology of Orpheus. He looked upon the Orphic poems and Chaldean oracles, which he had diligently studied, as divine revelations, and capable of becoming instrumental to philosophy by means of an allegorical exposition. He therefore wrote a separate work on the coincidence of the doctrines of Orpheus, Pythagoras, and Plato. It was in much the same spirit that he attempted to blend together the logical method of Aristotl and the fanciful speculations of Neo-Platonic mysticism. He called himself, as we have already had occasion to say, the last link of the Hermetic chain, that is, the last of men consecrated to the study of philosophy, in whom, by personal adulation, was preserved the occult knowledge of the Mysteriae. Where reasoning fails him, he takes refuge in the ποιήμα of Plotinus, which is superior to knowledge. He conducts us to the operations of theory, which transcend all human wisdom, and comprise within itself all the advantages of divinations, purifications, initiations, and all the activities of divine inspiration. Through it are united the primary unity, in which every motion and energy of our souls comes to rest. It is this principle which unites not only men with gods, but the gods with each other, and with the one—the good, which is of all things the most credible.

Proclus, held, in all its leading features, the doctrine of emanations from one ultimate, primeval principle of all things, the absolute unity, towards union with which again all things strive. This union he did not, like Plotinus, conceive to be effected by means of pure reason, as even things destitute of reason and energy participate in it, purely as the result of their subsistence. In such a conception, therefore, he must have conceived the ποιήμα, by which he represents this union as being effected, as something which did not involve rational or thinking activity. All inferior existences are connected with the highest only through the intermediate ones, and can return to the higher only through that which is intermediate. And the principle is, in a certain way, particular and impalpable, and everything which comes by partaking of the one (Inst. Theol. c. 3).

Every object is a union of the one and the many: that which unites the one and the many is nothing else than the pure, absolute one—the essential one, which makes everything else partake of unity. Proclus argued that there is either one principium, or many principia. If the latter, the principia must be either finite or infinite in number. If infinite, what is derived from them must be infinite, so that we should have a double infinite, or a quartet; and because it was only finite, so that the principia must be finite in number. There would then be a definite number of them. But number presupposes unity. Unity (ἰόντος) is consequently the principium of principia, and the cause of the finite multiplicity and of the being of all things (Theol. Plat. ii. 1). There is therefore one principium which is incorporeal, for the corporeal consists of parts. It is immovable and unchangeable, for everything that moves, moves towards some object or end, which it seeks after. If the principium were movable it must also be divisible. The good is not divisible, for it is of itself desirable outside of it. But this is impossible, for the principium has need of nothing, and is itself the end towards which everything else strives. The principium, or first cause of all things, is superior to all actual being (οὐσία), and separated from it, and cannot even have any cause. Thus it is not an object of cognition to any existing thing, nor can it be named (L. c. p. 93). But in contemplating the emanation of things from the one and their return into it we arrive at two words, the good, and the one, of which the first is an absolute, positive, the latter negative only (L. c. p. 96). The absolutely one has produced not only earth and heaven, but all the gods which are above the world and in the world: it is the god of all gods, the unity of all unities (L. c. ii. 110).

Everything which is perfect strives to produce something else; the full seeks to impart its fulness. Still more must this be the case with the absolute good, though in connection with that which we must not conceive of any creative power or energy, for that would be to make the one imperfect and not simple, not fruitful through its very perfection (L. c. p. 101). Every emanation is less perfect than that from which it emanates (Inst. Theol. c. 7), but has a certain similarity with it, and, so far as this similarity goes, remains in it, departing from it so far as it is unlike, but as far as possible being one with it, and remaining in it (ibid. 31). What is absolutely one is a multitude, for in the one there is both unity, or of the nature of unity. Thus the first produced things are independent unities (αὐτός αὐτός), of these independent unities some are simple, others more composite. The nearer the units are to the absolute unity, the simpler they are; the greater is the sphere of their operation and their productive power. Thus out of unity there arise a multitude of things which depart further and further from the simplicity of the absolute one; and as the producing power diminishes, it introduces motion and more conditions into things, while it diminishes their universality and simplicity. His whole system of emanations seems, in fact, to be a realization of the logical subordination of ideas. The simplest ideas which are contained in those which are composite being regarded by him as the principles of things.

The emanations proceeded in a curious triadic manner. That which precedes all power, and emanates immediately from the primal cause of all things, is finite. Unity, duality, he considered as identical with limitation (ἰόντος) and boundlessness (ἀνάμετρος). From the principle compounded of these two there arises a third, a compound of the two—substance (as a sort of genus of all substances), that which in itself is abso-
PROCLUS

lately an existing thing and nothing more (Theol. Plat. l., 138 sq.). Everything, according to Proclus, con-
tains in itself being (οὐσία), life (ζωή), and intelligence ( νοημα). The life is the centre of the thing, for it is both an object of thought and exists. The intelligence is the limit of the thing, for the intellect ( νοημα) is in the thing, but it is not outside of it (οὐσία), and the latter in the former; but the intellect or thought ex-
ists in the thing thought of objectively, and the thing thought of exists in the intellect productively ( νοημος).

This accordingly is the first triad—limit, infinity, and the compound of the two. Proclus distinguished the divided the divine unity (the entire mind, and the reproduction of itself into a life (οὐσία) to be intelligible and intelligent, super-

natiual and natural; it attributed supernatural ef-
cacy to the name of the Supreme Being, and, like his predecessors, exalted theory above philosophy. The first triad—limit, infinity, and the compound of the two. Proclus taught, is the deity who advances to the extreme verge of the conceivable from the inconceivable, primal deity, measuring and de-

fining all things, and establishes the paternal, concete-
nating, and immeasurable race of gods. The infinite is the inexhaustible power of this deity. The "mixed" is the first and the highest of gods; the mixed comprehends everything within itself. Out of this first triad springs the second. As the first of the units produces the highest existing thing, the inter-

mediate unity produces the intermediate existing thing, in which is contained the unity of the deity, reality, and all the limits of the existent. The middle is non-theirs, something intermediate—power; and something last—the existence in the second grade, conceivable life (νοημα). For there is everything which is the object of thought being (το ον), life (ζωή), and thought ( νοημα). The third of the units, the "mixed", produces the third triad, in which the intelli-

gence or thinking power ( νοημα) attains to its subsistence. This thinking power is the limit and completion of everything which can be the object of thought. The first triad contains the principle of union; the second of multiplicity and increase by means of continuous motion or life, for motion is a species of life; the third, the principle of the separation of the manifold, and of formation by means of limit.

In his treatise on Providence and Fate, Proclus seeks to explain the difference between the two, and to show that the second is subordinate to the first in such a manner that freedom is consistent with it. Both provi-

dence and fate are causes—the first the cause of all good, the second the cause of all connection (and con-

nection as cause and effect). There are three sorts of things, the one is the connection of the deity, the other anterior to the deity, others whose substance does not exist, but is perpetually coming into existence, and, between these, things whose substance is eternal, but whose operation takes place in time. Proclus names these three kinds

intellectual, animal, and corporeal. The last alone are who advance to the extreme verge of the conceivable from the inconceivable, primal deity, measuring and de-

fining all things, and establishes the paternal, concete-
nating, and immeasurable race of gods. The infinite is the inexhaustible power of this deity. The "mixed" is the first and the highest of gods; the mixed comprehends everything within itself. Out of this first triad springs the second. As the first of the units produces the highest existing thing, the inter-

mediate unity produces the intermediate existing thing, in which is contained the unity of the deity, reality, and all the limits of the existent. The middle is non-theirs, something intermediate—power; and something last—the existence in the second grade, conceivable life (νοημα). For there is everything which is the object of thought being (το ον), life (ζωή), and thought ( νοημα). The third of the units, the "mixed", produces the third triad, in which the intelli-

gence or thinking power ( νοημα) attains to its subsistence. This thinking power is the limit and completion of everything which can be the object of thought. The first triad contains the principle of union; the second of multiplicity and increase by means of continuous motion or life, for motion is a species of life; the third, the principle of the separation of the manifold, and of formation by means of limit.

His Works.—The following of Proclus's writings are still extant: (1) ΕΙΣ την Πλάτωνος Θεολογίαν, in six books. (2) Στοιχείων Θεολογία (Institutio Theo-

logical). This treatise was first published in the Latin translation of 16th century. (3) The Greek text, with the translation of Εμ. Portus, is appended to the edition of the last-mentioned work (Hamb. 1618). (5) A commentary on the First Alcibiades of Plato. (4) A commentary on the Timaeus of Plato. Of this Comment. On the Timaeus five books remain, but they only treat of a third of the dialogue. It is ap-

pended to the first Basle edition of Plato. (6) Various notes on the Politeia of Plato, printed in the same edition of Plato as the last-mentioned work. (6) A commentary on the Parmenides of Plato, published in Stalbmah's edition of that dialogue. (7) Portions of a commentary on the Cratylus of Plato, edited by Bois-

sonade (Leips. 1820). (8) A paraphrase of various diffic-

ult passages in the Τηγαλδίδος σύναξις of Ptole-

maeus: first published, with a preface, by Melanchon (Basle, 1564). (9) A treatise on motion (Περί κινή-

τικός), a sort of preface to the second book of Aristotle's treatise Περί φυσικής ακροασίας. (10) Επιτότων των αστρονομικών υποθέσεων (ibid. 1560). (11) Σφαίρα, frequently appended to the works of the ancient astronomers. There are also several separate tracts and tracts of books in the library, to which are attached various editions of the text of Euclid. (13) A commentary on the «Εργα και ημιρα» of Heidus, in a somewhat mutilated form (Τηγαλδίδος έποιη μαρτιν την Περί των αστρονομικών ιποθέσεων (ibid. 1560). (13) Σφαίρα, frequently appended to the works of the ancient astronomers. There are also several separate tracts. (14) Chρηστολόγια γραμματική, or, rather, some portions of it preserved by Photius (cod. 289), treating of poetry and the lives of various celebrated poets. The short life of Homer which passes under the name of Proclus was probably taken from the time of Theophrastus (which requires the existence of the poetic). (15) Επιτότων των αστρονομικών υποθέσεων (De Astronimia Mundb). (16) De Provincia et Fato, addressed to Theodorus, a mechanician. (17) Deceum Detaetiones circa Provincialem (Περί των υποθέσεων την την Πρώτων ακροασίων). (18) De Malorum Substantiis (Περί των και δακτυλίων αστρονομικών). (19) Two treatises only exist in the Latin translation of Giulielmo M. The works of Proclus are printed entire by Fabricius in his Bibliotheca Graeca, ix, 373, etc. (19) A little astrological treatise on the effect of eclipses, in a Latin translation. (20) A treatise on po-


eternity, also in a Latin translation, printed together with a treatise by Chrysobulus (Paris, 1615). (21.) Five hymns. (22.) Some scholia on Homer.


This edition of the chief works of Proclus. The edition of Cousin (Paris, 1820-27, 6 vols. 8vo) contains the treatises on Providence and Fate, on the Ten Doctrines about Providence, and on the Nature of Evil, the commentary on the Alcibiades, and the commentary on the Parmenides. This learned Frenchman has since brought out Procli Philos. Platonic opera inedita (Paris, 1864). There are English translations of the commentaries on the Timaeus, the six books on the Theology of Plato, the commentaries on the first book of Euclid, and the Theological Elements, and the five Bks. Elements, in Heath, Elements of Euclid, Bks. I-VI. 8vo, 363-415; Brucker, Historia Critica Philosophiae, ii, 819-336; Tennemann, Geschichte der Philosophie, vol. vi: Ritter, Geschichte der Philosophie, bk. xiii, c. 3, vol. iv, 699, etc.; Dr. Butler's, Life of Proclus, in Memoirs of the Academy of Inscriptions, vol. xxxi; Marinus, Vita Procli (Gr. and Lat. ed. by Fabricius [Hamb. 1740, 4to]); ed. by Boisnoude [Leips. 1814, 8vo]; Baur, Chriss. Jahrbücher (Tubing. 1846, p. 92-72); Cudworth, Intell. Universe (see Index); Hunt, Pantheism, p. 117 sq.; Lewis, Hist. of Philos. of the Jews; Simon, Ezech. Alter. Interpretes, 2nd ed., p. 60 sq.; Horsemaster, Μόον τῆς Φύσεως, Μοὶς τῆς Φύσεως, p. 190 sq.; Gibbon, Decline and Fall, c. x., 12; Hase, Oh. Hist., p. 48 sq.; Ueberweg, Hist. of Philos. i, 255-258; Smith, Dict. of Greek and Roman Mythol., v. (from which a part of the above has been taken); Kingsley, Alexandria, c. 116-134, 139; Algol, Patrul., § 57; Noutison, Peuteres Humanae, p. 161 sq.

Proclus, St., an Eastern ecclesiastical of the 5th century. He was at a very early age appointed reader in the church at Constantinople. He was also engaged as secretary or amanuensis to St. Chrysostom, and was employed in a similar capacity by Atticus (who succeeded Aracius as patriarch of Constantinople), by whom he was invested successively with the orders of deacon and presbyter. He was raised to the rank of bishop of Cyzicus by Sisinius, the successor of Atticus, but did not exercise the functions of his office, the people of Cyzicus choosing another in his place. On the death of Sisinius (A.D. 427) there was a general expression of feeling in favor of Proclus as his successor, but Nestorius was appointed. Proclus continued zealously against the heresy or which the swan was introduced into the Church, combating them even in a sermon preached before Nestorius himself. On the deposition of Nestorius, Proclus was again proposed as his successor; but his elevation was again opposed, though on what grounds does not appear very clearly ascertained. But on the death of Maximianus, who was appointed instead, Proclus was at last created patriarch. In A.D. 438 Proclus gained a great deal of honor by having the body of St. Chrysostom brought to Constantinople. There is still extant a fragment of a Latin translation of a eulogy on St. Chrysostom, by Proclus, delivered at his funeral (Procli in Tim., p. 329). A treatise of Proclus that the custom of chanting the Triasian was introduced into the Church. While in office, Proclus conducted himself with great prudence and mildness. For further details respecting his ecclesiastical career, the reader is referred to Tertullian, De Corrept. Monachi, § 704-718. His extant writings are enumerated by Fabricius (B. G. ix, 505-512). One of the most celebrated of his letters (Παρέξιον παράτησι) was written in A.D. 435, when the bishops of Armenia applied to him for his opinion on certain propositions which had been disseminated in their dioceses, and were attributed to Theodorus of Mopsuestia. The discussion that ensued with respect to these propositions made a considerable stir in the East. Proclus bestowed a good deal of pains upon his style, which is terse and sententious, but is crowded with antitheses and rhetorical points, and is a laborer endeavor to reiterate the same sentiment in every possible variety of form. From the quotations of subsequent authors, it appears that several of the writings of Proclus are lost. The Platonist Theology of Proclus Diadochus has sometimes been described as the 24th book of the works of St. Proclus. The 24th of October is the day consecrated to the memory of St. Proclus by the Greek Church. See Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog, and Mythol., s. v.; Neander, Ch. Hist., ii, 946 sq.; Biddle, Hist. of the Popes, i, 160 sq., 170 sq.

Proconsul. The Greek word προκονσαλτ, for which this is the true equivalent, is rendered uniformly "deputy" in the A.V. of Acts xiii, 7, 8, 12; xix, 38, and the derived verb προκονσαλτος in Acts xvi, 12 is translated "to be deputy." At the division of the Roman legions, the provinces of Asia, the Roman Proconsul was the civil and imperial, the emperor assigned to the senate such portions of territory as were peaceable and could be held without force of arms (Sueton. Oct. 47; Strabo, xvii, 460; Dio Cass. xiii, 12), an arrangement which remained with frequent modifications till the 3rd century. Over these senatorial provinces the senate appointed by lot yearly an officer who was called "proconsul" (ibid., 13), who exercised purely civil powers, had no power over life and death, and was attended by one or more legates (ibid. 14). He was neither a civil nor a military governor, nor wore military dress (ibid., 13). He was chosen out of the body of the senate; and it was customary, when any one's consulate expired, to send him as a proconsul into some province. He enjoyed the same honor with the consuls, but was allowed only six lectores with the fasces before him. Such provinces were in consequence called "proconsular." With the exception of Africa and Asia, which were assigned to men who had passed the office of consul, the senatorial provinces were given to those who had been proconsuls, and were divided by lot each year among those who held this office five years previously. Their term of office was one year. The proconsuls decided cases of equity and justice, either privately in their palace, where they received petitions, heard complaints, and granted writs under their seals; or publicly in the common hall, with the formalities generally observed in the courts at Rome. These duties were, however, more frequently delegated to their assessors, or other judges of their own appointment. As the proconsul had also the direction of justice, of war, and of the revenues, these departments were assigned to the senators who were usually nominated by the senate. The expense of their journeys to and from their provinces was defrayed by the public. Livy (viii and xxi) mentions two other classes of proconsuls—those who, being consuls, had their office continued beyond the time appointed by law; and those who, being privi-
only in a private station, were invested with this honor, either for the government of provinces or to command in war. Some were created consuls by the senate without being appointed to any province, merely to command the army, and to take charge of the military discipline; others were allowed to enter upon their provincial office before being admitted to the consulate, but having that honor in reserve.

Among the senatorial provinces in the first arrangement by Augustus were Cyprus, Achaia, and Asia within the Illyris and Tauris (Strabo, xvii, 840). The first and last of these are alluded to in Acts xiii, 7, 8, 12; xix, 38, as under the government of proconsuls. Achaia became an imperial province in the second year of Tiberius A.D. 16, and was governed by a procurator (Tacit. Ann. i, 76), but was restored to the senate by Claudius (Sueton. Claud. 25), and therefore Gallio, before whom St. Paul was brought, is rightly termed "proconsul" in Acts xvii, 12. See GALLIO. Cyprus also, after the battle of Actium, was first made an imperial province (Dio Cass. iii, 12), but five years afterwards (B.C. 22) it was given to the senate, and is reckoned by Strabo (xvii, 440) ninth among the provinces of the people governed by σταυροείδους, or Achaia is the seventh. These σταυροείδους, or procurators, had the title of "proconsul," and the provinces were given to the senate in exchange for Dalmatia, and thus, says Dio Cassius (liv, 4), "proconsuls (ἀντικυβερνητές) began to be sent to those nations." In Bockh's Corpus Inscriptionum, No. 2631, is the following relating to Cyprus: "Τάκτων Κοίνων Ιωαδων Κύρων αντικυβερνητός. This Quintus Julius Cornutus appears to have been proconsul of Cyprus before the twelfth year of Claudius. He is mentioned in the next inscription (No. 2632) as the predecessor of another proconsul, Lucius Annius Bassus. The date of this last inscription is the twelfth year of Caligula. The third proconsul of Cyprus in the time of Claudius occurs on a copper coin, of which an engraving is given under CYPRUS. A coin of Ephesus (q. v.) illustrates the usage of the word ἀντικυβερνητός in Acta xix, 38.

PROCOPIUS (also known as Procop the greater, the elder, or the elder, or the shaven, in allusion to his having received the tonsure in early life), one of the greatest of the Hussite leaders, and ranks only second to Ziska, whose successor he was among the Taborites. Procop was born of a noble family towards the close of the thirteenth century. His father, a nobleman of Prague. After having travelled for some years through France and Spain, Procop returned to his native country just as the religious wars were breaking out. He had taken holy orders, but instead of entering the ministry he joined the ranks of the insurgents, the Hussites, and, by his military genius, rapidly rose to the first rank. In 1424 Ziska died, and the Taborites elected Procop as their leader. Palacky, in comparing the two great Hussites, says of Procop that if he did not equal Ziska in warlike ability, he surpassed him in the art of political cunning and swindliness. Procop's history from this time till 1427 presents an almost unbroken series of daring attacks upon the Austrians. At the same time, a larger body of Taborites, who called themselves Orphans, and had been overrunning Lusatia and had burned Lauban, under the leadership of a man subsequently known as Procop the lessor (or younger), now, in concert with the more distinguished Procop, attacked Silesia, and took part in those internal feuds of the Hussite factions by which Bohemia was almost wholly ruined. His efforts were not without success. He has been described as the author of the law of protection for the military glory, the religious inflexibility, of Bohemia." See Guillett, Life and Times of John Huss, vol. ii, ch. xvii sq.; Život i život opuštenosti, vii, 565-568; Palacky, Gesch. von Böhmen, iii, 91 sq.

Procop the Younger. See Procop, Andrew.

Procopius of Cesarea, a noted character in the history of the East in the 6th century, is especially distinguished as the writer of a history in which he dwells at large on the ecclesiastical condition of the periods of which he treats. He was born at Cesarea, in Palestine, about the end of the 6th or beginning of the 6th century. After studying rhetoric in his native country, he went to Constantinople, where he gave lessons in rhetoric, and afterwards was called to the court as a linguist for learning and ability reached the court; and the emperor Justin the elder, in the last year of his reign, appointed him assessore (αξιωτάτος) to Belisarius, who was about that time sent as governor to Dara, on the frontiers of Armenia. Procopius afterwards served against the Persians (580), afterwards in that against the Vandals in through Silesia, Moravia, and Hungary as far as Pressburg. In 1429 Procop made inroads into the German states as far as Magdeburg, and returned to Bohemia laden with spoil, and followed by a numerous band of captive nobles. The Emperor Sigismund at this crisis offered to treat with him, but the imperial demand, that the Hussites should submit to the decision of a council, afforded Procop a pretext for breaking off all negotiations with the imperial court. A second German crusading army now advanced in 1451, but was thoroughly defeated at Riesenburg. These successes, which were followed by others of nearly equal importance in Silesia, Hungary, and Saxony, where the princes had to purchase peace at the hands of the two Procopas on humiliating terms, induced the Council of Basle to propose a meeting between the Hussite leaders and ten learned Catholic doctors. The meeting lasted fifty days, but was productive of no good result. Procop himself went before that learned body, and defended, with much spirit, the creed of his party. But failing to receive any acknowledgment of his views, he finally refused further to attend the council, and returned to Bohemia, where, combining his forces with those of Procop the lesser, he laid siege to Pilsen. The Calixtines, who came here in force, had offended Procop by the peace treaty they had made with a delegation of the Council of Basle. The council, on this, passed an act known as the Basle Compact, by which the Hussites were allowed the use of the cup in the Lord's Supper, and the Bohemians were designated by the title of the First Sons of the Catholic Church. The Taborites and Hussites of the Orphans, under the lessor, another proconsul of Cyprus in the time of Claudius occurs on a copper coin, of which an engraving is given under CYPRUS. A coin of Ephesus (q. v.) illustrates the usage of the word ἀντικυβερνητός in Acta xix, 38.
Africa (538–555), and lastly against the Goths in Italy (580–589). During these campaigns he appears to have rendered himself very useful by his ability and ac-
tuosity, and he was intrusted with important commissions connected with the service of the army.
In his capacity of censor, he was the gen-
eral's legal adviser, and he was also his private secre-
tary. In 538 he assisted Antonina, the wife of Beli-
sarius, in raising troops in Campania, and in sending some
men of a force with which he was then bound.
On his return to Constantinople, about 540, the emperor Justinian
made him a senator, as a reward for his services.
In 562 he was made prefect of Constantinople, unless if per-
haps it was another of the name who obtained this
advantage.
His death is not recorded with any degree of
accuracy. He died in that year, but the exact year which
was then bound.
He was a man of great ability, and the private
year of his death is not ascertainned.
It was during his extensive travels that he gathered
the materials for the History of his Own Times (in eight
books), translated into Latin by Claude Maitre, a Jes-
ut, under the title Procopius Caesarinus Historiarum
sui Temporis Libri Octo (Paris, 1662, fol.; with
the Greek text in English, Lond. 1638, fol.). His descrip-
tions of the manners of the various barbarous nations
which invaded the Roman empire are vivid and interes-
ting. The first two books of his history concern the
Byzantine army, and the third book with the death of
Arcadius, and briefly relates the wars between the
Romans and Persians under Theodosius the younger,
Anastasius, and Justinian, and lastly Justinian.
As he comes down to contemporary times, his history is more
full of interesting events.
He died in that year, the third year of Ju-
tician's reign (A.D. 550).
Books iii and iv treat of the wars of the Vandals in Africa, and the reconquest of that
province by Belisarius.
The 5th, 6th, and 7th books are concerned with the history of the Gothic kingdom
in Italy founded by Theodoric, and the expedition of
Belisarius against Totila. The 8th book is of a mixed
character; it resumes the account of the Persian wars,
then speaks of the affairs of the Roman empire in other
quarters—in Africa, on the Rhine, and in Thrace—
and at last resumes the narrative of the Gothic war
in Italy, the expedition of Narses, the defeat and death
of Teiss, and the final overthrow of the Gothic
kingdom.—English Cyclop. a. v. As a historian, Procopius
took Herodotus for his pattern, and even resembles his
master's fatalism in the material conception of his
history. The latter, however, views the world as
acquit, and as such regards himself as above all positive religion
and dogmatic disputes. On account of the cold, unsympa-
thetic manner in which he writes of Christianity, some
have not believed him a Christian, but a deist, Jew,
or even a heathen. He was, however, at least in outward
character, a Christian: in his sermons he appears from

Procopius of Gaza, a very respectable Greek
sofist of the 6th century, and the first who suffered
martydom in Palestine, under the reign of Dociatian.
The precise time of his birth or death is not recorded.
He wrote commentaries on the Octateuch (ed. C. Cau-
sier, Tigur. 1555, fol.), the books of Kings, the Chronic-
es (ed. J. Murnius, Lugd. Bat. 1639, 4to), Isaiah (ed. J.
Curtius, Paris, 1860, fol.), etc., and opened among the
Greeks the explanation of the Catholicon of Eucer.
Ecela, Hist. (Index in vol. iii); Alzog, Patrologie, § 76.
Procopius, Friedrich P., a Roman Catholic
monastic noted especially for his valuable contributions
Christian song, was born in the year 1608, of Protestant
parents, at Templin, in Brandenburg. At a very early
age he joined the Roman Catholic Church, and when
eighteen years old he entered the Order of the Capu-
chins of the Austro-Bohemian province. Having
completed his studies, he visited many cities as a preacher
and missionary. He soon became known as a famous
pulpit orator, but more so by his poetical productions,
which gave him the name of "Catholic Meistersinger."
Procopius died at Linz in 1680. He wrote, Der Gross-
Wunderthaftig Mutter Gottes Maria Hilf Lob-Ge-
zog (Passau, 1659):—Herzten-Fried und Seelen-Trost (ibid.
1660, 1661):—Marial Consecatorium rythmo-melodi-
cum (2d ed. Salzburg, 1667), a collection of sermons;
St. Mary's Day (in the Dominale publicum, ibid. 1667),
sermons for the Christmas year:—Catechisme (ibid.
Capocorniwm, p. 217–219; Buhli, Geschichte der Litera-
tur des Kath. Deutschland, p. 90 sq.; Kehrlein, Ge-
schichte der Kathol. Konzilberaadene der Medemb.
Regensburg, 1843, vol. i, § 36; Schletterer, Ueberreligi-
ösche Darstellung der Geschichte der kirchlichen Dicht-
ung u. geistlichen Musik (Nordlingen, 1866), p. 217 sq.;
and the notice of the latter work in Hauck's Theol.
Jahrbuch, i, 1866, p. 191 sq. (B. P.)
Procopovitch. See Procopovitch.
Procraestination, the postponement of a matter
from one day to another; according to the maxim of the
laok and of the men of pleasure, "Seria in crastini-
urn (dium or tempus)." Generally, in such cases, time
wears on, and things are not done, at least not in the
right time or in the right way: "Cras cras et semper
cras et sic dilabitar etas." The system of procrastina-
tion, therefore, is to be commended in no respect; but
least of all in moral, or, better, religious matters. Ev-
every day lost in our moral amendment is an irreparable
loss, a loss for eternity, as reformation becomes the more
more the more it is delayed.
Proctor (formed by a contraction from the Latin
procurator, of a procurator, "he who is authorized to take
care of another person's cause in ecclesiastical courts, in
the stead of the party whom he represents. It corre-
sponds to attorney or solicitor in the other courts.
In the Church of Rome there are extra-proctors, a class
who settle in the name of another a legal business of
no litigious character; a more accurate title is man-
datory. The title of proctor has been preserved only
in some kinds of procurations concerning ecclesiastical
affairs. These procurors may act instead of, 1. Bride
and banns for the conclusion of the betrothal. For
not only the bride, but also the betrothed, (stra-
tus sponsalis), and the suit (actum de inesuisia spo-
alis), which, after its acceptance, takes the lawful
nature of a betrothal, but the betrothal itself, or the
actual contract about the future marriage, can be per-
formed by a procurator in the capacity of procuror
(service pro procuratori). Only the proctor must have special powers for the conclusion of a promise
of marriage with a determined person (cf. 34, Dig.
De Rupt. Bapt. xxxii, 2). 2. Either party at the marriage-
day itself may authorize a procurator to represent
the powers given to the mandatory have been recalled be-
fore the copulation, the marriage-act would be void,
even if the proctor at that time had no knowledge of
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the revolution. The mandatory must be present in person, and cannot be represented by a substitute (Secat. c. 9, De Procure, i, 19); and the bride and bridgroom thus united must afterwards give their consent in person. These dispositions of canon law are preserved in the Austrian and Bavarian legislation. Protestant matrimonial law rejects marriage by procuration, but allows an act in favor of type gipers, but not for the procurator. 3. God fathers and godmothers, in baptisms or confirmation, may, if sick or otherwise prevented, choose three persons for their representatives at the holy ceremony (procurator patrii). As, according to the decision of the Council of Trent, the sacramental minister must have a godfather and a godmother (prens et pretia), each of the parties can make choice of a substitute, either male or female, but both mandates cannot belong to the same sex. The real godfather, not his representative, contracts in this case the cognotio spiritualis, and the prohibition of marriage founded on it (Dudder. 2. Conrs. Conc. Trid. May 16, 1680, Aug. 23 and Sept. 1, 1731). 4. Absent electors, if they can sufficiently justify their absence, and are prepared to swear to it (c. 42, § 1, de Elect. i, 6), cannot declare their vote by writing. Electors from foreign countries are entitled to this privilege. Electors from foreign countries are entitled to be present in the secular state. In the English ecclesiastical constitution, proctors are those clergymen who are chosen in each diocese to represent the brethren in convocation. In the universities the name refers to those officers who are chosen to represent the masters of arts, maintain the discipline of the university. The proctors are chosen out of the several colleges by turn. The pro-proctors are the deputies of the proctors.

Proctor. David C., a Presbyterian minister, was born in New Hampshire in 1792. He graduated at Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H., in 1818, studied divinity in the Andover Theological Seminary, Mass., was licensed by a Congregational association, and in 1822 was ordained by a Congregational council, and went West under the auspices of the Connecticut Home Missionary Society. His first field of labor was Indiana, Ind.; subsequent to his removal to Kentucky, and took charge of the Church in Springfield and Lebanon. In 1826 he was temporarily called to the presidency of Centre College, Danville, Ky., after which he was without charge for a number of years. He died Jan. 18, 1836, at the age of 44, leaving a wife and two children, and had considerable reputation as a scholar. See Wilson, Prep. Hist. Almanac, 1866, p. 167. (J. L. S.)

Procuration. Different meanings have been applied to this word. 1. An entertainment given to the archdeacon with provision for seven horses and six men. 2. An equivalent in money; according to Lyndwood, 7s. 6d. to the archdeacon and 1s. to each of the other six at his visitation, to commute for the provision or entertainment which was formerly expected to be provided at the time of visitation. 3. An entertainment made at a visitation for a bishop. In 1386 a money composition was permitted to be offered by pope Benedict XII, but only one procurator could be demanded if several churches were visited in one day. The amount varied in different countries. In England an archbishop received 220 turus, a bishop 150, an archdeacon 50, and an archpriest or rural dean 10. See S. N. O. D.

Procurator. This word does not occur in the Vulgate or in the A. V., nor is it an accurate Greek equivalent, εἰκονομέας (though used by Philo, Leg. ad Cim. and by Josephus, Ant. xx, 6, 2, 8, 5; comp. xx, 5, 1; his office is called εἰκονομεῖα [ibid. xx, 5, 1]), found in this sense in the Greek Testament, where it is rephrased by the yeparxw; by our translators ( governor (Luke ii, 2; Matt. xxvi, 2; xxvii, 14, etc.). ὑγρός also occurs in a perfectly general sense (Matt. x, 18; 1 Pet. ii, 14). In Matt. ii, 6 it is rendered "prince," and corresponds to the Hebrew

PROCURATOR. "Governor" in the A. V. is also used for ὑγρός (2 Cor. xi, 82). Δέοματος is another Greek term for procurator. The word ὑγρός, or procurator, is generally applied, both in the original and in our version, to the procurator of the temple (Josephus, Ant. xxvi, 370, etc.), Felix (Acts xxiii, 1), and Festus (xxvi, 80), but it is also used of Cyrenius (Quirinus), who held the more responsible and distinguished office of praeses or legatus Caesaris over the province of Syria (Luke ii, 2). Procurators were chiefly despatched to the imperial, and not to the senatorial provinces. See Provincia. The revenues of the states that were created must be chequered, while those of the former belonged to the fiscus, or privy purse. The procuratores Caesaris were specially intrusted with the interests of the fiscus, and therefore managed the various taxes and imposts, performing similar duties to those exercised by the quaestors in the provinces administered by the senatorial procurators; were, however, sometimes sent as well as questores to the senatorial provinces (Tacit. Amm. xiii, 1; Dio Cass. liii, 15); but these were doubtless offices of less dignity, though bearing the same title. Procurator is also used for the governors of the two ecclesiastical provinces (Ulpian, Dig. 8, 3), regent (Cesar, B. C. liii, 112), etc. They were selected from among men who had been consuls or praetors, and sometimes from the inferior senators (Dio Cass. liii, 13-15). They were attended by six scribes, used the military dress, and wore the sword (ibid. 12). No quaestor held the title of procurator from the time of Augustus, nor any of the property and revenues of the imperial treasury were administered by the rationales, procuratores, and actores of the emperor, who were chosen from among his freedmen, or from among the knights (Tacit. Hist. v, 9; Dio Cass. liii, 10). Sometimes the procurators were invested with the dignity of legati, or procuratores cum jure gildii (τεταραμένοι ιούλοιοι), Josephus, War, ii, 8, 1), and this was the case with the procurators of Judea, which had been made a sub-province of Syria (Josephus, Ant. xiii, 1, 1) since the deposition of the etnarch Archelaus, A.D. 6. There is therefore no inaccuracy in the use of ὑγρός in the New Test., since we find from inscriptions that praeses and procurator were often interchangeable (Gruter, p. 495, b). In one respect, indeed, the ὑγρός were even more powerful than the procuratores themselves (disponabant); for, being regarded as the immediate emissaries and representatives of the Caesar, by whom they were appointed to an indefinite tenure of office (Dio Cass. liii, 15-15), they had the power of inflicting capital punishment on their own districts, or even beyond these (ibid. 10; Josephus, War, ii, 8, 1). They also governed the province when the procurator was dead or absent, "vice proconsulam," as we see from many inscriptions (Murat. p. 907, 4, etc.). In a turbulent and seditious province like Judea, their most frequent functions were of a military or judicial character. The first procurator was Coponius, who was sent out with Quirinius to take a census of the property of the Jews and to confiscate that of Archelaus (Josephus, Ant. xviii, 1, 1). His successor was Marcus Ambibius, then Annius Rufus, in whose time the emperor Augustus died. Tib. Claudius Gratus, who was procurator for eleven years, and was succeeded by Pontius Pilate (ibid. 2, 2), who is called by Josephus (ibid. 3, 1) ὑγρός, as he is in the New Test. He was subject to the governor (praeses) of Syria, for the council of the Samaritans denounced Pilate to Vespasian, who sent him to Rome and put one of his own friends, Marcellus, in his place (ibid. 4, 2). The headquarters of the procurator were at Cesarea (Josephus, War, ii, 2, 2; Acts xxiii, 28), where he had a judgment-seat (xxv, 6) in the audience-chamber (ver. 31, 23), and was attended by a committee of procurators, consulted in cases of difficulty, the assessores (Sueton. Gall. 14), or ὑγρομάχοι, who were mentioned by Josephus (War, ii, 16) as having been consulted by Cestius, the governor of Syria, when certain charges were made
against Florus, the procurator of Judæa. More important cases were laid before the emperor (Acts xxv, 12; comp. Josephus, Ant. xx, 6, 2). The procurator, as the representative of the emperor, had the power of life and death (Acts xxvii, 27; Matt. xxvii, 26), which was denied to the proconsul. In the New Testament we see the procurator only in his judicial capacity. Thus Christ is brought before Pontius Pilate as a political offender (Matt. xxvii, 2, 11), and the accusation is heard by the procurator, who is seated on the judgment-seat (ver. 19). Felix heard St. Paul's accusation and defence from the judgment-seat at Cesarea (Acts xxix), which was in the open air in the great stadium (Josephus, War, ii, 9, 2, and St. Paul calls him "judge" (Acts xxiv, 10), as if this term described his chief functions. The procurator (archon) is again alluded to in his judicial capacity in 1 Pet. ii, 14. He was attended by a cohort as body-guard (Matt. xxvii, 27), and apparently went up to Jerusalem at the time of the high festivals, and there resided in the palace of Herod (Josephus, Wars, ii, 14, 8; Philo, De Leg. ad Gaium, c. 57; ii, 589, ed. Lachm.), in which was the praetorium, or "judgment-hall," as it is rendered in the A. V. (Matt. xxvii, 27; Mark xv, 16; comp. Acts xxvi, 35). Sometimes, it appears, Jerusalem was made his winter quarters (Josephus, Ant. xvii, 5, 1). The high-priest was supposed to be removed at the will of the procurator (ibid. 2, 2). Of the oppression and extortion practiced by one of these officers, Gessius Florus, which resulted in open rebellion, we have an account in Josephus (Ant. xx, 11, 1; War, ii, 14, 2). The same laws held both for the government of the imperial and senatorial provinces, that they could not raise a levy or exact more than an appointed sum of money from their subjects, and that when their successors came they were to return to Rome within three months ( Dio Cass. lxi, 15). The pomp and dignity of the procurators may be inferred from the narrative of these trials of the titles of "most excellent" and "most noble" (Πρωτάρης), applied to them by such different lips as those of Claudius Lyssias, Tertullian, and St. Paul; but they were usually chosen from no higher rank than that of the equites, or even the freedmen of the emperor; and the "most noble Felix," in particular, was a mere manumitted slave (Tacit. Hist. v, 9; Amm. xxvi, 54; Suett. Claud. 28). It is satisfactory to find that even in the minutest details the glimpses of their position afforded to us by the New Testament are corroborated by the statements of ancient writers. The diocetes (Luke xiii, 1), the velatio (Acts xxiv, 26), the insolence (John xix, 22), and the gross injustice (Acts xxiv, 27), which we see exemplified in their conduct towards our Lord and his apostles, are amply illustrated by contemporary historians (Josephus, Ant. xvii, 5, 1; Dio Cass. xxv, 12; Comp. Suet. Claud. 28) and we may say, in the main, that they were heavy on the mind of the emperor Trajan that he called the extortions of provincial governors "the spleen of the empire" (comp. Aurel. Vict. Epit. 42). Vespasian (more so) took a more humorous view of the matter, and said that the procurators were like sponges (Sueton. Vesp. 16). The presence of the wives of Pilate (Matt. xxvii, 19) and Felix (Acts xxiv, 24) reminds us of the famous debate on the proposition of Cæcina to forbid the procurals and procurators to be accompanied by their wives (Tacit. Ann. iii, 33, 34). This had been the old and perhaps the wise regulation of earlier days, since the cruelty, ambition, and luxury of these ladies were often more formidable to the provincials than those of the governors themselves. But the rule had often been violated, and had of late been forbidden by the emperor. See, too, the ready handing-over of the prisoner from one authority to another (ἀνώνυμος, remiss, Luke xxiii, 7; Acts xxvi, 82), some trace of that statutory dread of being denounced after their term of office was over, which alone acted as a check upon the lawless of the even the most uncivilized among the provincials. This is seen at first sight so trivial as the tribunal (δικαστήριον), and the tessellated pavement (Ἀπολλονιος) on which it was elevated, derives an interest and importance from the fact that they were conventional symbols of wealth and dignity, and that Julius Caesar thought it worth while to decorate his own (see Suetonius, Aug. 63). See Julius Cæsar, 14, 66. See Sib. De Statu Judeae Præstae, (Franc. 1698; also in Iken, Thea. Nor., ii, 592; Deyling, Observat. ii, 429; Grossmann, De Procuratoren (Lips. 1828); Langen, in the Theod. Quartalschr. (1862) iii; Bible Educator, iii, 180. See Governor.

Probodisa, a body of Antinomian Gnostic heretics, took their name from their founder, Probus, a heretic of the first century, who instituted the sect of the Adaminites. Probodius maintained that he and his followers were the sons of the most high God, a royal race (ζεύγατος), and therefore, in crazy self-conviction, thought themselves bound by no laws. They rejected the Sabbath; dispensed with prayer and all ordinances of external worship, which they considered to be necessary only for those who were under the power of the Demiurges. They indulged in open profanity, calling themselves Adaminites, because they professed to imitate the condition of daily life which many of their first parents beheld them fall. Their maxim was that they were restored by Christ to a state of innocence equal to that which characterized Adam before his transgression; and that, therefore, whenever they appeared together, they should not be ashamed to appear as Adam did in the state of his innocence. The practice of the habit of appealing to the authority of certain apocryphal books which were attributed to Zoroaster. Probodius is placed by Baronius in A.D. 120, before Valentinus. His followers are sometimes identified with the Aedonates, and sometimes with the Bishops. See Clement Alex. Strom, i, 304; ii, 438; viii, 722; Theodoret, Fab. Heret. i, 6; Farrar, Eccles. Dict. a. v.; Neander, Church Hist. i, 451.

Probodius (I), an Athenian philosopher of the school of the Sophists, was a contemporary of Socrates, and forerunner of the latter in the domain of philosophy, insomuch as he prepared the way for the logical and ethical efforts of Socrates. Probodius was a native of Sulis, in the island of Cosae. He went frequently to Athens for the purpose of transacting business on behalf of his native city, and even attracted admiration in the senate as an orator (Plato, Hipp. Mag. p. 292; comp. Philostr. Adv. Cels., 12), although he was apt to fall (Plato, Legg., p. 316, a; Philostr. L. c.). Plutarch describes him as slender and weak (Plut. ad sen. in Resp. c. 15); and Plato speaks of a degree of effeminacy which resulted therefrom (Protap. p. 815, d). Philostratus is the first who taxes him with luxury and extravagance (L. c.; comp. Welcker, Kleine Schriften, ii, 518, etc.). In the Protegorus of Plato, which points to the eighty-seventh Olympiad (any more exact determination is disputable) as the time at which the dialogue is supposed to take place, Probodius is mentioned as having previously arrived in Athens. Still later, when Isocrates (born Ol. 86, 1) is mentioned as his disciple (see Welcker, Prodikos von Keos, Vorgänger des Socrates, published first in the Rhénisches Museum der Philologie, von Welcker and Naeke, i, 1-39, 585-584, afterwards in Welcker's Kleine Schriften, ii, 392-541), and in the account of the death of Socrates, a man by the name of Probodius is still living (Plato, Apol. p. 19, c). The dates of his birth and death cannot be determined. The statement of Suidas (a. v.; comp. Schol. on Plato De Rep, x, 600, c) that he was born to the hemlock cup as a corrupor of the body and spirit of the soul, is of no special or personal significance (comp. Welcker, p. 582). According to the statement of Philostratus (p. 488 — comp. p. 496, ed. Olearium), on which little more reliance can be placed, he delivered his lecture on virtue and vice in Thessaly and Sparta also. The Apology of Plato unites him with Gorgias and the seventy-two critics of things as if he might have been, had he been living in whatever city they might come, they were competent to instruct
the youth. Lucian (Vit. Herod. c. 8) mentions him among those who had held lectures at Olympia. In the dialogues of Plato he is mentioned or introduced, not indeed without irony, though, as compared with the other Sophists, with a certain degree of esteem (Hipp. Maj. p. 381; Theaet. p. 161 b; Phaedo, 60; Protag. p. 368 b; Symposium, p. 248; Cratil. p. 384; b; Symposium, p. 177; Enu. of 385). Aristoph. 

In the Clouds (II. 560), deals more indulgently with him than with Socrates; and the Xenophonic Socrates, for the purpose of combating the voluptuousness of Aris- tippus, borrows from the book of the wise Prodicus, (Προδίκος | Προδίκος) the story of the choice of Hercules (Mem. ii. 1, § 21, etc.). This separation of Prodoi from the other Sophists has been pointed out by Welcker in the above-quoted treatise (p. 400, etc.). Like Protagoras and others, Prodoi delivered lectures in return for the payment of contributions (Iat: Σαυτοροσ | Σαυτοροσ | Σαυτοροσ). Mem. ii. 1, § 21; comp. Philostr. p. 482; Diog. Laert. ix. 50; ἤρως | ἤρως | ἤρως; Plato, Prote. 314, b; ) of from half a drachma to fifty drachmas, probably according as the hearers limited themselves to a single lecture, or enticed them to a complete course of lectures. (Arist. Rhet. 315, b; Arist. Rhet. iii. 14, § 9; Suid. s. v.; comp. Welcker, p. 414). Prodoi was said to have amassed a great amount of money (Hipp. Maj. p. 382, d; Xenoph. Symp. iv. 62; i, §; on the practice of paying for instruction and lectures, comp. again Welcker, p. 314, 31, etc. 

As Prodoi and others maintained with regard to themselves that they stood equally on the confines of philosophy and politics (Enu. p. 305, c.), so Plato represents his instructions as chiefly ethical (Men. p. 96, d; comp. De Rep. x. p. 600, e), and gives the preference to his distinction of ideas—as of those of courage, rashness, boldness—over similar attempts of other Sophists (Lack. p. 197, c.). What pertained to this point was probably only contained in individual show-orations (Diog. Laert. Phil. ii. 22, comp. Prodius), which he usually declined (Philos. p. 492). Though known to Callimachus, they do not appear to have been much longer preserved (Welcker, p. 465, etc.). In contrast with Gorgias and others, who boasted of possessing the art of making the small appear great, the great small, and of expatiating in long or short speeches, Prodoi required that the speech should be neither long nor short, but of the proper measure (Plato, Phaed. p. 267, a; comp. Gorg. p. 449, c; Prot. p. 384, e, 335, b, 336, d; Arist. Rhet. iii. 17), and it is only as associated with his philosophical and educational aims that he makes the weaker cause stronger by means of his rhetoric (Cicero, Brut. c. 8). He paid especial attention to the correct use of words (Plato, Etuid. p. 187, e; Cratyl. p. 384, b; comp. Galen, Hippocr. de Articul. iv. p. 461, 1), and the distinction of expressions related in sense (Lack. p. 197, d; Prot. p. 840, a, 841, a; Charisim. p. 163, d; Mem. p. 75, c; comp. Themist. Orat. iv. p. 113). But he deserves greater remembrance for his parrenatical discourses on moral subjects, among which one of the best known is Hercules at the Cross Roads (Phil. of Mem. p. 384, a; comp. the σύνταγμα προς το Προδίκος). It was entitled ὁ Προδίκος (Suid. s. v. ὁ Προδίκος | ὁ Προδίκος | ὁ Προδίκος). Schol. ad Aristoph. Nub. l. 360. Respecting the different explanations of this title, see Welcker, p. 466, etc., who refers it to the youthful bloom of Hercules). To Hercules, as he was on the point, at his entrance on the age of youth, of deciding for one of the two paths of life—that of virtue and that of vice—there appear two women, the one of dignified beauty, adorned with purity, modesty, and discretion, the other of a voluptuous form and mere-}
rived from the ἄρρητα, the elevated seat which the bishop occupied in the synod and in the religious assemblies of the people. See Coleman, Ancient Christianity Exemplified (Phila. 1856, 8vo), p. 131, and the references quoted on p. 261; Siegel, Christl. Alterthümer (see Index in vol. iv); Riddle, Christ. Antiquit. p. 211.

Proodrosia, sacrifices, or, as some allege, a festival offered to Demeter or Ceres at seed-time, with the view of securing a bountiful harvest.—Gardner, Faith of the World, s.v.

ιππορίας (ναοειριας), one of the names by which the early Church distinguished the teachers or preachers from the "brethren" (1 Tim. v. 17). Justin Martyr uses the term as synonymous with ἱππορίτης, when he speaks of the ἱππορίκαι as the person whose duty it was to consecrate the elements in the administration of the Lord's Supper (Apocol. II. 67), a duty subsequently performed only by the bishop except in his absence. (Pe- pin's decree, A.D. 755, is as follows: "Nullus presbyter presumat missas celebrire sine jurese episcopi in cujus parochia est." The Council of Aries laid similar restrictions upon the deacons [canon 15].) The title Proostes was translated into Latin by Proconsulatus, whence the English word Procuret (q. v.). See Coleman, Ancient Christianity Exemplified, p. 102 et al.; Siegel, Christl. Alterthümer (see Index in vol. iv); Riddle, Christ. Antiquit. p. 211.

Profane (πρόφανος, chadéph, Jer. xxiii, 11; βιβλικος, Heb. xii, 16). To profane is to put holy things to vile or common use; as the money-changers did the Temple, by converting a part of it into a place of business (Matt. xxi, 12), and as those do who allow secular occupations to encroach any part of the Sabbath under the old, or of the Lord's day under the new dispensation (Exod. xx, 8-10). Esau, for despising his birthright and his privileges, is styled by the apostle "a profane person" (Heb. xii, 16). The term is also used in opposition to holy. Thus the general history of ancient nations is styled profane, as distinguished from that contained in the Bible; profane writings are such as have not been held in the church to have a connection with the sacred books of Scripture, and the writings of Christian authors on sacred subjects.

Professio Fidelis Tridentina is the form of the Roman Catholic profession of faith in which it took shape at the Council of Trent and in which it was afterwards published by pope Pius IV, so that it is sometimes called the Acta Piae V. The general Christian confession of faith had been renewed in the third session of the Council of Trent on Feb. 8, 1546 (decretum de symbolo fidei), but there was need of something for general use in the Church at large, so that all its members might become obdactuated to the Church and its teachings, not only for their own faithfulness, but for their arraig against heretics. Hence Pius IV in 1546 ordered to be prepared a Formula Christiana et Catholica Fidei, and on Sept. 4, 1560, presented it for consideration to the cardinal college. In 1564 it was finally promulgated, and persons on becoming members of the Church of Rome are expected to recite the creed. This profession of faith runs as follows:

"I most steadfastly admit and embrace apostolical and ecclesiastical traditions, and all other observances and constitutions of the same Church.

"I also admit the holy Scriptures, according to that sense which our holy mother Church has held and does hold, to which it belongs to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Scriptures: neither will I ever take and interpret anything otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the fathers.

"I acknowledge that there are truly and properly seven sacraments of the new law, instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord, and necessary for the salvation of mankind, though not for the remission of sins: baptism, confirmation, matrimony, the holy eucharist, penance, extreme unction, holy orders, &c.

"Under penance is included confession, as the Catholic sacrament of penance consists of three parts—confession or acknowledgment of sin, together with the contrition or real sorrow, and satisfaction, by which the hair is shorn, initiatory to the ecclesiastical state.

"I firmly hold that there is a purgatory, and that the souls therein detained are helped by the sufferings of the faithful.

"Likewise, that the saints reigning with Christ to be honored and invoked, and that they offer intercession for God for us; and that their relics are to be had in veneration.

"I most firmly assert that the images of Christ, of the mother of God, and also of other saints, ought to be had and retained, and that due honor and veneration are to be given them.

"I also affirm that the power of indulgences was left by Christ in the apostles, and that the use of them is most wholesome to Christian people.

"I acknowledge the holy Catholic Apostolic Roman Church for theKirche, and of the mother of our Lord Jesus Christ, and I promise true obedience to the bishop of Rome, successor to St. Peter, prince of the apostles, and vicar of Jesus Christ."

Then follow clauses condemnatory of all contrary doctrines, and expressive of adhesion to all the definitions of the Council of Trent.

It is obvious that the Professio Fidelis Tridentina was framed in accordance with the decrees of that council, and has chiefly in view the opinions of those who followed the Reformation. See Möhler, Symbolik; Köllner, Die Symbolik der römischen Kirche, p. 141 sq.; Schaff, Creeds of Christendom (see Index in vol. III); Fisher, Hist. of the Reformation, p. 402.

Profession. Amoung the ceremonies of baptism in the early Church, one of great importance was the profession of faith and vow of obedience. The catechumens first renounced the devil, and then professed to live in obedience to the laws of Christ. See PACTUM.

Christians are required to make a profession of their faith—1, boldly (Rom. i. 16); 2, explicitly (Matt. v, 16); 3, consistently (John xiv. 23); 4, with cordiality, not ostentatiously, but with humility and meekness.

Among the Romanists, profession denotes the entering into a religious order, whereby a person offers himself to God by a vow of inviolably observing obedience, chastity, and poverty.

Professor, a term commonly used in the religious world to denote any person who makes an open acknowledgment of the religion of Christ, or who outwardly manifestis his attachment to Christianity. All real Christians are professors, but all professors are not real Christians. In this, as in all other things of worth and importance, we find counterfeits. There are many who become professors not from principle, from investigation, from love to the truth, but from interested motives, prejudice of education, custom, influence of connections, novelty, etc., as Saul, Jehu, Judas, Demas, the foolish virgins, etc. See CHRISTIAN.

Profesti Dies. Days without any special service, in distinction from solemn or officiating days, which include stations, litanies, fasts, and feast-days or festivals, into two classes, sacred and minor orders. The first consists of some of the suborders of the church, such as tonsure, the daily recitation of the Breviary, and the collection of psalms and prayers, occupying a considerable time. The minor orders are four in number, and are preceded by the tonsure, an ecclesiastical ceremony in which the hair is shorn, initiatory to the ecclesiastical state.
PROFIAT DURAN

Profiat Duran, whose Jewish name was Isaac ben Moses (surnamed Ephedocus from his principal work "Deis Natan") was known as a gifted poet, philosopher, and astronomer. He flourished between 1680 and 1412. In the bitter persecution of 1391 he was driven outwardly to embrace Christianity to save his life. In order to appear as a mask of Christianity, he took the name of love nearly exterminated all his co-religionists, Profiat and a friend, who had become an apostate for like reasons, concluded to go to Palestine to confess Judaism. Profiat Duran left first and went to a seaplace in the south of France, awaiting the arrival of his friend. Meanwhile, Profiat the Ben-Giorno wrote to Paul of Benger (q. v.), who persuaded him to remain steadfastly in his Christian faith. Ben-Giorno wrote a letter to Duran in full praise of the bishop of Burgos, expounding his religious belief and exhorting him at the same time to be also true to Christianity. This imbibed Duran not only against his friend, but especially against the bishop of Burgos, and he answered in a polemical epistle, full of bitter sarcasm and irony, entitled "Be not like thy Fathers," called by Christians Alecta Boteca, who, misunderstanding its purpose, took it as a defence of Christianity, while in reality aimed against it. The whole letter was equivocal. It was believed at first reading that it was an exhortation to stand fast in the religion he had embraced; but the mystery was easily discovered, and it appeared by an attentive consideration that Duran meant to oblige his friend to return to Judaism. This celebrated work was first published at Constantinople in 1577 in a collection of other works. It was later published by A. Gundersburg in the collection "Itinerarium" (Breslaw, 1844). Geiger published a German translation in his "Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift," iv, 452-458 (Stuttgart, 1839), and an English translation was published in the "Jewish Messenger" (N. Y. Sept. 12, 1873). Besides, Duran wrote "The Reproach of the Gentiles," in 12 chapters, which has not as yet been published. An extract of it, as well as the contents of the chapters, is given in the "Catalogue of Michael's Library," p. 364, 365 (Hamburg, 1848); "The Work of Ephedoc," a Hebrew grammar, divided into 32 chapters, with an interesting and elaborate introduction. Endowed with remarkable grammatical tact, he was the first to demonstrate the reflexive or reciprocal instead of the passive meaning of Niphal. His important grammar, which he finished in 1405, of which fragments are printed in the "Bible" of Amstel (1551), is one of the best editions of its kind. It was also published in the "Jewish Times," iv, 42-43 (ed. Ginsburg, London, 1865), but lately been published by Dr. J. Friedlander and J. Kohn, with an introduction, notes, and elucidations (Vienna, 1865):—

a commentary on two sections of Ibn Ezza's commentary on the Pentateuch (De Rossi, No. 835):—a commentary on Ibn Ezza's exegisa on the following passages:


PROKOPIVICH

Profft, George Marion, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Yancey County, N. C., about 1835. He professed religion and joined the Church in 1853. He was admitted to the Holston Conference in 1858. His first appointment was to the Cleveland circuit as junior preacher; his second year was spent on Spencer mission; his third, on Sulphur Springs circuit; his fourth, on Newport circuit. His health having failed, he went to Florida, where he died on Sunday, June 5, 1864. He led an exemplary and pious life.

Prognosticator. The phrase "monthly prognosticators" occurs in the A. V. as a rendering of ψευδόνυμος, making known as to the months, in Isa. xxiv, 13, where the prophet is enumerating the astrological superstitious of the Chaldeans. It is known that the Chaldean astrologers professed to divine future events by the positions, aspects, and appearances of the stars, which they regarded as having great influence on the affairs of men and kingdoms; and it would seem, from the present text, that they put forth accounts of the events which might be expected to occur from month to month, like our modern astronomers. Some carry the analogy further, and suppose that they also gave monthly tables of the weather; but such prognostications are only cared for in climates where the weather is uncertain and variable; while in Chaldea, where (as we know from actual experience) the seasons are regularly fixed and known in their duration and recurrence, where variations of the usual course of the weather are all but unknown, no prognosticator would gain much honor by foretelling what every peasant knows. See ASTROLOGY; DIVINATION.

Pro-Hegoumenos, the ex-superior of a Greek convent who has completed his term of office, which is two years, and retires divested of nothing but his authority.—Gardner, "Faiths of the World," s. v.

Pröble, Heinrich Andreas, Dr., a Lutheran minister, who died April 19, 1876, at Hornhausen, near Oeschersleben, in Germany, is best known by his writings in the departments of homiletics, liturgy, and pedagogy. He published, among other works, an "Liturgetische Forme" (Halberstadt, 1846):—Die körperliche, christliche und bürgerliche Schulersziehung (Magdeburg, 1846);—"Leitfaden bei dem Komfirmanden.- Unterrichte, mit einem Vorworte von Claus Harms (q. v.)" (Halberstadt, 1851);—"Liturgetischer Handwörterbuch" (Wernigerode, 1856):—Predigt-Erwürfe für die Evangelien u. Episteln, etc. (ibid. 1856);—Das Halberstädtische Kirchen- und Haus-Grundbuch in seiner erneuerten Gestalt (Oeschersleben, 1856):—Kirchliche Sitten. Ein Bild aus dem Leben evangelischer Gemeinen (Berlin, 1858). This latter work is the most important of his writings. See Zuchold, "Bibliotheca Theologica," iii, 1015; "Literarischer Handwörterbuch" (1875), p. 522; Hauck, "Theol. Jahresbericht" (1866), ii, 734. (B. P.)

Prostamene (προσταμένου) is only another title which was given to the preacher of the early Church. See Phoebus.

Prokmimion (προκκίμιον, something that lies before) is, in the Greek liturgy, the short anthem pronounced previous to the reading of the epistle from the Holy Scriptures, consisting of verse and response usually taken from the Psalms. The purpose is to give a hint as to the way in which the day of the celebration is to be used. Such phrases are, for instance, "Praise ye the Lord," "Give ear to my prayer, O Lord," "Thy mercy, O Lord," "God help me through thy name," "My help comes from the Lord," "O Lord, thou art my protector." Previous to the calling out of the prayer text the deacon exclaims, "Let us listen!"—Wetzer u. Welte, "Kirchen Lex." s. v.

Prokopivitch, Teofan, a Russian prelate of
great renown, especially as a pulpit orator, and therefore called the Chrysostom of the Russo-Greek Church, was born at Kief June 8, 1881. Baptized Eleazar, he exchanged, with the consent of St. Basil, in a United Greek monastery of that order in Lithuania. He was sent to Rome to finish his studies, and there he remained three years when he suddenly removed, by force of circumstances not known, and went to Potchefstroom in Volynia, where he renounced his faith, and was translated to the chair of rhetoric in the Academy of Kief. When Peter I passed through the city, after the victory at Pultava, the duty of complimenting him was confided to Prokopovitch. He accompanied the czar in his unequal campaign on the Pruth, and was made abbot of the monastery of Kief. In 1715 he was promoted to the seat of Pakop, although he avowed that he had expressed heretical doctrines at the court and in his writings. The doctors of the Sorbonne, wishing to profit by the visit Peter I had paid to them in 1717, attempted to enter into friendly relations with the Russian Church. Appointed to reply to their address to the czar, Prokopovitch frustrated this attempt; and, yielding himself to all the views of the despot, he composed an ecclesiastical constitution which made of the Church a national institution, and the clergy servants employed by the State—a condition which remains unaltered in the Russian Church to this day. He also, at the emperor’s instigation, consented to the sequestration of the Church domains, and apportioned to the clergy a share of their revenue proportionate to their several ranks. He received from Catherine, whom he had crowned empress, the presidency of the synod and the archbishopric of Novgorod, founded by Theodosius. Prokopovitch crowned Peter II, whose right to the throne he had attacked in a work condemned by a ukase of July 26, 1727, by the then emperor Anna, and encouraged the latter to commit in 1730 the stroke of policy from the effects of which Russia yet suffers the most deplorable consequences. He died at St. Petersburg Sept. 8, 1736. He left a great number of pamphlets and expositions of all sorts, some in impure Russian, some in Latin. Quatrefais admits that the works of this prelate were specimens of the basest adulation.—Hoefer, Nouve. Biog. Génér. s. v. See Tschickovitch, Théophile Prokopóvitch et Théophile Lopatinski (St. Petersburg, 1861); Otto. Russ. Lit. s. v.; Metz. Quart. Rev. July, 1878, p. 498.

Promotor, the chairman or president of convocation in the church. See ConvoCATION.

Promoter. See SPONSOR.

Promise (some form of "εγαίνω", to say, or "εγαίνω", to speak; εγαίνων) is a solemn assurance by which one pledges his veracity that he will perform, or cause to be performed, for the benefit of another, the thing which he mentions. A promise, in the scriptural sense of the term, is a declaration or assurance of the divine will, in which God signifies what particular blessings or good things he will freely bestow, as well as the evils which he will remove. Promises differ from the command of God, inasmuch as the former are significations of the divine will concerning a duty enjoined to be performed, while the promises relate to mercy to be received. The exceeding great and precious promises are applicable to all believers; they appertain to the present and the future life (2 Pet. i. 4). Some particular promises are predictions, as the promise of the Messiah, and the blessings of the Gospel (Rom. iv, 13, 14; Gal. iii, 14—20). Hence the Hebrews were called the "children of the promise" (Rom. ix, 8). So all the true believers in the Lord Jesus Christ are called "children" and "heirs of the promise" (Gal. iv, 20; Heb. vi. 12, 17). There are four classes of promises mentioned in the Scriptures, promises relating to the new covenant, promises relating to the Messiah; 2, promises relating to the Church; 3, promises of blessings, both temporal and spiritual, to the pious; and, 4, promises encouraging the exercise of the several graces and duties that compose the Christian character. The first two of these classes, indeed, are many of them predictions as well as promises. See PROMISE. The mentioning of the others should prove, 1, an antidote to despair; 2, a motive to patience under affliction; 3, an incentive to perseverance in well-doing; 4, a call for prayer.

Promise is a solemn assurance by which one pledges his veracity that he shall perform, or cause to be performed, the new name of the Church. See PROMISE. The consideration of the promises arises from the necessity of the well-being and existence of society. "Virtue requires," as Dr. Doddridge observes, "that promises be fulfilled. The promisee, i.e. the person to whom the promise is made, acquires a property in virtue of the promise. The uncertainty of property would evidently be attended with great inconveniences. By failing to fulfill my promise, I either show that I was not sincere in making it, or that I have little constancy or resolution, and either way injure my character, and consequently my usefulness in life. Promises, however, are not binding, 1, if they were made by us before we came to such exercise of reason as to be fit to transact affairs of moment; or if by any distemper or sudden surprise we are deprived of the exercise of the reason at the time when the promise is made; 2, if the promise was made on a false premise, in which the promisee was not diligent inquired, was imposed upon, especially if he were deceived by the fraud of the promisee; 3, if the thing itself be vicious, for virtue cannot require that vice should be committed; 4, if the accomplishment of the promise be so hard and intolerable that there is reason to believe that, had it been foreseen, it would not have been an accepted case; 5, if the promise be not accepted, or if it depend on conditions not performed." But really this question concerning the possibility and obligation of a promise, given or obtained under false views is a matter that falls within the Curiosity of Ethics—a very uncertain ground. See Grotius, De Jure, lib. ii, cap. xi; Paley, Moral Philosophy, vol. i. ch. v.; Grove, Moral Philosophy, vol. ii. ch. xii, p. 2; Watts, Sermons, ser. 20; Dymond, Essays; Verplanck, On Contracts. See OBLIGATION; PROMISE.

Promises of God are the kind declarations of his Word, in which he hath assured us he will bestow blessings upon his people. The promises contained in the sacred Scriptures may be considered, 1, divine as to their origin; 2, certain as to their number; 3, clear as to their expression; 4, certain as to their accomplishment. The consideration of them should, 1, prove an antidote to despair; 2, a motive to patience; 3, a call for prayer; 4, a spur to perseverance. See Clark, On the Promises; Back, Sermons, ser. 11.

Promissum. See PACTUM.

Promotio per saltum is, in the Church of Rome, the intentional disregard of the legal scale of the different orders. It is the collusion or the obtaining of a higher order by way of skipping one or several other orders, which, according to rule, ought to precede. In consequence, he who has been ordained perhaps cannot perform the functions of the order thus unlawfully bestowed until the next inferior order has been subsequently obtained also (c. um. Dist. ili); this inferior degree the bishop can confer on him, and allow him at once to perform the duties of the higher degree (Cest. Trad. sess. xxiii. c. 14, De Eccl.); while, if the professed ecclesiastical officiates according to the higher order thus illicitly conferred on him without the episcopal dispensation, he becomes irregular, and needs papal dispensation (c. um. x, De Cler. per salt. prom. v. 29). The consecration of a bishop, with omission of the several steps in the order, would not only be illicit, but utterly void (Art. x. 10, fin. x. De excess. protal. pr. 81).—Weitzen u. Welte, Kirchen-Lexicon, s. v.
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Jean Henri Roman, a French ecclesiastic, was born on April 7, 1758, at Montauban. He was the eldest of twelve children. After he had finished his classical studies in the little seminary, he was received into the large seminary of Valence, and was admitted to the priesthood two years before the required age, Nov. 5, 1721. At first employed to do curate's duty in the office of his parish, he then taught dogmatic theology in the great seminary of Valence, and ended in doing parochial duty. Having been appointed in 1727 to the chair of philosophy in the College of Tournon, he refused, without being authorized, to have his name added to that required by the professors by the ordinance of 1828, and was deposed. At the end of 1829 he went to Paris, and was attached to M. de Croi, then head chaplain to the hospital of Quinze Vingt, in the capacity of chaplain. He saved that establishment from downfall in 1831. In this humble position the abbé Prompsaut, although scrupulously fulfilling the obligations of priest and chaplain, had yet considerable time to give to study. He put aside the largest share of the receipts of his publications and of his literary pension to buy books, and he formed a library of 25,000 volumes. He began his literary career by publishing a critical edition of the works of Villon in 1832, and in 1835 he published a criticism of an edition of French literature published by Crapelot. This last work engaged him in a lively controversy with Crapelot, in which he defended himself in a work that was really universal, and he was afterwards the character of his polemical writings. He occupied himself for many years with the Latin and Romance languages. In 1857 he published many translations of ascetic works. His principal study was canon law and the civil and ecclesiastical jurisprudence of France. Himself a thorough Gallican he discarded the ultramontane tendencies of the French episcopacy, and advocated the liberties of the Gallican Church. In this spirit he attacked the encyclical of pope Pius IX, and brought such odium upon himself that he was led to retract much that he had uttered against ultra-Romanism, though at heart he always felt his first course to have been the true and proper one. His last years were embittered by remorse, and he died Jan. 7, 1868, neglected by those for whom he had sacrificed his honor.—H. B., Rev. membroner, xliii, 340; Vaperater, Dict. des Contemporains, s. v.

Promulgation or Publication, i. e. proclaimation—usually of a law by the competent legislative power of a nation. The promulgation is the act of communicating a law or ordinance to the public, and is the sole condition of its binding character ("lex non promulgata non obligat").

In consequence, an ecclesiastical law, like any civil law, in order to become obligatory in foro externo must be promulgated in the customary way by the competent authorities of the Church. The binding power of the law rests entirely on the will of the legislator publicly expressed, and begins at the very moment of the promulgation ("lex promulgata statim obligat").

A law has generally no retroactive power ("lex non retro agit"), unless it be merely an explanation or reiteration of a former disposition, or unless retroactive power be expressly given to it. From the moment of the promulgation takes effect also the juridical presumption of the general knowledge of the law, which excludes every excuse of ignorantia legis (Sext. c. 13; De R. T. v, 13), unless the legislator substrates the validity of the ordinance to the observance of the law, and this former presumption has not been observed. Every one whom the law may concern is bound to conform to it as soon as he has obtained, no matter by what means, a knowledge of it. The diocesan ordinances of archbishops and bishops are, as a rule, communicated to the deaneries, and through them, by circuit letters, to the curates, etc., who publish them from the pulpit, or by placards at the church doors.

The papal see used in former times to address its ordinances to the chief ecclesiastical dignitaries of the countries, provinces, or dioceses which they concerned, and had them communicated by them to the subordinate clerical authorities, for further publication, by way of synods and circular letters. Afterwards the custom prevailed of publishing the general prescriptions of the papal see only at Rome, in acte campi Flora, and of posting them at the door of the Vatican. Thus the principle was adopted that the publication was required by the professors by the ordinance of 1828, and was deposed. At the end of 1829 he went to Paris, and was attached to M. de Croi, then head chaplain to the hospital of Quinze Vingt, in the capacity of chaplain. He saved that establishment from downfall in 1831. In this humble position the abbé Prompsaut, although scrupulously fulfilling the obligations of priest and chaplain, had yet considerable time to give to study. He put aside the largest share of the receipts of his publications and of his literary pension to buy books, and he formed a library of 25,000 volumes. He began his literary career by publishing a critical edition of the works of Villon in 1832, and in 1835 he published a criticism of an edition of French literature published by Crapelot. This last work engaged him in a lively controversy with Crapelot, in which he defended himself in a work that was really universal, and he was afterwards the character of his polemical writings. He occupied himself for many years with the Latin and Romance languages. In 1857 he published many translations of ascetic works. His principal study was canon law and the civil and ecclesiastical jurisprudence of France. Himself a thorough Gallican he discarded the ultramontane tendencies of the French episcopacy, and advocated the liberties of the Gallican Church. In this spirit he attacked the encyclical of pope Pius IX, and brought such odium upon himself that he was led to retract much that he had uttered against ultra-Romanism, though at heart he always felt his first course to have been the true and proper one. His last years were embittered by remorse, and he died Jan. 7, 1868, neglected by those for whom he had sacrificed his honor.—H. B., Rev. membroner, xliii, 340; Vaperater, Dict. des Contemporains, s. v.

Promulgation or Publication, i. e. proclamation—usually of a law by the competent legislative power of a nation. The promulgation is the act of communicating a law or ordinance to the public, and is the sole condition of its binding character ("lex non promulgata non obligat").

In consequence, an ecclesiastical law, like any civil law, in order to become obligatory in foro externo must be promulgated in the customary way by the competent authorities of the Church. The binding power of the law rests entirely on the will of the legislator publicly expressed, and begins at the very moment of the promulgation ("lex promulgata statim obligat").

A law has generally no retroactive power ("lex non retro agit"), unless it be merely an explanation or reiteration of a former disposition, or unless retroactive power be expressly given to it. From the moment of the promulgation takes effect also the juridical presumption of the general knowledge of the law, which excludes every excuse of ignorantia legis (Sext. c. 13; De R. T. v, 13), unless the legislator substrates the validity of the ordinance to the observance of the law, and this former presumption has not been observed. Every one whom the law may concern is bound to conform to it as soon as he has obtained, no matter by what means, a knowledge of it. The diocesan ordinances of archbishops and bishops are,
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630 PROPAGANDA OF THE FAITH

full title is De Propagandâ Fide, i.e. "concerning the propagation of the faith." Its object is to direct and forward the propagation of the Roman Catholic religion, especially among the heathen. Gregory XIII (1572) established the congregation, which is the most zealously for the expansion of the Christian faith, had directed that a number of cardinals should be instructed with the direction of the Oriental missions, and caused catechisms and other religious books to be printed for the use of Oriental Christians. But as the resources required for such a purpose were wanting, the matter could not have its proper development. Pope Gregory XV, desirous that this good work, so well begun, should be continued, established, by a bull of June 22, 1622, a congregation of cardinals, under the name above mentioned, and intrusted it to the direction of the whole Catholic missionary system. Every month they assembled once in the Vatican, and twice at the residence of the eldest. Besides some stipends of less importance, the pope presented the new institution with the 500 ducats which at the death of a cardinal accrue to the pontifical treasury. His successor, Urban VIII (1623-1644), increased its privileges and income, and founded the Seminaria (or Collegium) de Propagandâ Fide, to which young men from all nations are brought at an early age and gratuitously instructed and fitted out for foreign service. This college was subdi- divided entirely to the Congregation, and a splendid palace was built for both institutions. Through the provision of the popes, and pious foundations made by the cardinals and other benefactors, the seminary grew to a most flourishing condition; and even in our days, when the income and foundations which support it have been considerably diminished by the State, under the new order of things, it entertains, instructs, and trains for missionary life nearly 200 young men from all quarters of the world. The alumni pledge themselves to serve God and Church among the heathen, and are consecrated to this function. All rites actually subsisting in the Catholic Church (besides the Latin rite, the Armenian, Greek-Melchite, Syrian, Coptic, Maronite, and Chaldaic rites) are represented in the semi- nary by alumni from the corresponding provinces, and present every year, at the feast of Epiphany (Jan. 6), an imposing spectacle, called the Feast of the Languages. This feast is celebrated by an exhibition of exceeding interest and curiosity, in which are delivered recitations in every language proper to it in the world, and in its mission- aries, amounting often to fifty or sixty. Of this festi- val the celebrated cardinal Mezzofanti (vq.) used to be the guiding spirit, as well as to strangers its chief cen- tre of attraction. It continues to be one of the chief literary sights of the Roman winter. In 1873 the colle- gium published its first statistical report of its missionary and estate and made dependent upon private contributions.

With the congregation and college are connected, 1, a library rich in precious works, especially translations of all kinds of important works in Chinese and Ori- ental manuscripts, 2, a printing-office (richer formerly than it is now), in which the books required by the missionaries and the missionary work are printed in all foreign languages ("Ha questa congregazione una fa- mosa stamparia co' caratteri di tutte le nazioni; ne si troverà altra stamparia che nella varietà di tanti carat- teri l' aggrazia,") Zaccaria, in his book Della Corte di Roma (Rome, 1774); 3, a remarkable museum, filled with a great variety of objects and monuments, mostly from countries visited and converted by the missiona- ries. The congregation, which answers somewhat to a Protestant mission board, consists of a president, managing secretary (all of cardinal's rank), an apostolic prothonotary, twenty-four cardinals appointed for life, one of whom is prefect, and who are assisted by a num- ber of consultants (partly monastics and partly clergy), clerks (minuanti), and other officials. Originally it had no fixed meeting-place, but only gathered together at the pope; now they are monthly, being, however, weekly conferences (congressi) of the prefect, secretary, and consultors; and all important business is submitted to the pope in person by the prefect or the secretary. This congregation conducts the affairs not only of the missionaries, but also of all those— as England, the northern kingdoms, the United States, Canada, South America, etc. — in which the hierarchal organization is not, or has not been, full and formal. To the Propaganda no small part of the ag- gressive power of the Church of Rome is due. It has complete military power, under the pope, over the whole missionary field, not only to send missionaries wherever it is the interest of the Church to send them, but to give them special training adapted to their spec- ial work. There are nowhere to be found better modern maps of the newly settled states of the United States than in the college of the Propaganda, and nowhere men better informed as to the probable points of future importance than the cardinals who compose the congregation of the Propaganda. The work of this congregation is greatly facilitated by coordinate associations for the propagation of the faith, among the most important of which are those at Lyons (France), Vienna, and Bavaria. It supports, besides, another similar institution for the Chinese at Naples. The founder of the congregation has a palaestra in the house of Urban VIII, in Via Viva, both in Rome. It is part of the duties of the pope to superintend this vast and complicated work, and to invite all nations to the communion of the Church. See Erechtu S. Congregations de Fide Cath. Propagandâ (Bullar. iii., 441 sqq.; Bullar. Pontif. S. Congr. de Prop. Fide (Rome, 1829-1841, 3 vols. 4to); Boys, Congr. de Prop. Fide (Rome and London, 1721, 4to); Mejer, Die Propaganda (Gotting. 1835-36, 2 vols. 8vo; a most valuable treatise); Hase, Church Hist. p. 470; Alzog, Kirchenlexic. ii. 410, 429, 574; Church Rev. v. viii; Wetzel u. Weber, New Work in Catholic Missions, Kirchen-Lex. s. a. in Barnum, Romanism (see Index); Marsden, Hist. of Churchs and Sects. ii. 202. (J. H. W.)

Propagation of the Faith, Associations for, Roman Catholic. The earliest and the highest in dignity of these has been already described under the head PROPAGANDA (q.v.); but the present century has produced several private associations, the resources of which arise entirely from voluntary annual contributions, and the organization of which is most complete and most extensive. The first of these is that founded at Lyons, called the Congregatio de Propagatione de la Foi, with a branch at Paris, and subordinate branches in the other Catholic kingdoms. It is under the direction of a council, which communicates as well with the local associations through which the funds are supplied by small weekly, monthly, or yearly contributions. The mission work of the society is carried on in French and in its mission stations and helps, the fund so raised is applied, by an apportionment reg- ulated according to the necessities of each. The piety of contributors is stimulated by the exhortations of the popes, and the granting of indulgences to those who, with the other requisite donations, contribute to the work. The journal of the society, entitled Annales de la Propagation de la Foi, is a very interesting bimonthly collection of letters and reports from the different mis- sions connected with the central body. The receipts of this association for the year 1862 were 4,784,496 fr. 86 c. Of this sum, by far the largest proportion was raised in France—3,307,248 fr. Italy came next, though at a long interval, contributing 429,658 fr.; Belgium gave 271,597 fr.; Germany, 251,678 fr.; the British is- lands, 127,900 fr.; Spain, once the great propagator of the Gospel in the New World, is not now represented; but it is to be observed that Spain maintains for her own missionary enterprises a large and liberal establish- ment in connection with the mission of the Philippines and the South Sea. Another association somewhat later date was that known as the affectation of Vienna in 1829, the chief object of which is to assist the missions of German origin, especially in America.
This association also has its own journal, entitled *Berechic der Leopoldiner Stiftung*. It is under the presidency of the archbishop of Vienna. A third is that established in Bavaria as an offshoot of the Lyoner association, under the name "Ludwig's Missions-Verein." Like this German association, its chief, also an exclusive object is the support of German missions. The Ludwig's Verein is conducted under the auspices of the archbishop of Munich. All these associations, although quite independent in their management and direction, nevertheless maintain close relations with the Propagation of the Gospel, and are often guided by the recommendations of the cardinal prefect in the distribution of their funds to particular missions.

**Proper Names.**—The chief names that strike us, on a general view of them all, is that the ancient Hebrews always retained the greatest simplicity in the use of names. In reality there is always only one single name which distinguishes a person. Where it is necessary, the name of the father is added; sometimes that of the mother instead, in cases where women have been more celebrated (thus the three heroic brothers, Job, Abishai, and Asael, are always called after their mother, Zeruiah [1 Chron. ii. 16]); or the line of descent is traced further back, often to the fourth generation, or even further. More epithets, like "David the king," "Isaiah the prophet," always express the actual and significant dignity of a man. The instances in which a person receives two names alternately, as Jacob-Israel, Gideon-Jerubbaal (Judg. vi-x), are casual and rare, and are not to be ascribed to a general custom of the people.

1. The simple names exist in great abundance; and their signification, as to the mere word itself, is generally evident: as גן, Gan, "judge;" יַעֲעִירוּ, Ya’iru, "desired," also an ancient name, according to Gen. xlvi. 10; 1 Chron. ii. 27; ויַעֲעִירוּ, Ya’iru, "desire;" also an ancient name, according to Gen. xlvi. 10; comp. xxxvi. 87; וב, Gebor, "hero" (1 Kings iv. 19). Thus most of them express an honorable sense; although examples are not wanting of the contrary design, as שֹׁכֹן, Shok, "crooked" (2 Sam. xxiii. 26). With what case also feminine names become names for men is shown by cases like רַע, Reu, "vulture" (iii. 7; xxii. 8; comp. Gen. xxxvi. 24). ולֹעַ, Josch, "dove," which are just as applicable to men as to the masculine בֵּית, Beth, "fox." (1 Chron. vii. 36). Diminutives, which are so frequently used as proper names by the Arabs, are rare among the Hebrews; but are by no means wanting, as is proved by בֵּיתָא, Betha, זָבֵל, Zavol, the son of Jacob, and וַעֲעִירוּ, Ya’iru, the singer of David. All those names which are formed with a prefixed god are to be considered as especially ancient, because this nominal formation became entirely obsolete in the languages almost only in proper names, as is shown not only by the well-known names בֵּיתָא, Jacob, בֵּיתָא, Joseph, יִשְׂרָאֵל, Yisra’el;יִשְׂרָאֵל, Yisra’el, also but by a number of less common ones, as בֵּיתָא, Betha (Num. xxvi. 24); בֵּיתָא, Betha (1 Chron. iv. 24); בֵּיתָא, Betha; Jamlech (ver. 34); בֵּיתָא, Betha; Jason (v. 13); בֵּיתָא, Betha (Exod. vi. 18); בֵּיתָא, Betha (2 Sam. v. 15); בֵּיתָא, Betha, Jebsanech (Num. xiii. 6; 1 Chron. vii. 88); בֵּיתָא, Betha, Jerahom (1 Sam. i. 1; 1 Chron. viii. 27); and others. There is an ancient adjective-ending, that in בֵּית or בֵּית, which has fixed itself most firmly in proper names, as בֵּיתא, Abzazm (1 Chron. iv. 6); בֵּיתא, Gaszma (Ezra ii. 49; בֵּיתא, Miriam, the sister of Moses, and בֵּיתא, Gerahom, his son; בֵּיתא, Chinkam (2 Sam. xix. 34), which not only exists also in the form יִשְׂרָאֵל, Chinkam (Jer. xiii. 17), but in בֵּיתא, Chinkam (2 Sam. xix. 40), according to customary changes.

2. The compound names, however, are more important for history, because they express more complete and distinct ideas than the simple names. Some of them are altogether isolated, as בֵּיתא, Chinkam, properly "serpentine mouth," the grandson of Abiram; בֵּיתא, Jasuch, the son of Jacob; Oboiah (Exod. xxx. 6), "father's tent," a name resembling the Greek Patricios. But most of them bear a general resemblance to each other, and follow in shools certain dominant opinions and customs; and these last are what we must particularly consider here.

A great number of them owe their origin to the relations of the house, as the sense of the first word of the compound shows. Most of these have the word בֵּיתא, Abi, "father," for their first member, as Abi-zer, Abi-ab, Abigal. First (Handwörterbuch, p. 7, 50) regards these words as names for the Divine Being, rendering such a name as Abi-zer, as B.'s king; Abi-ab, Abi's God; so judge and so Achib, Abi's hand. Others deny any reference to the Deity in these words, but cannot agree whether they are to be taken literally or figuratively. The Easterns use the word ab (father), etc., to express the possession of any quality. The fox is abu Wusaxu ("father of the little fort," i.e., the borrower). The mosquito is abu ’Ya’u’a ("father of the axe"), from its sharp instrument of incision. The camel is abu yyyub ("father of Job"), from his patience. Many therefore think that such a name as Abinaom ("father of kindness") means merely very kind. Others, as Esra, regard the words ab, aci, ən, etc., as at least at one time expressive of real relationship, and think such names exhibit an approach to our family names. It sometimes happens that a person appears with the name both in its simple as well as its compound state. For example, Nadah, as well as Abinadah, Ezer and Abi-zere, Abner ("father of Ner") was son of Ner. This seems to imply that something like the present Arabic practice had begun to prevail among the Hebrews. Certain names become hereditary in a family, and a man in an especial sense to name his male relative the traditional name. To such an extent is this custom carried that a man whose son should have been called "Yusuf" is styled "Abu Yusuf," even if he has no son; and a woman who is childless rejoices in the name uma Masa ("Mother of Moses"); because, had she had a son, he would have borne the name "Muas." In all likelihood these words, ab, etc., have not always the same meaning; the connective vowel i is not always a sign of the genitive, but merely of the construct or state of composition. We could more easily admit a metaphorical sense in the compounds with son, since צא is really often used in a highly metaphorical sense. Beshi-ba is certainly not the daughter of a man named Sheba (2 Sam. xi. 8). Such compound names with son, however, are, on the whole, rare, and are only found in some frequency in 1 Kings iv. 7, 9. See An.; Bex.;

Under this class we may also include יִשְׂרָאֵל, Yisra’el, "man," with which several names are compounded. Another, but a smaller, class consists of names compounded with בֵּית, Am, "people," resembling the many Greek compositions with λαός and διός; and just as in Greek διός is placed first or last (Demosethes, Aristodemos), so also Am is at one time found in the first, and at another in the last place; only that, according to the laws of the Semitic language, the sense of one of these positions is exactly the reverse of the
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other. As all these compounds must be conceived to be in the state construct, so likewise we are probably to take the names יִרְאוּבָּן, Jeroboam, properly "people's increaser," a suitable name for a prince, and יָשָׁבְוָן, Yashobam, "people's turn," or "as it pleases," for, as we observed above, the simple names are often formed with a prefixed יָדָד; and we actually find יַשָּׁבְוָנוֹ, Yashbona, as a simple name in Numb. xxvi, 29; 1 Chron. vii, 1.

Many compound names endeavor to express a religious sense, and therefore contain the divine name. Here we are at the same time find a new law of formation: as these compounds are intended to portray the thoughts, such as the religious sentiment requires, a name may consist of an entire proposition with a verb, but of course in as brief a compass as possible; and indeed shorter compounds are made with a verb than with a passive participle, as יִשָּׁבְווֹ נְתָנָהָל, Nathanael (in the New Test. נְתָנָאֶל), properly "God-gave," i.e. whom God gave, given by God, Θεοσώκος or Θεοσώκον, sounds shorter than יִשָּׁבְווֹ נְתָנָהָל, Nethaneiel, with the participle, which would certainly express the same sense. But since the finite verb, as also any other predicate, can just as well precede as follow, accordingly a great freedom in the position of the divine name has prevailed in this class; and this peculiarity is preserved, in the same cases, in the following period: but indeed the Greeks use Δωροτίτας as well as Θεοσώκος. Thus יִשָּׁבְוֹ נְתָנָהָל, Nethaneiel (1 Chron. ii, 14), or יִשָּׁבְוֹ נְתָנָהָל, Elhanan (Jer. xxxvi, 12). The two names are there generally assigned to two different persons; nevertheless, both combinations may form names for the same person, as יִשָּׁבְוֹ נְתָנָאֶל, Ammiel (1 Chron. iii, 5), and יִשָּׁבְוֹ נְתָנָאֶל, Ekiam (2 Sam. xi, 3), belong to the same individual.

Lastly, many proper names have assumed the derivative suffix -יט, or -ית (which appears to be only dialectically different from -ית, and is chiefly frequent in the later period): and we must certainly consider that, in some cases, this suffix may possibly form mere adjectives, and therewith simple names, as יִשָּׁבְוֹ נְתָנָאֶל, Amittai, "ironsman," from יִשָּׁבְוֹ נְתָנָאֶל, Emeth, "truth," and בָּשָׁלָת, "iron," the name of a celebrated Gileadite family (Exra ii, 61; 2 Sam. xviii, 27); or that it is derived from a place, as יִשָּׁבְוֹ נְתָנָאֶל, Beer ( Hos. i, 1; 1 Chron. vii, 26), "he of the well," or "he of a place known as the well." But it undoubtedly very often also expresses a genealogical relation, like the Greek ending -ῖον, and presupposes a previous proper name from which it is derived; thus the name יִשָּׁבְוֹ נְתָנָאֶל, Huri (1 Chron. v, 14), as surely presupposes the above-mentioned Chir, as the Greek Philippi does Philipps, and as Kethibh (ii, 9), one of the descendants of Judah, is connected with the Ketibh in iv, 11. It is remarkable that the genealogical relation appears to be sometimes expressed by the mere יִשָּׁבְוֹ נְתָנָאֶל, motion, as יִשָּׁבְוֹ נְתָנָאֶל, Jaco- 

bak (ver. 36), which would be equivalently expressed by a German name, Zu-Jacob; יִשָּׁבְוֹ נְתָנָאֶל, Ishereiel, De Israel (xxx, 14; comp. vers. 2), and most distinctly in יִשָּׁבְוֹ נְתָנָאֶל, Ishchobadah (De Israel), "reckoned to Dan" (Neh. vii, 4; comp. יִשָּׁבְוֹ נְתָנָאֶל, Joshekkashah, in 1 Chron. xxx, 4, 5).

Among the names of the women, the oldest as well as the simplest which are found are actually only suited for women, as Rachel, "Ewe;" Deborah, "bee;" Ta- 

mar, "Palm-tree;" Hannah, "Favor," the mother of Samuel. Those which express such a delicate and essentially feminine feeling, as גָּרָה Hophra, "box of eye-ointment," (Job xlii, 14), and יָשָׁבְוֹ נְתָנָאֶל, Hezechiah, "my delight is in her" (2 Kings xxii, 1), betray that they were generally formed in much later times. Indeed it appears to have been customary, at an early period, to form names for women from those of men, by means of the feminine termination; as יִשָּׁבְוֹ נְתָנָאֶל, Haggah (2 Sam. iii, 4), besides יִשָּׁבְוֹ נְתָנָאֶל, Haggai (Numb. xxvi, 15); יִשָּׁבְוֹ נְתָנָאֶל, Meshullumeth, i.e. Pia (2 Kings xxi, 19), besides יִשָּׁבְוֹ נְתָנָאֶל, Meshullem, Pia (1 Chron. v, 18; viii, 17), and יִשָּׁבְוֹ נְתָנָאֶל, Shelomith, Friederika (Numb. xxiv, 11), besides יִשָּׁבְוֹ נְתָנָאֶל, Shelomoh, Friederich. But we must not overlook the fact that all these are instances of simple names; or of those also in which the masculine has already dropped the second member; for Chananaj and Zabzi, as is shown below, are shortened from Chananaiah, Zobziah: no single example occurs from a compound man's name. As the same thought is here intended to be conveyed as a compound complete and perfect, so a shorter form is often chosen. This is used both for men and women, and as even those very names are applied to women which could not originally have been applicable to any but men, as Abiyyil, Achinoam, accordingly we must assume that the plastic power of the language had already exhausted itself in this remote province, and that, for that reason, the distinction of the feminine was omitted.

II. Symbolical Import of Proper Names.—As the name was the "sign" of the thing, it expressed as nearly as possible its character; it was the expression of the impression which was produced by the beholder on the mind, the name being the shorter and truer the expression was to the impression, and the truer the impression was to the object, the more nearly did the name represent the thing named. Hence the name in Hebrew is used to signify the collected attributes or characteristics of the object named. This is seen in the case with דָּבָר, "The Lord descended in the cloud and proclaimed the name of the Lord." And the Lord passed by him and proclaimed, The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious," etc. (Exod. xxxiv), where all these terms furnish but the exegesis of the word name. The use is similar in the New Test. Our Lord says, "I have manifested thy name unto the men which thou gavest me out of the world" (John xvii, 6); where name embraces the whole divine nature revealed by the Son, who hath "declared" the Father. In general the name was the result of an effort to embody in language as nearly as possible the nature of objects. When the whole nature could not be taken in, the chief characteristic was seized upon—what struck the eye or any of the senses mainly —and hence arose such names as Esaú ("hairy"). When there was no outstanding attribute to seize and embody, some incident was laid hold of connected with the object named, e. g. Moses ("drawn out of the water"); or some feeling in the mind of the names at the moment of imposing the name, as Benoni ("my son of sorrow"). Even the names of natural objects are full of meaning, or at least full of poetry, often having reminiscences of ancient times and deeds floating about them. The river names are very suggestive. The Jordan (Yarden, yarad, "to come down" [comp. Ganges, Ribe-

nus]) is the two rapids, one into the Sea of Galilee, and one into the Dead Sea. The Arnon is the stream that "sings" (runam, to "make a tremendous sound") among the mountains. Jabbok, that which "bevels" ("byoka") through the rocky gorge. The Cherith, that which "cuts" its way. So are the names of mountains. Lebanon is the Mont Blanc of Syria, but perhaps named less from its snowy mantle than its bare white ribs of naked stone. Sirion, the "breastplate" of rock. The whole land is full of Abel (grassy meads), Bera (wells), Ayine (fountains); and in the evening the maidens danced in the meads, and called them Abel-melah (Judg. vii, 22); and the kids announced it, and it was named En-gedi (Josh. xv, 62); and the scissors basked in the sunny slopes, and their haunts were named Akkrabim; and the gazelles bounded across the heights, and men called their favorite resorts Ajabon. See each name above, and its earlier terms in its place.

For the philosophical questions involved in the above examination, see the Hebrew lexicon. More special treatises are the following: Redelob, Die alttestamentlichen Namen (Hamb. 1846); Farrar, Proper Names of the Bible.
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LORD (1844); Jones, Names in the Old Test. (ibid. 1856); Wilkinson, NAMES in the Bible (ibid. 1865). See NAMES.

Proper Psalms, i.e. psalms adapted by their contents to the subjects of particular Sundays or festivals and holydays. St. Chrysostom refers to ancient pre-
scription in this matter, and St. Augustine mentions an
old custom the use of Psa. xxii on Good Friday.
Cassian informs us that Psa. xxii with its at matins
and lauds in the 14th century St. Ambrose and St.
Augustine appointed special psalms on certain occa-
sions.

Prophecies is the name given to the biblical texts which are read in the Church of Rome on the day before Easter-Sunday, after the consecration of the paschal lamb. They are the following: Gen. 1: 1-2; 2: 23; viii; 21; xxii. 1-19; Exod. xiv. 24; xv. 1; Isa. liv. 17;
li; Bar. iii. 9-38; Ezek. xxxvii. 14-14; Isa. iv. 2; Exod. xii. 11-11; Jon. iii.; Deut. xxxi. 22-30; Dan. iii.
1-24. They are called prophesies, inasmuch as they are symbols of the redemption of mankind through Jesus Christ, and have a direct bearing upon the mysteries which the Church is at that period solemnly commemor-
ating. The first prophecy relates the creation of the world: we are to remember here that Christ, by his death on the cross, became the creator of a new, spir-
ituall creation. The second prophecy is the flood; about Noah saved with his family in the ark: it must remind the faithful that the Redeemer saves through the
waters of baptism all those who believe in him.
The third prophecy brings before our eyes Abraham, whose faith was as firm as a rock, and is an assurance to similar confidence in our Lord. The fourth prophecy relates the exodus from Egypt and the passage through the Red Sea, showing how Christians should leave the bond-
age of sin and follow their own God-sent leader. The fifth and sixth prophecies recommend constancy in our purpose, teaching: the former: that we must bestow
eternal bliss upon such as follow him; the latter, that rain sinners awake. To give us the necessary forces for the struggle we are to go through, God sends us the Holy Ghost: this is what we are reminded of by the vision of Ezekiel in the seventh prophecy. The eighth prophecy points out the eternal glory which awaits those who fight under the cross. The ninth prophecy is about the Jewish passeover, the tenth about Jonah's preaching in Nineveh, the eleventh about the respect to be paid to the Pentateuch, and the twelfth about the three young men in the oven. William Durand (1, 6, c.
81) knows of four, six, twelve, and fourteen of them.
In some churches five were read, in others eight.
lische Arbeitheime (Index in vol. iv); Riddle, Christian Antiqurnes (see Index).

Prophesy. Under this head we propose to treat of certain general aspects of the subject of permanent interest, reserving for the head of Prophesy what re-
lates more personally to the organs or media of true prophecy, as found in the Bible. In doing so we com-
bine the Biblical elements with the best results of modern criticism and discussion.

I Design of Prophecy. In this respect we would de-
fine prophecy as "God's communication to the Church,
to be her light and comfort in time of trouble and perplexity." Vitringa defines it as "a prediction of some contingent circumstance or events in the future received
by immediate or direct revelation." Dr. Pye Smith speaks of it "as a declaration made by a creature under the inspiration and commission of the omniscient God relating to an event or series of events, which have not taken place at the time the prophecy is uttered, and which could not have been certainly foreknown by any science or wisdom of man." Other writers say prophecy is "nothing but the history of events before they come to pass." Dean Magge dissects from this popular but erroneous view. In a lecture on the uses of prophecy he defines a prophet as "the religious teacher of his age, whose aim is the religious education of those whom he addresses." To have received a call and message direct from God, and to deliver it, is the essence of prophet-
ism. The Jewish lawyer delivering moral and ceremonial precepts received from God, and our blessed Lord in the Sermon on the Mount, were prophets just as much as when they predicted the future of Israel (M'Caul, Aids to Faith). As a reaction from the gen-
eral body of writers on prophecy, who exalt the predic-
tive and neglect the moral element of God's communica-
tion to man, there have arisen in Germany, and to some extent in our land, writers who maintain there is not only the moral stream of light flowing through prophecy, and deny altogether its predictive character. Both errors will be avoided by bearing in mind that the word of prophecy was profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction, to the first recipients of the message, all for successional ages.
The usual view of prophecy as anticipated history virtually excludes from the roll the great Prophet who was its theme and author, Moses; his distinguished pro-
totype, John the Baptist; his eminent forerunner, Eliezer, Samuel, under the old covenant, as well as the apostles and prophets under the new. According to this view, prophecy is virtually limited to what the Spirit spake unto the churches in the four hundred years between Hosea and Malachi, and by the beloved John, the writer of the Apocalypse. But if we agree to regard
the prophet as the forerunner, possessing the munus pra-
dicendi—rather than the forerunner, possessing only the munus propheticum—we see at once how the very highest place is assigned to our Lord and to Moses; how John the Baptist was more than a prophet, as he stood with
in the actual dawn of the day of Christ, and as a religi-
ous teacher did really more for the religious training of those whom he addressed than any of the prophets of the old covenant. We see, too, how naturally and clearly the earlier prophets were subordinate to Moses, so that the new commission that led Jeremiah and Ezekiel to the lawgiver; and how appropriately the term is applied to the apostles of our Lord and Saviour, as charged by Christ with the whole ordering and establishing of the Church in its institutions, government, and progress. In fact, students of prophecy perpetually use the word in a non-natural sense. Hence the variety and discord-
ancy of their interpretations. Our attention must be rigidly fixed on the natural and proper sense of the terms, if we would gain any satisfactory results.

In all communications from God to man two elements may be traced, the moral and the predictive. Neither element must be pressed or insisted on, so as to depress and exclude the other. Yet the moral element is the foundation, to which the predictive is always subsidiary. The moral element occupies the highest place in the communications made by our Lord by the apostles; the predictive element prevails in those who had the more ordinary gifts, as all their announce-
ments appealed to the revelations made by Moses and by Christ. The testimony of Jesus as the author, and the testimony borne to Jesus as the theme, is the spirit of prophecy. The custom of regarding to this view of the subject, if it was not, the moral element is fundamental, the predic-
tive is entirely subsidiary. All who bore testimony to Jesus before his incarnation were preachers of righteousness, and all who testify that Jesus is come in the flesh exercise the prophetic function.
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II. Value of Prophecy as Evidence of the Truth of Revelation.—Davison, in his Discourses on Prophecy, fixes a "Criterion of Prophecy," and in accordance with it he describes "the conditions which would confer cogency of evidence on single parts of prophecy," as "the truth in the world of a childlike application of the prophecy prior to the event; secondly, the clear and palpable fulfillment of it; lastly, the nature of the event itself—if, when the prediction of it was given, it lay remote from human view, and was such as could not be foreseen by any supposable effort of reason, or be deduced upon principles of calculation derived from probability and experience" (Disc. viii, 378). Applying his test, the learned writer finds that the establishment of the Christian religion and the person of its Founder were predicted when neither religion nor experience could have anticipated them; and that the predictions respecting them have been clearly fulfilled in history. Here, then, is an adequate proof of an inspired prescience in the prophets who predicted these things. He applies his test to the prophecies recorded of the Jewish people, and their actual state, to the prediction of the great apostasy and to the actual state of corrupted Christianity, and finally to the prophecies relating to Nineveh, Babylon, Tyre, Egypt, the Ishmaelites, and the Four Empires, and to the events which have befallen them; and in each case he finds proof of the existence of the predictive element in the prophecies.

In the book of Kings we find Micaiah, the son of Imlah, uttering a challenge, by which his predictive powers were to be judged. He had pronounced, by the word of the Lord, that Ahab should fall at Ramoth-Gilead. Ahab, in return, commanded him to be shut up in prison until he came back in peace. "And Micaiah said, If thou return at all in peace (that is, if the event do not verify my words), "the Lord hath not spoken by me" (that is, I am no prophet capable of predicting the future," 1 Kings, viii, 29). The remark is sound as a negative test, and so it is laid down in the law (Deut. xviii, 22); but as a positive test it would not be sufficient. Ahab's death at Ramoth-Gilead did not prove Micaiah's predictive powers, though his escape would have disproved them. But here we must notice a very important difference between single prophecies and the series of prophecy. The fulfillment of a single prophecy does not prove the prophetic power of the prophet, but the fulfillment of a long series of prophecies by a series or number of events does in itself constitute a proof that the prophet is inspired. The more particular instances, and, consequently, that predictive power resided in the prophet or prophet. We may see this in the so far parallel cases of satirical writings. We know for certain that Aristophanes refers to Cleon, Pericles, Nicia (and we should rather say that his satire more of the satirical is, simply from the fact of a number of satirical hits converging together on the object of his satire. One, two, or three strokes might be intended for more persons than one, but the addition of each stroke makes them still more apparent; and when we have a sufficient number before us, it is easier to draw a conclusion than if we have but a few instances on which to base our design. The same may be said of fables, and still more of allegories. The fact of a complicated lock being opened by a key shows that the lock and key were meant for each other. Now the Messianic picture drawn by the prophets as a body contains at least as many traits as these: That salvation should come through the family of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Judah, David; that at the time of the final absorption of the Jewish power, Shiloh (the tranquillizer) shall gather the nations under his rule; that there should be a great Peace, a " Pax deorum," after it, and that the event be to David: A Priest forever, typified by Melchizedek; that he should be born into the world a child to be called Mighty God, Eternal Father, Prince of Peace; that there should be a Righteous Servant of God on whom there should be laid the government of the earth, Messias, Israel, and to David, the Prince should be cut off, but not for himself, that an everlasting kingdom should be given by the Ancient of Days to one like the Son of man. It seems impossible to harmonize so many apparent contradictions. Nevertheless, it is an un doubted fact that at the time seemingly pointed out by one or more of these predictions there was no prefiguration of David, and therefore of the family of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Judah, who claimed to be the object of these and other predictions; who is acknowledged as Prophet, Priest, and King, as Mighty God and yet as God's Righteous Servant who bears the iniquity of all; who was cut off, and whose death is acknowledged not to have been for his own, but for others' good: who has instituted a spiritual kingdom on earth, which kingdom is of a nature to continue forever, if there is any continuance beyond this world and this life; and in whose doings and sufferings on earth a number of specific predictions were minutely fulfilled. Then we may say that we have here a series of prophecies which are so applicable to the person and earthly life of Jesus Christ as to be thereby shown to have been designed to apply to him. If they were designed to apply to him, prophetic prediction is proved.

Objections have been urged: (a) Vagueness.—It has been said that the prophecies are too darkly and vaguely worded to be proved predictive by the events which were they are to be fulfilled. This objection is met with clearness and force by Ammon. He says, "Such simple sentences as the following: Israel has not to expect a king, but a teacher; this teacher will be born at Bethlehem during the reign of Herod; he will lay down his life under Titus, in attestation of the truth of his religion; through the destruction of Jerusalem, and the complete extinction of the Jewish state, he will spread his doctrine in every quarter of the world—a few sentences like these, expressed in plain historical prose, would not only bear the character of true predictions, but, when compared with the authenticated event, would be of incomparably greater worth to us than all the oracles of the Old Testament, taken together" (Christology, p. 12). But to this it might be answered, and has been in effect answered by Hengstenberg: 1. That God never forces men to believe, but that there is such a union of definiteness and vagueness in the prophecies as to enable those who are willing to discover the truth, while the willfully blind are not forcibly constrained to see it. 2. That, had the prophecies been couched in the form of direct declarations, their fulfillment would have been impossible to doubt, but the events are in keeping with, and not improper to, the idea corresponding to the Gospel, and not to the idea corresponding to the Gospel Delivering. 3. That the effect of prophecy (e.g. with reference to the time of the Messiah's coming) would have been far less beneficial to believers, as being less adapted to keep them in a state of constant expectation of the Messiah, than it would have been had prophecy been more distinctly formulated. 4. That the expectation of the Messiah's deliverance could not be so clearly portrayed in his varied character as God and Man, as Prophet, Priest, and King, if he had been the mere "teacher" which is all that Ammon acknowledges him to be. 5. That the state of the prophecies, at the time of receiving the divine revelation, was such that we shall presently have occasion to show as necessary to make their predictions fragmentary, figurative, and abstrat from the relations of time. 6. That some portions of the prophecies were intended to be of double application, and some portions to be understood only on their fulfillment (comp. John xiv, 23; Ezek. xxxvi, 28). (b) Obscurity of a Part or Parts of a Prophecy otherwise Clear.—The objection drawn from "the unintelligibility of one part of a prophecy, as invalidating the proof of foresight arising from the evident completion of those parts which are understood" is not well founded, as it is drawn from a passage of the Bible which is not to be so clearly understood. If it may be answered with the same arguments, to which we may add the consideration urged by Butler that it is, for the argument in hand, the same as if the parts not understood were written in cipher, or not written at all: "Suppose, the writing of part of the prophetic words at length, and that in the part one understood
there appeared mention of several known facts—it
would never come into any man's thought to imagine
that, if he understood the whole, perhaps he might find
that these facts were not in reality known by the writer
(1. t. n. 1. ii, ch. vii). Furthermore, if it be true
that prophecies relating to the first coming of the Mes-
siah refer also to his second coming, some part of those
prophecies must necessarily be as yet not fully under-
stood.
It would appear from these considerations that Da-
vision's second "condition," above quoted, "the clear
and palpable fulfilment of the prophecy," should be so
favourable an addition to the inquiries as to render
more, or less great, in recognising the fulfilment of a
prophecy which results from the necessary vague-
ness and obscurity of the prophecy itself.
(c) Application of the Several Prophecies to a more
Immediacy Subject.—It has been the task of many Bibl.
ical critics to examine the different passages which are
alleged to be predictions of Christ, and to show that
they were delivered in reference to some person or thing
contemporary with, or shortly subsequent to, the time
of the writer. The conclusion is then drawn, sometimes
scarcely less, and at all times a dangerous one, that the
passages in question have nothing to do with the
Messiah. We have here to distinguish carefully
between the conclusion proved and the corollary drawn
from it. Let it be granted that it may be proved of all
the prophecies of the Messiah (it certainly may be
proved of many) that they are primary, historical and
present fact: in that case a certain law, un-
der which God vouchsafes his prophetic revelations,
is discovered; but there is no semblance of disproof of
the further Messianic interpretation of the passages un-
der consideration. That some such law does exist has
been argued at length by Mr. Davison. He believes,
however, that "it obtains only in some of the more dis-
tinguished monuments of prophecy," such as the prophecies
found on, and having primary reference to, the
kingdom of David, the restoration of the Jews, the
destruction of Jerusalem (On Prophecy, disc. v). Dr.
Lee thinks that Davison "exhibits too great reserve in
the application of this important principle" (On Inspira-
tion, sect. iv). He considers it to be of universal ap-
lication; and upon it he founds the doctrine of the
"divine prediction," according to which a prediction
is fulfilled in two or even more distinct but
analogous subjects: first in type, then in antitype; and
after that perhaps awaits a still further and more com-
plete fulfillment. This view of the fulfilment of prophecy
seems to be quite consistent with the Lord's remark on
the Red letter prophecy which is easily accounted for.
The divergence is in the two religions themselves, and is called out by the question
whether the predictions for a Messianic to the
"chosen race" have been ever fulfilled. Upon this
query all turn. The law of the Lord's remnant is the
Christian the long-promised divine messenger, either de-
clares it a vain attempt to decipher the prophetic im-
ages, if he be a rationalist; or, if he be more faithfully
wedded to the canon of the synagogue, patiently sits
back, awaiting the final solution of the problem of God's
salvation of his people. See Jews; Messiah; Phars-
isee; Rationalism.
In the early and mediavel days of Christianity, the
Jews did not deny the facts of the Christian miracles,
but explained them away, and so nothing remained for
the settling of the doctrine of the prophecies and the
question of their fulfillment. The first of these the Jew
cculated to the Christian, but on the last point a some-
what rich literature of polemics is preserved to us. It
begins with the New Test. itself. Paul and other apostles
were frequently called upon to argue the Messias-
ship of Christ. We see the same phase of the contest
in the apologue of Justin Martyr (q. v.) against Trypho,
to which a new kind of objection expressive of preju-
dice is added in the discourse which Celsius, as pre-
served in Origen (Contr. Cel. bk. i and ii), puts into
the mouth of Trypho. The Jews" in their controversy to this contest, these Church fathers, and especi-
ally Semiisch's work on Justin Martyr and the works
on the Jewish Talmudic literature and philosophy, may be
consulted. See also, for later continuations of this con-
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test, Hagenbuch, Hist. of Doctr. i, § 144, and the art. POLIMICS, JEWISH.)

The Jew contends with the Christian not only for a special spiritual elevation in the prophet—an intense devotion to Jesus, the Messiah, with God given to all who worship him in love and reverence—but for a gift of light vouchsafed to him different from any ordinary endowment. Maimonides remains the chief of the Jewish hermeneutists. "This age of medieval Judaism thus teaches: Prophecy signifies the communication of verities to the human mind from God by the medium of the active reason, with or without the power to foretell future events or to perform miracles. The first point is essential, the other is merely accidental. Prophecy is a capacity of the human mind. All possess it more or less. Like other human capacities, it may remain dormant in this or that mind, or be developed partially or perfectly. In the development of this capacity, it is necessary, in the first place, to cultivate and purify the imagination, i.e. the ability of beholding internally, clearly, and truly things external and distant, either in space or time, and to place the imagination under the control of mental judgment. In the second place, the moral nature of the individual must be trained to purity, goodness, love of the true and the sublime, and the desire to understand and receive the voice of the essential Deity. This cannot be done outside of society, but within it and in its active service. It cannot be done by asceticism and the renunciation of the world and its charms; it must be done in gladness and joy, by chastity, temperance, and a life of moderation, governing and controlling the lower passions and developing the nobler, finer, and higher ones to a harmonious moral character. Passionate, immoral, and wicked persons will hinder their imagination, pervert their judgment, and baffle their reason. In the third place, reason must be fully developed to control all other powers of the individual, without weakening them or disturbing the harmony of the soul, and to elevate him to universal reason, which Maimonides calls the 'active reason,' which enables him to grasp universal truth and to depict it clearly to himself or others by the power of his imagination. Man so prepared, so developed and trained, is a prophet, although he may still receive no special messages from on high, either because his age requires none, or outer influences, climatical or social, disturb the mind. But the man so prepared, and he only, is the prophet of the Lord. So the ancient prophets were prepared for their messages and their missions. Others, also, may conceive original ideas and prophecies; but if the reason predominates over the imagination, they cannot realize or reproduce their own internal visions. If the imagination predominates, they probably err. But the prophet of the Lord is a master, not a visionary, of his prophecies and an expert in interpreting and conforming his messages to the conditions of the times. Moreover, but hear prophetic words addressed to them, not in a dream or vision—not merely sometimes and in a state of ecstasy—but waking, intelligent, and whenever they wish. Albo adds, "If a man has elevated himself to this high state of mind, he should no longer be called a prophet—he is a seer. A seer is one who has not yet received this perfection, except our teacher Moses." See Dr. Wise, Lectures on the Philosophy and Philosophers of the Jews as reported in the Jerusalem (Cincinnati, 1873); Rothchild (Miss), Hist. and Lit. of the Israelis, vol. ii; Wigger, Judaism, vol. i; McCaul, Old Paths. (J. H. W.)

PROPHESYING. Religious exercises of the Puri- tan clergy in the reign of queen Elizabeth, instituted for the purpose of promoting knowledge and piety. The ministers of a particular division, at a set time, met together in some church of a market or other large town, and there each in his order explained, according to his ability, some portion of Scripture previously allotted to him. This done, a moderator made his observations on what had been said, and determined the true sense of New Testament, New Testament, and of censure for despatching the whole. These institutions, borrowed evidently from the Controversies (q. v.) of Scotland, like all others, however, it seems, were in England soon marked by irregularity, disputations, and divisions. Archbishop Grindal endeavored to regulate the prophecies and prophecies and in 1568 they be abolished by the court made against them, by enjoining the ministers to themselves must expound; or they see an angel or a person—in themselves, of course—who speaks to them; or they hear a voice without seeing any vision, in which they suppose they have heard God speak. Therefore the prophetic voice is not the same thing with the vision of the writers of Scriptures, and the oracles of some are announced in different poetical forms. The prophet knows how to distinguish divine visions from vulgar ones by the profound impression which the former make upon him, carrying conviction into his mind, and we must know it by the test of reason to which the matter revealed is subjected. All visions recorded in the Bible, Maimonides advances, were subjective, psychological processes. Wherever it is said God appeared, an angel appeared, this or that vision was seen, it must always be understood to have appeared so in the prophet's imagination. Only one prophet received his revelations through and to reason directly, without poetical garbs or visionary assistance, and that was Moses. Only one divine manifestation of this nature did actually come to pass, and that was the revelation on Mount Sinai, and this, also, Maimonides rationalizes in his own way. In all these rational expositions of prophecy, Maimonides refers to the Bible and the Talmud for support. (comp. his Yose- dei Htsorah, which forms the introd. to his Yad-Ha- chak.) Another sage, whose authority the ultra-orthodox prefer to depend upon, is Joseph Albo (q. v.). He has expressed his opinion on the various grades of prophets in his book on Principles (Sepher Ikkarim, ch. x, § 3). It differs materially from that of Maimonides. Albo has four grades of prophets; the first class consists of proph- ets with whom the understanding has no domination over the vision. They receive the prophetic vision in a state of slumber and dream, after an attack of pain and terror. The second class consists of prophets in whom the understanding and the phantasy are well balanced; they receive the prophetic visions without pain or terror, in quiet dreams. The third class consists of prophets with whom the understanding predominates over the phantasy; they see no imaginary visions, as the above two classes do, which must be expounded; they see real objects in their visions, and hear them speak intelligible words; there is neither pain nor terror, nor doubtful visions in the prophetic ecstasy of this class. The fourth class consists of prophets with whom phantasy has no influence whatever upon the understanding, but who receive their visions in the same manner as the second class, they hear prophetic words addressed to them, not in a dream or vision—not merely sometimes and in a state of ecstasy—but waking, intelligent, and whenever they wish. Albo adds, "If a man has elevated himself to this high state of mind, he should no longer be called a prophet—he is a seer. A seer is one who has not yet received this perfection, except our teacher Moses." See Dr. Wise, Lectures on the Philosophy and Philosophers of the Jews as reported in the Jerusalem (Cincinnati, 1873); Rothchild (Miss), Hist. and Lit. of the Israelis, vol. ii; Wigger, Judaism, vol. i; McCaul, Old Paths. (J. H. W.)
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observe decency and order, by forbidding them to meddle with politics and Church government, and by prohibiting all nonconformist ministers and laymen from being speakers. The queen, however, seeing that they spread the religious notions of the Puritans and estranged the people from all Romanistic tendency, was resolved to suppress them; and having sent for the archbishop, told him she was informed that the rites and ceremonies of the Church were not duly observed in these prophecies; that persons not lawfully called to be ministers exercised in them; that the assemblies themselves were illegal, not being allowed by public authority; that the laity neglected their secular affairs by repairing to these meetings, which filled their heads with notions, and might occasion disputes and sedition in the State; that it was good for the Church to have but few preachers, three or four in a county being sufficient. She further declared her dislike to the number of these exercises, and therefore commanded him peremptorily to put them down. The archbishop, however, instead of obeying the commands of his royal mistress, thought that she made some infringement upon his office, and wrote the queen a long and angry letter, declaring that her command would not suffer him to comply with her commands. The queen was so inflamed with this letter that the archbishop was sequestered from his office, and he never afterwards recovered the queen's favor. Thus ended the prophecies. See Nona, Hist. of the Puritans.

PROPHET, a person who acts as the organ of divine communication with men, especially with regard to the future. He differs from a priest in representing the divine side of this mediation, while the priest rather acts from the human side. The following article therefore discusses chiefly the personal relations of the prophet himself. See PROPHECY.

I. The Title in Scripture.—The ordinary Hebrew word for prophet is נבּ (nabi), derived from the verb נבּ (nab), connected by Gesenius with נבּל (nabl), “to bubble forth,” like a fountain. If this etymology be correct, the substantive would signify anyone who, as it were, involuntarily bursts forth with spiritual utterances under the divine influence (comp. Psa. xiv. 1, “My heart is bubbling up of a good matter”), or simply one who pours forth words. The analogy of the word נבל (nabal), which has the force of “dropping” as honey, and is used by Micah (ii, 6, 11), Ezekiel (xxii, 2), and Amos (vii, 16) in the sense of prophesying, points to the last signification. The verb נבל is found only in the niphal and hiphil, a peculiarity which it shares with many other words expressive of speech (comp. בּנות, בּות, לֹאכֵר, לֹאכַר, לֹאכַר, בּלַדְנוּ, as well as הָבְרִיָה and הָבְרִיָה). Bunsen (Gott in Geschichte, p. 141) and Davidson (Intr. Old Test. ii, 480) suppose nabi to signify the man to whom announcements are made by God, i.e. inspired. Exod. iv. 1-17 is the classical passage as to the meaning of this word. There God says to Moses, “Aaron shall be thy נבּ (nabi) unto the people, and thou shalt be unto him instead of God. The sense is, “Aaron shall speak what thou shalt communicate to him.” This appellation implies, then, the prophet's relation to God: he speaks not of his own accord, but what the Spirit puts into his mouth. Thus נבּ (nabi) is an adjective of passive signification: he who has been divinely inspired, who has received from God the revelations which he proclaims. But it is more in accordance with the use of the word נבל as a signifying (actively) one who announces or pours forth the declarations of God. The latter signification is preferred by Ewald, Hlvernick, Oehler, Hengstenberg, Bleek, Lee, Pusey, McCaul, and the great majority of Biblical critics. We have the word in Barnabas (27 נבּ), which is rendered ὅποιος ρήηζε (Acts iv, 36), one whom God has qualified to impart consolation, light, and strength to others. Augustine says, “The prophet of God is nothing else nisi enunciator verborum Dei omnibus.” So Heidelberger, “Nabi is properly every utterer of the words of another, not from his own, but from another's influence and will.”

Two other Hebrew words are used to designate a prophet—נבּ (nab) and נבּ (chok):—both signify¬ing one who sees. They are rendered in the A. V. by “seer.” In the Sept. usually by בּיָּמָל or בּיָּמָל, sometimes by נקּ (1 Chron. xxvi, 28; 2 Chron. xvii, 7, 10). The three words seem to be contrasted with each other in 1 Chron. xxix, 29. “The acts of David the king, first and last, behold they are written in the book of Samuel the seer (רָדֶּק), and in the book of Nathan the prophet (נֵּבּ), and in the book of Nathan the prophet (נֵּבּ), and in the book of Nathan the prophet (נֵּבּ), and in the book of Nathan the prophet (נֵּבּ), and in the book of Nathan the prophet (נֵּבּ), and in the book of Nathan the prophet (נֵּבּ), and in the book of Nathan the prophet (נֵּרֶדֶק),” נבּ is a title almost appropriated to Samuel. It is only used ten times, and in seven of these it is applied to Samuel (1 Sam. ix, 9, 11, 18, 19; 1 Chron. xxii, 22; xxvii, 28; xxxix, 29). On two other occasions it is applied to Haman (2 Chron. xvi, 7, 10). Once it is used by Isaiah in this connection with no reference to a particular person. It was superseded in general use by the word הנביא, which Samuel (himself entitled הנביא as well as רָדֶּק [1 Sam. iii, 20; 2 Chron. xxxv, 18]) appears to have revived after a period of disuse (1 Sam. ix, 9), and to have applied to the prophets organized by him. The word נבּ, from which it is derived, is the commonest word signifying “a prophet” or “one who utters or utters through God” whence the substantive נבּ (chok) is derived—is more poetical, q. d. “to gaze.” נבּ is rarely found except in the books of the Chronicles, but נבּ is the word constantly used for the prophetic vision. It is found in the Pentateuch, in Samuel, in the Chronicles, in Job, and in most of the prophets. In 1 Sam. ix, 9 we read, “He that is now called a prophet (נביא) was beforetime called a seer (רָדֶּק):” from whence Stanley (Lect. on the Jewish Church) has concluded that רָדֶּק of the heathen designation of the prophetic office, “superseded by הנביא shortly after Samuel's time, when הנביא first came into use” (ibid. xviii, xix). This seems opposed to the fact that הנביא is the word commonly used in the Pentateuch, whereas רָדֶּק does not appear until the days of Samuel. The passage (1 Sam. ix, 20) is of Samuel himself by the prophetic insertion, perhaps made by the הנביא Nathan (or whoever was the original author of the book), perhaps added at a later date, with the view of explaining how it was that Samuel bore the title of רָדֶּק, instead of the now usual appellation of הנביא. To this the days of Samuel were “beforetime,” and he explains that in those ancient days—that is, the days of Samuel—the word used for prophet was רָדֶּק, not הנביא. But that does not imply that רָדֶּק was the primitive word, and that הנביא first came into use subsequently to Samuel (see Hengstenberg, Beiträge zur Einleitung ins A. T. iii, 335). Stanley represents יָבֵא as “another antique title,” but on no sufficient grounds. יָבֵא is first found in 2 Sam. xxiv, 11; so that it does not seem to have come into use until רָדֶּק had almost disappeared. It is also found in the books of Kings and Chronicles (frequently), in Amos (vii, 12), Isaiah (xxix, 10), Micah (iii, 7), and the derivatives of the verb יָבֵאת are used by the prophets to designate their visions down to the Captivity (comp. Isa. i, 1; Dan. viii, 1; Zechar. xxii, 4). The derivatives are however, and, as being prose words, are chiefly used by Daniel (comp. Ezek. i, 1; Dan. x, 7). On examination we find that הנביא existed before and after and alongside of רָדֶּק and יָבֵאת, but that יָבֵאת was somewhat more modern than רָדֶּק.

Whether there is any difference in the usage of these three words, and, if any, what that difference is, has been much debated (see Witsius, Miscell. Sacra, i, 1, § 19; Carpzovius, Introduct. ad Libros Canon. V. T. iii, 1, 2; Winer, Real-Wörterbuch, art. “Propheten”).
which was this: that the ministers within a precinct did meet upon a week-day in some principal town, where there was some ancient grave minister that was president, and an auditory admitted of gentlemen or other persons of leisure. Then every day successively, being as he had done the last day, did handle one and the same part of Scripture, spending severally some quarter of an hour or better, and in the whole some two hours. And so the exercise being begun and concluded with prayer, and the president giving a text for the next meeting, the assembly was dispersed.

The meaning of the word is made further familiar to us by the title of Jeremy Taylor's treatise On Liberty of Prophecying. Nor was there any risk of the title of a book published in our own days, On the Prophetic Office of the Church (Oxford, 1830), being misunderstood. In fact, the English word prophet, like the word inspiration, has always been used in a larger and in a closer sense. In the larger sense our Lord Jesus Christ is a "prophet," Moses is a "prophet," Mohammed is a "prophet." The expression means that they proclaimed and published a new religious dispensation. In a similar, though not identical sense, the Church is said to have "a prophetic," i.e. an expository and interpretative, office. But in its closer sense the word, according to usage, though not according to etymology, always has, lastly and always has been its more usual acceptation. The different meanings, or shades of meaning, in which the abstract noun is employed in Scripture have been drawn out by Locke as follows: "Prophets comprehends three things: prediction, singing by the dictate of the Spirit; and understanding and explaining the mysterious hidden sense of Scripture by an immediate illumination and motion of the Spirit" (Paraphrase of 1 Cor. xii, note, p. 121 [London, 1742]). It is in virtue of this last signification of the word that the prophets of the New Testament, as of the Old (1 Cor. xii), by virtue of God's endowment of the sons of Asaph, etc., are said to have "prophesied with a harp" (xxv, 3), and Miriam and Deborah are termed "prophetesses." That the idea of potential if not actual prediction enters into the conception expressed by the word prophecy, which word is used to designate the function of the Hebrew prophets, may be proved by the following passages of Scripture: Deut. xviii, 22; Jer. xxxviii, 9; Acts ii, 30; iii, 18-21; 1 Pet. i, 10; 2 Pet. i, 19, 20; iii, 2. Etymologically, however, it is certain that neither presence nor prediction is included in the phrase "prophet." Whereas this was equivalent to the gift of prophecy (see 2 Pet. i, 21).

The word prophecy is uniformly translated in the Sept. by προφητής, and in the A. V. by "prophet." In classical Greek, προφήτης signifies one who speaks for another, specially one who speaks for a god, and so interprets his will to man (Liddell and Scott, s. v.). Hence its essential meaning is "an interpreter." Thus Apollo is προφήτης, as being the interpreter of Zeus (Theoclymus, Enn. 19). Poets are the Prophets of the Muse, as being their interpreters (Plato, Phaedr. 262 d). The προφήτης attached to heathen temples are so much so removed from their interpreting the oracles delivered by the inspired and unconscious μάντης (Plato, Tim. 72 b; Herod. vii, 111, note [ed. Bühr]). We have Plato's authority for deriving μάντης from μάνωμα (l. c.). The use of the word prophecy in its modern sense is post-classical, and is derived, according to Roemers, from the Hebrew word נביא, because such as he received were in the special form described; so, indeed, in chap. xxv it is expressly stated that divine communications were made to him in visions and dreams. The patriarchs as a class are in the same manner called prophets (Ps. cxv, 15). Moses was a prophet, as being a prophesier of a new dispensation, a
reveler of God's will, and in virtue of his divinely inspired songs (Exod. xv; Deut. xxxii, xxxiii; Ps. xc), but his main work was not prophetical, and therefore formally distinguished from prophets (Num. xi. 26) and not placed among the classes of professional seers (v. 10). Aaron is the prophet of Moses (Exod. vii. 1); Miriam (xv. 20) is a prophetess; and we find the prophetic gift in the elders who "prophesied" when "the Spirit of the Lord rested upon them," and in Eldad and Medad, who "prophesied in the camp" (Num. xi. 27). At the time of the settlement of Miriam, the possible existence of prophets is recognized (xii, 6).

When the Mosaic economy had been established, a new element was introduced. The sacerdotal caste then became the instrument by which the members of the Jewish theocracy were taught and governed in things spiritual. Feast and fast, sacrifice and offering, rite and ceremony, constituted a varied and ever-recurring system of training and teaching by type and symbol. To the priests, too, was intrusted the work of "teaching the children of Israel all the statutes which the Lord hath spoken unto them by the hand of Moses" (Lev. x, 11). Teaching by act and teaching by word were alike their task. This office they adequately fulfilled for some hundred or more years after the giving of the law at Mount Sinai. But during the time of the Judges the priesthood sank into a state of degeneracy, and the people were no longer affected by the acted lessons of the ceremonial service. They required less enigmatic warnings and exhortations. Under these circumstances a new moral power was evoked—the regular Prophetic Line. Special functionaries of this kind had from time to time already appeared. In the days of the Judges we find that Deborah (Judg. iv, 4) was a prophetess; a prophet (vi, 4) rebuked and exorted the Israelites when oppressed by the Midianites; and in Samuel's childhood a "man of God" predicted to Eli the death of his two sons, and the curse that was to fall on his descendants (1 Sam. ii, 27). But it was now time for a more formal institution of the prophetic order. Samuel, himself a Levite, of the family of Kophah (1 Chron. vi, 28), and certainly acting as a priest, was the instrument used at once for effecting a reform in the sacerdotal order (ix, 22), and for giving to the prophets a position of influence which they had never before held. So important was the work wrought by him that he is classed in Holy Scripture with Moses (Jer. xv, 1; Ps. cxix, 6; Acts iii, 24), Samuel being thus ranked among the ecclesiastical students to be reckoned among the prophetic order, as Moses was the great legislator and founder of the priestly rule. Nevertheless, it is not to be supposed that Samuel created the prophetic order as a new thing before unknown. The germ of both the prophetic and sacerdotal orders was already given to the Israelites by Moses (Deut. xiii, 1; xvii, 20; xxi, 18), but they were not yet developed, because there was not yet the demand for them. Samuel, who evolved the one, himself saw the evolution of the other. It is a vulgar error respecting Jewish history to suppose that there was an antagonism between the prophets and the priests. There is not a trace of such antagonism. Isaiah may denounce a wicked hierarchy (i, 10), but it is because it is wicked, not because it is a hierarchy. Malachi 'sharply reproves the priests' (xi, 1), but it is in order to support the priesthood (comp. i, 14). Mr. F. W. Newman even designates Ezekiel's writings as "hard sacerdotialism," "tedious and unifying as Leviticus itself" (Hebr. Monarch. p. 330). The prophetic order was, in truth, supplemental, not antagonistic, to the sacerdotal. See SAMUEL.

Brian was enabled to make his work of restoration permanent as well as effective for the moment. For this purpose he instituted companies, or colleges of prophets. One we find in his lifetime at Ramah (1 Sam. xix, 20, 23); others afterwards at Bethel (2 Kings x. 17) and Haarmon (17), and the former may be regarded as the forerunner of the latter. Their constitution and object were similar to those of theological colleges. Into them were gathered promising students, and here they were trained for the office which they were afterwards destined to fulfill. So successful were these institutions that from the time of Samuel to the closing of the Canon of the Old Test., there is no lack of prophet or prophetess, and due supply of men to keep up the line of official prophets. There appears to be no sufficient ground for the common statement that after the schism the colleges existed only in the Israelitish kingdom, or for Knobel's supposition that they ceased with Eliahs (Prophetiamus, ii, 39), nor again for Bishop Lowth's statement that "they existed from the earliest times of the Hebrew republic" (Sacred Poetry, lect. xviii), or for M. Nicolas's assertion that their previous establishment can be inferred from 1 Sam. viii, ix, x (Etudes Critiques sur la Bible, p. 562). We have, however, no actual proof of their existence except in the days of Samuel and of Elijah and Elisha. The apocryphal books of the Maccabees (I, iv, 46; ix, 27; xiv, 41) and of Ecclesiasticus (xxxvi, 15) represent them as extinct. The colleges appear to have consisted of students differing little in age or capacity, but they were very numerous (1 Kings xviii, 4; xxii, 6; 2 Kings i, 16). One elderly, or leading prophet, presided over them (1 Sam. xix, 20), called their father (x, 12), or master (2 Kings i, 2), who was apparently admitted to his office by the ceremony of anointing (1 Kings xiv, 16; 1 Sam. i, 11; 2 Sam. ix, 24; 1 Kings i, 10). Their chief subject of study was, no doubt, the law and its interpretation; oral, as distinct from symbolical, teaching being henceforward tacitly transferred from the priestly to the prophetic order. Subsidiary subjects of instruction were music and sacred poetry, both of which had been connected with prophecy from the time of Moses (Exod. xvi, 20) and the Judges (Judg. iv, 1; v, 1). The prophets that meet Saul "came down from the high place with a psaltery and a tabret, and a pipe and a harp before them" (1 Sam. x, 5). Elijah calls a minister to evoke the prophetic gift in himself (2 Kings iii, 15). David "separates to the service of the sons of Asaph and of Heman and of Jeduthun, who should prophesy with harps and with psalteries and with cymbals. . . . All these were under the hands of their father for song in the house of the Lord with cymbals, psalteries, and harps for the service of the house of God" (1 Chron. xxv, 16). Hymns, or sacred songs, are found in the books of Jonah (i, 2), Isaiah (xiii, 1; xxxvi, 1), Habakkuk (iii, 2). It was probably the duty of the prophetic order to prepare the material for the public preaching (see Lowth, Sacred Poetry of the Hebrews, lect. xviii). Having been themselves trained and taught, the prophets, whether still residing within their college or having left its precincts, had the task of teaching others. From the question of who shall be a prophet his husband, "Wherefore will thou go to him to-day? It is neither new moon nor Sabbath" (2 Kings iv, 23), it appears that weekly and monthly religious meetings were held as an ordinary practice by the prophets (see Patrick, Comm. ad loc.). Thus we find that "Elisha sat in his house" engaged in his official duties (2 Kings iv, 2; 2 Kings vii, 13), and the elders sat with him" (2 Kings vii, 32), when the king of Israel sent to slay them. It was at these meetings, probably, that many of the warnings and exhortations on morality and spiritual religion were addressed by the prophets to their countrymen. See PROPHETS, SCHOOLS OF.

The schools of the prophets were thus engaged in what we may call pastoral functions, rather than in the display of things to come; their office was to bring home to men's business and to booming the announcements already made. Derived from the Levitical sacerdotal classes, they performed services chiefly of a priestly character (1 Sam. ix, 13), but presided over devotional exercises and gave spiritual instruction. We may regard Elijah as the type of the whole prophetic order at this his time, "a man of metheors, and endowed with a gift of prolific thought or excellent discourse. Power was given him to smite the earth with plagues (Rev. vi, 6).
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When an impression had been made by these extraordinary displays of power, a still small voice was heard to quicken the people to newness of life. If we pass on to the religious teachers who are associated with the name and age of David—Nathan, Solomon, and others, who composed the Psalms—we shall see that these aimed at the religious education of their contemporaries by a pure stream of didactic and devotional poetry. Their object was to advance the members of the ancient covenant to the highest degree of light and purity which was attainable in that state of minority. The predictive element crops out most distinctly in the Messianic psalms, which point to the ultimate completion of the kingdom in David's Lord, and the universal reign of righteousness, truth, and peace. When these efforts failed to stem the tide of corruption and to rescue the chosen people from disorder, ancient prophecy assumed the form of specific prediction. The moral element is chiefly seen in denouncing the iniquity and unrighteousness of the age, but the distinctive characteristic is that, in exposing the evils which prevailed, they directed the eye to the future. This band of religious teachers who are popularly spoken of as "the prophets" commenced with Hosea soon after the ministry of Elijah and Elisha. Hosea's labors commenced in the days of Jeroboam II, king of Israel, and were prolonged to the time of Hezekiah, comprising more than sixty years, so that with him were contemporary Amos, Jonah, Joel, Obadiah, Isaiah, Micah, Nahum. Next to those in order of time came Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Habakkuk, Zephaniah. The last three were Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi. From these we derive our ample materials for comparing the anticipations of prophecy with the subsequent events of history. Thus the prophets of the Old Covenant form a regular succession; they are members of an unbroken continuous chain, which one perpetually reaches forth to the hand of the other. See PROPHETS, MAJOR, and MINOR.

In the first book of the Maccabees (i, 17) the discontinuance of the prophetic calling is considered as forming an important era in Jewish history (see Steemann, De Termino Prophetarum [Hest. 1723]), while at the same time an expectation of the renewal in future ages of prophetic gifts is avowed (1 Macc. iv. 46; xiv. 41). After the Babylonian exile the sacred writings were collected, which enabled every one to find the way of living. The immediate revelations to the people of Israel were to cease for a while, in order to raise a stronger longing for the appearance of the Messiah, and to prepare for him a welcome reception. For the same reason the ark of the covenant had been taken away from the enemy. The Church of the apostles, in which earlier times might have been incurred by this withdrawal, was not now to be apprehended. The eternal worship of the Lord was so firmly established that no extraordinary helps were wanted. Taking also into consideration the altered character of the people, we may add that the time after the exile was more fit to produce men learned in the law than prophets. Before this period, the faithful and the unbelieving were strongly opposed to each other, which excited the former to greater exertions. These relaxed when the opposition ceased, and pious priests now took the place of the prophets. The time after the exile is characterized by weakness and dependence; the people looked up to the past as to a height which they could not gain; the earlier writings obtained unconditional authority, and the disposition for receiving prophetic gifts was lost. About a hundred years after the return from the Babylonian exile, the prophetic profession ceased. The Jewish tradition uniformly states that after Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi no prophet arose among the Jews till John the Baptist woke the echoes of a long-lost voice, and the new dispensation was born. For its resurrection under the New-Test. economy, see § x below.

2. Manner of Life of the Prophets.—The prophets went about poorly and coarsely dressed (2 Kings i, 8), not as a mere piece of asceticism, but that their very appearance might teach what people ought to do; it was a "sermo propheticus realis." Comp. 1 Kings xxi, 27, where Ahab does penance in the manner figured by the prophet: "And it came to pass, when Ahab heard these words, that he rent his clothes, and put sackcloth upon his flesh and fasted" (see Nicolai, De Prophetarum Vaticis [Magdeh. 1746]; Zachariä, De Prophetarum Habitus [Sodin, 1756]). The general appearance and life of the prophet were very similar to those of the Eastern derelivah at the present day. His dress was a hairy garment, girt with a leathern girdle (Isa. xx. 2; Zech. xiii. 4; Matt. iii. 4). He was married or unmarried as he chose; but his manner of life and diet were stern and austere (2 Kings iv, 10; 1 Kings xix, 6; Matt. iii. 4). Generally the prophets were not anxious to attract notice by ostentatious display; nor did they seek worldly wealth, most of them living in poverty and even want (1 Kings xiv, 8; 2 Kings iv, 38; iv, vi. 5). The decay of the congregation of God deeply chagrined them (comp. Micah vii, 1, and many passages in Jeremiah). Insult, persecution, imprisonment, and death were often the reward of their godly life. The expression of the author of the Apocalypse (Rev. iii. 7): "They were stoned, they were sawn asunder, were tempted, were slain with the sword; they wandered about in sheep-skins and goat-skins, being destitute, afflicted, tormented" (comp. Christ's speech, Matt. xxiii, 29 sq.; 2 Chron. xxiv, 17 sq.). The condition of the prophets, in their temporal humiliation, is vividly represented in the lives of Elijah and Elisha in the books of the Kings; and Jeremiah concludes the description of his sufferings in the 20th chapter by cursing the day of his birth. Repudiated by the world in which they were aliens, they saw in the life of him whom their appearance announced, and whose spirit dwelt in them. They figured him, however, not only in his lowness, but in his elevation. The Lord stood by them, gave evidence in their favor by fulfilling their predictions, frequently proved by miracles that they were his own messengers, or retaliated on their enemies the injury done them. The prophets addressed the people of both kingdoms: they were not confined to particular places, but prophesied where it was required. For this reason they were most numerous in capital towns, especially in Jerusalem, where they were stationed in the Temple. Sometimes their advice was asked, and then their prophecies take the form of answers to questions submitted to them (Isa. xxxvii; Ezek. xx.; Zech. vii). But much more frequently they felt themselves called to be "inwardly conversant with the courts of the high princes," to be the servants of the prince, or other great men, and to be so exclusively employed as to be entirely under the influence of the prince. But the prophets were not afraid to stand forward in places where their appearance, perhaps, produced indignation and terror. Whatever lay within or around the sphere of religion and morals formed the object of their care. They strenuously opposed the worship of false gods (Isa. i. 19 sq.; Hos. xiii. 16 sq.), as the work of the outfit. (iii, 16 sq.). Priests, princes, kings, all must hear them—must, however reluctantly, allow them to perform their calling as long as they spoke in the name of the true God, and as long as the result did not disprove the pretensions to be the servants of the invisible King of Israel (Jer. xxxviii, 15-21).

As seen above, there were institutions for training prophets; the senior men instructed a number of pupils and directed them. These schools had been established by Samuel (1 Sam. x. 11), and at a later time there were such institutions in different places, as Bethel and Gilgal (2 Kings ii, 3; iv, 38; vi, 1). The pupils of the prophets lived in fellowship united, and were called "sons of the prophets;" while the formation of the several new dispensations was in connection with their spiritual parents, and were styled fathers (comp. 2 Kings ii, 12; vi, 21). Samuel, Elijah, and Elisha are
mentioned as principals of such institutions. From them the Lord generally chose his instruments. Amos relates of himself (vii, 14, 15), as a thing uncommon, that he did not belong to the prophets, but was a herdsman, when the Lord took him to prophesy unto the people of Israel. At the same time, this example shows that the bestowal of prophetic gifts was not limited to the school of the prophets. Women also might come forward as prophetesses, as instanced in Miriam, Deborah, and Huldah, though such cases are of comparatively rare occurrence. We should also observe that only as regards the kingdom of Israel we have express accounts of the continuance of the schools of prophets. What is recorded of them is not directly applicable to the kingdom of Judah, except, as stated above, prophecy had in it an essentially different position. We cannot assume that the organization and regulations of the schools of the prophets in the kingdom of Judah were as settled and established as in the kingdom of Israel. In the latter, the schools of the prophets had a kind of monastic constitution: they were not institutions of general education, but missionary stations; which explains the circumstance that they were established exactly in places which were the chief seats of superstition. The spiritual fathers traveled in their evangelization, the pupils had their common board and dwelling, and those who married and left ceased not on that account to be connected with their colleges, but remained members of them. The widow of such a pupil of the schools of prophets who is mentioned in 2 Kings iv, 1 sq., considered Elisha as the person bound to care for her. The offerings which, by the Mosaic law, were to be given to the Levites were by the pius of the kingdom of Israel brought to the schools of the prophets (iv, 42). The prophets of the kingdom of Israel thus in some sort stood in a hostile position to the priests. These points of difference in the situation of the prophets of the two kingdoms must not be lost sight of; and we further add that prophecy in the kingdom of Israel was much more connected with extraordinary events than in the kingdom of Judah: the history of the latter offers no prophetic deeds equaling those of Elijah and Elisha. Prophecy in the kingdom of Israel not being grounded on a hierarchy venerable for its antiquity, consecrated by divine miracles, and constantly flavored with divine protection, it needed to be supported more powerfully, and to be less liable to be discredited. It may be observed that the expression "schools of the prophets" is not exactly suited to their nature, as general instruction was not their object. The so-called prophets' schools were associations of men endowed with the spirit of God, for the purpose of carrying on their work, the able-bodied members being directly and strengthened by those of a higher class. To those who entered these unions the Divine Spirit had already been imparted, which was the imperative condition of their reception. See Prophets, Sons of. The prophets of these, there have already been in part glanced at, but the importance of the subject demands a fuller exposition. To belong to the prophetic order and to possess the prophetic gift are not convertible terms. There might be members of the prophetic order to whom the gift of prophecy was not vouchsafed. There might be inspired prophets who did not belong to the prophetic order. As we have seen above, the inspired prophet generally came from the college of the prophets, and belonged to the prophetic order; but this was not always the case. In the instance of that prophet, whose exception to the rule are both manifested. When Amaziah, the idolatrous Israelitish priest, threatens the prophet and desires him to "flee away into the land of Judah, and there eat bread and prophesy there, but not to prophesy again any more in Bethel," it was not a prophet, neither was it a prophet's son; but it was a herdsman, and a gatherer of sycamore fruit: and the Lord took me as I followed the flock, and the Lord said unto me, Go prophesy unto my people Israel" (Amos vii, 14). That is, though called to the prophetic office, he did not belong to the order, and had not been trained in the prophetical colleges; and this he indicated, was an unusual occurrence (see J. Smith On Prophecy, ch. ix.).

1. In a general way, we may indicate that the sphere of action of the prophets was absolutely limited to Israel, and there is only one case of a prophet going to the heathen to preach among them—that of Jonah sent to Nineveh. He goes, however, to Nineveh to shame the Hebrews by the reception which he meets with there, and acting upon his own nation was thus even in this case the prophet's ultimate object. Many predictions of the Old Test. concern, indeed, the events of foreign nations, but they are always uttered and written with reference to Israel, and the prophets thought not of publishing them among the heathens themselves. The conversion of the pagans to the worship of the true God was indeed a favorite idea of the prophets; but the Divine Spirit told them that it was not to be effected by their exertions, as it was connected with extensive future changes, which they might not forestall. That the Lord would send such prophets was promised to the people by Moses, under a special law (Deut. xviii, 1) securing to the authority and office of ordinary servants and teachers, God appointed the priests: the characteristic mark which distinguished the prophets from them was inspiration; and this explains the circumstance that, in times of great moral and religious corruption, when the ordinary means no longer sufficed to reclaim the people, the number of prophets increased. The regular religious instruction of the people was no part of the business of the prophets: their proper duty was only to rouse and excite. The contrary—viz. that a part of the regular duty of the prophets was to instruct the people—is often argued from 2 Kings iv, 23, where it is said that the Shunammite on the sabbaths and days of new moon used to go to the prophet Elisha; but this passage applies only to the kingdom of Israel, and admits of no inference with respect to the kingdom of Judah. As regards the latter, there is no proof that prophets held meetings for instruction and edification on sacred days. Their position was here quite different from that of the prophets in the kingdom of Israel. The agency of the prophets in the kingdom of Judah was mainly to be found in their relations to the people as active agents in the establishment and maintenance of the kingdom. They were not the ordinary servants of the king, but the members of the royal household. The priestly order, which was the peculiar glory of the kingdom of Israel, had no existence in the kingdom of Judah. The office of the prophet in the former was a distinct and special rank in the kingdom; he was an office full of weight and authority, and enjoyed great privileges. The kingdom of Judah was the subject of the prophet's office, and the prophet was the instrument of the divine mind to maintain and establish the kingdom. The prophet was the representative of the divine will, and the means by which God intended to preserve the kingdom of Judah. The prophet was the mediator between God and the people, and the instrument by which God intended to communicate his will to the people. The prophet was the founder of the kingdom, and the instrument by which God intended to establish the kingdom. The prophet was the protector of the kingdom, and the instrument by which God intended to preserve the kingdom. The prophet was the promoter of the kingdom, and the instrument by which God intended to advance the kingdom. The prophet was the reformer of the kingdom, and the instrument by which God intended to reform the kingdom. The prophet was the legislator of the kingdom, and the instrument by which God intended to establish the law. The prophet was the counselor of the kingdom, and the instrument by which God intended to guide the kingdom. The prophet was the Helmsman of the kingdom, and the instrument by which God intended to steer the kingdom. The prophet was the watchman of the kingdom, and the instrument by which God intended to preserve the kingdom from the encroachments of its foes. The prophet was the advocate of the kingdom, and the instrument by which God intended to vindicate the kingdom. The prophet was the prophet of the kingdom, and the instrument by which God intended to establish the kingdom. See King, Prophecy, Prophecy, Prophets, Prophets, Sons of.
to which it refers, from which it derives its sanction, and with which it is fully impressed and sanctified. There is no chapter in the prophets in which there are not several references to the law. The business of the prophets was to explain it, to lay it to the hearts of the people, and to make its vital spirit live in the hearts of the people. It was, indeed, also their duty to point to future reforms, when the ever-living spirit of the law would break its hitherto imperfect form, and make for itself another: thus Jeremiah (iii, 16) foretells days when the ark of the covenant shall be no more, and (xxvi, 31) days when a new covenant will be made with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah. But for their own times they never once dreamed of altering any, even the minutest and least essential precept, even as to its form; how much less as to its spirit, which even the Lord himself declares (Matt. v, 18) to be immutable and eternal! The passages which some interpreters have alleged as opposed to sacrifices as instituted by the Mosaic law have been misunderstood; they do not denounce sacrifices generally, but only those of the Canaanites, with whom sacrifice was not even a form of true worship, but opposed to the genuine and spiritual service of God.

2. More specifically, the sixteen prophets whose books are in the Canon have that place of honor because they were endowed with the prophetic gift as well as ordinariness (so far as we know) belonging to the prophetic office. There are hundreds of prophecies contemporaneous with each of these sixteen prophets; and no doubt numberless compositions in sacred poetry and numberless moral exhortations were issued from the several schools, but only sixteen books find their place in the Canon. Why is this? Because these sixteen had what their brother collegians had not—the divine call to the office of prophet, and the divine illumination to enlighten them. It was not sufficient to have been taught and trained in preparation for a future call. Teaching and training served as a preparation only, when the schools were over, then the instrument of power, whose work was done, Moses had an external call at the burning bush (Exod. iii, 2). The Lord called Samuel, so that Eli perceived, and Samuel learned, that it was the Lord who called him (1 Sam. iii, 10). Isaiah (vi, 8), Jeremiah (i, 5), Ezekiel (ii, 4), Amos (vii, 15), declare their special mission. Nor was it sufficient for this call to have been made once for all. Each prophetic utterance is the result of a communication of the divine to the human spirit, received either by what we call inspiration, or by the word of the Lord (Deut. xi, 1). (See Aida to Faith, essay iii. "On Prophecy.") What, then, are the characteristics of the sixteen prophets thus called and commissioned, and inwrought with the messages of God to his people?

(1.) They were the national poets of Judaea. We have said, that poetry, chants and hymns, were a main part of the studies of the class from which, generally speaking, they were derived. As is natural, we find not only the songs previously specified, but the rest of their compositions, poetical, or breathing the spirit of poetry. Bishop Lowth ("Sacred Poetry," Lect. xxi). The book of Isaiah poetical, a few passages excepted, which, if brought together, would not at most exceed the bulk of five or six chapters, "half of the book of Jeremiah," "the greater part of Ezekiel." The rest of the prophets are mainly poetical, but Haggai is "epigram," and Jonah and Daniel are plain prose ("Sacred Poetry," Lect. xxi). The prophetical style different from that of books properly called poetical, whose sublimity it all but outvies, only in being less restrained by those external forms which distinguish poetical language from prose, and is more frequenting than prose does play upon words and thoughts. This peculiarity may be explained by the practical tendency of prophetical addresses, which avoid all that is unintelligible, and studiously introduce what is best calculated for the moment to strike the hearers. The same appears from many other circumstances, e.g. the union of music with prophecying, the demeanor of Saul when among the prophets (1 Sam. x, 5), Balaam's description of himself (Num. xxiv, 8) as a man whose eyes were opened, who saw the vision of the Almighty, and heard the words of God, the established phraseology to denote the inspired prophet, the writing of the word of the Lord was "written upon him" (Ezek. iii, 14; comp. Isa. viii, 11; 2 Kings iii, 15), etc. (See vi, below.)

(2.) They were annalists and historians. A great portion of Isaiah, of Jeremiah, of Daniel, of Jonah, of Haggai, is direct or indirect history.

(3.) They were preachers of patriotism; their patriots being founded on the religious motive. To the subject of the theocracy, the enemy of his nation was the enemy of God, the traitor to the public weal was a traitor to his God; a denunciation of an enemy was a denunciation of a representative of evil; an exhortation in behalf of Jerusalem was an exhortation in behalf of God's kingdom on earth, "the city of our God, the mountain of holiness, beautiful for situations, the joy of the whole earth, the city of the great King" (Psa. xxiv, iii, 5).

(4.) They were preachers of morals and of spiritual religion. The symbolical teaching of the law had lost much of its effect. Instead of learning the necessity of purity by the legal washings, the majority came to rest in the outward act as in itself sufficient. It was also, as in the case of the law, to look up before the eyes of their countrymen a high and pure morality, not veiled in symbols and acts, but such as none could profess to misunderstand. Thus, in his first chapter, Isaiah contrasts ceremonial observances with spiritual moralities: "Your new moons and your appointed feasts my soul hateth: they are a trouble unto me: I am weary to bear them ... Wash ye, make ye clean; put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes; cease to do evil; learn to do well; seek judgment; relieve the opprobred, stablish the afflicted; judge the fatherless, plead for the widow" (Isa. i, 14—17). He proceeds to denounce God's judgments on the oppression and covetousness of the rulers, the pride of the women (ch. iii), on grasping, profligacy, iniquity, injustice (ch. v), and so on throughout. The system of morals put forward by the prophets, if not higher or sterner or purer than that of the law, is more plainly declared, and with greater, because now more needed, vehemence of diction. "Magna fides et grandia audacia prophetarum," says St. Jerome (In Ezra). This was their general characteristic, but that gifts and graces might be discerned is proved by the cases of Balaam, Jonah, Canticles, and the disobedient prophet of Judah.

(5.) They were extraordinary, but yet authenticated, exponents of the law. As an instance of this we may take Isaiah's description of a true fast (lxxvii, 7—7); Ezekiel's explanation of the sins of the father being visited on the children (ch. xviii); Micaiah's preference of "doing justly, loving mercy, and walking humbly with God," to "thousands of rams and ten thousands of rivers of oil" (vi, 6—8). In these, as in other similar cases (comp. Num. xix, 19), it was the task of the prophets to restore the balance which had been overthrown by the Jews and their teachers dwelling on one side or on the outer covering of a truth or of a duty, and leaving the other side or the inner meaning out of sight.

(6.) They held, as we have shown above, a pastoral or quasi-pastoral office.

(7.) They were a political power in the state. Strong in the safeguard of their religious character, they were able to serve as a counterpoise to the royal authority when wielded even by an Abah. 

(8.) They had something more than national poets and annalists, preachers of patriotism, moral teachers, exponents of the law, pastors, and politicans. We have not yet touched upon their most essential characteristic, which is that they were instruments of revealing God's will to man; as in other ways, so specially, by predicting future events, and, in par-
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cicular, by foretelling the incarnation of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the redemption effected by him. There are two chief ways of exhibiting this fact—one is suitable when discoursing with Christians, the other when arguing with unbelievers. To show that the truth of the New Testament and the truthfulness of its authors, and of the Lord himself, are bound up with the truth of the existence of this predictive element in the propheta. To the unbeliever it is necessary to show that facts have verified their predictions.

(a) In Matthew's Gospel, the first chapter, we find a quotation from the prophet Isaiah, "Behold a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel;" and, at the same time, we find a statement that the birth of Christ took place as it did "that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet," in those words (i, 22, 23). This means that the prophecy was the declaration of God's purpose, and that the circumstances of the birth of Christ were the fulfillment of that purpose. Then, either the predictive element exists in the book of the prophet Isaiah, or the authority of the evangelist Matthew must be given up. The same evangelist testifies to the same prophecy having "spoken of" John the Baptist (iii, 3) in words which he quotes from Isaiah xxvi, (i, 13, 14). Jesus came and dwelt in Capernaum "that other words "spoken by" the same prophet (ix, 1) "might be fulfilled." He says (viii, 17) that Jesus did certain acts "that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the prophet" (Isa. iii, 4). He says (xii, 17) that Jesus acted in a particular manner "that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the prophet" in words quoted from xiii, 1. Then, if we believe Matthew, we must believe that in the pages of the prophet Isaiah there was predicted that which Jesus some seven hundred years afterwards fulfilled. The prophecy cannot be escaped by pressing the words τα προφητείας, for if they do not mean that certain things were done in order that the divine predetermination might be accomplished, which predetermination was already declared by the prophet, they must mean that Jesus Christ knowingly moulded his acts so as to be in accordance with what was said in an ancient book which in reality had no reference to him, a thing which is entirely at variance with the character drawn of him by Matthew, and which would make him a conscious impostor, insincerely predicting as to the prophecies. Further, it would imply (as in Matt. i, 22) that God himself contrived certain events (as those connected with the birth of Christ), not in order that they might be in accordance with his will, but in order that they might be agreeable to the declarations of the ancient book—than which nothing could well be more absurd.

But, further, we have not only the evidence of the evangelist; we have the evidence of the Lord himself. He declares (Matt. xiii, 4) that in the Jews of his age "is fulfilled the prophecy of Esaias, which saith—" (Isa. vi, 9). He quotes (Mark ii, 7), "Esaias well prophesied of them" (Isa. xix, 18). Then, if we believe our Lord's sayings and the record of them, we must believe in prediction as existing in the prophet Isaiah. This prophet, who was cited between fifty and sixty times, may be taken as a sample; but the same argument might be brought forward with respect to Jeremiah (Matt. ii, 18; Heb. viii, 8), Daniel (Matt. xxiv, 15), Hosea (Matt. ii, 15; Rom. ix, 25), Joel (Acts ii, 17), Amos (Acts vii, 42; xvi, 10), Jonah (Matt. iv, 10), Micah (Matt. xiii, 7), Habakkuk (Acts xiii, 41). But this does not end our work of distinguishing the facts. The subject appears from Numb. xii, 6 sq., where Moses, who enjoyed divine inspiration in his highest grade, is represented as differing from those called prophets in a stricter sense, and as standing in contrast with them. Divine inspiration is given not only to the general body of the prophetic office, to which other elements must be added, especially the gift of that inspiration in a formal manner and for a specific purpose. This will become still more clear from the considerations adduced under the next heads.

IV. Test of the Prophetic Character. As Moses had foretold, a host of false prophets arose in later times among the people, who promised prosperity without repentance, and preached the Gospel without the law. The writings of the prophets are full of complaints of the mischief done by these impostors. Jeremiah significantly calls them "prophets of the deceit of their own heart"—i.e. men who followed the suggestions of their own fancy in prophesying (Jer. xxiii, 26; comp. ver. 16, and ch. xiv, 14). All their practices prove the great influence which true prophetism had acquired among the people of Israel. But how were the people to distinguish between the true and the false? This question is decided partly by positive or negative criteria, and partly by certain general marks.

1. In the law concerning prophets (Deut. xviii, 20; comp. xiii, 7-9) the following enactments are contained:

(1) The prophet who speaks in the name of another
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gods—i. e., professed to have his revelations from a god different from Jehovah—is to be considered as false, and to be punished capitally; and this even though his predictions should come to pass.

These enactments established a peculiar right of the prophets. He who prophesied in the name of the true God was, even when he foretold calamity, entitled to be treated as a prophet in this respect; and his failure of accomplishment. He might then be imprisoned, but could not be put to death, as instanced in Jeremiah (xxvi, 8-16), who is apprehended and arraigned, but acquitted: "Then, said the princes and the people unto the priests and the prophet. This man was not worthy to die, for he has spoken to us in the name of the Lord our God." Ahab is by false prophets encouraged to attack Ramoth-gilead, but Micahias prophesied him no good; on which the king becomes angry, and orders the prophet to be confined (1 Kings xxii, 1-27): "Take Micahias and put him in prison, and feed him with bread of affliction, and with water of affliction, until I come in peace." Micahias answers (ver. 28), "If thou return at all in peace, the Lord has not spoken by me." Until the safe return of the king, Micahias was put to prison; after that, he shall be put to death. The prophet agrees to it, and the king goes up to Ramoth-gilead, but is slain in the battle.

(3.) From the above two criteria of a true prophet flows the third, that his addresses must be in strict accordance with the laws. Whoe'er departs from it cannot be a true prophet, for it is impossible that the Lord should contradict himself.

(4.) In the above is also founded the fourth criterion, that a true prophet must not promise prosperity without repentance; and that he is a false prophet, "of the deceit of his heart," if he does not repose the sins of the people, and who does not inculcate on them the doctrines of divine justice and retribution.

2. In addition to these negative criteria there were positive ones to procure authority to true prophets. First of all, it must be assumed that the prophets themselves received, along with the divine revelations, assurance that these were really divine. Any true communion with the Holy Spirit affords the assurance of its divine nature, and the prophets could, therefore, satisfy themselves of their divine mission. There was nothing to make them feel in this respect that their gifts were bestowed on them with the gift of prophesying. Their own native disposition was often much averse to this calling, and could be only conquered by the Lord forcibly compelling them, as appears from Jer. xx, 7-9: "Since I spoke, the word of the Lord was made a reproach unto me, and a derision daily. Then I said, I will not make mention of him, nor speak any more in his name, but his word was in mine heart as a burning fire shut up in my bones, and I was weary with bearing, and I could not stay." Now, when the prophets themselves were at once convinced of their divine mission, they could in various ways prove it to others whom they were called on to enlighten.

(1.) To those who had any sense of truth, the Spirit of God gave evidence that the prophecies were divinely inspired. This testimonium Spiritus Sancti is the chief argument for the reality of a divine revelation; and he who is susceptible of it does not, indeed, disregard the other proofs suitting the wants of unimproved minds, but lays less stress on them.

(2.) The prophets themselves utter their firm conviction that they act and speak by divine authority, not of their own accord (comp. the often occurring phrase, הִשָּׁמֵשׁ, "a prophecy of Jehovah," Jer. xxvi, 12, etc.). Their pious life bore testimony to their being worthy of a nearer communion with God, and defended them from the suspicion of intentional deception; their sobriety of mind distinguished them from all fanatics, and defended them from the suspicion of self-delusion; their fortitude in suffering for truth proved that they had their commission from no human authority.

(5.) Part of the predictions of the prophets referred to proximate events, and their accomplishment was divine evidence of their divine origin. Whoever had been once favored with such a testimonial, his authority was established for his whole life, as instanced in Samuel. Of him it is said (1 Sam. iii, 19): "The Lord was with him, and did not withdraw his hand from him until he fulfilled them; and all Israel knew (from this) that Samuel was established to be a prophet of the Lord." Of the divine mission of Isaiah no doubt could be entertained after, for instance, his prophecies of the overthrow of Sennacherib before Jerusalem had been fulfilled. The credentials of the divine mission of Ezekiel were certified when his prediction was accomplished, that Zedekiah should be brought to Babylon, but should not see it, for the king was made prisoner and blinded (Ezek. xii, 12, 18); they were further confirmed by the fulfillment of his prediction concerning the destruction of the city (ch. xxiv).

(6.) Sometimes the divine mission of the prophets was also proved by miracles; but this occurred only at important crises, when the existence of the kingdom of Israel was in jeopardy, as in the age of Elijah and Elisha. Miracles are mentioned as criteria of true prophets (Deut. xiii, 2), still with this caution that they should not be trusted alone, but that the people should inquire whether the negative criteria were extant.

(5.) Those prophets whose divine commission had been sufficiently proved bore testimony to the divine origin of their mission. It is one of the characteristics of the prophetic office that there was a certain gradation among the prophets; the principals of the colleges of prophets procured authority to the "sons" of prophets. Thus the deeds of Elijah and Elisha at the same time authenticated the hundreds of prophets whose superior they were. Concerning the relation of the true prophets to each other, the passage 2 Kings ii, 9 is remarkable: Elisha says to Elisha, "I pray thee, let a double portion of thy spirit be upon me." Here Elisha, as the first-born of Elijah in a spiritual sense, and standing to him in the same relation as Jesus to John, raised to Elisha one of his spiritual inheritance, alluding to the law concerning the hereditary right of the lawfully begotten first-born son (Deut. xxi, 17). This case supposes that other prophets also of the kingdom of Israel took portions of the fullness of the spirit of Elijah, and that, as already mentioned, it is plain, then, that only a few prophets stood in immediate communion with God, while that of the remaining was formed by mediation. The latter were spiritually incorporated in the former, and, on the ground of this relation, actions performed by Elisha, or through the instrumentality of one of his pupils, were at once ascribed to Elijah, e.g., the anointing of Hazael to be king over Syria (1 Kings xix, 15; comp. 2 Kings viii, 13); the anointing of Jehu to be king over Israel (1 Kings xix, 16; comp. 2 Kings ii, 1, 14); the writing of the letter to Joram, etc. Thus in a certain sense it may be affirmed that Elijah was in his time the only prophet of the kingdom of Israel. Similarly of Moses it is recorded, during his passage through the desert, that a portion of his spirit was conveyed to the seventy elders (Num. xii, 17). The history of the Christian Church itself offers analogies; look, e.g., at the relation of the second-class Reformers to Luther and Calvin.

(6.) It hardly needs to be mentioned that before a man could be a prophet he must be converted. This clearly appears in the case of Isaiah, "whose iniquity was taken away, and was pardoned," and who, in a religious sense, acted as a mediator between God and his people. The passage quoted from the covenant.
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For a single momentary inspiration, however, the mere beginning of spiritual life sufficed, as instance in
Balaam (Num. i, 10; xvi, 13).

3. As to prophecy in its circumscripted sense, or the foretelling of future events by the prophets, some ex-
positors would explain all predictions of special events; while others assert that no prediction contains anything
but general promises or threatenings, and that the
prophets knew nothing of the particular manner in
which their predictions might be realized. Both these
classes deviate from the correct view of prophecy: the
former often resort to the most arbitrary interpreta-
tions, and the latter are opposed by a mass of facts agai-
ning to a contrary view. It seems necessary to con-
tend, e.g., when Ezekiel foretells (xii, 12) that Zedekiah
would try to break through the walls of the city and to
escape, but that he would be seized, blinded, and taken
to Babylon. The frailty of the people, under the Old
Test., required external evidence of the real connection
of the prophets with God, and the predictions of par-
ticular forthcoming events were to them empyrean, signa.
These were the more indispensable to them, because
the ancients generally, and the Orientals in particular,
always had a tendency to the exploration of futurity,
which tended to foster superstition and for-
ward idolatry. All other methods of knowing future
events by necromancy, conjuration, passing through the
fire, etc., had been strictly forbidden (Deut. xviii, 10,
11), it might be expected that the deep-rooted craving
for a knowledge of futurity could be gratified in some other and nobler manner. The success of
a prophet depended on the gift of special knowledge of
futurity; this, it is true, was granted comparatively to
only few, but in the authority thus obtained all those
abhored who were likewise invested with the prophetic
character. It was the seal impressed on true prophe-
cy, as opposed to false. From 1 Sam. ix, 6, it appears
that, to incline unenlightened minds with the sense of
divine truths, the prophets stopped occasionally to dis-
close things of common life, using this as the means to
reach a higher mark. On the same footing with defi-
nite predictions stand miracles and tokens, which proph-
pects of the highest rank, as Elijah and Isaiah, volun-
teered or granted. These also were requisite to confirm
the free will faith of the people; but Ewald justly remarks
that with the true prophets they never appear as the
chief point; they only assist and accompany prophecy,
but are not its object, not the truth itself, which super-
cedes them as soon as it gains sufficient strength and
influence.

Interpreters, misunderstanding passages like
Jer. xviii, 8; xxvi, 13, have asserted, with Dr. Köster,
(p. 226 sq.), that all prophecies were conditional; and
have maintained that their revocability distinct-
visted the true predictions (Weispora) from sooth-
saying (Wohranung). But beyond all doubt, when the
prophet denounced the divine judgments, he pro-
ceeds on the assumption that the people will not repent,
an assumption which he knows from God to be true.
Were the people to repent, the prediction would fail; but
because they will not, it is uttered absolutely. It
does not follow from this, that the prophets knew nothing
of repentance and exhortations are useless. These serve "for a wit-
ness against them;" and besides, amid the ruin of the
mass, individuals might be saved. Viewing prophecies
as conditional predictions nullifies them. The Mosaic
criterion (Deut. xviii, 22), that he was a false prophet
who predicted "things which followed not nor came to
pass," would then be of no value, since recourse might
always be had to the excuse that the case had been al-
tered by the fulfillment of the condition. The fear of in-
roducing fatalism, if the prophecies are not taken in a
conditional sense, is not felt by the oriental, for his foreknowledge, does not establish fatalism, and from
divine omniscience simply is the prescience of the
prophets to be derived. The prophets feel themselves
so closely united to God that the words of Jehovah are
given as their own, and that to them is often ascribed
what God does, as slaying and reviving (Hos. vi, 5),
rooting out and rebuilding (Isa. i, 29; xlii, 7; Ezek. xxxii, 18; xxxiii, 3), which proves their own
consciousness to have been entirely absorbed into that
of God.

V. The Prophetical State of Inspiration. — We learn from Holy Scripture that it was by the agency of the
Spirit of God that the prophets received the divine
communication. Thus, on the appointment of the sev-
enty elders, "The Lord said, I will take of the Spirit
which is upon thee, and will put it upon them. . . . And
the Lord . . . took of the Spirit that was upon him, and put it upon them . . . to the intent . . . to pass
that when the Spirit rested upon them, they prophesied and did not cease. . . . And Moses said,
Would God that all the Lord's people were prophets, and that the Lord would put his Spirit upon them"
(Numb. xi, 16, 29, 25). Here we see that what preceded the seventy prophesy was their being endowed with
the Lord's Spirit by the Lord himself. So it is the Spirit
of the Lord which made Saul (1 Sam. x, 6) and his
counselors (xiv, 20) prophesy. Thus Peter assures us
that "prophets previous to the old testament time by the
will of man, but holy men of God spake, being moved
d(4) by the Holy Ghost" (2 Pet. i, 21), while false
prophets are described as those "who speak a vision of their
own heart, and not out of the mouth of the Lord" (Jer.
xxiii, 10), "who prophesy out of their own hearts, . . .
and who follow not the Spirit but the carnal mind" (Ezek.
xiii, 8). Hence the emphatic declarations of the Great
Prophet of the Church that he did not speak of himself
(John vii, 17, etc.). The prophet held an intermediate
position in communication between God and man. God communicated with him by his Spirit,
and he, having received this communication, was "the
spokesman" of God to man (comp. Exod. vii, 1, and iv,
16). But the means by which the Divine Spirit com-
municated with the human spirit, and the conditions of
the human spirit under which the divine communica-
tions were received, have not been clearly defined to
us. They are, however, indicated. On the occasion
of the sedition of Miriam and Aaron, we read, "And the
Lord said, Hear now my words: If there be a prophet
among you, I the Lord will make myself known unto
him in a vision, and will speak unto him in a dream. My
servant Moses is not so, who is faithful in all mine
house: with him will I speak mouth to mouth, even ap-
parently, and not in dark speeches, and the similitude of
the Lord shall he behold" (Numb. xii, 6-8). Here
we have a clear division of those communications in
which the revelations of God are made to man: 1. Di-
rect declaration and manifestation — "I will speak mouth
to mouth, apparently, and the similitude of the
Lord shall he behold;" 2. Vision; 3. Dream. It is indicated
that, at least at this time, the vision and the dream
were the special means of conveying a revelation to a
prophet, while the higher form of direct declaration
and manifestation was reserved for the more highly
favored Moses. Joel's prophecy appears to make the
same division, "Your old men shall dream dreams, and
your young men shall see visions," putting the two
methods in which the promise, "your sons and your
daughters shall prophesy," is to be carried out (ii, 28).
Of Daniel we are told that "he had understanding in
all visions and dreams" (Dan. i, 17). Can these phases
of the prophetic state be distinguished from each other?
and in what sense do they consist?

According to the theory of Philo and the Alexandrian
school, the prophet was in a state of entire unconscious-
ness at the time that he was under the influence of di-
vine inspiration, "for the human understanding," says
Philo, "is enveloped and swallowed up in the Spirit,
and on the removal of the latter again returns to its
home, for the mortal must not dwell with the im-
 mortal" (Quis Rev. Div. Hist. i, 511). Balaam is de-
scribed by him as an unconscionable instrument through
whom God spoke (De Vind Mosia, lib. i, vol. ii, p. 124). Josephus makes Balaam excuse himself to Balak on the same principle: "When the Spirit of God seizeth us, it uttereth whatsoever sound and words it pleases, without any guidance out of which we would arrange into us, there is nothing in us which remains our own" (Ant. iv, 6, 5). This theory identifies Jewish prophecy in all essential points with the heathen maieutic, or divination, as distinct from propheta, or interpretation. Montanism adopted the same view: "Defiluminus, causa non prophetarum, gratia est dexteram, id est amenitatem, convenire." In spiritu enim homo constitutus, praeceter illum gloriare Dei convicti, vel cum per ipsum Deus loquitur, necesse est excitat sensu, obumbraturn nollecit virtute divina; de quo inter nos et Psychicos (catholicos) (in veste est) (Tertullian. Aen. Marcion, iv, 29). According to the belief, then, of the heathen, of the Alexandrian Jews, and of the Montanists, the vision of the prophet was seen while he was in a state of ecstatic unconsciousness, and the enunciation of the vision was made by him in the same state. The fathers of the Church opposed the Montanist theory with great unani- mity. In Eugubinus's History (v, 17) we read that Miltiades wrote a book Proi tov μη δινος προφητην in icaetatit aiavita. St. Jerome writes: "Non loquitur prophetas in icaetas, ut Montanos et Frisica Maximalius, quia spiritusque prophetarum et liber est visio et visiones intelligens universa quia loquitur" (Prolog. in Nahuam). Again: "Nec vero ut Montanos cum insanias feminas somniat, prophetae in ecstazi locuti sunt nec exserein quid loquenterum, ut cum aliqui eruditi ipsi ignorantem quid dicerent" (Prolog. in Ezek.). Origin (Conf. Col- um, vii, 4) and St. Basil (Commentary on Isaiah, Pro- rem, c. 5) contrast the prophet with the soothsayer, on the ground of the latter being deprived of his senses. St. Chrysostom draws out the contrast: Τοῦτο γὰρ μάντως θέω, τὸ ξενάγητα, τὸ ἀνάγγελυ υπομνῄ- σται, τὸ γὰρ συνιστᾶναι τὰ κατάπασας, καὶ τις δὲ φτιαγεῖται, φωνὰς ἀνάκτο καὶ φοί- τα της ἀληθεῖας κατεδίδεται γνῶρις τῶν μάντων καὶ τῶν προφητῶν (Hom. viii in Epist. ad Corinth.). At the same time, while drawing the distinction sharply between heathen soothsaying and Montanist prophesying on the one side, and Hebrew prophecy on the other, the fathers use expressions so strong as almost to represent the latter not necessarily inspired on by the Power of God. Thus it is that they describe them as musical instruments—the pipe (Athenagoras, Leg. pro Christianis, c xx; Clem. ALEX. Cohort. ad Gent. c i, il.; the lyre (Justin Martyr, Cohort. ad Graec. c viii; Epiphanius Rhet. Heteroclit. xxxii; Chrys. Hom. Apol. Antioch. ii, 61.); the harp (St. Greg. Magn. Prof. in Mor. in Job). Expressions such as these (many of which are quoted by Dr. Lee, On Inspiration, Appendix G) must be set against the passages which were directed against the Montanists. Nevertheless, there is a very appreciable, difference between the view that and that of Tertullian and Philo. Which is most in accordance with the indications of Holy Scripture?

It does not seem possible to draw any very precise distinction between the prophetic "dream" and the prophetic "vision." In the case of Abraham (Gen. xv, 1) and of Daniel (Dan. vii, 1), they seem to melt into each other. In both the external senses are at rest, reflection is quiescent, and intuition energizes. The action of the ordinary faculties is suspended in the one case by natural, in the other by supernatural or extraordinary causal agencies, the "state into which the prophet was occasionally, at least, thrown by the ecstasy, or vision, or trance, is described poetically in the book of Job (iv. 13-16, xxxiii, 16), and more plainly in the book of Daniel. In the case of Daniel, the "vision" is described by its accom- panying terror (vii, 17, 8). Then he is raised up- right (vii, 18) on his hands and knees, and then on his feet (x, 10, 11). He then receives the divine revelation (vii, 19, x, 12). After this he falls to the ground in a swoon (x, 15, 17); he is faint, sick, and astounded (vii, 27). Here, then, is an instance of the ecstatic state; nor must we doubt that he did not find it in the New Testament accompanied by such vio- lent effects upon the body. At the Transfiguration, the disciples fell on their face, being overpowered by the divine glory, and were restored, like Daniel, by the touch of Jesus' hand. Peter fell into a trance (torre- ncia) before he received his vision, instructing him as to the admission of the Gentiles (Acts x, 10; xi, 5). Paul was in a trance (in icaetas) when he was commanded to devote himself to the conversion of the Gentiles (xxii, 17), and when he was caught up into the third heaven (2 Cor. xii, 1). John was probably in the same state (in iveauet) when he received the message to the seven churches (Rev. i, 10). The prophetic trance, then, must be acknowledged as a scriptural account of the state in which the prophets and other inspired per- sons, sometimes, at least, received their revelations. It would seem, in particular cases, to have been of the following nature: (1) The bodily senses were closed to external objects in deep sleep; (2) The reflective and discursive faculty was still and inactive; (3) The spiritual faculty (sou) was awakened to the highest state of energy; (4) The phenomena of which we are described by the prophets as "seen" or "heard" by them, for the spiritual faculty energizes by immediate perception on the part of the inward sense, not by in- ference and thought. Thus Isaiah "saw the Lord sitting" (Isa. vi, 1). Zecharias "laid up his eyes and saw" (Zech. ii, 1); "the word of the Lord which Micah saw" (Mic. i, 1); "the wonder which Habakkuk did see" (Hab. i, 1). "Peter saw heaven opened and there came a voice to him" (Acts x, 11). Paul was "in a trance, and saw him speaking" (xxii, 19). John "behold, I saw seven golden candlesticks" (Rev. i, 12). Hence it is, too, that the prophets' visions are not connected and fragmentary, inasmuch as they are not the subject of the reflective, but of the percep- tive faculty. They described what they saw and heard, not what they had themselves thought out and systematized. Hence, too, succession in time is disregarded or unnoticed. The subjects of the vision being, to the prophetic's sight, in juxtaposition or enfolding each other, some in the foreground, some in the background, are not necessarily "seen" by the prophet; in this, too, the imagery with which the prophetic writings are colored, and the dramatic cast in which they are moulded; these peculiarities resulting, as we have already said, in a necessary obscurity and difficulty of interpre- tation. But though it must be allowed that Scripture lan- guage seems to point out the state of dream and of trance, or ecstasy, as a condition in which the human instrument occasionally received the divine com- munications, it does not follow that all the prophetic revelations were thus made. We must acknowledge the state of trance in such passages as Isa. vi (called ordinarily the vision of Isaiah), as Ezek. i (called the vision of Ezekiel), as Dan. vii, viii, x, xi, xii (called the visions of Daniel), as Zech. i, iv, v, vi (called the visions of Zecharias), as Acts x (called the vision of St. Peter), as 2 Cor. xii (called the vision of St. Paul), and similar instances, which are indicated by the language used. But it does not seem true to say, with Hengstenberg, that "the difference between these prophecies and the rest is a vanishing one, and if we but possess the power and the ability to look into them, the marks of the vision may be discerned" (Christology, i, 417). This view is advocated also by Veltheim (De Opificio Rerum Futurorum Descriptione), Jahn (Eiselsl. in die gotthlichen Bücher des A. B.), Tholuck (Die Propheten und ihre Wirken, ii, 68), and others, who call these "vocations" or "visions" (2 Cor. xii, 1). In the books of Moses "speaking mouth to mouth" is contrasted with
visions and dreams" (Numb. xii. 8). It is true that in this last-quoted passage "visions and dreams" alone appear to be attributed to the prophet, while "speaking mouth to mouth" is reserved for Moses. But when Moses was dead, the cause of this difference would cease. During the era of prophecy there were none numerically. In the present day, when the Holy Ghost see us, we may suppose, communicate more openly than the prophets. We should expect, then, that they would be the recipients, not only of visions in the state of dream or ecstasy, but also of the direct revelations which are called speaking mouth to mouth. The greater part of the divine communications we may suppose to have been thus made to the prophets in their waking and ordinary state, while the visions were exhibited to them either in the state of sleep or in the state of ecstasy. "The more ordinary mode through which the word of the Lord, as far as we can trace, came, was through a divine impulse given to the prophet's own thoughts" (Stanley, p. 420).

Hence it follows that, while the fathers in their opposition to Montanism and mania were pushed somewhat too far in their denial of the ecstatical state, they were yet under which the greater part of the prophetic revelations were received and promulgated. No truer description has been given of them than that of Hippolytus and that of St. Basil: "Оς γὰρ εἰ ἰδία δυνάμεις φαίνονται, οὐδὲ ἢπειρα ἢπειρα ταῦτα ἐπηφανεύονται ἢπειρα πρὸς ἑαυτούς ἔχουσαν ὅσδικα, ἐνταξεὶ ἐν ἐπαράμεναι προδέχοντο τὰ μὴ καταλαβόντα εἰς τὰ παντα ἢπειρα τὰς ἐπηφανείας τὰς πρὸς ἑαυτούς τὰς ἡμῶν." (St. Basil, De Antichristo, c. ii). With preservation of a καλοῦντα καὶ ἀκούειν ἕκαστο ἣπειρα ἀκούειν τὰς ἢπειρας τῆς ἡμῶν, τὰς ἡμῶν ἐπηφανείας τὰς "ὑπερήφανες τῆς ἡμῶν" to speak the word of God in a manner of time, as was prescribed to them, was not inherent in the divine inspiration generally; and some of the latter times, which the angel in the latter part of the prophecy of Hosea (xvi. 1) is to be interpreted. However, we may well believe, understood in his own words no more than a reference to the historical fact that the children of Israel came out of Egypt. But Hosea was not the author of the prophecy—he was the instrument by which it was promulgated. The Holy Spirit intended something further, and what this something was he informs us by the evangelist Matthew (Matt. ii. 15). The two facts of the Israelites being led out of Egypt and of Christ's return from Egypt appear to Prof. Jowett so distinct that the reference by Matthew to the prophet Hosea is understandable, and does not constitute a mistake on the part of the evangelist (see Jowett, Essay on the Interpretation of Scripture). A deeper insight into Scripture shows that "the Jewish people themselves, their history, their ritual, their government, all present one grand prophecy of the future Redeemer" (Lec, p. 107). Consequently "Israel" is one of the forms naturally taken in the prophetic vision by the idea "Messian." It does not follow from the above, however, that the prophets had no intelligent comprehension of their ordinary significations. These, so far as at least the primary reference is concerned, were mere symbols to their own mind, although the future and full significance was of necessity dim and imperfectly apprehended. Time, in the order of providence, is God's own best exponent of prophecy.

While the prophets were under the influence of inspiration, the scenery might produce deep, absorbing, or elevated emotion, which would sometimes greatly affect their physical system (Gen. xv. 12; Numm. xxiv. 16; Dan. x. 8; Ezek. i. 28; Rev. i. 17). Still they had an intelligent consciousness of what they were describing; they recognized their divinity, but they did not utter frantc ravings like the prophets of Beal. Undoubtedly, as the prophecies are a revelation from God, the prophets well understood, at least in a general way, the predictions they uttered; but they did not necessarily testify or know anything respecting the time.
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when the events predicted should happen (Dan. xii. 8, 9; 1 Pet. i. 10-12). Occasionally even this was revealed to the prophet (Zech. xi). The symbols which were often exhibited to the prophets described as they came before them in succession, and in some instances they were subsequently favored with a more full and particular explanation of the scenery which passed before them (Ezek. xxxvi. xi). Though the prophetic office was a dignified one, it needed not, and should not, be supposed that at all times and on all occasions the prophets spoke and acted under the special aid and guidance of the Holy Spirit. So much was not true of even the apostles of Christ. It is enough that at all due propriety of circumstances, they were specially guided and aided by the Spirit of God. Nor is it necessary to assume that all the prophets were endowed with miraculous powers. Such was not the case even with Christian prophets (1 Cor. xii. 10). See INSPIRATION.

VI. Form and Peculiarities of the Prophetic Utterances.—1. Verbal Modes of Delivery.—Usually the prophets promulgated their visions and announcements in public places before the congregated people. Still some portions of the prophetic books, as the entire second and third books, and the description of new world people (Ezek. xl-xlviii), probably were never communicated orally. In other cases the prophetic addresses first delivered orally were next, when committed to writing, revised and improved. Especially the books of Hosea and Habakkuk contain, for the apocryphal parts, not of separate predictions, independent of each other, but form, as they now are, a whole—that is, they give the quintessence of the prophet's labors of their authors. In this case it is certain that the authors themselves caused the collection to be made. But it is so likewise in some cases where their books really consist of single declarations, and in others it is at least highly probable. Further particulars concerning the manner in which prophetic rolls were collected and published we have only respecting Jeremiah, who, being in prison, called Baruch "to write from his mouth his predictions, and to read them in the ears of the people" (Jer. xxxviii. 4-14).

There is evidence that the later prophets sedulously read the writings of the earlier, and that a prophetic canon existed before the present was formed. The predictions of Jeremiah throughout rest on the writings of earlier prophets, as Isaiah had established in his Jeremias Librorum Sacrorum Interpretationes (Vindobonae, 1837). Zechariah explicitly alludes to writings of former prophets; "to the words which the Lord has spoken to earlier prophets, when Jerusalem was inhabited in its first glory." (Zech. viii. 14).

In all probability we have complete those predictions which were committed to writing; at least the proofs which Ewald gives (p. 43 sqq.) for his opinion, of prophecies having been lost, do not stand trial. The words "as the Lord hath said," in Joel ii, 32, refer to the predictions of Joel himself. In Isa. ii and Mic. iv nothing is introduced from a lost prophetic roll, but Isaiah borrows from Micah. Hosea alludes (viii, 12), not to some unknown work, but to the Pentateuch. In Isa. xcv and xvi the prophet repeats, not another's prediction, but his own, previously delivered, to which he adds a supplement. Obadiah and Jeremiah do not avail themselves of the written address of a former prophet, but Jeremiah makes the prophecy of Obadiah the groundwork of his own. The opinion that in Isa. lvi, 10; lvi, 11, there was inserted, uncentered, a long remnant of an older roll is founded on erroneous views respecting the time of its composition. The same holds good of Isa. xxiv, where Ewald would find remnants of several older rolls. The very circumstance that in the prophets there nowhere occurs a tenable ground for maintaining that they referred to rolls lost and unknown to us, but that they often allude to writings which we know and possess, clearly proves that there is no reason for supposing, with Ewald, that a great number of prophetic compositions have been lost, "and that of a large tree, only a few blossoms have reached our time." In consequence of the prophets being conscious of the dispensations of God, much care was bestowed on the preservation of their publications. Ewald himself cannot refrain from observing (p. 56), "We have in Jer. xxvi, 1-19 a clear proof of the exact knowledge which the better classes of the people had of all that had, a hundred years before, happened to a prophet—of his words, misfortunes, and accidents."

2. Symbolic Actions.—In the midst of the prophetic declarations symbolic actions are often mentioned which the prophets had to perform. The opinions of interpreters of these actions, they were carried out by the prophets themselves, that they always, at least generally, were really done; others assert that they had existence only in the mind of the prophets, and formed part of their visions. See HOSEA.

Another symbolic action of Jeremiah prefigures the people's destruction. He says (xiii, 1-10) he had been by the Lord directed to get a linen girdle, to put it on his loin, to undertake a long tour to the Euphrates, and to hide the girdle there in a hole of the rock. He does so, returns, and after many days the Lord again orders him to take the girdle from the place where it was hidden, and wither it nothing. In predicting the destruction of Babylon and a general war (xxvi, 12-38), he receives from the Lord a wine-cup, to cause a number of kings of various nations, among whom the sword would be sent, to drink to destruction. He says (xiii, 4) with this cup to the kings of Egypt, Arabia, Persia, Media, and many other countries. When the prophet Ezekiel receives his commission and instructions to prophesy against the rebellious people of Israel, a roll of a book is presented to him, which he eats by the direction of the Lord (Ezek. ii. 3). He next ordered to lie before the city of Jerusalem on his left side three hundred and ninety days; and when he had accomplished them, on his right side forty days. He must not turn from one side to the other, and he is ordered to bake with dung of man the bread which he eats during this time (iv. 4, 4, 12). Isaiah is ordered to walk naked and barefoot, for a sign upon Egypt and Ethiopia (Isa. xx, 2, 3). But, however we may understand these directions, we cannot refer all symbolic actions to internal intuition at least, of a false prophet we have a sure example of an extraordinarily performed symbolic action (1 Kings xxii, 11), and the false prophets always aped the true ones (comp. Jer. xix, 1 sqq.). These undoubted instances of a literal action warrant the presumption that in the other cases likewise there was a spatial fact as the basis of a spiritual symbolism. See VISION.

In the case of visions the scenery preceded or came after the mind, something like a panoramic view of a landscape, gradually unfolding; in symbolic imagery, forms of glory or of gloom; accompanied with actions of a corresponding character, not uncommonly exhibiting, as in actual occurrence, the future and distant events. The prophets occasionally beheld themselves as actors in the symbolic scenery. In the visionary pageant many objects would appear to be grouped, or lying near together, which were in fact separated by considerable intervals of time; so that it is not to be expected that the prophets would describe what they saw in their connections and relations. See SYMBOL.

3. Prophetic Style and Diction.—The idea of prophecy as anticipated history has given rise to many erroneous views of prophetic language. No prophecy can be rightly interpreted which does not illustrate the name of God in the elements of his character, the principles of his government, his purposes of mercy and judgment towards men. The human race presents the only proper object of more or less limited Jehovah's judgments; and blessings are announced upon states and kingdoms, to have respect upon the territory rather than the inhabitants to merge the spiritual in the natural. The
promises which are associated with Mount Zion, and the threatenings uttered against Edom, belong not to the locality, but to the people, and to all who imitate the Edomites in their policy.

The mission of the prophets was the religious education of the Jewish people. They were raised up, according to the exigencies of the times, to preserve them from error, and to prepare their minds for the future development of the kingdom of God. Their object was twofold—to maintain the Church in due allegiance to prescribed rites, institutions, ordinances, and yet to prepare the people for a further manifestation of the blessings of the new covenant. By their writings they designed to impart to future ages an explanation of the vast events of the present order which they lived, and to confirm the divine origin and authority of the new order of things. The prophetic style and diction exactly accord with this view of their design. This will account for the various hues of light and shade which streak the scroll of prophecy.

If the future course of events had been clearly marked out and formally laid down, all motives to present duty would have been oblitered; no room would have been left for the exercise of faith, of hope, of fear, and love; all thoughts, all feelings, all desires, would have been anesthetized, and the prophecies would have been analogous to the dreams of a dreamer. But enough is revealed to support faith and animate hope. The remoter future is seen afar off in promises indistinct yet glorious. Confidence is bespoken for these distant predictions, by the clear and precise terms which portray some nearer event, fulfilled in that generation as a sign and token that all shall be accomplished in its season. Heathen divination, when it refers to any event which is near at hand, uses language remarkable for its ambiguity, but speaks distinctly of those matters which are reserved for the distant future. Those who spake in the name of Jehovah pursue the directly opposite course. Their language is much more express, distinct, and clear when they speak of events in the nearer future than in describing what shall take place in the latter days. Prophecy of this nature would not raise its voice at all times, lest that voice from its familiarity should be unheeded; but at every critical and eventful period prophecy led them on—"a pillar of cloud in the brighter daylight of their purer and better times; a pillar of fire gleaming in the darker night of their calamity or sin" (Dean Magee).

(1) The future is described in terms of the past. The known is made use of to give shape and form to the unknown. We have a striking instance of this in Hos. (vii, 13; ix, 5): that is, the Assyrians shall return to Egypt. The old state of bondage and oppression should come back upon them. The covenant whereby it was promised that the people should not return was virtually cancelled. They had made themselves as the heathen; they should be in the condition of the heathen. For in Hos. x, 5 we read: "He shall not return into the land of Egypt, but the Assyrian shall be his king; because they refused to return." They would not have God for their king; therefore the Assyrian should be their king, and a worse captivity than that of Egypt should befall them. In accordance with this, the teachers of false doctrine and the abettors of corruption in the Asiatic churches are spoken of as a re-suscitation of Jezebel and Balaam (Rev. xi, 14, 20).

(2) Prophecy made great use of the present, and especially of the standpoint and personal circumstances of the agent, to illustrate the future. Ezekiel describes the coming glory of the Church under the gorgeous and elaborate description of a temple. All the images in the nine concluding chapters are taken from this one analogy. Ezekiel gives his own life up like the prophet's sentiment with the significant hint, "The name of the city from that day shall be, The Lord is there." The Apocalyptic seer, living when the Temple was laid waste, and all its rites and institutions were superseded, describes the prophet of the new Jerusalem as if it seemed to be directly contradictory (Rev. xxi, 22), "I saw no temple therein;" but in entire harmony with Ezek. xlviii, 35, the Spirit testifies, "The Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the temple of it." Both Ezekiel and John speak of the same glorious future in language and imagery perfectly natural and appropriate in the times and circumstances in which they were placed.

(3) Frequentially the prophetic style received its complexion and coloring from the diversified circumstances of the parties addressed, as well as from the standpoint of the prophet. This is peculiarly the case with the language of Daniel, which presents such an approximation to the style of history that some have rashly assigned his writings to a date long posterior to the captivity of Babylon. The specific form which a portion of his prophecies assumes may be accounted for by considering the scene and the condition of the people on resuming their residence in Judaea; the anomalous and shattered condition of the theocratic constitution when the ark of the covenant, the Urim and Thummim, the kingly rule and government, were gone, when the visible state of the kingdom, as the formal order remained. This is the time selected for setting forth the external aspect of God's kingdom to one who
w as well conversant with political revolutions, who stood at the centre of the world's power and glory when earthly monarchies began to aspire after universal dominion. The visions granted to Daniel (vii, 17), though plain to us who read them after the event, were far from being clear to himself or to others (vii, 27; xii, 4, 8, 9). In the symbols he employs we have a reflection of his own peculiar position and political experience; and in the detailed exhibition of the coming future, in the explicit predictions of the changes and vicissitudes which were at hand, the children of faith felt that the God of their fathers was still in the midst of them. Prophecy is always a revelation of specific events, when the events spoken of are to be fulfilled in the immediate future. The picture presented to the Church was minutely portrayed in a historical dress whenever the hope of the faithful required special and immediate support. (See § viii, below.)

(4.) The divine impulse under which the prophets spoke, though it was supernatural, acted in harmony with personal characteristics and native susceptibilities. The supernatural ever bases itself upon the natural. Constitutional tendencies are moulded by the plastic influence of divine grace, but are never entirely obliterated. The prophets never lost personal consciousness, or any characteristic of light and feeling, even when they were raised into an ecstasial condition. Extraordinary impressions of divine light and influence affected the rational as well as the imaginative power. The false lights which pretended to prophecy were impressions of the imagination, the imagination itself, "whose conceptions ran only in a secular channel, as the sect of diviners, enchanters, dreamers, and soothsayers" (J. Smith). The lowest degree of prophecy is when the imaginative power is most predominant, and the scene becomes too turbulent for the rational faculty to discern clearly the mystical sense. The highest is where all imagination ceases—as with Moses, "whom God knew face to face"—where truth is revealed to the reason and understanding.

(5.) The poetical element of prophecy arises from the ecstasial condition of the constitutional tendencies. But as the primary aim of the religious teachers of the Hebrews was to influence the heart and conscience, the poetical element, though never entirely suppressed, was held in restraint, to further the higher ends of spiritual instruction. Hence, as Ewald remarks, "Prophehtical discourse has a form and impress of its own, too elevated to sink to simple prose, too practical in its aim to assume the highest form of poetry." Of the two ideas involved in rules, the poetical ruled the poetical. The poetical element of the prophecy is to be thus expressed: as the prophet's aim was to work upon others in the most direct and impressive manner, he was at liberty to adopt any form or method of representation; but as the immediate aim of the poet is to satisfy himself and the requirements of his art, he cannot vary his definite manner, and change his mode of address at pleasure, in order to work upon others. The poetical elevation appears most vividly in the idealistic and imaginative form, when the patriarchal hearts of the Jewish nation, their sacred formulae, Jerusalem, their religious and political centre, are addressed as living personalities present to the mind and eye of the prophet. A vivid instance of this personification occurs in Jer. xxxii, 13. Rachel weeping for her children, refusing to be comforted. It was at Ramah that the Chaldean conqueror assembled the last bands of captives (xl, 1): the prospect of perpetual exile lay before them. On their departure the last hope of Israel's existence seemed to expire. In the bold freedom of Eastern imagery, the ancestral mother of the tribe is converted into a wondering maiden, and the second as raising a loud wall of distress. This scene was substantially repeated in the massacre at Bethlehem. The cruel Edomite who then held the government of Judaea aimed what was meant to be a fatal blow against the real hope of Israel. "Though it was but a handful of children that actually perished, yet as among these the Child of Peace was slain, so it well seemed as if all were lost" (Fairbairn). See Prophecy.

VII. Interpretation of Predictions. In addition to the hints given above and below, we have here only space for a few rules, deduced from the account which we have given of the nature of prophecy. They are, (1.) Interpose distances of time according as history may show them to be necessary with respect to the past, or inference may show them to be likely in respect to the future, because, as we have seen, the prophetic visions are abstracted from relations in time. (2.) Distinguish clearly between the prophet's promises to the Church (which represents the idea of the removal of all obstacles from before God's people in the form of the Lord's destroying the tongue of the Egyptian sea, and smiting the river into seven streams). (3.) Distinguish in like manner figure from what is represented by it, e. g., the reference previous to that quoted do not understand literally "They shall fly upon the shoulders of the Philistines" (ver. 14). (4.) Make allowance for the imagery of the prophetic visions, and for the poetical diction in which they are expressed. (5.) In respect to things past, interpret according to the apparent meaning, checked by reference to events; in respect to things future, interpret by the apparent meaning, checked by reference to the analogy of the faith. (6.) Interpret according to the principle which may be deduced from the examples of various prophecies, both of the Old and New Testament, the principle which may be deduced from the examples of prophecies interpreted in the New Testament. See Interpretation.

VIII. Use of Prophecy. Predictions are at once a part and an evidence of faith: at the time that they are delivered, and until their fulfilment, a part after they have been fulfilled, an evidence. An apostle (2 Pet. i, 19) describes prophecy as "a light shining in a dark place," or "a taper glimmering where there is nothing to reflect its rays," that is, throwing some light, but only a feeble light as compared with what is shed from the Gospel history. To this light, feeble as it is, "you do well," says the apostle, "to take heed." And he warns them not to be offended at the feebleness of the light, because it is of the nature of prophecy until its fulfilment (in the apocalyptic predictions of which he is speaking, described as "until the day dawn, and the day star arise in your hearts") to shed only a feeble light. Nay, he continues, even the prophecies are not to be limited to a single and narrow interpretation, "for the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." This is in entire keeping with the above views (§ vii) of the character of the prophetic utterances, and was the use of prophecy it, e. g., its influence—to act as a feeble light in the midst of darkness, which it did not displace, but through which it threw its rays in such a way as to enable a true-hearted believer to direct his steps and guide his anticipations (comp. Acts xxii, 27). But after fulfilment, Peter says, "the use of prophecy" becomes "more sure" than it was before, that is, it is no longer merely a feeble light to guide, but it is a firm ground of confidence, and, combined with the apostolic testimony, serves as a trustworthy evidence of the faith; so trustworthy that even after he and his brother apostles are dead, those whom he addressed will feel secure that "they had not followed cunningly devised fables," but the truth.

As an evidence, fulfilled prophecy is as satisfactory as anything can be, for who can know the future except the wise diviner? And from whom can one prediction except from him who knows the future? After all that has been said and unsaid, prophecy and miracles, each resting on their own evi-
dence, must always be the chief and direct evidences of the truth of the divine character of a religion. Where they exist, a divine power is proved. Nevertheless, they should never be rested on alone, but in combination with the general character of the whole scheme to which they bear witness, its moralities, its sublimities, its condescensions, its miracles, its moralities, and its adaptation to human needs, are the chief evidences of Christianity. None of these must be taken separately. The fact of their conspiring together is the strongest evidence of all. That one fact with which these evidences are delivered is to serve in an after-age as an evidence on which faith may reasonably rest is stated by our Lord himself: "And now I have told you before it come to pass, that when it is come to pass, ye might believe" (John xiv, 29).

See PROPHET.

As prophecy came 

for many parts and in many modes (Heb. i, 1), we need not be surprised to find a relative disregard of time in its announcements. The seers beheld things to come as much as we look upon a starry sky. To the natural eye all the orbs that bespeak the firmament seem to be at the same distance from the earth. Though the monarchies of Daniel are successive, yet in a certain way they are described as co-existent; for it is only on the establishment of the last that they seem to disappear. As the precise time of individual events is not revealed, the accuracy of the representation is rather in space than in time; the whole appears foreshortened; perspective is regarded rather than actual distance; as a common observer would describe the stars, grouping them as they appear, and not according to their true positions. Prof. Payne Smith well observes, "The prophets are called seers, and their writings visions. They describe events passing before their mental eye as simple facts, without the idea of time. A picture may represent the past, the present, or the future; this we may know from its accessories. But an eye cannot reproduce to the mind an event without seeing corruption (Ps. xvi). In Ps. lxxix, the sons of Korah and Solomon describe his peaceful reign. Between Solomon and Hezekiah intervened some 200 years, during which the voice of prophecy was silent. The Messianic conception entertained at this time by the Jews might have been that of a King of the royal house of David who would arise, and gather under his peaceful sceptre his own people and strangers. Sufficient allusion to his prophetic and priestly offices had been made to create thoughtful consideration, but not in the letter of the system of him in these characters. It was reserved for the prophets to bring out these features more distinctly.

The sixteen prophets may be divided into four groups: the Prophets of the Northern Kingdom—Hosea, Amos, Joel, Jonah; the Prophets of the Southern Kingdom—Isaiah, Jeremiah, Obadiah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah; the Prophets of the Captivity—Ezekiel and Daniel; the Prophets of the Return—Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi. In this great period of prophethood there is no longer any chronological development of Messianic prophecy, as there was before the end of Solomon. Each prophet adds a feature, one more, another less clearly: combine the features, and we have the portrait; but it does not grow gradually and perceptibly under the hands of the several artists. Here, therefore, the task of tracing the chronological progress of the revelation of the Messiah comes to an end: its culminating point is found in the prophecy contained in Isa. lii. 18-15, and liii. We here read that there should be a Servant of God, lowly and despised, full of grief and despising, suffering, oppressed as a malefactor, and put to death. But his sufferings, it is said, are not for his own sake, for he had never been guilty of fraud or violence; they are spontaneously taken, patiently borne, vicarious in their character; and, by God's appointment, they have an atoning, reconciling, and justifying efficacy. The result of his sacrificial offering is to be his exaltation and triumph. By the path of humiliation and expiatory suffering, he is to reach that state of glory foreshown by David and Solomon. The prophetic character of the Messiah is drawn out by Isaiah in other parts of the book, as the Heb. has. By the time of Hezekiah therefore (for Hengstenberg, Christology, vol. ii, has satisfactorily disproved the theory of a Deutero-Isaiah of the days of the captivity) the portrait of the David-Servant—once King, Priest, Prophet, and Redeemer—was drawn in all its essential features. The contemporary and later prophets (comp.}
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soundly discussed by Hengstenberg, Christology of the Old Testament, in T. T. Clark's transl. (Edinb., 1854). Other German works of importance on the subject are those of Umbrecht, Die Propheten des A. Test. (in the Supplementa Patristica, vol. ii., 1858, p. 104 to 114, 1859); and H. Tholuck, Die Propheten und ihre Weissagungen (1868); transl. in the Bibliotheca Sacra, 1883, p. 361 sq.

The subject is likewise discussed more or less fully in all the introduc-
tions (s. v.) to the Old Test. See also Bibl. E. H. D. (Index, s. v.). One of the latest and most specious productions is that of Prof. Kuenen (of the University of Leyden), The Prophets and Prophecy in Israel (transl. by Milroy, Lond., 1877, 8vo); it reiterates with ingenious array all the difficulties, contradictions, and failures alleged by hostile writers, and refuted or explained again and again by orthodox scholars. Comp. Sna. Among writers in English we may especially name the following: Sherlock, Discourses on the Use and Intend of Prophecy (1758, 8vo); Hurst, Introd. to the Study of the Prophets, etc. (1772, 8vo); Athobpreh, Discourses on Prophecy (1786, 2 vols., 8vo); Davison, Discourses on Prophecy (1821, 8vo); Smith (J. P.), Principles of Interpretation as applied to the Prophecies of Holy Scripture (1829, 8vo); Books, Elements of Prophetic Theology (1837, 12mo); Alexander, Connection of the Old and New Testaments, 2 vols. (1838-39); H. L. L. Brown, History of Prophets (1841); Parke, Prophecy: its Nature, Functions, and Interpretation (Edinb., 1856); W. McCanl, Aids to Faith (Lond., 1861); Smith (R. H.), Meaissance Interpretation of the Prophecies of Isaiah (Oxf., 1862); Davidson, Introduction to the Old Testament (Lond., 1862), p. 422; Stanley, Lectures on the Jewish Church (Lond., 1865); Tholuck, Prophets and Kings of the Old Testament (rep. Bost., 1853); Stuart,Hints on the Interpretation of Prophecy (Andover, 1844); Arnold, On the Interpretation of Prophecy (in his Works, Lond., 1844, 1, 378 sq.); Taylor, Spirit of Hebrew Poetry (rep. N. Y., 1862).

See also Journ. Sacred Literature, Oct., 1862; Meth. Quart. Rev., April, 1862; Alford, Greek Test. (note on Acta xiii., 41); the monographs cited by Volbeding, Index Programmatis, p. 22, 43, 44; by Hase, Leben Jesu, p. 103; by Danz, Worterb., p. 738; by J. D. Dutcher, Cyclopaedia Bibliothecae, vol. 1, 65 sq.; and under the initials of the prophets.

Propheta (προφητας), prophēta, progýrate, Exod. xvi, 20; Luke i, 36). Among the remarkable women who appear to have exercised the gift of prophecy, we find Miriam (Exod. xv, 20); Deborah; Hannah (1 Sam. ii, 1); Huldah (2 Kings xxii, 14); the wife of Isaiah (Isa. viii, 3); Anna (Luke ii, 36); and the four daughters of Philip (Acta xx, 8, 9). Miriam, Deborah, Huldah, and others were called prophetesses, not because they were supposed to be gifted with a knowledge of futurity, like the seers, but because they possessed a poetical inspiration; and inspired (especially sacred) poetry was always deemed of supernatural and divine origin. See Prophecy.

Prophecy, False. As Moses had foretold, a host of false prophets arose in later times among the Hebrews, who promised prosperity without repentance, and predicted after "the deceit of their own hearts" (Deut. xiii, 1-5; Jer. xiv, 14-16; xxxii, 9-27). According to Deut. xxi, 20-22, a false prophet was punished capitually, being stoned to death. There were two cases in which a person was held convicted of this crime, and consequently liable to its punishment: 1. If a prophet spoke in the name of Jehovah, he was tolerated, so long as he remained unconvicted of imposture, even though he threatened calamity to the state. He might be im-

The kingdom of Israel for a century and a half to the hundred prophet of Baal at a time (1 Kings xiv, 21). It was in still later times false prophets, uttering the suggestions of their own imagination, abounded in the Church, and did much mischief (Matt. vii, 15; xxix, 11; Mark xii, 27; Luke xvi, 2); 2 Pet. ii, 1; 1 John iv, 1). See Mis-


Prophets, Major and Minor. We have in the Old Testament the writings of sixteen prophets: that is, of four greater and twelve lesser prophets. The four greater prophets are Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Daniel. The Jews do not properly place Daniel among the prophets, because (they say) he lived in the splen-
dor of temporal dignities, and led a kind of life different from other prophets. The twelve lesser prophets are Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, and Mal-
ach. The collectors of the canon arranged the prophets chronologically, but considered the whole of the twelve lesser prophet books as one unity, in which Hosea placed after Jeremiah and Ezekiel, inasmuch as the last three lesser prophets lived later than they. Daniel, as above ob-
served, was placed in the Hagiographies, because he had not filled the prophetic office. The collection of the lesser prophets themselves again intended to be chronologically disposed; still Hosea is on account of the extent of his work, allowed precedence before those lesser prophets who, generally, were his contemporaries, and also before those who flourished at a somewhat earlier period. It is the opinion of Hengstenberg (Christology, iv, 239) and Maurer, The Prophets, pt. i, introd.) that the writings of the Minor Prophets are actually placed chronologically. Accordingly, the first arranges the list of the prophets as follows: Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Isaiah (the principal prophetic figure of the first or Assyrian period of canonical prophethood), Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Jeremiah, "the principal prophetic figure in the second or Babylonian period of canonical prophethood"), Ezekiel, Daniel, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi. Calmet (Dict. Bibl. s. v. "Prophet") as follows: Hosea, Amos, Isaiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Zephaniah, Habakkuk, Obadiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Haggai, Malachi, Zechariah, Malachi. Stanley (Lect. xix.) in the following order: Joel, Jonah, Hosea, Amos, Isaiah, Micah, Nahum, Zephaniah, Habakkuk, Obadiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Haggai, Malachi, Zechariah, Malachi. Hence it appears that Stanley recognises two Isaiahs and two Zechariahs, unless "the author of Isa. xi-lxvi is regarded as the older Isaiah transported into a style and position later than his own time" (p. 428). Obadiah is generally considered to have lived at a later date than is compatible with a chronological arrangement of the canon, in consequence of his reference to the capture of Jerusalem. But such an inference is not necessary, for the prophet might have thrown himself in imagination forward to the date of his prophecy (Hengstenberg), or the words which, as translated by the A. V., are a remembrance as to the past, may be really but an imperative as to the future (Pusey). For the various questions relating to each person and book, see the several names in their alphabetical places. See also Bibl. E. H. D.

Commentaries.—The following are the special exe-
getical helps on the prophets in general: Jerome, Commentarii (in Opp. vol. v. ed. Basili); Abrahanel, הגדת (written in 1497, and frequently printed and translated in various forms and portions); Kimchi, David (first printed in the Rabbinical Bible, Ven. 1548, fol.); (Exo-
lampadius, Commentarii (Harii. 1558. 2 vols. fol.)); Petz.
Propitiation.

erally chose the prophets whom he inspired out of these schools. Amos, therefore, speaks of it as an extraordinary case that though he was not one of the sons of the prophets, a herdsman, "yet the Lord took him as he followed the flock, and said unto him, Go, prophesy unto My people Israel." This was very unusual for some of these schools, or at least for their tutors, to be endued with a prophetic spirit, appears from the relation of the prophecies concerning the ascents of Elijah, delivered to Elisba by the sons of the prophet, both at Jericho and at Bethel (I Kings ii. 3, 5). See Bible Notes, xxiii. 64. See PALAEOLOGUS: SCHOOL.

PROPHETS, SONS OF THE. The disciples, or scholars, of the prophets were thus called, agreeably to the Hebrew idiom; they were instructed in the knowledge of religion and in sacred music, and were thus qualified to become public teachers (1 Sam. x. 11). See Prophets.

Propitiation. The Greek word ἀναπτυγμός (ἀναπτυγματικός), rendered propitiation (Rom. iii. 25; I John ii. 4, 10 and mercy seat (Heb. ix. 5), is used in the Septuagint as the translation of the Hebrew word מְכַס, i.e. covering, properly the lid or cover of the ark of the covenant in the most holy place, which was overlaid with pure gold, over which the cherubim stretched out their wings, and where Jehovah communed with the Lord Yahweh (Exod. xxxii. 34). It is ordinarily supposed (not with no good reason) that it is of these tombs our Lord speaks when he says: "Woe unto you! for ye build the sepulchres of the prophets, and your fathers killed them" (Luke xi. 47). See Tomb.
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PROPITIATORY SACRIFICES

Propitiatory Sacrifices include both trespass-offering and sin-offering. See Sacrifice. In this place we are to examine the disputed question what the Israelites held before them as their object in offering their beasts of sacrifice; that is, whether they wished merely to offer a gift to the offended Deity (Velser, p. 296); or (as Mennonites, Mos., and Rhein. Prec., p. 446) it was considered as a municipal penalty, a kind of fine; or, finally, as a substitute for the sinners presenting it, who had themselves properly deserved death. The last is the view of many rabbins (see Outram, De Sacrific. p. 251 sq.) and Church fathers (Theodor, Quast. 61 ad Exod.; Euseb. Deor. Ev. i, 10, etc.,) and lately of Baur (Theol. d. N. T. iv, 124 sq.), De Wette (Bibl. Theol. p. 98 sq.; comp. Opusc. p. 23 sq.; Genesius (Zu Is. ii, 189), Heugstenberg (Theol. i, 265), Scholl (in ib. Stud. etc. v, ii, 146 sq.), and Tholuck (2. Hist. d. Brief., a. d. Hebr. p. 78 sq.; comp. Col's Bible, Theol. i, 270 sq., for many others). This meaning of the sin-offerings seems at first view the most natural, significant, and most accordant with ancient testimonies. Yet Klaiber (Studien der Wissenschaft. Gesell. VIII, ii, 10 sq.) has recently combated both and has offered several objections to it. Many other interpretations, some very monstrous, but offered with philosophical pretension, are referred to by Scholl (op. cit. p. 153 sq.) Early opposition to the usual view is found in Levy, iv, 20, "And the priest shall make an atonement for them, and it shall be forgiven them," repeated in xxvi, 5, 10, or that in Lev. v, 10, "And the priest shall make an atonement for his sin that he hath sinned in one of these, and it shall be forgiven him," or the similar words in the 18th verse, do not make it certain that a substitution is to be thought of in the case of the sin-offering. The laying of the hand on the animal, too, though on the day of atonement (Lev. xvi, 21) it certainly implies the laying of guilt upon it, does not in general determine this point, since it was also customary in other sacrifices. Further, that the sin-offering was considered unclear, which would only be possible in case the uncleaness of the sin sinner passed upon the sacrifice in the act of the atonement, is not to be inferred from Exod. xxix, 14; Lev. xvi, 28, etc. (as Klaiber has well shown), but would seem to contradict Lev. iv, 12; vi, 27 (see below). On the other hand, (1.) Lev. xvii, 11, unless it be interpreted in a very forced sense, can scarcely be understood to mean anything else than that the life of the sacrifice, which is in the blood, and is poured out with the blood, was offered instead of the life of him who presented it. It is not necessary to lay stress upon the rendering of הָעִם (kippėr, to expiate, to atone); but the parallelism between the נֶפֶשׁ or "life of the flesh" and the נֶפֶשׁ or soul for which it is given as an atonement is certainly not without force. (2.) The sprinkling of the blood of the sin-offering shows that the mere death of the sacrifice, and the burning of pieces of its flesh on the altar, were not the object here as in other sacrifices. What other meaning could the sprinkling have then but that in the blood the life is poured out and scattered, and thereby destroyed? The pouring-out of the blood was not in this case, as elsewhere, merely a means of killing the animal, but was the real object in view. But it could only be an object when the sprinkling of the blood symbolizes the institution of the sacrifice for the offerer, who has forfeited his life by sin. (3.) The idea that one man could suffer as a substitute for another (and hence, according to the Israelitish view, even be punished by God in his stead) is not only expressed by 2 Sam. xii, 15 sq.; xxiv, 10 sq.; Isa. iii, 4 (see Prov. xxvi, 18), but the representation is transmitted of guilt appears in Deut. xxiv, especially verse 8; in the symbolic meaning of the covenant-sacrifice (Jer. xxxix, 18 sq.; comp. Gen. xv, 17), and in the ritual service with the scapegoat (Lev. xvi, 21). See especially also Isa. xlix, 3, where, too, the word הָעִם (kippër, ransoms), so common where the sin-offerings are mentioned, is used. (Klaiber is right in saying that הָעִם, kippër, from הָעִם, kuphar, properly means corder; and hence points out the removal of guilt, without detriment to the method. Yet it is indubitable that this word kippër (covering over), elsewhere only used in the sense of expiation, is used here when the subject is penal substitution. Was it so easy and natural for the Israelites to view expiation as an act of substitution? Nor must we omit to remark that הָעִם (chittith [Gen. xxxi, 39], meaning properly to alone for) is used for making compensation, and Klaiber's explanation of the passage is awkward. (4.) There can be no doubt that the representation of expiatory substitution by sacrifices was prominent among other ancient nations (Herod. ii, 39; Cass. Sol. Gal. vii, 16; Ovid, Fast. vi, 180; Porphyry, Aeliax, iv, 10). The remnants of the sin-offerings were accounted uncleans, seems to have no great weight, since the eating of pieces of flesh from most of sin-offerings might be urged for the contrary view; and certainly that idea did not appear in the case of the trespass-offerings (see Bahr, op. cit. p. 388 sq.). On the offering of men for propitiation, in case of public misfortune (2 Kings iii, 37) among the Greeks, comp. Schoel. in Aristoph. Plat. 454; Wachsmuth, Heil. Aelther. ii, 530 sq. The self-offerings of the Romans are not at all belonging here. The children of Saul (2 Sam. xxii, 6 sq., comp. Lament. Die Sühnepf. der Griechen und Römer [Würzburg, 1841]). (5.) Lastly, a circumstance which speaks strongly for the common explanation of these sin-offerings is that all others which have been suggested are far less natural, simple, and appropriate. We need not refer especially to the homely interpretation of Michaelis. The idea that blood passed for the principle of sensuality, and hence of sin, that thus the shedding of blood became the symbol of the putting-away of sin, does not appear in the Old Test., nor, indeed, in the New. Steidel's supposition is that the gracious acceptance by God of the offering of reconciliation was the essential element, and that the various forms of sacrifice were only intended to impress on the mind the abominable nature of sin and to lead to a true repentance; but this view strangely barren. Klaiber supposes that clean animals without blemish were to awaken in the worshipper the sense of the law's requirement from him and of his imperfection. But this leaves out of sight all the peculiar forms appropriated to the sin-offering, and dwells on a simple circumstance which was common to all the other sacrifices, and not even confined to sacrifices. It is impossible to sacrifice the common view, which is quite satisfactory, in favor of such schemes as these. The interpretation of Menken has been sufficiently answered by Bahr (op. cit. p. 292 sq.). See Propitiation.

Proportion of Faith. See ANALOGY (of Faith).

Propositiones Damnatiæ is, in theological language, every thesis which contains either a dogmatical assertion or one intimately related to dogma, in the form of an authoritative reprobation, supported by the usual arguments founded by Scripture, the dogmas of the Church, etc. The doctrinal opinions of those who diverge in any way from the belief of the Romish Church are also called propositions, and the de-
proceeds of divergence is indicated by corresponding qualifications. If the authorities of the Church (general councils, or the pope himself) positively reject those propositions, they are condemned propositions, i.e., pro-
positiones damnatae. The doctrines expounded, especially in writings, can be rejected summarily (in globo) without previous examination of each single proposition. In the latter case each condemned proposition is described by an adjective, which indicates its relation to the belief of the Church: heretical, heretical, erroneous, false, blasphemy, dangerous, immoral, etc. Such sentences have been pronounced against the Reformation, among others, against the works of Luther, M. Bajus, Ozenius, Hus, etc. See HERESY; INDEX EXCOMMUNICATUS.

Proctors are assistants of proctors (q. v.).

Procorit, a Slavic deity, was represented with four heads on a common trunk. He carried a fifth head on his chest, and held in such a way that his eyes could see through the intervals of the fingers. Many explanations of this extraordinary figure have been proposed, and all is by, or contrasted with the spirit of the Slavic religious; all these surmises are based on the similitude of the image with that of Janus quadridorsa.

Proser is the service-book containing the form of the prose (q. v.).

Prosal or Prosal (προσαλ) is the name of a legal enactment instituted by Hillel I, or the Great (q. v.). Whether the word is equivalent to the Greek προσάλος or προσαλoς, or, as Sache prefers, προσάλ or προσαλo, which latter is preferred by Jost and Grätz, cannot be decided. The reason for this curious legal provision, which, though contrary to the law of Moses, was necessitated by the time, and on the whole a very wholesome one, was that because, according to the law (Deut. xxvi), the claiming of debts was unlawful during the Sabbath year, the rich would not lend to the poor during that year, which seriously impeded commercial and social intercourse. Hillel found that under these circumstances the warning contained in Deut. xvi, 9 was disregarded, and in order to do away with this evil he introduced the prosal or prosal, i.e., a declaration made before the court of justice at the time of lending not to remit the debt in the Sabbath year. The formula of this legal declaration was as follows:

Προσαλος ε ἡμιδυναμηδων λεγοντες λειτονας ἀλληλοι—i. e., "A B deliver to you, the judges of the district C, the declaration that I may call in at any time I like all debts due to me," and it was signed either by the judges or witnesses. Comp. Jost, Geschichte d. Judenth. u. s. Secten, i, 265 sq.; Grätz, Geschichte der Juden, iii, 172; Eversheim, Hist. of the Jewish Nation, p. 365; Frankel, Hodegiften in Mishnah (Leips. 1839), p. 39; Weiss, Zur Geschichte d. jüd. Torthudion (Wien, 1872), i, 172; Sachs, Beiträge zur Sprach- u. Alterthumsfor-
schung (Berlin, 1854), No. 2, p. 70; Mishna, Sbkh, x, 1-5; Gittin, iv, 3; Peuh, iii, 6; Schürer, Lehrbuch der neustamentlichen Zeitgeschichte (Leips. 1874), p. 457 sq.; Duktorff, Lexicon Talmudicum et Chaldaeicum, col. 1906 (revised edition by B. Fischer [Leips. 1860-74], col. 898); Denesbourg, Essai sur l'Histoire et la Geo-
graphie de la Palestine (Paris, 1867), p. 188 sq.; Löw, Beiträge zur jüdischen Alterthumskunde (Leips. 1871), vol. i, pt. ii, p. 88 sq. (B. P.)

Prose (Lat. Pros), the French name for the Se-
quence. (1.) The prayer sung in the Mass after the Gloria and before the Gospel on great festivals. It required the license of the bishop or the superior of a monastery before it could be used. (2) A canticle in which no metre is defined. An expression, in loose measure, of the principal circumstances of a festival to be added to the psalm or adapted to its notes. St. Cosmasius of Arles required the laity in the diocese to sing prose and antiphons in church.—Some in Greek and some in Latin—aloud like the clergy, in order to introduce among the people a love of psalmody and hymns. These compositions, called prose, are in rhyme, but ignore the law of measure and quantity established by the ancient Greeks and Roman. At a time after the Gradual or Introits, they were likewise called Seguato (q. v.). The use of prosing began near the close of the 9th century. Notker, abbot of St. Gall, cir. 880, composed and favored the use of prose, but cer-
tainly did not invent them. He says that he found one in an antiphon book of Benedictine Abbey near Rome, which had been burned by the Normans in 841. Pope Nicholas first authorized their use. Proses in the Middle Ages were written in the vulgar tongue for the edification of the people. These prose, having become exceedingly numerous, and in some places even ridiculous, were retemned by the Council of Cologne in 1536, and of Rheims in 1564. The four prose used since the time of Pius V are Victima Paschali Laudes, for Easter; Fili Creator Spiritus, appointed by pope Innocent III, at White Monday; Ascensio Simi Balsulorum, for Corpus Christi, 1264, written either by Gratian or St. Thomas Aquinas; and Dies Irae, Dies Illa, used in the commemorations of the dead, and attributed to Thomas de Celano, or Salerno, a Franciscan, cir. 1230, cardinal Ursin (who died 1294), cardinal D'Aqua-
porta (who died 1309), and Humbert, general of the Dominican (who died 1277), Augustus Buzenelius, or Bonaventura. The Stobat Mater Dolores, written by pope Innocent III, or Giacomo da Toda, a Minorite, in the 14th century, is a prose. Possibly the chants used by St. Althelm, bishop of Sherborne, sitting on the bridge of Malmsbury, to win the attention of the pas-
ers-by, were of the nature of prose. In the 12th, 13th,
and 14th centuries rhythmical chants were sung at the end of a banquet which the pope gave to his clergy. At Aem, Lyons, Paris, and Rouen prose were in fre-
tent use (unlike the Roman custom), but they were mere rhapsodies, as we have in one instance preserved to us "Alle—nec et perenne celeste—lucia." After the prose, the Mass-book is removed from the Epistle to the Gospel side, to represent the translation of au-
thority from the Aaronsiah to the apostolic priest-
hood.—Walcott, Sacred Archology, s. v.; Barney, Hist. of Music, s. v.

Proseleyt (προσεληνός, one who has joined a new faith) occurs only in the A. V. of the New Test. (Matt. xxii, 15; Acts ii, 10; vi, 5; xiii, 43); but the Greek word is occasionally used in the Sept. (1 Chron. xxii, 22, etc.) as a rendering of the Heb. "y. gérer (a stronger, as usually rendered; sometimes Grecoised in the Sept., ἠσσαραγ [Exod. ii, 19] from the Aramaic form נסהרג). (The following article is substantially based upon Leyrer's treatment of the subject in Herzog's Real-
Enzyklopädie, with additions from other sources.) See ALLIN.

1. Historical Development of this Class.—The exist-
cence, through all the stages of the history of the Israelites, of a body of men, not of the same race, but holding the same faith and adopting the same ritual, is a fact which, from its very nature, requires to be dealt with historically. 1. During the Patriarchal Age.—The position of the family of Israel as a distinct nation, with a special relig-
ous character, appears at a very early period to have exercised a power of attraction over neighboring races. The slaves and soldiers of the tribe of which Abraham was the head (Gen. xvii, 27), who were included with him in the covenant of Sinai, perhaps were classed as proseleutes in the later sense. The case of the Shechemites, however (ch. xxxiv), presents a more distinct instance. The converts were awayed partly by passion, partly by interest. The sons of Ja-
cob then, as afterwards, required circumcision as an in-
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dispensable condition (xxxiv, 14). This, and apparently this only, was required of proselytes in the pre-Mosaic period.

3. From the Exodus to the Monarchy.—The life of Israel under the law, from the very first, presupposes and provides for the incorporation of men of other races. The "mixed multitude" of Exod. xii, 38 implies the presence of proselytes more or less complete. It is recognized in the earliest rules for the celebration of the Passover (xii, 19). The "stranger" of this and other laws in the A. V. answers to the word which distinctly means "proselyte," and is so translated in the Sept., and the prominence of the class may be estimated by the frequency with which the word recurs: nine times in Exodus, twenty in Leviticus, eleven in Numbers, nineteen in Deuteronomy. The laws clearly point to the position of a convert. The "stranger" is bound by the law of the Sabbath (xx, 10; xxiii, 12; Deut, v, 14). Circumcision is the condition of any fellowship with him (Exod. xii, 46; Num. ix, 14). He is to be present at the Passover (Exod. xii, 11), the Feast of Weeks (Deut. xvi, 11), the Feast of Tabernacles (ver. 14), the Day of Atonement (Lev. xvi, 29). The laws of prohibited marriages (xviii, 26) and abstinence from blood (xvii, 10) are binding upon him. He is liable to the same punishment for Moloch-worship (xx, 2) and for blasphemy (xxi, 16), may claim the same right of asylum as the Israelites in the cities of refuge (Num. xxxvi, 16; Josh. xx, 9). On the other side he is subjected to some drawbacks. He cannot hold land (Lev. xix, 10). He has no jas consabili with the descendants of Aaron (xxi, 14). His condition is assumed to be, for the most part, one of poverty (xxiii, 22), often of servitude (Deut. xxvi, 11). For this reason he is placed under the special protection of the law (x, 18). He is to share in the right of gleani (Lev. xix, 10), is placed in the same category as the fatherless and the widows (Deut. xxiv, 17, 19; xxvi, 12; xxvii, 19), is joined with the Levite as entitled to the tithe of every third year's produce (xv, 29; xxvi, 12). Among the proselytes of this period the Kenites (q. v.), who under Hobab accompanied the Israelites in their wanderings, and ultimately settled in Canaan, were probably the most conspicuous (Judg. i, 16). The presence of the class was recognized in the solemn declaration of blessings and curses from Ebal and Gerizim (Josh. viii, 59).

The mention of the conquest of Canaan was not favorable to the admission of proselytes. The people had no strong faith, no commanding position. The Gibeonites (ch. ix) furnish the only instance of a conversion, and their condition is rather that of slaves compelled to conform than that of free proselytes. See Note at v, 1.

3. The Period of the Monarchy.—With the introduction of royalty, and the consequent fame and influence of the people, there was more to attract strangers from the neighboring nations, and we meet accordingly with many names which appear, still in the presence of another race conforming to the faith of Israel. Dagon the Edomite (1 Sam. xxi, 7). Uriah the Hittite (2 Sam. xi, 9). Araham the Jebusite (xxiv, 29). Zelek the Ammonite (xxiii, 87). Ithnah the Moabit (1 Chron. xi, 46)—these being in spirit of an express law to the contrary (Deut. xxiii, 3)—and at a later period Shelshua the scribe (probably; comp. Alexander on Isa. xxii, 15), and Ebed-Melech the Ethiopian (Jer. xxxviii, 7), are examples that such proselytes might rise even to high offices about the person of the king. The Cherethites and Pelethites (q. v.) constitute probably the possession of foreigners who had been attracted to the service of David, and were content for it to absorb the religion of their master (Ewald, Gesch. i, 330; iii, 183). The vision in Psa. lxxxvii of a time in which men of Tyre, Egypt, Ethiopia, and Cush rose to the great cities of the earth, registers among the citizens of Zion, can hardly fail to have had its starting-point in some admission of proselytes within the memory of the writer (Ewald and De Wette, ad loc.). A convert of another kind, the type, as it has been thought, of the later proselytes of the gate (see below), is found in Naaman the Syrian (2 Kings v, 15, 18) recognizing Jehovah as the Lord; but not binding himself to any rigorous observance of the law.

The position of the proselytes during this period appears to have undergone considerable changes. On the one hand, men rose, as we have seen, to power and fortune. The case for which the law provided (Lev. xxv, 47) might actually occur, and they might be the creditors of Israelites as debtors, the masters of Israelites as slaves. It might well be a sign of the times in the later days of the monarchy that they became "very high," the "head" and not the "tail" of the people (Deut. xxviii, 43, 44). The picture had, however, another side. They were treated by David and Solomon as a subject class, brought (like Perioci, almost like Helots) under a system of compulsory labor from which others were exempted (1 Chron. xxii, 2; 2 Chron. ii, 17, 18). The statistics of this period, taken probably as the measure of a purpose, give their number (i.e. apparently the number of adult working males) at 153,600 (ibid.). They were subject at other times to wanton insolence and outrage (Psa. xxvi, 6). As some compensation for their sufferings they became the special objects of the care and sympathy of the fathers of the family, who claim the "goodly fellowship" pleads the cause of the proselytes as warmly as that of the widow and the fatherless (Jer. vii, 6; xxiii, 3; Ezek. xxiii, 7, 29; Zech. vii, 10; Mal. iii, 5). A large accession of converts enters into all their hopes of the divine kingdom (Isa. ii, 2; xi, 15; xli, 8-6; Mic. iv, 1). The sympathy of one of them goes still further. He sees, in the far future, the vision of a time when the last remnant of inferiority shall be removed, and the proselytes, completely emancipated, shall be able to hold and inherit land even as the Israelites (Ezek. xxli, 29).

4. From the Babylonian Captivity to the Destruction of Jerusalem.—The proselytism of this period assumed a different character. It was for the most part the conformity, not of a subject race, but of willing adherents. Even as early as the return from Babylon we have traces of those who were drawn to a faith which they recognized as holier than their own, and had "separated themselves" unto the law of Jehovah (Neh. x, 29). The presence of many foreign names among the Nethinim (vii, 46-55) suggests that it is not to be believed that those who were called converts dedicated themselves specially to the service of the new Temple. With the conquests of Alexander, the wars between Egypt and Syria, the struggle under the Maccabees, the expansion of the Roman empire, the Jews became more widely known, and their power to proselytize increased. They had a strong religious devotion, and the spirit of martyrdom was followed naturally by propaganda. Their monotheism was rigid and unyielding. Scattered through the East and West, a miracle and a potent, won wonder at and admired, attracted by repelling, they presented, in an age of shattered creeds and corroding doubts, the spectacle of a faith, or at least a dogma, which remained unshaken. The influence was sometimes obtained well, and exercised for good. In most of the great cities of the empire there was kept a board of proselytes (in the place of the "sibyls") who had been rescued from idolatry and its attendant debasements, and brought under the power of a higher moral law. It is possible that in some cases the purity of Jewish life may have contributed to this result, and attracted men or women who shrank from the unutterable abhorrence of a mode of life to which they lived. The converts who were thus attracted joined, with varying strictness (see below), in the worship of the Jews. They were present in their synagogues (Acts xii, 42, 43, 50; xvii, 4; xvii, 7). They came up as pilgrims to the great cities, and not infrequently by itself the influence was often stronger and better. Even Roman centurions learned to love the conquered nation,
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built synagogues for them (Luke vii, 5), fasted and prayed, and gave alms, after the pattern of the strictest Jews (Acts x, 2, 30), and became preachers of the new faith to their countrymen (ver. 7). Such men, drawn by what was best in Judaism, were naturally among the readiest receivers of the new truth which rose out of it, and became in many cases the nucleus of a Gentile church.

Proselytism had, however, its darker side. The Jews of Palestine were eager to spread their faith by the same weapons as those with which they had defended it. Had not the power of the empire stood in the way, the religion of Moses, stripped of its higher elements, might have been propagated far and wide by force, as was afterwards the religion of Mohammed. As it was, the Idumeans had the alternative offered them by John Hyrcanus of death, exile, or circumcision (Josephus, Ant. xiii, 9, 3). The Idumeans were converted in the same way by Aristobulus (ibid. xiii, 11, 3). In the more frenzied fanaticism of a later period, the Jews under Josephus could hardly be restrained from seizing and circumcision two chiefs of Trachonitis who had come as envoys (Josephus, Life, 28). They compelled a Roman centurion, whom they had taken prisoner, to purchase his life by accepting the sign of the covenant (Josephus, Ant. xiv, 1, 11, 3). What was not in their power (the "velut Judaei, cogenum" of Horace, Sat. i, 4, 142, implies that they sometimes ventured on it even at Rome), they obtained their ends by the most unscrupulous fraud. They appeared as soothsayers, diviners, exorcists, and addressed themselves especially to the fears and superstitions of women. Their influence over these became the subject of indignant satire (Juvenal, Sat. vi, 543-547). They persuaded noble matrons to send money and purple to the Temple (Josephus, Ant. xviii, 3, 5). At Damascus the wives of nearly half the population were induced to sign contracts with Judaism (Josephus, War, ii, 10, 2). At Rome they numbered in their ranks, in the person of Poppea, even an imperial concubine (Josephus, Ant. xx, 7, 11). The converts thus made cast off all ties of kindred and affection (Tacitus, Hist. v, 9). Those who were most active in proselytizing were precisely those from whose teaching all that was most true and living had departed. The vices of the Jews were ingrained on the vices of the heathen. A repulsive casuistry released the convert from obligations which he had before recognized, while in his new creed he was afforded an unhealthy superstition. The Law of the Corban may serve as one instance (Matt. xv, 4-6). Another is found in the rabbinic teaching as to marriage. Circumcision, like a new birth, cancelled all previous relationships, and the converts, who were thus cut off from their former ties, were therefore no longer incestuous (Maimon. ex Jesh. p. 582; Selden, De Jure Nat. et Gent. ii, 4; Ussor Hebr. ii, 18). It was no wonder that the proselyte became "twillowed more the child of Gehenna" (Matt. xxiii, 15) than the Pharisaes themselves.

The position of such proselytes was indeed every way pitiable. At Rome, and in other large cities, they became the butts of popular scurrility. The words "curtus," "verpest," met them at every corner (Horace, Sat. i, 4, 142; Martial, vii, 29, 34, 61; xi, 53; xii, 37). They had to share the fortunes of the people with whom they had cast in their lot, might be banished from Italy (Acts xviii, 2; Suet. Claud. 25), or sent to die of malaria in the most unhealthy stations of the empire (Tactius, Ann. ii, 85). At a later time, they were branded as the profession of their conversion, and to pay a special tax (Sueton. Domit. xii). If they failed to do this and were suspected, they might be subject to the most degrading examination to ascertain the fact of their being proselytes (ibid.). Among the Jews themselves their case was not much better. For the details of the inscriptions of the Jewish sect of the "Jesus people" we are indebted even from those who gloried in having brought him over to their sect and party. The popular Jewish feel-
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converts, or, if with a specific meaning, were applied to the full proselytes of righteousness (comp. a full examination of the passages in question by N. Larrinher, On the Decree, pp. 583-584, etc.). The two tendencies were, at all events, at work, and the battle between them was renewed afterwards on holier ground and on a wider scale. Ananias and Eleazar were represented in the two parties of the Council of Jerusalem. The germ of truth had been quickened into a new livelihood and was emancipated from the old tradition. The decrees of the council were the solemn assertion of the principle that believers in Christ were to stand on the footing of proselytes of the gate, not of proselytes of righteousness. The teaching of St. Paul to righteousness and its conditions, its dependence on faith, its independence of circumcision, stands out in sharp, clear contrast with the teachers who taught that that rite was necessary for salvation, and confined the term "righteousness" to the circumcised convert.

5. From the Destruction of Jerusalem downwards. — The teachers who carried on the rabbinical succession consolled themselves, as they saw the new order waxing and their own glory waning, by developing the decaying system with an almost microscopic minuteness. They would at least transmit to future generations the full creed of their fathers. In proportion as they ceased to have any power to proselytize, they dwelt with exhaustive fulness on the question how proselytes were to be made. To this period accordingly belong the rules and decisions which are often carried back to an earlier age, and which may now be conveniently discussed. The precepts of the Talmud may indicate the practices and opinions of the Jews from the second to the fifth century. They are very untrustworthy as to any earlier time.

II. Debatable Questions. — The points of interest which present themselves for inquiry are the following: 1. The Classification of Proselytes. — The whole Jewish state was considered as composed of the two classes — Jews, and strangers within their gates, or proselytes. In later years this distinction was observed even to the second generation; a child of pure Jewish descent on both sides being designated Ἐκσπασός ἢ Ἐκσπασώμ. a "Hebrew of the Hebrews" (Phil. iii, 5), while the son of a proselyte was denominated Ἱππερο, "son of a stranger;" and if both parents were proselytes, he was styled by the rabbins ηυκρις, a contraction for Ἰουδαιος Ἱππερος (Firkke Abou, c. 5). Subordinate to this, however, was a division which has been in part anticipated, and was recognized by the Talmudic rabbins, but received its full expansion at the hands of Maimonides (Hic. i, 7). They defined for it a remote antiquity, a divine authority.

1. The term Proselytes of the Gate (ἡυκρις ήπειρος) was derived from the frequently occurring description in the law, "the stranger (ἡμῶν) that is within thy gates" (Exod. xx, 10, etc.). They were known also as the sojourners (ἡπέρος ήπειρος), with a reference to Lev. xxv, 47, etc. To them were referred the greater part of the precepts of the law as to the "stranger." The Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan have given this law as the equivalent in Deut. xxiv, 21. Convents of this class were not bound by circumcision and the other special laws of the Mosaic code. It was enough for them to observe the seven precepts of Noah (Otho, Lex. Rabbi, & c. Noachida; Selden, De Jur. Nat. et Gent. i, 10, i. e. the six supposed to have been given to Adam—(1) against idolatry, (2) against blasphemy, (3) against bloodshed, (4) against uncleanliness, (5) against theft, (6) of obedience, with (7) the prohibition of "flesh with the blood thereof" given to Noah. The proselyte was not to claim the privileges of an Israelite, might not redeem his first-born, or pay the half-shekel. He was forbidden to study the law under pain of death (Otho, L. c.) The later rabbins, when Jerusalem had passed into other hands, held that it was unlawful for him to reside within the holy city (Maimon. Bath-hacher, vii, 14). In return they allowed him to offer whole burnt-offerings for the priest to sacrifice and to contribute money to the Orphan of the Temple. They held out to him the hope of a place in the paradise of the world to come (Levrat). They insisted that the profession of his faith should be made solemnly in the presence of three witnesses (Maimon. Hic. Mel. viii, 10). The Jubilee was the proper season for his admission (Muller, De Pros. in Ugino, xxii, 841).

All this seems so full and precise that we cannot wonder that it has led many writers to look on it as representing a reality, and most commentators accordingly have given to these proselytes of the gate the exaltation, εὐπληρώματα, ἐνσηματικός, κοινωνία τῶν Θεον of the Acts. It remains doubtful, however, whether it was ever more than a paper scheme of what ought to be, disguising itself as having actually been. The writers who are most full, who claim for the distinction the highest antiquity, confess that there had been no gate since the two tribes and a half had been carried away into captivity (Maimonides, Hic. Mel. i, 6). They could only be admitted at the jubilee, and there had since then been no jubilee celebrated (Muller, L. c.).

All that can be said of these proselytes is flatly denied in the New Test. We have independent evidence (ib supra) of the existence of converts of two degrees, and that the Talmudic division is the formal systematizing of an earlier fact. The words "proselytes" and ἐνσηματικοὶ τῶν Θεον were, however, in all probability limited to the circumcision.

2. (2) In contrast with these were the Proselytes of Righteousness (ἡπέρος ήπειρος), known also as Proselytes of the Covenant, perfect Israelites. Some writers use the Talmudic phrase proselyti tracti (ἡμῶν ήπειρος) is applied to them as drawn to the covenant by spontaneous conviction (Buxtorf, Lex. s. v.), while others (Kimchi) refer it to those who were constrained to conformity, like the Gibeonites. Here also we must receive what we find with the same limitation as before. That there were, in later times especially, many among the Jews who had renounced the grosser parts of heathenism without having come over entirely to Judaism, is beyond all doubt; but that these were ever counted proselytes admits of no certain. Certain it is that the proselytes mentioned in the New Test. were all persons who had received circumcision, and entered the pale of the Jewish community; they were persons who, according to the phraseology of the Old Test. had become Jews (ἡπέρος ήπειρος, joined, Esth. viii, 17). It is probable that the distinction was not as early mentioned as in the later rabbinical, the sake of including among the conquerors of their religion those who, though indebted probably to the Jewish Scriptures for their improved faith, were yet not inclined to submit to the ritual of Judaism, or to become incorporated with the Jewish nation. That this, however, was not the ancient view is clearly apparent from a passage in the Babylonian Gemara, quoted by Lightfoot (Hor. Heb. et Talm. in Matt. iii, 6), where it is said expressly that "no one is a proselyte until such time as he has been circumcised.

First, himself a Jew, confirms our suggestion; for in a note upon the word ἡμῶν, in his Concomitante Libb. V. T., he says: "The Jews, interpreting dogmatically rather than historically, refer the word to him who has embraced the Jewish religion; and, as he supposed itself to be bound to this law, in fact both extent the observations of the authors, in fact both extent the observations of the authors, indeed, speaks of such a distinction, but the late sense of the period at which he flourished (A.D. 1169), and the absence of any scriptural authority, require us to consider his assertions as referring to a time much later than that of which his treatise is an idea," says bishop Tomline, "proselytes were those, and those only, who took upon themselves the obligation of the whole Mosaic law, but retained that name till they
were admitted into the congregation of the Lord as adopted children. Gentiles were allowed to worship and offer sacrifices to the God of Israel in the outer court of the Temple; and some of them, persuaded of the sole and universal sovereignty of the Lord Jehovah, might renounce idolatry without embracing the Mosaic law and its ceremonies. This became especially effective in the Christian church. The convert was quickly baptized, and this was a symbol of his dying and rising with Christ. The Scriptural word for baptism is πολύτιμος (polýtimo), which means "precious." It is derived from πολύς (poly's), "much," and τιμή (timē), "worth." The practice of baptism was immediate and was performed in various ways, depending on the circumstances of the convert. The arguments on the other side are ably stated in Townsend, "Chronological Arrangements of the New Testament," i, 115, etc., Lond. ed.

2. Ceremonies of Admission.—Here all seems at first clear and definite enough. The proselyte was first catechized as to his motives (Maimonides, ut sup.). If these were satisfactory, he was first instructed as to the divine protection of the Jewish people, and then circumcised. In the case of a convert already circumcised (a proselyte), the circumcision process is not necessary in the New Testament. However, it is a common practice in Christian history to require that a person who chooses to become a Christian be circumcised. The convert was then instructed in the Jewish Law and the Jewish traditions. The instruction took place in a special place, the synagogue, where the instructions were given. The convert was also instructed in the Jewish customs and practices. The instruction was given by the rabbis, who were the Jewish leaders. The instruction was given in the Hebrew language, and the convert was expected to learn and understand it.

3. Antiquity of these Practices.—Was this ritual observed as early as the commencement of the 1st century? If so, was the baptism of John or that of the Christian church borrowed from it? This is a question that has been much debated in the history of the church. The answer is not straightforward, but it is believed that the baptism of Jesus and the baptism of the early Christians were similar in many respects. The baptism of Jesus was a sign of his death and resurrection, and the baptism of the early Christians was a sign of their commitment to Christ. The baptism of the early Christians was performed by immersion in water, and it was performed by the local church leaders. The baptism of Jesus was performed by John the Baptist, and it was performed by the early Christians in the name of Jesus Christ.

4. The negative argument drawn from the silence of the Old Testament, of the Apocrypha, of Philo, and of Josephus, is almost decisive against the belief that there was in their time a baptism of proselytes with as much importance attached to it as it has in the Christian church.

5. It remains probable, however, that there was a baptism in use at a period considerably earlier than that for which we have direct evidence. The symbol was in itself natural and fit. It fell in with the disposition of the Philistines to the east of the Dead Sea. The rites were performed by the Philistines and the Philistines were a seafaring people. The symbol of the Washing (βαπτίσματι, Mark vii, 4) of all kinds. The tendency of the later rabbis was rather to heap together the customs and traditions of the past than to invent new ones. If there had been a baptism before the 1st century, there would have been no initiatory rite at all for female proselytes. The custom of baptizing proselytes thus arose gradually out of the habit which the Jews had of purifying by ablation whatever they deemed unclean, and came to be raised for the first time to the importance of an initiatory ordinance after the destruction of the Second Temple. The rite of circumcision had been a part of the Jewish law, and it was a sign of Jewish identity. The rite of baptism was a sign of the spiritual identity of the Christian.
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tive evidence. 1. We have, in the first place, the unam-

uous tradition of the Jewish rabbinis, who impute to

the practice an antiquity commensurate almost with

that of their nation. 2. We have the fact that the

baptism of Jesus was not regarded by the Jews

and some of John's disciples about purifying was ap-

aparently a dispute as to the competing claims of John and Jesus to

make proselytes (iii, 25 sq.). 3. We have the fact

that on the day of Pentecost Peter addressed to a mul-
titude of persons collected from several different and
distant countries, Jews and proselytes, an exhorta-
tion to "reptent and be baptized" (Acts ii, 38), from which

it may be fairly inferred that they all knew what bap-
tism meant, and also its connection with repentance or

a change of religious views. 5. We have the fact that,

according to Josephus, the Essenes were accustomed,

before admitting a new convert into their society, sol-

emnly and ritually to purify him with waters of clean-

sing (War, ii, 8, 7), a statement which cannot be un-

derstood of their ordinary ablutions before meals (as

some have supposed), but only in connexion with his

Exon on the "Rule of Baptism," p. 67); for Josephus expressly adds that even after this

allusion two years had to elapse before the neophyte

enjoyed the privilege of living with the proficients.

6. We have the mode in which Josephus speaks of the

baptism of John, when, after referring to John's having

exhibited the people to virtue, righteousness, and godli-

ess, as preparatory to baptism, he adds, "For it ap-
ppeared to him that baptism was admissible not when

they used it for obtaining forgiveness of some sins, but

for the purification of the body when the soul had been

more royally cleansed by it than the body could be by

the way of sweating, 5, 28, 5." This conclusion, which

seems to indicate the conviction of the historian

that John did not introduce this rite, but only gave to

it a peculiar meaning. Yet John's proceeding was not

an act of initiation into any new system of faith, much

less comparable to a conversion from paganism; for

the subjects were Jews already. It was rather a general

ablution, in token of wiping off a long-accumulated

score of offences. See JOHN THE BAPTIST.

(4.) The history of the New Test. itself suggests the

existence of such a custom. A sign is seldom chosen

under any circumstances but it has a meaning and a

force to whom it is addressed. The fitness of the sign in this case would be

in proportion to the associations already connected

with it. It would bear witness on the assumption of the

previous existence of the proselyte-baptism that the

Christian church from the then condition of Judaism to the

dominion of God was as great as that from idolatry to Juda-

ism. The question of the priests and Levites, "Why

baptizest thou then?" (John i, 25), implies that they

wondered, not at the thing itself, but at its being done

for Israelites by one who disclaimed the names which, in

their eyes, would have justified the introduction of a

new order. In like manner the words of Christ to

Nicodemus (iii, 10) imply the existence of a teaching as to

teaching like that above referred to. He, "the teacher of Israel," had been familiar with "these things"—

the new birth, the gift of the Spirit—as words and

phrases applied to heathen proselytes. He failed to

grasp the deeper truth which lay beneath them, and to

see that they had a wider, a universal application. See

REGENERATION BY WATER.

(5.) That the Jews directly borrowed this custom

from the Christians is an opinion which, though sup-
ported by De Wette (in his De Morte Christi expirato-
rid), cannot be for a moment admitted by any who re-

flect on the implications of which the Jews for

many centuries regarded Christianity, its ordinances,

and its presence. It is, however, improbable that

there may have been a reflex action in this matter from

the Christian upon the Jewish Church. The rabbinis

saw the new society, in proportion as the Gentile ele-

ment in it became predominant, throwing off circum-

cision, relying on baptism only. They could not ignore

the very existence of the outward sign, their belief that it was all but identical with the thing

signified. There was everything to lead them to give

a fresh prominence to what had been before subordi-

nate. If the Nazarenes attracted men by their bap-

tism, they would show that they had baptism as well

as the circumcision. The existence of the church after

the destruction of the Temple would also tend to give

more importance to the remaining rite. The reader

will find the whole subject amply discussed in the

following works: Selden, De Jure Nat. et Gent., ii,


Kuiniln, Com. in Libro N. T. Hist. ap. Matt. iii, 6;

and Dr. Halley's recent volume on the Sacraments

(Lond., 1844), p. 114 sqq, all of whom contend for the

antiquity of Jewish proselyte-baptism, while the follow-

ing take the opposite side: Wernsdorff, Contra. de

Bapt. Recens. § 18; Carpzov, Apparat. p. 47 sqq.; Paulus,

Comment. i, 279; Bauer, Gottdessendi. Verfassung der

Alten Heb. ii, 392; Schneckenburger, Lib. sub. civ.; and

the Moser Schiesl. Bib. Rep. No. 10. See also Bible Reader, i, 38 sq. See also BAPTISM.

4. Two facts of some interest remain to be noticed in

this connection. (1.) It formed part of the rabbinic

hopes of the kingdom of the Messiah that then there

should be no more proselytes. The distinctive name,

with its brand of inferiority, should be laid aside, and

all, even the Nethinim and the Manzermünzen (children

of mixed marriages), should be counted pure (Schöttgen,

Hor. Heb. ii, 614). (2.) Partly, perhaps, as connected

with this feeling, partly in consequence of the ill-repute

with which the Jews were regarded in the New Test., a sedulous avoidance of it. The

Christian convert from heathenism is not a proselyte, but a

vægeroc (v. Tim. iii).

III. Literature.—In addition to the works cited above,

see in general, Buxtorf, Lex. Talm. et Robb. a.v. 23;


Juden, iv, 70 sqq.; Schröder, Sitzungsn. und Abhand-

lungen der K. u. B. d. W. 4, 4, 3, 28, 31; Krüger,

Juden-, in the Archiv for Geschichte des Judentums

of John (iii, 315 sq.), De Wette (p. 318 sq.), Keil (i, 316

sq.), Carpzov, Lewis, and Bauer; Schmiedeke, Mi-

nisch. Rech. ii, 690 sqq., 730 sqq.; Lesandré, Phil.

Hebr. Misc. p. 142 sqq.; the monographs by Slevogt,

Alting, and Moller, in Ulgolini Thesaur.; those cited

by Danz (p. 797 sq.); appendix by Sleem in Realwörterb. a.v.; by Furst, Biblisch. Jud. i, 146; iii.

345, 392, 459, 471, 488, 555; and by Vol bedding, Index

Programmat. p. 22; and those written by Zorn (Lips.

Liber. 1703) and Wohner (Götting. 1748); also Luthkert in the


Jesu Proselyten-Tempel (Berlin, 1839).

PROSELYTES. This word is employed in modern

language to designate such individuals as have aban-

doned their faith and embraced another, and who, in
general, devote all their energy to the expansion of

their new creed. The endeavor to gain others to one's

own convictions, either by illicit or illicit means, is calld

proselytism. Biblical representatives of this system

are the Pharisees, to whom Christ said, "Woe unto

you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye compass

sea and land to make one proselyte; and when he is

made, ye make him twofold the child of hell than

hath fallen into the mischief of the devil that is not

yet brought into the snares of the devil himself; ye

must feel impelled to propagate its creed; the followers of a
discipline to whom it is indifferent whether the nom

of those who share it with them increases or decreases,

have no true faith. The Christians are espe-

cantly active in winning converts to their religion, but

this spirit is due entirely to a selfish desire en-
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large their borders and increase their numbers, but to
give to all the world the great truths to establish
which Christ came into the world in the form of man
and to make his word known. It is the right of
the Jews to be the chosen people of God. They
drew to consider themselves the armor-bearers of divine
truth, and if they felt impelled to carry "the law and the
prophets" to the strangers (2 M 3:2), it was only
a reasonable consequence of the divine revelation which
they had enjoyed. But it was by the fair means em-
ployed that they could best indicate the moral sublim-
ity of divine teachings over philosophical schemes and
heathenish systems of religion. When, therefore, the
Jews, after the establishment of Maccabean rule, com-
pelled, under Hyscanaus, the Idumaeans, and, under Aris-
tobulus, the Idumeans, to embrace the Jewish faith and to
subject themselves to circumcision, there was an adop-
tion of religious forms for which the Old Testament dispensa-
furnished no warrant; and though it may be conceded
that their object was probably to advance the interests
of true religion, they yet, by the adoption of unauthor-
ized measures, evinced an unrighteous zeal which must
have been underlaid by a selfish purpose. Thus the
Roman Censorship have constantly acknowledged the propog-
ation of the Christian faith by measures wholly un-
warranted and not in uniformity with the lofty state of its
ethics.

The Jesuit Sambaga says, in defence of the Jesuitic
proselytism: "The matter of proselytism in priests is no
mania, but a holy zeal." The prince-cardinal von
Hohehofer approves of this defence in his Lichblüte
und Erlebnisse aus der Welt und dem Priestereiben (Ratisbon,
1836, 8vo), p. xxxix. But this defence is, after all, a
simple Jesuitic sophism. The matter of proselytism is a
mania, and because priests are subject to it, it does not
become therefore a holy zeal; or else we must admit that
anything done by avaricious and ambitious priests of
all persuasions (Christians and pagans) was holy, or
was the result of a holy zeal, and therefore not blame-
worthy, but, on the contrary, praiseworthy and com-
mandable. When proselytes are gained in such a way
or violent manner as that resorted to by Jesuits; when
the means employed are money and promotions on one
side, threats and persecutions on the other, we perceive
in it the evidence of a most unholy zeal, against which
the fathers and teachers of Christianity pronounced anathema
in his condemnation of the priests of his time, the doctors
of the law, and Pharisees. For this very reason Christ
called them "children of hell." See ROMANISM. It is
a curious fact worth remembering that one of the main
features of the times of the Messiah was to be, accord-
ing to Jewish tradition, the utter abolition of proselyt-
ism, and the entire ceasing of all distinctions of an
opprobrious nature among men. The evil repute into
which the term proselyte had fallen in the times of
Christ also caused the early converts to Christianity to
adopt the name of Neophytes (newly planted) instead.
See NEOPHYTE.

(J. H. W.)

Proseucha (προσευχή), a word signifying "pray-
er," and always so translated in the A. V. It is, how-
ever, applied, per meton., to a place of prayer—a place
where assemblies for prayer were held, whether a build-
ing was erected for the purpose, or not. It occurs in
Luke vi, 12, where it is said that our Saviour went
up into a mountain: to pray, and continued all night in
the proseucha of God (ἐν τῷ προσευχῷ τῷ Θεῷ),
which can very well bear the sense our translators have
put upon it, "in prayer to God." Yet Whitby and others
infer, from the use of parallel phrases, such as "the
mount of God," "the bread of God," "the altar of
God," "the lamp of God," etc., which were all things
consecrated or appropriated to the service of God, that
this phrase might here signify "an oratory of God," or
a place that was devoted to his service, especially for
prayer. In the sense, however, in which the word here
is used, it may be understood in Acts xvi, 18, where we
are informed that Paul and his companions, on the Sabbath
day, went out of the city, by the river side, unto προσευχήν
προσευχήν ὄνας, which the A. V. renders "where prayer was wont
"to be made." But the Syriac here has, "because there
was perceived to be a house of prayer."

"a certain place which was supposed to be a place
of prayer." In both these versions due stress is laid upon
προσευχήν, where there was taken, or supposed to be
—or, where, according to received custom, there was, or
where there was looked for by law—a temple, or church,
or chapel; and where, therefore, they expected to meet
an assembly of people. Boe conveys (Exercit. Philol. ad loc.),
however, that the word προσευχή is redundant, and that
the passage ought simply to be, "where there
was a proscheia;" but in this he is clearly opposed by
Emerson (Obser. Sac. at ad loc.). See PRAYER.

That there really were such places of devotion among
the Jews is unquestionable. They were mostly outside
those towns in which there were no synagogues, because
the laws or their administrators would not admit any
This was, particularly the case in the colonies and colonies (and Philippi, where this circumstance oc-
curred, was a colony); for Juvenal (Sat. iii, 296) speaks
of proscheia, not synagogues, at Rome. They appear
have been usually situated near a river or the sea-
shore, for it is given for instance of ablution (Jer. xiv,
10, 28). Josephus repeatedly mentions proscheia
in his Life, and speaks of the people being gathered
into the proscheia (44, 45). Sometimes the proscheia
was a large building, as at Tiberias (I. c. 54), so
that the name was sometimes applied even to syna-
gogues (Vitr. Varr. de Leg. I. v. 11). Proscheia are
frequently mentioned as buildings by Philo, particular-
ly in his oration against Flaccus, where he complains
that the proscheia of the Jews were pulled down, and
that no place was left them in which to worship God
and pray for Caesar (Phil. in Flacc. Op. p. 722). But,
for the most part, the proscheia appear to have
been placed in the open air, in a grove, or in shrub-
beries, or even under a tree, although always, as we
may presume, near water, for the convenience of those
ablutions which with the Jews always preceded prayer;
as, indeed, they are among the proverbs among
the Moesians at the present day. The usages of
the latter exhibit something answering to the Jewish
proscheia in the shape of small oratories, with a niche
indicating the direction of Mecca, which is often seen
in Moesian MSS., and the side of a house, or a wall,
or a large water-jar, which is daily replenished for the
use of travellers (Whitby, De Dies et Wettstein, Kuimil,
on Acts xvi, 13; Jennings, Jewish Antiquities, p. 383-
382: Prideaux, Connection, ii, 556).—Kitto.

"Questions have been raised," says the late Dr. M'Far-
lan, of Renfrew, "as to the origin of these, and their
being or not being the same with the synagogue.
Phi-
lo and Josephus certainly speak of them and the syna-
gogues as if they were substantially one. The former
expressly declares that they were places of instruc-
tion. The places dedicated to devotion, says he,
"which are commonly called proscheia, what are the
they but schools in which prudence, fortitude, temper-
ance, righteousness, piety, holiness, and every virtue
are taught—everything necessary for the discharge of
their duties, whether human or divine." As the writer's ob-
servations were chiefly confined to the Jews of Alex-
andria and other parts of Egypt, this description will
chiefly apply to those. But there is no doubt, on the
other hand, that such synagogues existed, and espe-
cially in Judea, that the Jews were there are therefore very much disposed to concur in the
opinion that the oratory was substantially and in effect
a synagogue. But the latter was the more perfect form,
and required, for its erection and support, special means. There was in every synagogue a local court, deriving its authority, at least in Judea, from the Sanhedrin; and there were office-bearers to be maintained; whereas in Christian churches the clergy have been neither very fixed or necessary form of procedure. These might, for aught that appears, have been all or substantially all which belonged to the synagogue, or it might be little more than what we would call a prayer-meeting. Hence, perhaps, the reason of the prevalence of the one—the synagogue—in Judea, and of the other in Egypt and other countries not subject to Jewish laws.

It is highly probable that prosnechē existed long before synagogues. It is remissible, continues Mr. McFarlan, "that the only places where Daniel is said to have been favored with visions, during the day, were by the sides of rivers (Dan. viii. 2, 16; also x. 4; xii. 5, 7; and ix. 21), the very places where oratories were wont to be. Ezekiel also received his commission by the rivers of Babylon, and when 'among the captives' of Israel (Ezek. i. 1). And he afterwards mentions his having received visions in the same circumstances (iii. 15, 16). And Ezra, also, when leading back Israel to the land of their fathers, proclaimed and observed a fast with them as the way, and, as to keep up the same tender associations, he assembled them by the river Ahava, where they remained three days (Ezra viii. 15, 32). But the very finest illustration which occurs is that contained in the 137th Psalm.—'By the rivers of Babylon, there we sat down; yea, we wept, when we remembered Zion. We hanged our harps upon the willows in the midst thereof. For there they that carried us away captive required of us a song; and they that wasted us required of us mirth, saying, Sing us one of the songs of Zion!' (1-3). The people of Israel were accustomed, in after-times, to make choice of the banks of rivers for their oratories, and this point of agreement is one of the grounds on which we are proceeding. But it will hold equally good, whether the Israelitish captives followed, in this, the example of their fathers, or whether, as is more probable, their circumstances in Babylon led to this choice. It is not unlikely that this led to a similar choice in after-times, and particularly in foreign countries. The poor captives of Babylon had perhaps no other covering or even enclosure than the willows of the brook; and thus might be driven to do the things which we are familiar with when the God of their fathers, into the woody margins of Babylon's many rivers. Meeting in such places, as they had been accustomed to do in the oratories of their native land, it is not wonderful that many tender associations should be kept up."

After the return of the Jews from the Babylonian captivity, synagogue worship was much enlarged and improved, while oratories gradually diminished in number and importance. Hence, in later times, oratories were chiefly found in countries beyond the land of Israel. Under the Roman government synagogues were disestablished, but oratories, or places of meeting for devotional exercises, were generally permitted all over the empire. Dr. Lardner thinks that the synagogue mentioned in Acts vi. 9 was really an oratory; and Josephus speaks of a very large one in the city of Tiberias. But it was chiefly in foreign parts that prosnechē in later times were found. Josephus, in detailing the decree passed in favor of the Jews at Halicarnassus, says, "We have decreed that as many men and women of the Jews as are willing so to do may celebrate their solemnities and pass through their holidays according to the Jewish laws; and may make their prosnechē at the sea-side, according to the custom of their forefathers." See Ridder, Christian Antiquities (see Index); Stillingfleet, Works, vol. i; and the monographs cited by Vellboeuf-Dezeg Programmum, p. 76. See CHAPEL ORATORY.

PROSPER, St., surnamed Aquitanus or Aquilanus, from the country of his nativity, was a distinguished theologian of Gaul, and flourished in the first half of the 5th century. He settled as a young man in Provence, and there became the intimate companion of a certain Lusius of Narbonne. He is said to have held a certain rank of bishop in a certain town of Aquitania. The two friends studied and wrote together in defense of orthodox Christianity in general, and of Augustinianism in particular. Yet, although a staunch defender of the doctrines and person of St. Augustine, he was no priest, still less a bishop, as has been frequently asserted since the 7th century, but a married layman, pious and well versed in divine lore, who had been impelled by the miseries of his time to devote himself to an austere way of life (see Simond, not. ad viii, ep. 15; Sidon. Apoll. and Bolduc, Collect. Sanctorum, in Augustinianis. Constant readers and zealous disciples of St. Augustine, especially in the doctrine of grace, Prosper and Hilary displayed great zeal in defending his doctrines against the attacks of the Semi-Pelagians (see Pelagianism); but finding that they were making very little headway against the heretics, who had largely weakened orthodoxy in Southern Gaul, Prosper wrote, about 427 or 428, a letter entitled Epistola ad Augustinum de Reliquiis Pelagianarum Heresiae in Gallia (considered one of the most important among the works of a Semi-Pelagianism), in which he informed the illustrious bishop of Hippo that a number of priests and monks at Marseilles asserted, contrary to the Augustinian theory, that man must himself take the first step towards his justification and salvation (ep. 225 and 226 inter Ep. Aug.). Thus Prosper not only himself acted as defender of the catholic doctrine against the Semi-Pelagians, but gave occasion to St. Augustine to write his two works on the predestination of the saints and on the gift of constancy (De Predestinatione Sanctorum, and De Dono Remittendi). But not all those whom Prosper names as adversaries of St. Augustine were, like Cassian, Semi-Pelagians. The heresies of this Cassian Prosper exposed in a work which he subsequently (about A.D. 430) composed: De Gratia Dei et Libero Arbitrio contra Collatorum. Prosper, still before St. Augustine's death, wrote several works against the Pelagians, and especially the Semi-Pelagians. To these works of controversy belong his poem De Ingratia, so highly admired by the Jansenists, and a letter to a certain Rufinus. After the death of St. Augustine, his works, especially his master and admirable treatise on worshipping the God of their fathers, into the woody margins of Babylon's many rivers. Meeting in such places, as they had been accustomed to do in the oratories of their native land, it is not wonderful that many tender associations should be kept up."

After the return of the Jews from the Babylonian captivity, synagogue worship was much enlarged and improved, while oratories gradually diminished in number and importance. Hence, in later times, oratories were chiefly found in countries beyond the land of Israel. Under the Roman government synagogues were disestablished, but oratories, or places of meeting for devotional exercises, were generally permitted all over the empire. Dr. Lardner thinks that the synagogue mentioned in Acts vi. 9 was really an oratory; and Josephus speaks of a very large one in the city of Tiberias. But it was chiefly in foreign parts that prosnechē in later times were found. Josephus, in detailing the decree passed in favor of the Jews at Halicarnassus, says, "We have decreed that as many men and women of the Jews as are willing so to do may celebrate their solemnities and pass through their holidays according to the Jewish laws; and may make their prosnechē at the sea-side, according to the custom of their forefathers." See Ridder, Christian Antiquities (see Index); Stillingfleet, Works, vol. i; and the monographs cited by Vellboeuf-Dezeg Programmum, p. 76. See CHAPEL ORATORY.
PROSPERITY

direct editors to A.D. 483, but placed by Schönenmann and others before A.D. 424—Sententiarum ex Operibus S. Augustini delibaturam Liber unus, compiled about A.D. 431. He is commemorated by the Church of Rome on June 30. The Benedictine edition of the works of Augustine; the epistle is numbered cxxxv, and is placed immediately before another upon the same subject by Hilary; the remaining tracts are all included in the appendix to vol. x. If we believe Gennadius (De Viris Illust. c. 64), Prosper was, after 448, called Thessalonian by pope Leo I., and became the secreyary of that pontiff. We have no positive knowledge of the year of his death; it falls between 455 and 468. There are other writings of Prosper, among which we mention 106 small poems (epigrams), in which are numerous moral and religious reflections on the Sacraments and Sacramentals. The most important work is the 'De Benedictice' by Lebrun de Marette and Magunrat (Var. 1711, fol.). For a record of the time when Prosper's monographs first appeared in print, see also Smith's Dictionary. Full information with regard to the inestimable controversy arising out of the works of Prosper is contained in the notes and dissertations of the Benedictines, in the dissertations of Quenel and the Ballerini in their respective editions of the 'Reges of the English, and in a rare volume, De Viris Operibus SS. Patrum Leonic Mogi et Prosperi Aquilini Dissertations, etc. (Paris. 1664, fol.), in which Josephus Antelmius, to which Quenel put forth a reply in the Ephemerides Parisienses, vol. viii and x, and Antelmius a reply in two Epistolas Dominica Epistola P. Queneli Parisiis Responsoriae (Var. 1806, 4to). To see Tilitonem, Mem. vol. xvi; Oudin, De Script. Eccl. Schrock, Kirchengesch. vol. x-xviii; Fleury, Hist. Eccl.; Dollinger, Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte; Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctrines (see Index); Neander, Ch. Hist. ii, 630 sq.; Hist. of Dogmatics, ii, 575 sq.; Gieseler, Ch. Hist. i, 226 sq; Schaff, Ch. Hist. iii, 650 sq; Bähr, De Magi Antichristi, i, 213 sq; Wieggers, Aug. Pol. II, 136 sq. (J. H. W.)

Prosperity, the state wherein things succeed according to our wishes, and are productive of abundance and ease. However desirable prosperity be, it has its manifest disadvantages. It too easily softens the soul from God, excites pride, exposes to temptation, hardens the heart. Occasions idleness, promotes effeminacy, damps zeal and energy, and in general has a baneful relative influence. It is no wonder, therefore, that the Almighty in general withholds it from his children, and that adversity shall be their lot rather than prosperity. Indeed, adversity seems more beneficial on the whole, although it be so unpleasant to our feelings. "The advantages of prosperity," says Bacon, "are to be wished, but the advantages of adversity are to be admired. The principal virtue of adversity is temperance: the principal virtue of adversity is fortitude, which in morality is allowed to be the most heroic virtue. Prosperity best discovers vice; adversity best discovers virtue, which is like those perfumes which are most fragrant when burned or bruised. It is not, however, to be understood that prosperity in itself is unlawful. The world, with all its various productions, was formed by the Almighty for the happiness of man, and designed to endear him to us, and to lead our minds up to him. What, however, God often gives us a blessing, by our own folly is often converted and turned into a curse. Where prosperity is given, there religion is absolutely necessary to enable us to act under it as we ought. Where this divine principle influences the mind, prosperity may be enjoyed and become a blessing; for "while bad men match the pleasures of the world as high as they can find in it, the proprietor of the world, the righteous sit quietly down to the feast of life, under the smile of heaven. No guilty fears damp their joys. The blessing of God rests upon all they possess. Their piety reflects sunshine from heaven upon the prosperity of the world; it unites in one point of view all the pleasing aspect both of the powers above and of the objects below. Not only have they as full a relish as others of the innocent pleasures of life, but, moreover, in them they hold communion with God. In all that is good or fair they trace his hand. From the beauties of nature, from the improvements of art, from the enjoyments of social life, they raise their affections to the source of all the happiness which surrounds them, and thus widen the sphere of their pleasures by adding intellectual and spiritual to earthly joy." Spiritual prosperity consists in the continual progress of the mind in knowledge, purity, and joy. It arises from the participation of the divine blessing; and evidences itself by frequency in prayer, love to God's word, delight in his people, attention on his ordinances, and patience in both the sufferings and the fulness in his Church, and increasing abhorrence of everything that is derogatory to his glory (8 John ii). See Blair, Sermons, vol. i, sect. iii; Bates, Works, p. 297.

PROSPER, LORENZO D., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was a native of New York State, and was born in 1803. He was early converted, and joined the Church as a mere youth. In 1827 he was received into the Pittsburgh Conference, and successively appointed to the following circuits, namely: Butler, Grand River, Mercer, Hartford, Twinsburg, Windsor, and Columbiana. In 1846, when the Erie Conference was formed, he fell into its bounds, and received from it his appointment to the following fields of labor, namely: Ellsworth, Cleveland, Harmonsburg, M'Kean, Wesleville, Carhton, Chagrin Falls, Wesleville, Edinborough Mission, M'Kean, Albon, and Springfield. This last appointment he held in 1862. The next year he became a terminer, and continued in that relation until his death, April 13, 1869. He was of a nervous temperament, and his burning zeal led him often to exert himself beyond his strength. His preaching was with power, and at times his exhortation was overwhelming. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1869.

Prostitute, (a) female, in Hebrew נגשה, נמשה, נמשש, נֳמֶשׁ (on the last see Genesis. Thes. iii, 1167); (b) male, in Hebrew נַמשוֹן. While all sexual intercourse between others than married persons was for-
Prostitution

bitten by the Mosaic law, especial prohibition was laid upon Israelitish women from hiring themselves as prostitutes (Lev. xix. 29; comp. xxxi. 9); and, with special reference to the Levites, they were forbidden to abandon themselves to the use of men (Deut. xxiii. 17). The "hire of a whore" (גַּלְגָּלָל) comp. also Ezek. xvi. 33, and Rosenmuller, *ad loc.*) must not be accepted by the priests as the subject of a vow, or a gift of devotion in the Temple (Deut. xxiii. 18); this hire, consisting in a piece of money or a kid (Gen. xxxvii. 17), if presented at the Temple for a sacrifice, and received as among other and honest nations, would have seemed to allow prostitution (comp. Mishna, *Terumoth*, vi. 2; Mover, *Phonik* i. 680). In Paphos, a kid was offered to the goddess of love (Tacitus, *Hist.* ii. 8). The Heterae were used to bring to Aphrodite Pandemos the sacrifice of a goat (Lucian, *Dialog*. *Metr.* vii. 1). The trade of prostitutes was sometimes very profitable among the ancients (Herod. ii. 90). In spite of all prohibitions, there were always public prostitutes among the Hebrews—probably, who, as among the Arabs and Persians, practiced dancing and music (Baruch vi. 8, 43; Wisd. ix. 14; 1 Kings ii. 6; Prov. vi. 20, 22, 23; Amos ii. 7; vii. 17; Hosea i. 2); and may have been in part foreigners (Mover, *Phonik* i. 53), as did the Phoenicians and Syrians (Judg. xvi. 1). Syrian harrlots travelled in the time of the Roman empire, and were called *Amena* (Sueton. *Nero*, 27; *Vest. Lat.* i. 2, 1), because they were sometimes skilled in playing on the harp (see Heindorf, *Horace*. L. c.; comp. Apuleius, *Metam.* viii. 182, ed. Bipp). But the Hebrew name קָנֵבָה perhaps means not a stranger, but the strange woman, like קָנָה; hence, adulteress.

The harlots walked in public, adorned and veiled (Gen. xxxviii. 14; Petron. *Satyr*. xvii. 1; but see Pococke, *Eust.* i. 729, 526). They even went thus, and with seductive gestures, strove to lead aside travellers (Gen. xxxviii. 14; Baruch vi. 43; comp. Dougaii *Amenae* i. 42 sq.). We may well suppose that the harlots could be in some way recognised in dress, gait, etc., even when they put on a show of modest behavior (comp. Hartmann, *Hebr*. ii. 492 sq.). It is not probable that the ceiling ever distinguished the harlots from chaste women. See Velt. (Comp. Buckingham, *Meos* p. 65.) In the brothels the girls bore peculiar names which had been assigned to them (Seneca, *Contraf*. i. 2, 84, ed. Bipp). Some would interpret in allusion to this the words in Rev. xv. 5, but see Ewald, *ad loc*. At the time of the division of the Hebrew kingdom, whoredom was practiced, especially among the ten tribes, under the Syrian influences then pouring in on them, first from the north, then from the west, and was condoned by the gods, especially of Ashtarot (Hosea iv. 17; 1 Kings xiv. 24; xv. 12; xxii. 47; 2 Kings xxiii. 7; comp. Baruch vi. 43; Herod. l. c.; Justin, xviii. 5; Irenaeus, *Cont. haer.* i. 95; Origen, *Cont. haer.* iv. 29; *Clement. *Corinth. *i.* *pervicax* de s. *v. g.* c. 52; *Clement. *Corinth. *i.* *pervicax* de s. *v. g.* c. 52). The practice of prostitution was therefore prevalent, even among the Jews, especially the higher classes (Rom. ii. 22; John viii. 7; see in general Michaelis, *Nova Rechenschaft der Juden*. Among the nations of the ancient world it was a common practice of combining immorality with the worship of the gods appears to have continued down to the days of Constantine, as is evident from a passage in his life, written by Eusebius, where he mentions it in a very vigorously as the practice of Venus, at Aphroessa on Mount Libanus. Sacred prostitution forms a part in the religious rites of heathen nations both in ancient and modern times. Among the Phoenicians, Babylonians, and other Eastern nations, it was the custom to erect adjoining the temples of their gods (especially the goddess Ishtar) chapels for courtesans, to accommodate them to the deities. Strabo says that no fewer than 1000 of these abandoned females were attached to the temple of Aphrodite in Corinth, and were considered as indispensable part of the retinue of the goddess. Among the Hindus we have the Linga worship, etc. See also Adultery; Forgery; Harlot; Sodomy.

Prostratation. See Attitude.

Prostration in Prayer. See Posture.

Protagoras ([Προταγόρας]), the first of that class of Greek philosophers who took the name of Sogenkatai (q. v.), flourished near the opening of the 5th century B.C. He was a native of Abydus, according to the concurrent testimony of Plato and several other writers (Protag. p. 309, e.; *De Rep.*, x. p. 606, e.; *Herculei zodiaecr.*, *Sext. Cont. ap. am. vi. 51, ed. Furtw. c. 52; *Servius* viii. 578; *I. c.* 655; *Val. Max.*, ii. 6; 15; August. *De thren*. 10; *Theo.* p. 174, ed. 164; *Euseb. *Ev. *XXI.* 50; *Philo*, *Ad Callistum*, *Ad Herod. *II., c. 48). The existence of companies of prostitutes in the sacred groves and high-places of the ancient Jews may serve to account for the rendering which the Sept. gives to the expression "high-places" in Ezek. xvi. 39, by a term which in Greek denotes a place of indecent resort. The *Sukkah bethn*, literally "tabernacles of daughters," which the men of Babylon are mentioned in 2 Kings xxi. 23 to have established, are probably places of the same kind, being haunts of wickedness. According to Josephus (*Ant*. iv. 8, 23), all intercourse with a prostitute was illegal, which is natural, since even the sons of public harlots could never attain citizen's rights among the Jews (Deut. xxiii. 2), and had no claim to share in their father's inheritance (comp. Judg. xi. 1). Among the Greeks, however, the question of the appearance of Christianity, prostitution had become a great social evil. The cause of this lay by no means alone in the excessive worship of certain divinities (see *Wisd.* xiv. 28, sq.), but in the frivolity of the times and the general decay of morals. In Rome harlots were legally tolerated (Zimmermann, *Rom. Reichsrichter* i. ii. 489; comp. Schottgen, *Hor. Hebr.* i. 468, sq.). The laxer the principles of men in general were on this subject in its various forms, and the more boldly they avowed it (comp. Terence, *Adelphi*, i. 21, 21 sq.; *Eunuchius*, iii. 6, 85 sq.), the more openly were they tolerated and even espoused by the nobility who wished to oppose unchastity where it had entered the Christian Church (1 Cor. i. 7, sq.; 2 Cor. xii. 21; 1 *Thess.* iv. 3; 1 Tim. i. 10). The apostolic decree in Acts xx. 29 (comp. xxii. 25), which has often been denounced as not genuine (Deymey, *Oeuvr. ii. 499, sq.; Kantorowicz, *Polit. Bd.* i. 521, sq.), was sufficiently called for by the character of the times (comp. Tholuck, in Neander's *Duskwurd*, i. 143 sq.). The practice of prostitution was then prevalent, too, among the Jews, especially the higher classes (Rom. ii. 22; John viii. 7; see in general Michaelis, *Nova Rechenschaft der Juden*. Among the nations of the ancient world it was a common practice of combining immorality with the worship of the gods appears to have continued down to the days of Constantine, as is evident from a passage in his life, written by Eusebius, where he mentions it in a very vigorously as the practice of Venus, at Aphroessa on Mount Libanus. Sacred prostitution forms a part in the religious rites of heathen nations both in ancient and modern times. Among the Phoenicians, Babylonians, and other Eastern nations, it was the custom to erect adjoining the temples of their gods (especially the goddess Ishtar) chapels for courtesans, to accommodate them to the deities. Strabo says that no fewer than 1000 of these abandoned females were attached to the temple of Aphrodite in Corinth, and were considered as indispensable part of the retinue of the goddess. Among the Hindus we have the Linga worship (q. v.). See also Adultery; Forgery; Harlot; Sodomy.

Prostration. See Attitude.

Prostration in Prayer. See Posture.
who called himself a sophist and taught for pay (Plato, Protag. p. 349; a; Diog. Laert. i. 52). He must have come to Athens before B.C. 445, since, according to the statement of Herodotus Ponticus (Diog. Laert. ix. 95), he is said to have been with Harmodius and Aristogiton in the period that was probably adapted for the use of the new colonists, who left Athens for the first time in that year, the laws which had been drawn up at an earlier period by Charondas for the use of the Chalcidic colonies (for, according to Liv. xii. 11, 5 and others, these laws were in force at Thurii likewise). Whether he himself removed to Thurii, we do not learn, but at the time of the plague we find him again in Athens, as he could scarcely have mentioned the strength of mind displayed by Pericles at the death of his sons in the way he does (in a fragment still extant, Plutarch, De Consol. ad Apoll. c. xxxiii. p. 118, d) had he not been an eye-witness. He had also, as it appears, returned to Athens, after a long absence (Plato, Protag. p. 501, c), at a time when the sons of Pericles were still alive (ibid. p. 314, c; 329, a). A somewhat intimate relation between Protagoras and Pericles is intimated also elsewhere (Plut. Pericles, c. xxxvi. p. 172, a). His activity, however, was by no means restricted to Athens. He had spent some time in Sicily, and acquired fame there (Plato, Hipp. Maj. p. 292, c; 309, b), and this, his being a sophist of other Greek cities through which he had passed (Plato, Protag. p. 315, a). He was accused of atheism by one of his scholars, and was consequently impeached for what he had written in his book On the Gods, which began with the statement, "Respecting the gods, I am unable to know whether they exist or do not exist" (Diog. Laert. ix. 51, etc.). The impeachment was followed by his banishment (ibid. i. 52; Cicero, De Nat. Deor. i. 23; Euseb. Prep. Evang. xiv. 19, etc.), or, as others affirm, only by the burning of his book (Philos. Vit. Soph. L. c; Josephus, C. Apion. ii. 37; Sext. Emp. Adv. Math. i. 56; Cicero, Diog. Laert. ii. 52). Ueberweg says that it would seem Protagoras left Sicily after his condemnation and was lost at sea (Hist. Philos. i. 74).

Writings.—From the list of the writings of Protagoras, which Diogenes Laertius (ix. 55) doubtless borrowed from one of his Alexandrine authorities (he describes them as still extant, istori dawmpowma autwv Biblia raitov: comp. Wecker’s account of Prodicus, in his Kleine Schriften, ii. 447, 450), and which he gives probably as a list of his writings, we see that they comprised very different subjects: ethics (Περὶ ἀρετῶν καὶ Περὶ τῶν οἰκίων τῶν ἔρωτος τῶν προσαρμοσμένων, Περὶ φιλοσοφίας, Περὶ τῆς ἐν ὑπόκτυσι δοκιμασίας), political (Περὶ πολιτικῆς, Περὶ τῆς ἐν προφητεία καταρτισθέντων, comp. Frag. p. 182, etc.), or literature (Ἀντιλόγων ἐως, ἡγίστατα, οἰκονομία, ἐστίν, Περὶ ἀνθρώπων, Περὶ τῶν ἐν ἔλεος), and, after subjects of a different kind, legal (Περὶ ἀνθρώπων, Περὶ τῶν ἐν δόλω). The works which, in all probability, were the most important of those which Protagoras composed—Truth (Ἀλήθεια, and On the Gods (Περὶ θεῶν)—are omitted in that list, although in another passage (ix. 51) Diogenes Laertius refers to them. The first contained the theory refuted by Plato in the Theaetetus (p. 161, c; 162, a; 166, c; 170, e), and was probably identical with the work on the Existence (Περὶ τῶν ὄντων), attributed to Protagoras by Porphyry (in Euseb. Prep. Evang. x. 8, p. 468, Viger). This work was directed against the Eleatics (Πρὸς τῶν ἐν τῷ νῷ λόγους), and was still extant in the time of Porphyry, who describes the argumentation of the book as similar to that of Plato, though without adding any more exact statements. The other work, which he left behind him in Athens may have been the one of which Protagoras obtained the most complete acquaintance from the Theaetetus of Plato, which was designed to refute it, and to clear up the true meaning of the quotations in which it is confirmed by the much more scanty notices of Sextus Empiricus (Col. p. 217, b; 218, a). Of this work, and of the last, no abstract remains, as the points of the fundamental presupposition of Heraclitus that everything is motion and nothing besides or beyond it, and that out of it everything comes into existence; that nothing at any time exists, but that everything is perpetually becoming (Plato, Theaet. p. 156, 152; Sextus Empiricus inaccurately attributes to him matter in a certain order of nature, and the perpetual state of motion is probably substituting for the author’s Platonism). He then distinguished two principal kinds of the infinitely manifold motions, an active and a passive; but promised that the motion which in one concurrence manifested itself actively will in another appear as passive, so that the difference is, as it were, a fluctuating, not a permanent one (Theaet. p. 156, 157). From the concurrence of two such motions arises sensation or perception, and that which is felt or perceived, according to the different velocity of the motion; and that in such a way that where there is homogeneity in such things as exists, as between seeing and color, hearing and sound (ibid. p. 156), the definitiveness of the color and the seeing, of the perception and that which is perceived, is produced by the concurrence of corresponding motions (ibid. 156, d; comp. 158, c). Consequently, we can never speak of being and becoming absolutely, but only for something (τινί), or of something (τινώς), or to something (τινῷ τι, p. 160, b; 156, c; 152, d; Arist. Metaph. ix. 8; Sext. Emp. Hyp. i. 216, 218). Therefore there is or exists for each only of that which he has, and of what he has not, which he perceives is true for him (Theaet. p. 152, a; comp. Cratyl. p. 386; Aristotle, in Euseb. Prep. Evang. xiv. 20; Cicero, Acad. ii. 46; Sext. Emp. L. c. and Adv. Math. viii. 63, 369, 588, etc.) so that as sensation, like its objects, is engaged in a perpetual change of motion (Theaet. p. 152, b; Sext. Emp. Hyp. i. 217, fol.), opposite assertions might exist, according to the difference of the perception respecting each several object (Arist. Metaph. iv. 5; Diog. Laert. ix. 5; Clem. Alex. Strom. v. 674, a; Senec. Epist. 88). The conclusions hitherto discussed, which he drew from the Heraclitean doctrine of eternal becoming, Protagoras summed up in the well-known proposition: 'The man is the measure of all things; of the existent, that they exist; of the non-existent, that they do not exist' (Theaet. p. 152, a; 160, d; Cratyl. p. 386, c; Arist. Metaph. x. 1; xi. 6; Sext. Emp. Adv. Math. vii. 60; Pyrrhon. Hyp. i. 218; Arist. Metaph. Prep. Evang. xiv. 20; Diog. Laert. ix. 51); and understood by the man, the perceiving or sensation-receiving subject. He was compelled, therefore, likewise to admit that confusion was impossible, since every affirmation of assertion, if not thereby self-contradictory, was onaly justifiable (Plato, Euthyd. p. 186, d, etc.; Isocr. Helen. Enc. p. 231, Bekk.; Diog. Laert. ix. 53); but, notwithstanding the equal truth and justifiableness of opposite affirmations, he endeavored to establish a distinction or preference of better or worse condition of the perceiving subject, and promised to give directions for improving this condition, i. e. for attaining to higher activity (Theaet. p. 167; comp. Sext. Emp. Adv. Hyp. i. 218). Already, before Plato and Aristotle (Metaph. iv. 4; comp. the previously quoted passages), Democritus had applied himself to the construction of this sensuality of Protagoras, which annihilated existence, knowledge, and all understanding (Plutarch, Adv. Colot. p. 1109, a; Sext. Emp. Adv. Math. viii. 588).

It is not every pleasure, but only pleasure in the beautiful, to which Protagoras, in the dialogue which bears his name (p. 354, b), allows moral worth; and he refers virtue to a certain sense of shame (αἰσθήσεως) implanted in man by nature, and a certain conscious feeling of justice (ἐλεγχόν), which are to serve the purpose of securing the goals of connection in private and political life (ibid. p. 352, c, e, etc.; comp. 340, c). He is not able, however, to define more exactly the difference between the beautiful and the pleasant, and at last speaks with the greatest difficulty and confusion of the idea of enjoyment or enjoyment is the proper aim of the good (p. 354, etc.). In just as confused a manner does he express himself
with respect to the virtues, of which he admits five (honestas, securitas—and four others), and with regard to which he maintains that they are distinguished from each other in the same manner as the arts of the countenance (ibid. p. 349, b; 329, c, etc.). As in these ethical opinions of I'agoras we see a want of scientific perception, so do we perceive in his conception of the Heraclitean doctrine of the eternal flow of all things, and the way in which he carries it out, a sophistical endeavor to establish, fresh from the letters of science, his subjective notions, setting aside the Heraclitean assumption of a higher cognition and a community of rational activity (λόγος λόγος) by means of rhetorical art. That he was master of this in a high degree, the testament of the ancients leave indelible. His endeavors, moreover, were mainly directed to the communication of this art by means of instruction (Plato, Protag. p. 312, c), to render men capable of acting and speaking with readiness in domestic and political affairs (ibid. p. 318, c). He would teach how to make the weaker cause the stronger (νόμος ἐκ λόγου εἰρημένος τιτούλος, Aristot. Rhet. ii, 24; A. Gellius, N. A. v, 3; Eudoxus, in Stephan. Byz. a. v. Αἰγύπτιος: comp. Aristoph. Nub. 113, etc., 245, etc., 873, 874, 879, etc.). By way of practice in the art he was accustomed to make his pupils (κομματίς) on opposite sides (antinomically) (Diog. Laertius, ii, 52, etc.; comp. Suid. a. v.; Dionys. of Halicarnassus, loc.; Timon, in Diog. Laert. ix, 52; Sext. Emp. Adv. Math. i, 57; Cicero, Brut. 12) an exercise which is also recommended by Cicero (Ad Att. iii, 7; Quintilian, x, 6; 90). The mean of doing so was probably unfolded in his Art of Discourse (γρυγοί ἀπειρίστας; see above). But he also directed his attention to language, endeavored to explain difficult passages in the poets, though not always with the best success (Plato, Protag. p. 306, c, etc.; comp. respecting his and the opposed Platonic exposition of the well-known lines of Simonides, Frey, p. 122, etc.). See Plato, Hipp. Maj. p. 292, c; Meno, p. 91, d; Theat. p. 161, a; 179, a; Quintilian, iii, 1, § 10; Diogenes Laertius, ix, 52, 90, etc.; Zeller, Philos. der Griechen, i, 344 sq.; Fisher, Beginnings of Christianity, p. 117; Butler, Hist. of Ancient Philos. (see Index in vol. ii); Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol. a. v., which we have principally used; Ueberweg, Hist. of Philos. i, 78 sq.; Geist, De Protagore Sophiea (Giessen, 1827); Sprengel, in his Συμβολή (Stuttgart, 1829), p. 102 sq.; Haken, De Protagore in "Philologus" (Hamburg, 1832), p. 88 sq.; Krische, Forschungen, i, 180 sq.; Frei, Questions Protagores (Bonn, 1845); Weber, Quest. Prot. (Marb. 1850); Bernays, in Rhein. Mus. f. Phil. 1850 (vii), p. 464 sq.; Virgilia, De Prot. Vita et Phil. (Pallardi, Rome, 1792) and (in Plat. Lyr. 425, 5 vols.); and his Hist. of Greece, ch. lviii; Mallet, Etudes Philosopiques, vol. ii; and the literature under Sophists, especially Schanz, Vorhellenische Philosophie (Gottingen, 1867).

Protois and Gervais. Sra., flourished in the first century of the Christian era, and were martyred at Milan towards the year 68. These two brothers were sons of St. Vital and St. Valeria, and their martyrdom appears to have taken place in the last years of the reign of Nero. Their memory was forgotten, until a vision revealed the place of their sepulture to St. Ambrose, when about to dedicate the Cathedral of Milan. The two martyrs were buried in the Church of St. Nabor and St. Felix, and upon the representations of St. Ambrose their coffins were discovered. Their names were plainly inscribed on their coffins, as St. Ambrose announced only what he had learned by revelation. The bones were transferred to the Basilica, and legends report many miracles done by them during their transfer, which from the 6th century was celebrated at Milan and in the African Church. The worship of these two saints spread rapidly in the 7th century in a church at Milan, and they were transferred to that at Paris. This church has been several times restored, and exists yet in that city. The feast of St. Gervais and of St. Proterius is celebrated on the 19th of June.—Hoefr. Novv. Biogr. Générale, a. v. See Bullandus, Acta Synodorum, Jun.; Tillemont, Memoiirs sur les Synodaux et Benedictins; Baillet, Vies des Saints, 19 Jun. See GERVAIS.

Protaosof, Ambrrose, a Russian prelate, distinguished by a talent of oratory unusual in the Russian Church, was born in 1769 at Moscow. He became a monk at twenty-five, and was made archimandrite of a monastery near St. Petersburg; subsequently rector of the seminary of that capital, and in 1804 was invited to the episcopal see of Seula, from whence he was transferred in 1807 to Kazan and Smirsk. He died in 1808 in Tver. His sermons evince a tolerant spirit. Some have been published in Le Maçon de l'Europe, others in Le Fils de la Patrie, but have never been collected in separate form. — Hoefr. Novv. Biogr. Générale, a. v. See Otto, Hist. of Russian Literature, a. v.

Protection of the Church, a sort of right of asylum within or near sacred precincts, which prevailed in 1064 in England from Advent to the octave of Epiphany, from Septuagesima to the octave of Easter, from Ascension to the octave of Pentecost, and Ember weeks, throughout Sunday, on the vigils and feasts of apostles and saints which were hidden on the previous Sunday, All-Saints, the dedication-day of a church, in going to synods, chapters, on pilgrimage, to a consecration, or to church cemeteries.

Protectores Cardinales. Every Roman Catholic state of first rank enjoys the right of being represented in the College of Cardinals at Rome by one or several members who have been exalted to that high dignity as natives or naturalized citizens of that state. At the time of the universal domination of the popes, when the Roman see was mixed in all the political concerns of the European states, and before the permanent office of the nuncio had become the regular channel of communication between Rome and the Catholic rulers, the cardinals were the natural representatives of the ecclesiastical and political interests of their respective countries, and their position was, of course, one of considerable importance. But even in recent times their influence has not entirely vanished; for as they are supposed to be best acquainted with the institutions, manners, customs, and language of the nations they represent, they are more capable of giving the necessary information about the ecclesiastical situation of those nations, they are still, in the different congregations of which they are members, intrusted with the revision of all accounts and reports on the religious affairs of their respective states, but especially of the cardinal, the worthiness of the elected or nominated archbishops and bishops. Hence their name protectores nationum. With these must not be confounded the clerici nationum, or prelates, who occupy in the College of Cardinals the situation of secretaries, and must be alternately French, Spaniards, Germans; nor the cardo-cardinale, i.e. the archbishops and bishops who are proposed for the cardinalate by the ruler of their country, nominated by the pope, and who received the red biretta from the hand of their Catholic sovereign, but must go to Rome to receive the red biretta. The cardo's own hands, the right of cardinals and protectores reside in their metropolitanae, but have a right, on the decease of the pope, to give their vote in the election of his successor, and are themselves eligible to the papacy. As not every country has one of its natives in the College of Cardinals, a cardinal frequently unites in his hands the protectorate of several countries.—Weitzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lex. a. v.

Proterius (also called Bertaros—probably his name, but euphonized into the name by which he is better known), an Eastern prelate of some note because he provoked a schism which continues to the present day in the church of Melchisides (q. v.) and Melchisdech (q. v.). He flourished about the middle of the 6th century, and suffered martyrdom for the Church. He
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had been a priest by Cyril, bishop of Alexandria, who was well acquainted with his virtues. On the death of Cyril, the see of Alexandria was filled by Dioscorus, who, knowing the reputation of Proterius, did all in his power to gain his confidence and interest, that he might, through him, accomplish his designs. But Proterius, in his turn, determined to secure the see of Alexandria. He sent envoys to Jerusalem, with a commission to secure the influences of the Church there. The Church was next his heart, and no worldly preferment could bribe him to forego his duty. Dioscorus, being condemned by the Council of Chalcedon for having embraced the errors of Eutyches, was deposed, and Proterius was chosen to fill the vacant see, and appointed by the emperor to the bishoprick of Alexandria. This occasioned the resurrection of the apostle, and the city was divided into two factions. Much mischief was done on both sides, and Proterius was brought into the most imminent danger. The civil authority was set at naught, violence was resorted to, and men were selected to the office of emperor, and the emperor was selected by the people. Upon the death of Marcian's, the exiles returned to Alexandria, and seemed resolved to be revenged for what they had suffered in the last reign. Timothy, the chief of the conspirators against him, in the absence of Dionysius, seized on the great city of Alexandria, and occupied it, and was eventually expelled by the emperor, and was removed to another see by two bishops of his faction, who had been deposed for heresy. On the return of Dionysius, the incendiary Timothy was driven from the city, which so enraged the Eutychians that they assaulted the house of Proterius, who fled to the neighboring church and took refuge in the baptistery, thinking that the holiness of the place and of the season (for it was Good-Friday) would protect him. But he was pursued to the church, treated with every indignity, murdered in cold blood, and his body was dragged about the city, torn in pieces, burned, and the ashes scattered in the sea. Proterius was so highly esteemed that his writings were collected at once and recommended as profitable for study to the clergy. His memory is celebrated on Feb. 28; possibly on that day, says Neale, because his name was then restored to the diptych. See Neale, Hist. of the East Ch. (Patriarchate of Alez.), ii. 5–13; Fox, Book of Martyrs, p. 77. (J. H. W.)

Protestant Church of Jerusalem. See JERUSALEM.

Protestant Confessions. See Confessions.

Protestant Episcopal Church. This is the legal title of one portion of the Church of Christ which has its local habitation in the United States of America. The first part indicates its position relatively to the Roman Catholic Church, as protesting against the errors and repudiating the claims of that Church to supremacy in doctrine, discipline, and worship; the second part of the title expresses its attitude toward other Christian bodies who have rejected episcopacy on the ground of divine origin, and, therefore, not universal and permanent. The history of the Protestant Episcopal Church is consequently of more than ordinary interest, since, on the one hand, it has been compelled to resist the Roman Catholics and their progress, and, on the other, has been forced to maintain its position among Protestants, without being able to form any union or engage in any concert of action with them. In the present article it will be the writer's aim to give a tolerably full account of the history and progress of this Church, together with some supplementary statements and remarks in regard to its peculiar claims and adaptedness for the great work of evangelizing our country and helping to make the Gospel known throughout the dark places of the earth where heathenism prevails.

I. History.—Here a natural division suggests itself
faith of Christ, and to educate them in accordance with this faith. Mr. G. Thorpe, a man of good parts and breeding, was appointed head of the new institution, and it was confidently hoped and expected that the red men would be taught the true religion and become Christians and members of a civilized community; but a rude shock was given to this hope by the Indians, who, hating and fearing the intruders, as they considered the whites to be, resorted, in 1622, to a bloody massacre; this, it may be noted, would have been complete extermination, had not a Christian Indian disclosed the plot the night before, and thus prevented its entire fulfilment. The deplorable result was, the imbittering the feelings of all towards the Indians and a fierce war of retaliation; so that, for the time, the college, missionary labors, and Christian education were abandoned. In 1626 Virginia became a royal colony, and though its religious concerns were not so zealously looked after as under the charter, yet the people as a whole remained steadfast in their attachment to the Church of England, and their determination to sustain it in every way in their power.

Virginia, too, where many cavaliers sought refuge, was loyal to the exiled monarchy when Cromwell came into power, while New England, on the other hand, sympathized heartily with the "lord protector" and his work. After the Restoration, in 1660, the colonial legislature, under the new governors, gave early attention to the repairs and building of churches, the canonical performance of the liturgy, the ministration of God's word, the baptizing and Christian education of the young, etc. It is, however, safely true that religion had greatly declined among the people; violent contests occurred between the governors and the assembly of the people; the ruling party was intol erant; popular discontent increased; and rebellion actually broke out. So injurious were these disturbances and the wicked passions to which they gave rise that almost of necessity the godly life and conversation declined; and the Church became weakens to such an extent that, it is recorded, out of fifty parishes, nearly all were destitute of glebe, parsonage, church, and minister, and there were not more than ten in holy orders left. In 1665 Rev. James Blair came as missionary to Virginia. Four years later he was appointed commissary of the bishop of London, a position of great responsibility and trust, especially with regard to discipline of both clergy and laity. He also held a seat in the council, and continued at his post as commissary for more than half a century, doing much good and contributing to the advancement of the Church and the good work of the Church. It was through his energetic efforts and well-directed zeal that the College of William and Mary was chartered in 1692. Its design was to provide a college in Virginia for the education of young men and may be furnished with a seminary of ministers of the Gospel; that the youth may be piously educated in good letters and manners; and that the Christian faith may be propagated among the Western Indians, to the glory of Almighty God." Blair became president of this the second college founded in America, and lived to a very advanced age.

The neighboring colony of Maryland, founded in 1634 by lord Baltimore, a Roman Catholic, with some two hundred families and two or more priests of that Church, was not so successful in opening its doors to every person professing to believe in Jesus Christ. The colonial assembly in 1634 declared, in the words of Magna Charta, that "Holy Church within this province shall have all her rights and privileges." Whether by this term was meant the Church of England or not, it is certain that the influence and membership of that Church were greatly extended. The general progress of the colony was so successful that at lord Baltimore's death, in 1676, there were in Maryland ten counties and about sixteen thousand inhabitants, the largest part of whom were Protestants. At this day a letter was addressed to the archbishop of Canterbury by a clergyman named Yeo, complaining of the low state of morals in the colony, and of the fact that the clergy of the Church of England had no settled incomes like their brethren in Virginia, and that consequently their position was such that it was impossible for them to effect good as it ought to be. Efforts were made to induce the proprietary to provide maintenance for the Church; this, however, he wholly refused. Seditious movements thereupon were set on foot against him as being a "papist," and it was maliciously rumored that the Roman Catholics, with the complicity of the Indians, were purposing to massacre the Protestants. On the accession of William of Orange in 1688, a so-called "Protestant revolution" took place, and for three years the government was in the hands of the insurgents. Lord Baltimore having been deprived of his rights as proprietary, a royal governor was sent into Maryland, and in 1692 the Church of England was established by law; the province was divided into thirty parishes, and tithes were imposed for support of the clergy upon every inhabitant, no matter what might be his religious opinions. The Roman Catholics and Quakers opposed this with all their might, and with more or less success. In 1696 new laws were made, which still, however, recognized the Church of England as by law established as entitled to all its rights, privileges, and endowments. The governor and council, with the freedom of the house, begged the bishop of London to send them a commissary at least (since they were not allowed to have a bishop), "to redress what was amiss and supply what was wanting in the Church." Dr. Thomas Bray, a very estimable and truly godly man, was the one chosen to fill this important position. At great personal sacrifice he accepted it. He secured as many pious and devoted clergymen as he could to go with him to America, and was soon enabled to increase the number of those laboring in Maryland from three to sixteen; he also obtained for the new Church a willing and as one step led to another, and as he perceived how great was the need and how important was the result of combined action on the part of the members of the Church, he conceived the noble idea of founding the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, and for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts. The latter was chartered in June, 1701, the former in 1698. Early in March, 1700, Dr. Bray arrived in Maryland, and entered at once with zeal and diligence upon his work. He assembled the clergy, delivered charges, administered the sacraments, and exercised the influence of his office, and the laws passed by the legislature for the settlement and maintenance of the parochial clergy. By this bill it was provided "that the Book of Common Prayer and administration of the sacraments, with the rites and ceremonies thereunto annexed, should be used in the Church of England, the Psalter and Psalms of David, and morning and evening prayer, therein contained, be solemnly read by all and every minister or reader in every church or other place of public worship within this province." Despite some opposition, the king gave the enactment his sanction, and it became law. Although Dr. Bray's stay in Maryland was terminated in 1701, he never ceased his efforts in behalf of the Church there; and it is on record that out of some thirty thousand inhabitants in Maryland at this date, the majority were regular members of the Church of England. The Carolinas and Georgia were among the later colonies in the southern part of America. Several ineffectual efforts had been made from 1630-60 to found settlements in the region of Albemarle Sound; but it was not till after the restoration of Charles II that a body of colonists under the leadership of George Machamer took the task and met with success. "Being excited," as they declared, "by a landable and pious zeal for the propagation of the Gospel, they begged a certain country in the parts of America not yet cultivated and planted, as only by this the honor and blessings of him who has no other pledge of God." This letter allowed
entire freedom of religious opinion, and no one was to be disturbed on these matters by the public authorities. We are sorry to say, however, that, notwithstanding the pious and proper language quoted above, the noble proprietaries made no provision for the spiritual interests of the religious faith of the colonists. The famous John Locke's "grand model" of government (1670) turned out to be a grand failure, and was abolished in 1698. George Fox, the founder of the Quaker denomination, visited Carolina and gave quite an impulse to the peculiar notions in religion which he entertained. The religious condition of the colony at the close of the century was on the whole very unsatisfactory, and ungodliness prevailed to a lamentable extent. Early in the 18th century the majority of the colonists were dissenters, yet acts were passed in 1704-6, establishing the Church of England as the religion of the province. This produced trouble and resistance of course, and was of no real advantage to the Church. The Society for Propagating the Gospel sent missionaries into the Carolinas, and some, though mostly ineffective, struggles were made to stay the floods of ungodliness, fanaticism, and semi-heathenism; it was a hard and almost hopeless contest during the greater part of the century. Georgia owed its origin to Oglethorpe's benevolent designs and efforts from 1732 onward. Religious privileges were freely accorded. The Georgia Assembly decided that the first settlers to arrive should be the clergy. A small company of Jews came also; and a body of Scotch Highlanders founded New Inverness in 1736. At this date, too, John and Charles Wesley were in Georgia. John Wesley was parish minister in Savannah, and for a while matters went on very well and satisfactorily; but ere long the strictness of Wesley in enforcing the rubrics, and the dissatisfaction of the colonists who were very restive under Church discipline, led to dissension and irreconcilable differences; so that Wesley "shook off the dust of his feet," as he phrases it, and left Georgia in 1742. The first Methodist society after came to Georgia, and though he was continually itinerating to and from England and through the northern colonies, stirring up great excitement by his fiery zeal and energy, yet his labors in Georgia as a clergyman of the Church of England met with fair success. The same statement may here be made as in the case of the Carolinas, that missionaries of the Society for Propagating the Gospel did what they could in behalf of religion and the Church; but they were far too few and ill-supported to accomplish much. The religious condition of the colonies, where, as in Virginia, the Church of England was planted at the date of the earliest settlement in America, and where it flourished despite the fact of being deprived of an essential element in the life and growth of the Church, viz. episcopal presence and supervision, we may next glance at the more northerly portion of the continent. New York (formerly New Netherlands) was first colonized by the Dutch in 1615 onward, and of course was in its religious character Presbyterian, like the Hollanders at home. In 1664 it was seized by the English, and became the English part of the colonial empire of England. After a time the Church of England obtained precedence, and for a while was supported by public tax. Trinity Church was founded in New York city in 1698; the Rev. W. Vesey was its first rector, and was also for fifty years commencement of the bishop of London; it is probably the wealthiest church corporation in the United States. New Jersey (New Sweden), in like manner, and the banks of the Delaware from the mouth inland, were settled by Swedes in 1638. In 1655, the Quakers in Delaware had settled Quakers in the colony, and though in religious profession the inhabitants were principally Presbyterians and Quakers, yet there was open toleration to all other Christian believers. Missionaries of the Society for Propagating the Gospel were at an early day earnestly and zealously at work, at several points in New Jersey, and besides the names of Talbot, Beach, and others, that of Dr. T. B. Chandler, of Elizabethown, must ever be held in grateful memory by churchmen. The Protestant Episcopal Church has always been comparatively strong in New Jersey. Pennsylvania was founded by William Penn in 1681-82, and, so far as the Quakers were concerned, to all of every name. It deserves to be mentioned, too, that, as in the early history of Virginia, kindness and gentleness were displayed towards the native tribes, and no Quaker blood was ever shed by the Indians. The first Episcopal Church built in Pennsylvania was Christ's Church, Philadelphia, in 1695; and several points the missionaries of the Society for Propagating the Gospel were, during the early part of the 18th century, actively engaged in preaching the Gospel. Great ungodliness prevailed in all directions, and fanaticism, in its most offensive, hurstful form, displayed itself; but the clergy labored on, amid every discouragement, and their labors were blessed to a large extent. In all the colonial enterprises thus far, as we have seen, the Church of England was allowed a reasonably fair and just privilege of ministering to the wants of its own people, and extending its boundaries and influence, as best it could in accordance with the rights of others. But when we look at New England, and see what treatment the Church met with there, the contrast is striking indeed. Here, as is well known, it met with the first set of theocratic measures in the history of the time Puritans. They were men who had been engaged in long and fierce contentions with the established Church in England. They were men also of stern and unyielding natures, and among them, the leading ones at least, for good reasons, as they held, hated the Church with as nearly a perfect hatred as is possible for man to attain. There was no term in the vocabulary of reproach which they did not heap upon the Church and its clergy and members, as well as its liturgy and services. They refused to allow two clergymen of the Church of England to reside in New England, 1623-24, to preach and labor in any way in their vocation; and the brothers Browne, two of the original patentees of the Massachusetts Bay Company, who desired to enjoy the services of the Church of England, and that too only in a private dwelling, were shipped off in 1629, without ceremony, by Endecott, the governor, on the ground that they were "factious and evil-conditioned." Thus was begun that series of oppressive actions and intolerant disregard of the rights of others which resulted in the judicial murder of the Quakers. In a letter, dated from April 7, 1638, a body of Puritans were embarking from England under Winthrop and Saltonstall, they spoke of themselves as men "who esteem it an honor to call the Church of England, whence we rise, our dear mother; and we cannot part from our native country, where she specially resided, without much sadness of heart, and many tears in our eyes; ever acknowledging that such hope and part as we have obtained in the common salvation we have received in her bosom, and sucked it from her three breasts. And these chosen men and their successors, with strange and painful distinction, have no plain meaning of their words, resolved upon and put in practice intolerance in its most venerable form. They had suffered, as they averred, bitter persecution and grievous wrong in England from the "lord bishops" in authority there, who gave no heed to the scruples and scruples in Church matters; but, so far from showing forth love and gentleness and kindness and liberality as regards other people's consciences, they seem, when the power fell on their own hands, to have become, in all matters relating to their religion, as hardened as the rocks; and, with a spirit of unpiety and hateful as that of the Inquisition itself, they determined that no man, woman, or child, where they had strength to stop it, should ever hold any opinion or have any religious faith which they, the "lord brethren" of New England, did not approve. They fined, imprisoned, or banished
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recusants of all sorts. "God forbid," said they, through Endicott, an impersonation of bigotry, "that our love of truth should be so cold that we should tolerate errors!" They allowed no one who differed from them to live among them. Convicted Anabaptists were "sent in irons," Congregationalists with fanatical violence defied the magistrates and ministers, were sentenced, after the first conviction, to lose one ear; after the second, another; after the third, to have the tongue bored through with a red hot-iron; and several of them were put to death; but in 1661 Church II, by a peremptory order, forbade further outrages of this kind. As to the Indians, though the colonists were under chartered obligation to treat them well and endeavor to convert them to Christianity, these were looked upon as having no rights to be respected, as wolves, savages, heathen, and doomed, like the Canaanites of old, to utter excision as speedily as possible. It was only such men as Roger Williams in Rhode Island, and the estimable John Eliot, the Apostle to the Indians, and the comparatively few who sympathized with them, that helped to relieve New England bigotry and intolerance from being denounced as utterly detestable. The Puritans, in carrying out their principles, organized what they called churches on the same plan of independency as that employed in civil matters. They looked upon themselves as under no restraint, and under no obligation to anyone, or to any "denomination, sect, or mother, the Church of England," and they thought and acted as if they could just as readily have—to use a pet phrase of later days—a church without a bishop as a state without a king. Of course, under such a condition of affairs, and with such antagonism and prejudice against the Church and all appertaining to it, it could make little or no progress in New England; and it is a fact to be noted that for some sixty years after the landing on Plymouth rock there was not a single Episcopal church in all that part of the country. It was not until 1672 that Church II, in the form of a representation of some of the inhabitants through the bishop of London, caused a church to be built in Boston. William of Orange subsequently settled an annual bounty of £100 for endowment.

From this time onward, however, owing to the unwearied and judicious efforts of the Society for Propagating the Gospel, something began to be accomplished, in despite of penal enactments and bitter, uncompromising hatred. Missionaries were sent out to various parts of New England as well as to the other colonies (except Virginia and Maryland); and as they were honest, faithful men, abounding in labors, travelling over large districts, and ministering the Gospel to all whom they met with, they deserve all honor, and their labors were not without fruit. Had the Church of England listened to that supplication for bishops which went up continually and earnestly, and had she been permitted to send out worthy men for the episcopal office, the growth and prosperity of the Church in America would have been vastly greater and more secure: but the ungodly, the capitalists, the hammer condition of the Established Church, and the active opposition of the Puritans in New England and of the dissenters in England as well as their special friends in America, always succeeded in overpowering the cry of the destitute and the numerous and powerful remonstrances of the Society for Propagating the Gospel. At one time there were two nonjurors bishops in America, viz. Dr. R. Walton and Dr. J. Talbot (1722), the former in Philadelphia, the latter in Burlington, N. J.; but they were not allowed to exercise episcopal functions except by the government, when they were placed, with other interference, and put an entire stop to all action on their part. As early as 1704, a missionary of the society took up his residence in Newport, R. I., and continued there nearly half a century. During his ministry, and that of several helpers in the work, he could not but note the depressing effects of schism and heresy, there being then quite as many denominations in Rhode Island as there have been in subsequent days. Bishop Berkeley deserves to be named in this connection for his noble disinterestedness and zeal. In 1725 he entered upon his great philanthropic and Christian enterprise of erecting a college at Charlestown near Providence, for the education of the children of the planters, and suitable ones from among the natives as missionaries in order to convert the savages to Christianity. In 1726 Berkeley was in Rhode Island, and had not the government of Walpole kept him out the £20,000 voted, he would probably have accomplished his beneficent design. The next year he returned to England, and reluctantly gave up his cherished plan. Some eighteen years later he caused to be sent as a gift to the library of Harvard College a very valuable collection of books, containing such authors as Hooker, Pearson, Barrow, Hammond, Clarendon, etc., and these no doubt helped to leave the minds of some in New England, who, weary of the despotism of independency, and grieved and distressed at there being multitudinous sects of all kinds and characters, were disposed to seek and did seek, refuge in the sober, staid, and godly ways of the Church of England. It is also worthy of note here that early in the 18th century, about thirty-five years before Berkeley's donation to Harvard College, a library of books, similar in character and value to those just named, was given to Yale College, and the college was established in New Haven. At this date there was not a single Episcopal Church in Connecticut, and very few families of Church people. There were, however, in this region, several earnest seekers after truth, disenchanted and cheerless in their then position, among whom may be named especially Timothy Cutler, an accomplished scholar, and president of Yale College; Daniel Brown, one of the tutors; and Samuel Johnson, a Congregational preacher at West Haven. These, in company with others in like condition of mind, set to work to examine the books sent to Yale, and felt the need of a Church and doctrines of the apostolic and early Church. The result was, rather to the astonishment and alarm of most of their associates, a thorough conviction on their part that there was no valid ministry except through the laying-on of the hands of a bishop, and that the doctrines set forth in the Prayer-book are the true and full expression of the truth of the Gospel. Of course, Messrs. Cutler and Brown could not stay any longer in Yale College, which neither recognised nor tolerated the Church of England in any shape, but, in common with Congregationalists generally, as well as with others who entertained fears lest the introduction of Episcopal worship into the colony should have a tendency gradually to undermine the foundations of civil and religious liberty. Accordingly these gentlemen resigned their positions, and, accompanied by Mr. Johnson, they sailed for England in November, 1722, were ordained to the ministry, and (except Mr. Brown, who died of small-pox) returned to America as missionaries of the society the following year. Dr. Cutler became rector of Christ's Church, Boston, and Dr. Johnson, who settled at Windsor, Conn. Both of them were among the foremost men in the colonial Church, and were of especial service in defending its claims, warding off attacks, and promoting its growth and welfare. Both, too, lived till nearly the close of the colonial period, Dr. Cutler dying in 1765, Dr. Johnson in 1772. The Church in Connecticut was more than ordinarily blessed, and we find that, prior to the Revolution, it was comparatively vigorous and zealous in good works. The names of Beach, Seabury, Jarvis, Hubbard, and others abundantly evince the activity of churchmen. It may here be stated that down to the outbreak of the Revolution, the Society for Propagating the Gospel maintained, on an average, thirty clergymen in the New England states, and about fifty in the other colonies. One list of churches which was sent home by a missionary in 1748 makes the number in New Hamp-
Shire two, in Rhode Island five, in Massachusetts twelve, in Connecticut seventeen—total, thirty-six. It must be borne in mind that this was placed in the centre of an extensive district, and supplied as far as possible the spiritual wants of the people, whom oftentimes he could reach only by long and even dangerous journeys to and from distant settlements. The Society did all that its means allowed in sending missionaries into the wilderness. This was a direction in which it was already and properly be noted of its work that when it began its operations in the colonies, it found but five churches; and when compelled by the revolt of the colonies to close its labors, it left the country with some two hundred of its clergy. It was the life and soul of the life and growth.

The Church of England in America was peculiarly unhappy in its position just before and at the period of the Revolution. It had no popular favor to fall back upon in those days of trial. It was small in proportion to other Christian bodies, especially in the north, and it was hated and despised by the ill-informed multitude, which regarded it as virtually identical with priestcraft and tyranny. A considerable number of its clergy, particularly those who were English-born, felt compelled by their own convictions to adhere to the cause of the king. The work that was on them and the Church likewise; for when the disputes with the mother country reached that crisis which culminated in the war of the Revolution, there could be no longer any hesitation as to the side which every man must take. The Church was not neutral; it was on the side with the king or with the king's party; he must be a patriot, heart and soul, or he must be branded with and suffer with the odious Tories. The result was the abandonment of their fields of labor by most of the clergy in the employ of the Society for Propagating the Gospel, who found their only safety in flight to England or the British provinces; the closing of nearly all the churches; and, worse than all, the disgraceful ruin and defilement heaped upon many church edifices.

It was none the less hard and unjust to American churchmen to be forced to bear all this in addition to the trials of war, insomuch as it is only simple justice to put it on record, to the perpetual honor of the Church and the vindication of its members against the freely circulated charge of lack of patriotism in the great struggle against the tyranny of the English government. The Church stood forth, in the words of our forefather, the churchman, and the first chaplain of Congress was William White, a clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church.

2. History subsequent to the Revolution, including the full organization and entrance on its work of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States—When, at last, the war was over, and the independence of the United States was acknowledged (1783), it became a matter of immediate concern to those who had heretofore been dependent on England for ordination of clergy, and for efficient and steady help from the Society for Propagating the Gospel, to ascertain what was now to be done. Here they were, few in numbers comparatively; cut off from all direct connection with the English Church; having not even the small comfort of being considered as any part of the Church of London; with no means of helping themselves; no bishops, few clergy, and those scattered over a large surface of country; in great perplexity as to the proper course to be pursued; and reduced pretty nearly to the condition of hopeless uncertainty. In Virginia, for instance, at the beginning of the Revolution, there were 164 churches and chapels and 91 clergymen; at the close of the great struggle a large number of these churches had been destroyed; 95 parishes were extinct or forsaken; of the remaining 72, three-quarters were without parochial Wesley; while of the 91 clergy only 29 remained. But, bad as the state was of affairs, it was not altogether desperate. The great Head of the Church did not abandon his people in their trouble. Those brave and honest men who had tried for years and years to induce the government and Church of England to show a toleration to them were thoroughly conscious that they must not now give up in despair. The mean and paltry reasons of state, and the venal prejudice that had been stirred up from this side of the water against the continuous supplication for a bishop during nearly a century just past—these could not but wear out the patience of the people. There was a new nation in the world, in no wise hampered by any union of Church and State; now it could not be pretended that there was any danger to public liberty from the Episcopal Church having and enjoying what it regards as an essential to its being and growth. To us, at this day, when a century of existence has been granted to the United States, and the Protestant Episcopal Church has proved its right to be what it has now become, it seems almost incredible that it could ever have been seriously urged against that Church that its having bishops of its own was (in some strange, unaccountable way) hurtful and dangerous to liberty and true patriotism. However singular it may appear that such an opinion should prevail among fair-minded, intelligent persons, the fact is indisputable; this opinion did not thrive in the great war; it was not propagated; and when the crisis came, all the new growth and suffering to the Church in America. All that can be said is, that as prejudice is usually utterly unreasonable, and will listen to nothing which militates against its preconceived conclusions, so we have no alternate explanation but that on one side to the Government and protection to the Episcopal Church to this hard, stern prejudice; while it is almost certain that a large part of the opposition arose from settled hatred towards the Church and a determination to prevent its growth and influence. Bishop White's testimony is instructive in this connection. Writing in 1816, he may have seen the wonderful change the author lived to witness in reference to American episcopacy! He remembers the ante-revolutionary times, when the presses profusely emitted pamphlets and newspaper disquisitions on the question whether an American bishop were to be endured; and when threats were thrown out of throwing such a person, if sent among us, into the river, although his agency was advocated for the sole purpose of a communion submitting itself to his spiritual jurisdiction... The order has existed among us for nearly the half of a century, and the ecumenical, and we cannot but be thankful that the Church of England, and the other denominations of our country, have been able to preserve and maintain the constitution of the Church, and to provide for its administration. The Church of England in America was established by law, meetings, consisting of a large number of the clergy and laity, and the state so as to hold and retain its rights of property in churches, glebe lands, etc. A general willingness was expressed of uniting with Episcopal churches in other states; but ground was taken in regard to bishops and their office and position which alarmed the Northern churches. The Virginia nation was to receive a bishop to the lowest possible point, to use him simply for ordaining and confirming, to make him serve as a parish minister, and be amenable to the convention, etc. In Maryland, a special effort was made to secure a bill of rights for the Episcopal Church, for objects similar to those of Virginia: "a declaration of certain fundamental rights and liberties of the Protestant Episcopal Church of Maryland" was set forth; and Dr. William Smith was chosen to go to England for the purpose of obtaining episc...
cogual orders. It may be mentioned here that, for various and sufficient reasons, Dr. Smith did not obtain the proper papers, and was never consecrated. Farther south, a convention, consisting of a small number of clergy and laity, was held in Charleston, S. C., in 1785-86. The feeling against the Church of England was very bitter in that part of the country, which had suffered greatly from the ravages of the British armies. This convention, acknowledging the need of the three orders in the ministry, was willing to go so far as a general approval of union, but stipulated that there was to be no bishop settled in that state without the consent of the convention. In January, 1784, Dr. Beach, of New Brunswick, N. J., made a suggestion to Dr. White, of Philadelphia, and Dr. Provost, of New York, that a conference of as many of the clergy as could be conveniently got together be held, to take into consideration the condition of Church affairs. Previously to this, in August, 1789, before the recognition of American independence, and when it seemed as if the ministry of the Church were almost annihilated, Dr. White had issued a pamphlet, entitled "The Case of the Episcopal Churches in the United States Considered." In which the writer, apprehending the possibility of the Church being compelled to go forward without obtaining the succession from England, advocated the formation of a new body, without bishops in the regular line of succession, but without ordination. This, however, was only in case absolute necessity required such a course, and, as bishop White himself subsequently stated, it was suggested only for such a possible state of affairs. The writer was, in reality, too good a churchman not to embrace joyously the opportunity which was offered three years later of obtaining the succession in the English line. A meeting of several clergymen from New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey, members of the Corporation for the Relief of Widows and Children of Clergymen, was held in New Brunswick, May 11, 1784. At this meeting a number of laymen were also present, and another meeting was appointed for October in the same year in New York. Accordingly, Oct. 6, 1784, some fifteen clergymen from New England, New York, New Jersey, Delaware, and Maryland, and eleven laymen from the same states, assembled in New York. The result of this meeting, besides the making of some important recommendations, such as, that there be a General Convention of the Episcopal Church; that each state send clerical and lay deputies; that the doctrines held by the Church of England be adhered to; that the bishop and the altered order be in full exchange demand, that in any state having a bishop, he be, at the convent, a member of the convention; that the clergy and laity deliberate together, but vote separately, was thus and in quorum; that the first meeting of a general convention be held in Philadelphia on Tuesday before the Feast of St. Michael, in 1785, etc. Probably the most important benefit secured by the action of this body was a recognition of the value and need of lay representation as not only right in itself, but also in admirable harmony with the constitution of a republican form of government. England, on the other hand, was more strongly laid against the having a lay element in Church councils, and for a few years it appeared as if serious discord might arise, and hinder the union of the churches in the several states; but, happily, the point was conceded, though with some reluctance, by the Connecticut bishop and clergy in 1789. One other point of difference existed at the time. The Connecticut sentiment was decidedly in favor of securing a bishop first, and then proceeding to act as a fully organized Church, in passing laws, revising the liturgy, etc., and such was the course adopted in that state. Dr. Samuel Smith, the bishop-elect, meeting with annoying difficulties and delays in England, was consecrated by Scotch bishops, in November, 1784, and, on his return home early in the summer of 1785, entered at once upon his duties as bishop of Connecticut. The churches in the middle and more southern portions of the country held an opposite opinion to that entertained in Connecticut and Massachusetts, and in accordance therewith went forward, and took various steps antecedent to the obtaining of the succession from England. The first meeting of clergy and laity which can properly be considered as approaching to a general convention was held in Philadelphia in September and October, 1785. Seven states were represented by 16 clergymen and 26 laymen. It was hoped that bishop Seabury and some of the New England clergy might be present; but, as their health was precarious, they declined attending. Dr. White was chosen president, and Dr. Griffith, of Virginia, secretary, and the convention proceeded promptly to the work of organization and revision. A plan for obtaining the episcopal succession, and an address to the archbishops and bishops of the Church of England were discussed and agreed upon. These papers were mainly the production of Dr. White, and were manifestly dignified in tone and statement. A draft of alterations of the liturgy, in order to adapt it to the existing condition of civil affairs, and to a considerable extent of consideration, the writer, apprehending the possibility of the Church being compelled to go forward without obtaining the succession from England, advocated the formation of a new body, without bishops in the regular line of succession, but without ordination. This, however, was only in case absolute necessity required such a course, and, as bishop White himself subsequently stated, it was suggested only for such a possible state of affairs. The writer was, in reality, too good a churchman not to embrace joyously the opportunity which was offered three years later of obtaining the succession in the English line. A meeting of several clergymen from New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey, members of the Corporation for the Relief of Widows and Children of Clergymen, was held in New Brunswick, May 11, 1784. At this meeting a number of laymen were also present, and another meeting was appointed for October in the same year in New York. Accordingly, Oct. 6, 1784, some fifteen clergymen from New England, New York, New Jersey, Delaware, and Maryland, and eleven laymen from the same states, assembled in New York. The result of this meeting, besides the making of some important recommendations, such as, that there be a General Convention of the Episcopal Church; that each state send clerical and lay deputies; that the doctrines held by the Church of England be adhered to; that the bishop and the altered order be in full exchange demand; that in any state having a bishop, he be, at the conv...
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and to various features in "the Ecclesiastical Constitution," as it was then arranged. Renewed and distinct assurances were obtained from the American Church that there was no intention whatever on its part of departing from the Church of England in doctrine, or in discipline and worship, except in so far as changed civil relations made it necessary, before the venerable Prelates were willing to part, as was the case.

The three Funder's unpleasant feeling expressed by an examination of several members of the convention (Provoost and R. Smith especially) to throw doubt upon the validity of bishop Seabury's orders, obtained from the line of the Scotch nonconformist, was not appreciated; its good sense and discretion by refusing to take any action inimical to the bishop of Connecticut or his position; a resolution simply was passed advising the churches then represented in convention not to receive ministers ordained by any bishop in America, during the application pending to the English bishops for episcopal consecration. "A General Constitution of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States," freed from some serious former objections, was agreed upon, as also an answer to the letter from the archbishops and bishops of the British Church. By the letter, with the constitution, it was hoped and expected would give entire satisfaction. At an adjourned meeting held in Wilmington, Del., in October, 1786, the letter just before received from the archbishops and bishops, with former letters and resolutions annexed allowing the consecration of bishops for foreign countries, were read, and appropriate action was taken. A declaratory "Act of the General Convention of Clerical and Lay Deputies of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the States of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, and the District of Columbia," authorizing the consecration of bishops for foreign countries, was adopted, and an address was taken. A clergyman voting in its favor. Testimonials were signed in behalf of Dr. White, Dr. Provoost, and Dr. Griffith, bishops elect respectively of Pennsylvania, New York, and Virginia. The convention refused to give a like testimonial in favor of Dr. Alexander, bishop elect of Maryland. On Nov. 2, 1786, Drs. White and Provoost embarked for England, and arrived on the 20th; Dr. Griffith, for personal reasons, was unable to accompany them. Then they reached London, they were unable to have a conference with the American minister, John Adams, who, as bishop White says, in his Memoirs, "in particular, and in every instance in which his personal attentions could be either of use or as an evidence of his respect and kindness, continued to manifest his concern for the interests of a Church of which he was not a member." After some little delay, owing to Parliament not being in session, the consecration took place, Sunday, Feb. 4, 1787, in Lambeth chapel. The two archbishops, and the bishops of Bath and Wells and of Peterborough, united in the solemn act of giving the apostolic succession to the American Church. The new bishops very soon left England for home, and, after a long voyage of seven weeks, arrived in New York on the afternoon of Easter-day, April 7. Thus, at last, was secured for the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States the long and earnestly-sought-for privilege of having its organization rendered complete; thus, too, from this date it took its place as a distinct national branch of the Church of Christ, with all the privileges and duties and responsibilities thereunto attached.

The General Convention of 1789 assembled, July 28, in Philadelphia, bishop White presiding; bishop Provoost was absent. There were present sixteen laymen present from seven states, including South Carolina; but none came from New England. An application was made by the clergy of Massachusetts and New Hampshire, asking for the consecration of the Rev. Edward Bass as bishop. This application was placed on the ground that there were no bishops (the proper canonical number) in America, and that consequently they were fully able to act in the premises. A resolution was unanimously passed "that, in the opinion of this convention, the consecration of the Right Rev. Dr. Seabury and of the other clergy in regard to this general sentiment was strongly in favor of compliance with the request of the Massachusetts clergy. There was, however, an obstacle which hindered this compliance at this time, viz., the obligation which bishops White and Provoost felt themselves to lie under to the English bishops, not to consecrate any to the episcopal office until there were three in the English line in the United States. Dr. Griffith, in May, 1789, relinquished his appointment as bishop elect of Virginia, and died in Philadelphia during the session. Hence, it was thought that there was not the necessary compliance from Massachusetts. A body of canons, ten in number, was adopted; a General Constitution of the Church was agreed upon in substance; an appropriate address was prepared, thanking the archbishops of Canterbury and York for their urgent appeal; an authorizing the consecration of bishops for foreign countries, was adopted, and an address was sent to the President of the United States, which was courteously answered by Washington; and the convention adjourned, August 8, to meet again in the same place, Sept. 29. An important part of the object of this adjourned session was to secure the union of the churches of the United States with those already joined together. This was now happily accomplished. Bishop Seabury appeared, and took his place as a member of the convention, as did also deputies from Connecticut, Massachusetts, and New Hampshire. The third article of the constitution was modified so as to secure to the bishops the right to assemble and act as a separate house, in originating measures, etc.; they also were to have from this time a negative on the action of the lower house, unless adhered to by a four-fifths vote. The bishops then withdrew and organized as a house. Bishop White being absent on account of illness, bishop Seabury took the chair. From this date there have been two houses, whose concurrent action is necessary to the adoption of any legislation, the bishops also (since 1808) having the full negative. The American minister, John Adams, who, as bishop White says, in his Memoirs, "in this particular, and in every instance in which his personal attentions could be either of use or as an evidence of his respect and kindness, continued to manifest his concern for the interests of a Church of which he was not a member." After some little delay, owing to Parliament not being in session, the consecration took place, Sunday, Feb. 4, 1787, in Lambeth chapel. The two archbishops, and the bishops of Bath and Wells and of Peterborough, united in the solemn act of giving the apostolic succession to the American Church. The new bishops very soon left England for home, and, after a long voyage of seven weeks, arrived in New York on the afternoon of Easter-day, April 7. Thus, at last, was secured for the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States the long and earnestly-sought-for privilege of having its organization rendered complete; thus, too, from this date it took its place as a distinct national branch of the Church of Christ, with all the privileges and duties and responsibilities thereunto attached. The English liturgy was made the basis, and though entire independent action was claimed by the House of Deputies, as if there were no book of any authority or obligation now in existence, yet there was, after all, a sense of the propriety and fitness of varying as little as possible from the Book of Common Prayer of the Church of England. Five committees were appointed, to whom were assigned different portions of the work, and they discharged their duties with as much expedition as was practicable. The result, as soon as agreed upon by the house, was sent to the bishops for their action. The alterations were principally verbal, and for the purpose of adapting the Services to the needs and uses of a Church situated as the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States was and is. An office of Visitation of Prisoners, a service for Thanksgiving Day, and an order of Family Prayer were added, as also Selections of Psalms to be used instead of those for the day, and some parts of the Psalms, and some hymns in metre. One noticeable change was made in the Communion Office, i.e. putting in their proper place the oblative and the invo-
PROTESTANT EPISC. CHURCH 676 PROTESTANT EPISC. CHURCH
cation of the Holy Spirit, as found in the first Prayer
book. The Act also established the Episcopal Com-
mission, this was due mainly to bishop Seabury, who
was under some degree of a pledge to the Scottish bish-
ops to secure this change, if possible. The meekness
and wisdom of bishop White were clearly evident in
this matter, as in everything. He was always ready to
yield where principle was not violated, and he puts it
on record that his discussions with bishop Seabury were
entirely amicable and satisfactory to both parties. "To
this day," he says, "there are recollected with satisfac-
tion the hours which were spent with bishop Seabury on
this subject before him, and especially the Christian temper which he manifested all along." The Apostles' and Nicene Creeds were
adopted with hearty assent by the convention. A rub-
ic was prefixed to the former, as follows: "And any
churches may omit the words 'he descended into hell,' or
may, instead of them, use the words 'he went into the
place of departed spirits,' which are considered as words of
the same meaning in the Creed." Bishop Seabury
desired much to have the Athanasian Creed inserted,
not as obligatory on all, as in the Church of England,
but as a choice, as in the Scotch Church, which was.
bishop White states, the House of Deputies "would not
allow of the creed in any shape." The consideration of
the "Articles of Religion" was postponed to a subse-
quent convention. The Book of Common Prayer was
formally ratified by the bishops, clergy, and laity in co-
nvention June 16, 1789: "This Convention has in
their present session, set forth A Book of Common
Prayer, and Administration of the Sacraments, and oth-
er Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, do hereby estab-
lish the said Book; and they declare it to be the Lit-
urgy of this Church, and require that it be received as
such by all the members of the same; and this Book
shall be in use from and after the first day of October,
in the year of our Lord one thousand seven hundred
and ninety." A number of canons were passed in re-
gard to episcopal visitations, publishing a list of the
clergy, observance of the Lord's day, etc. The conse-
cratior of Dr. Bass was deferred. Dr. Madison, of Vir-
ginia, was consecrated bishop in England, Sept. 19,
1790; and thus the full number of bishops was secured
through the English line. Two years later the conse-
cration of Dr. Coke, as bishop of Maryland, united
both lines in the American episcopate, bishop Seabury
being present and joining in the solemn act.
The convention of 1792 met in New York Sept. 11.
There were five bishops, nineteen clerical and fourteen
laity deputies, who had been chosen in the elections of
the year, which met first in the city of New York, on
the 1st of July. The Ordinal was revised and set forth, the alter-
ations being few. An alternate form at the ordination
of priests was furnished; instead of "Receive the Holy
Ghost for the office and work of a priest in the Church
of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of
our hands; whom thou dost forgive, they are for-
given; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are re-
tained. And be thou," etc.; the bishop ordering is al-
lowed to say, "Take thou authority to execute the office
of a priest in the Church of God, now committed to
thee by the imposition of our hands; whom thou dost
forgive," etc. The consideration of the Articles was further pos-
poned. An act was passed "for supporting mission-
ares to preach the Gospel on the frontier of the
United States," in which it was recommended that
annual sermons be preached in all the churches, that
collections be made, and missionaries be sent out as
soon as may be, these being under the canonical jurisdic-
tion of the bishop of Pennsylvania. "Agreeably to
the requirement of a canon adopted at the last con-
vention, a list of the clergy of the Church is printed in
the book. Including the bishops, the number given is one hundred and eighty-four, no
lists having been handed in from New Hampshire and
Massachusetts, and there being no mention of the num-
ber of clergymen at that time in North Carolina and
on the Western frontiers. With every allowance there
would not have been more than the half of the repre-
sentatives of nearly two thousand who, with English
orders, had labored on the American continent since its
earliest attempted settlement, two hundred and fifty
years before" (Perry). One other matter deserves to
be put on record here, not only because of the impor-
tance of the object had in view, both as regards one
of the most influential denominations in the United
States and the Protestant Episcopal Church, but also
because of the entire failure at that date of so earnest
and truly Catholic a movement. We give it in the
original language, which was communicated to the author, on their journey from Phila-
delphia to New York, a design which he had at much at
heart—that of effecting a reunion with the Method-
ists; and he was so sanguine as to believe that by an
accommodation to them in a few instances, they would
be induced to give up their peculiar dogs of war and
come to the leading parts of the doctrine, the wor-
ship, and the discipline of the Episcopal Church. It
is to be noted that he had no idea of comprehending
them, on the condition of their continuing embodied,
as at present. He refers to an interview with Dr.
Coke, an intercourse held with Dr. Coke, one of the su-
perintendents of that society which might have shown
to bishop Madison how hopeless all endeavors for such
a juncture must prove. Nevertheless, he persisted in
his well-meaning design. The result of this was his in-
troducing a proposition for the union of the two
bodies, which his brethren, after some modifications, ap-
proved of the motive, but expecting little as the result of it,
conceived to send to the other house." The proposi-
tion (as given by bishop White) was placed on a broad
and liberal basis, leaving most of matters to future
discussion and settlement at a subsequent convention.
"On the reading of this in the House of Clerical and
Lay Deputies, they were astonished, and considered it
as altogether preposterous; tending to produce distrust
of the stability of the system of the Episcopal Church,
without the least prospect of embracing any other re-
ligious body. The members generally stated, as a mat-
ter of indifference, that they would permit the with-
drawing of the paper, and no notice to be taken of it.
A few gentlemen, however, who had got some slight in-
formations, thought, in the whole, that it did not in
Dr. Coke's mind, the author, who would have been gratified by an ac-
accommodation with the Methodists, and who thought
that the paper sent was a step in measures to be taken
to that effect, spoke in favor of the proposition. But it
was not adopted, and we drew it, agreeably to leave given."
Bishop White gives, in addition, the letter of Dr. Coke, and an account of
several interviews had with him. The letter is an in-
structive one in many respects, and shows what Dr.
Coke thought of his supposed "episcopal" character,
derived from John Wesley; bishop White's remarks
and statements also are worthy of grave consideration.
The subject has been more than once agitated, and
sometimes men have become sanguine of being able to
effect the end desired; but as the question of ordina-
tion still remains obscure, and it was on the 23rd of
May, and the Methodist ministers almost certainly
not be brought to acknowledge the obligation of being
ordained by our bishops in order to officiate in our
churches, we apprehend that there never has been any
real probability of bringing the Methodists to a sense
of the duty and propriety of becoming reunited to the
Church at whose altar John Wesley always ministered,
and which he at least was never willing to abandon.
Owing to the prevalence of epidemic disease in Phila-
delphia and its vicinity, the convention of 1798 was
not held, but then adjourned. Another conven-
tion was held in 1798. A special convention, how-
ever, met in Philadelphia, June 11, 1799. Eight states
were represented, nineteen clerical and ten lay deputies
being present. Bishop Seabury, who had died in 1786,
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was succeeded by bishop Jarvis, consecrated Sept. 18, 1797. Dr. R. Smith was made bishop of South Carolina in 1795, and Dr. Bass of Massachusetts in 1797. At this convention an attempt was made to obtain its approval of Dr. U. Ogden, bishop elect of New Jersey; but the electors withdrew and Dr. Jarvis, bishop of New York, was elected in their place. Eight years later Dr. Jarvis joined the Presbyterians. A proposition was made to hold General Convention every five years; a form of consecration of a church or chapel was set forth; and seventeen articles were reported and read. These were ordered to be laid over, and printed in the journal. The electors withdrew and the convention adjourned without the election of any bishop, and twelve clergymen. At the convention of 1801, held at Trenton, N. J., Sept. 8, it was announced that bishop Provost had resigned his jurisdiction as bishop of New York. Under the circumstances it was deemed right to consecrate Dr. Benjamin Moore as his assist ant, the principle being distinctly stated that bishop Provost was bishop during his life, and that bishop Moore was simply assistant or coadjutor, competent to all episcopal duty, but still to act in concurrence with bishop Provost. The principal work of the convention was the journal of the convention and the articles of religion. The printing of the seventeen articles, in the journal of 1799, produced one good result, viz., showing how difficult it was and would be to agree upon a new set of articles for the Protestant Episcopal Church, and that the entire matter was reduced to the reading acceptance of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England. It was bishop White's view that these articles were really "the acknowledged faith of the Church" all along, and that the safest and most satisfactory course was to make certain necessary changes, arising out of the actual condition of affairs, and then to adopt the Thirty-nine entire. This was accordingly done, and, as bishop White states, the articles "were adopted by the two houses of convention, without their altering even the obsolete diction in them..." The change of the general situation had rendered necessary." Article VIII was amended by leaving out the Athenian Creed. Article XLI, on general councils, was omitted, the reason being given in a note, "because it is partly of a local and civil nature, and is provided for, as to the remaining parts of it, in other articles." The XXXIVth Article, on the homilies, was retained, with a note added suspending "the order for the reading of said homilies in churches until revision of them may conveniently be made, for the clearing of them, as well from obsolete words as from distortion of thought." The article XXXVI was altered so far as to set forth that the ordinal of 1792 contained the Church's views and principles on this important point. Article XXXVII in the English Prayer-book was omitted, and a new one substituted, "Of the Power of the Civil Magistrate." The articles as a whole were then ratified by both houses of convention, and they have ever since held their place in the Prayer-book and standards of the Church. Bishop White's remarks, in this connection, deserve to be quoted: "The object kept in view, in all these changes, was the perpetuating of the Episcopal Church on the ground of the general principles which she had inherited from the Church of England; and of not separating from them, except so far as either local circumstances required, or some very important cause rendered proper. To those acquainted with the system of the Church of England, it must be evident that the object here stated was accomplished on the ratification of the Articles." 8. History of the Protestant Episcopal Church since the beginning of the century. — The standard of the Church having thus been adopted and, so to speak, in the final setting-forth of the Book of Common Prayer, its history and progress since that date are those of a completely organized branch of the Catholic Church. That it did not at once expand itself and cover the land is simply true, and that it has had in later years its times of sore trial and despondency is equally true. There was unhappily in the early part of the century a lack of thorough education in Church principles; there were the prevalence of sectarianism, jealousy felt by the various Protestant denominations, the sleepless enmity of the Roman Catholic Church; and the last years of the French Revolution and the Napoleonic Wars were sufficient to create in the Protestant Episcopal Church, and wide-spread ungodliness on every hand, resulting in spiritual torpor and almost death. For a time it seemed (as Dr. Hawks says of Virginia) as if naught but "gnominy darkness" enveloped the Church. By a strange combination of circumstances, the act of the legislature of New Jersey in 1808 for confounding the glebes and Church property, which was resisted on the ground of being clearly illegal, became law by the death of the presiding judge in the court of appeals the night before he was to deliver the decision, all written out, securing to the Church its just rights. The effect upon the Church in Virginia was fearful and well-nigh disastrous, especially in the ruin and utter abandonment of church edifices and the dying-out of religion in every shape among the people. Even when, in 1814, a brighter day began to dawn, "the Church at the time was the 'New York and New England Church.' Bishop Keppler was elected to show the presence of but seven clergymen and seventeen laymen. We look back upon the past, and are struck with the contrast. Seven clergymen were all that could be convened to transact the most important measure for the restoration of the Church, which was called upon to perform, and in this a territory where once more than ten times seven regularly served at the altar. We look back still farther, and find the Church, after the lapse of two hundred years, numbering as many ministers as she possessed at the close of the first eight years of her existence" (Hawks). In Maryland and its neighbor Delaware, matters were hardly any better. "In 1808 there was a spirit of indifference to religion and the Church too extensively prevalent in the parishes; nearly one half of them were vacant; and, in some, all ministerial support had ceased. Some few of the clergy had deserted their stations; and of the residue, several, disheartened and embarrassed by inadequate means of living, had sought subsistence in other states. Infidelity and fanaticism were increasing; and, on the whole, there never was a time when ministers were more needed, or when it was more difficult to obtain them" (Hawks). Such was the state of things in general at the South in the early part of the 19th century. Further North, in New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, and much of New England, the prospects were more promising. Thomas Jefferson, Henry Hobart as assistant to bishop B. Moore of New York, May 29, 1811, and of Alexander Viets Griswold for the eastern diocese (i.e. Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New Hampshire, and Vermont) at the same date, were indications of healthy growth. The former became especially prominent, during his episcopate of nearly twenty years, as the representative of what are called "High-Churchmen" in the Protestant Episcopal Church, and his influence on the character, claims, and position of the Church in the United States, in the estimate of his contemporaries, and in the estimation of the Christian bodies among whom he lived, can hardly be overvalued. No one could possibly, or did, misunderstand him, and he was so resolute withhold in the open avowal of his principles and convictions, and so ready to defend them on all occasions, even that "unchurching" dogma, as many like to call it, that it may be said the bishop or clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church...
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has ever done so much as John Henry Hobart in defining the position and claims, and educating, so to speak, the whole Church to the adoption of fixed and settled views on this important subject. Bishop Hobart's personal character and devotion to his work, his unquestionable purity of purpose, in all that he has said, his all too long free and cordial correspondence with bishop White (whom no one ever charged with being a High-Churchman), strengthened, undoubtedly, his influence, and even those who differed with him, and represented what are called 'Low-Church' views and principles, could not but respect a high consideration and a devout veneration of principles to which they were, with equal conscientiousness, totally opposed. It is not, probably, too much to affirm that the steadfast adherence of the Protestant Episcopal Church to its standards of doctrine, discipline, and worship, and its fixed and often expressed determination (through the General Convention and its action), never to recede from its attitude towards either Rome or Protestants of various names, are due in great measure to the labors, teaching, and publications of bishop Hobart, and the large number of clergymen and laymen who have been educated in the Church principles with which his name is associated.

The action of the General Convention, from this time onward, has been devoted to legislating for the best interests of the Church, and as far as possible to taking such steps as would promote the welfare of the Church, in God's blessing, under the practical guidance of the Church, which is to promote the increase of faith and holy obedience, to guard against the intrusion of error and unsound doctrine, and to place various matters of doubt or difference of opinion on such a footing that the largest tolerance be allowed, in these respects, consistent with preserving the faith once delivered to the saints and the maintenance of apostolic truth and order. In 1804 a "Course of Ecclesiastical Studies" was set forth by the bishops, and it still remains in its original shape, notwithstanding that many and valuable works, in the several branches of the Church, have since been published, and are in use in our seminaries and schools of divinity. The General Convention of 1871, in its canon on examinations for orders, says: "In all these examinations reference shall be had, as closely as possible, to the course of study established by the House of Bishops, and to the books therein recommended, or equivalent works of more recent date." In 1808 the bishops, in a message to the House of Deputies, who had asked for the enactment of the English canon concerning marriages, expressed their doubts as to the propriety of enacting the canon. In 1837 and 1846 there were two reports of committees presented on this subject, the majority adverse to legislation, the minority in favor of enacting the canon. Thus the matter stands, the civil law being supreme, except in regard to marriage of divorced persons, which is as follows: "No minister of this Church shall knowingly, after due inquiry, solemnize the marriage of any person who has had a divorced husband or wife still living, if such husband or wife has been put away for any cause arising after marriage; but this canon shall not be held to apply to the parties who are only divorced from another country, by a foreign or ecclesiastical authority of any foreign country." The result of this declaration was, some twelve years later in Vermont, where the Society for Propagating the Gospel had formerly owned lands, "that all the material points of law were settled in favor of the Church." —At this session also the constitution of the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society of the Church was perfected, and the American Church has since done much —though not so much as it might and ought to have done— in preaching the Gospel in the East, and in the West, and in the South, west of the Appalachian mountains, and in the North, west of the Allegheny mountains. The result of this Church has been to extend the light of Christian truth and power to heathen lands and peoples. From this date the Church seems to have experienced more fully than before the goodness and grace of God in sending his grace upon it, and to have given plain indications of healthy increase in the Church throughout the country. Following the uniform plan, adopted under bishop White's gentle but firm guidance and influence, of keeping clear of entanglements, the convention, in 1820, refused to allow the officiating of persons not regular members of the Church, by the priests of the Protestant Episcopal Church. —In 1814 the subject of a theological seminary was discussed, and the need of such an institution began to be evident. Three years later its organization was resolved upon, and initiatory measures were adopted. Its officers, course of study, etc., were finally agreed upon in 1820, and it began its work. The seminary is situated in New York, and the next year it was finally established as "The General Theological Seminary of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States." By this action, however, it was distinctly understood that there was to be no hindrance to any seminary or diocese establishing a separate institution of its own. The bishops exercise the wisdom of this policy of non-interference; for, in consequence of the vast extent of territory of the United States, it is found to be simply impossible to gather all the candidates for orders in the Church within the walls of the seminary in New York. We may mention here that there are divinity schools or seminaries in Massachusetts, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Virginia, Ohio, Wisconsin, and other Western states and dioceses. At this convention the identity of the Protestant Episcopal Church with the Church of England was declared in the following terms: "It has been correctly stated to the House of Bishops that on questions in reference to property devised, before the Revolution, to congregations belonging to the 'Church of England,' and to uses connected with that name, some doubts have been entertained in some parts of the Church; and, when the two names have been applied, the House think it expedient to make the declaration, and to request the concurrence of the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies therein, that 'The Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America' is the same body heretofore known in these states by the name of 'The Church of England; the change of name, although not of religious principle in doctrine, or in worship, or in discipline, being induced by a characteristic of the Church of England, supposing the independence of Christian churches generally, can be published, and are in use in our seminaries and schools of divinity. The General Convention of 1871, in its canon on examinations for orders, says: "In all these examinations reference shall be had, as closely as possible, to the course of study established by the House of Bishops, and to the books therein recommended, or equivalent works of more recent date."
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diocese may venture to do in such cases in the way of inviting ministers of various sorts into their churches, it is always to be borne in mind that they do it of their own will and pleasure, and in violation of the canon which they have promised to obey. As a further illustration of the Church policy it may be added that, in 1823, an offer was made by the Colonization Society that the Episcopal Church should send a delegate to act with that society in its benevolent plans. It was deemed inexpedient to accept the offer, because holding that the objects of this society were "more of a political nature, and not in harmony with the principles of our Church," Bishop Chase in his "Plan for Shortening the Morning Service", in respect to the Psalmist, the Lessons, Litany, etc., and also for improving and rendering more effective the confirmation service in the Prayer Book. Quite unexpectedly, considerable excitement followed this proposal, and three years later, when the sense of the state conventions became known as adverse to any changes in the services, the plan was quietly dismissed from all further consideration. So strong is the conservative element in the councils of the Church that no attempt was made to make any changes in the Prayer Book, which had become a part of the life of the Church. Among the clergy who were devout and zealous in their duty, many would gladly welcome a permission of the Church to make changes in the services, as well as in the discipline of the Church, with a view to the improvement of the Church in its service to the world.

In the "Great West", as it is used to be called, the Church had a work of extraordinary interest and importance to perform. The rapid filling-up of the states west of the Alleghenies, and the fact that in the race for life and increase of wealth and power, religion, in any and every form, was almost wholly ignored, caused no little anxiety and concern to thoughtful men in the Church, who saw the need of not only more, but better, work in the West. It was clearly seen that if the Church were to be abandoned to chance efforts and the zeal of a few religious men here and there, the result would be that that portion of the country would grow up into might and wealth virtually heathen or infidel, and would be without the restraining bonds of Christian faith and morals, and the civilizing and elevating influences of the Gospel of Christ. In the good providence of God, there was a man, named Philander Chase, whose heart was turned in this direction. After considerable experience in missionary labor, he was chosen to be the first bishop in the West. He determined to give himself to the work of an evangelist in that part of the United States. His labors were blessed, and he seemed to be the very man for the work to be done; hence, in 1819 he was consecrated bishop of Ohio. Every kind of labor and toil came upon him, but he bore up under it all. Yet the deep consciousness that, if the Gospel was to be preached, there must be men to do it—men, too, educated and trained for this special work, in a new country and among new settlers—pressed heavily upon his mind, and caused him to resolve anxiously what he was to do in such a state of affairs. He concluded to visit England, and to beg for means to found a college and seminary in Ohio for the education of young men for the ministry. The voyage was undertaken (though its expediency was doubted by many), and Bishop Chase obtained in all some thirty to forty thousand dollars in aid of his much-cherished object. He returned home in July, 1824, and during the next two years was busily engaged in laying the foundation of Kenyon College and the Theological Seminary at Gambier (both names being derived from prominent donor of money to the cause). For ten years he labored in the ministry, not only as president of the college, but also as bishop of Ohio. This was in September, 1831, and the case of his resignation of the diocese came before the General Convention of 1832. The House of Bishops pointedly censured the Church for having under such circumstances; but, in order that the Church should not suffer harm, the bishops united with the other House in approving the election of Dr. C. P. Mallivaine, who was consecrated bishop of Ohio, Oct. 31, 1832. Bishop Chase, we may mention here, continued his church work, and was invited to the Church at Lambeth in 1835. He visited England again, received further liberal donations in aid of the cause of Christian education, and founded another institution, which he called Jubilee College. For this he obtained, in 1847, a charter of incorporation from the state of New York. Even to the Pacific Ocean, there are heralds of the cross engaged in its sacred vocation. The episcopate, since 1835, has been coextensive with the boundaries of the United States; and the Church, in its complete organization, has been, and is, striving to bring men to the knowledge of God, and the salvation of their souls.

The venerable William White, in the fiftieth year of his episcopate, was called away to his rest, July 17, 1866. His name will ever be held in grateful memory by the Church in America, as well for the long-continued and earnest labors in its behalf which he was permitted to perform, as for the wisdom and judgment of his counsels on all occasions during a life extended far beyond the ordinary limit allotted to man. Meekness and gentleness, a large-hearted liberality, a spirit of genuine toleration, a willingness to yield for peace sake in all matters where principles of religion are not to be involved—these and the like qualities fitted him admirably for the station he was called upon, in God's providence, to fill; and we may with reverent thankfulness trace the indications of God's goodness and mercy to his Church in America, that such a man was raised up to take large share in its early struggles and history, and to live to so great an age as to see the "little one become a thousand," and the grain of mustard-seed grow up, and become a tree, and shoot out great branches. Bishop White's biographer and intimate friend, Dr. B. H. Latrobe, who occupied the same position in his Church as the former did in his, has given us the Church divines, as they were called in England, of the established Church in that country," and the good bishop has been claimed as representing that portion of the clergy in the Protestant Episcopal Church to whom the same title has been applied in England, of the Church, bishop White was not what is termed a "High-Churchman"; for, though he was on terms of great intimacy with bishop Hobart (of whom we have before spoken), and entertained for him warm affection and sincere respect, yet he was never willing to express his assent to all the views of bishop Hobart on the subjects of the ministry, and the necessity of the apostolic succession in order to constitute a lawful ministry in the Church. He held episcopacy to be of divine origin, and therefore, of course, the best form and mode of Church government; but, in view of the condition of the Protestant
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"it is exceedingly desirable that the minds of such persons should be calmed, their anxieties allayed, and the Church disburied of the charge of holding, in her Articles, the sacrament of the Lord's Supper under the emblems of bread and wine. All the views and opinions expressed in said Oxford writings, and should thus be freed from a responsibility which does not properly belong to her." But the house did not agree to any of the resolutions offered in this shape. It was, however, finally "Resolved, That the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies consider the Liturgy, Office, and Articles of the Church sufficient exponents of the essence of the essential doctrines of Holy Scripture; and that the canons of the Church afford ample means of discipline and control over all who depose from iniquity." Further, that the General Convention is not a suitable tribunal for the trial and censure of, and that the Church is not responsible for, the errors of individuals, whether they are members of this Church or otherwise." Thus the house disposed of the question; and the bishops, on their part, in compliance with certain memorials sent to them, gave expression to their godly counsel and warning in the pastoral letter which was soon after issued. In December, 1844, bishops Meade, Otey, and Elliott made a formal protest against the action of the Synod of New York, "as being guilty of immorality and impurity." The trial was held in the city of New York. There were seventeen bishops present, constituting the court, viz. P. Chase, Brownell, Ives, Hopkins, Smith, McVeyaine, Doane, Kemper, Polk, Delaney, Judson, Whitingham, Lee, Long, Bishop, and Freeman; also the three presenters, and bishop Onderdonk as respondent. The trial began December 10, and was continued from day to day till January 3, 1845, when bishop Onderdonk was pronounced guilty by eleven votes, and sentenced to suffer the loss of his bishop and from all the functions of the sacred ministry. Bishop Onderdonk protested in the strongest terms his innocence, and published a Statement of Facts and Circumstances in regard to his trial. It may be mentioned that the condemned bishop never acknowledged himself to be in any wise guilty (died 1861). The "Prayer of the Diocese of New York to the House of Bishops for relief from sufferings consequent upon the sentence of the Episcopal Court, January, 1845," was made September 25, 1850; but this and all other efforts put forth to have a compromise effected, and a new canon having been adopted applicable to the case of a diocese with a suspended bishop, Dr. J. M. Wainwright was consecrated provisional bishop of New York, in November, 1852. During these years, since the General Convention of 1844, the trallactary controversy gradually subsided. In 1866, a new vote was taken, and nearly everything had been said which could be said. A number of eminent men in the Church had put their views into written shape (as Jarvis, Seabury, Hawks, McVeyaine, Hopkins, Smith, and others); and after a while, the storm was lulled, the atmosphere became purified, and the Church was gladdened with a return of sunshine and comparative peace and quiet.

The disturbed condition of the country, in consequence of the succession from the Union of several of the Southern states, caused no little anxiety to the hearts of many of the Church's members, lest the Protestant Episcopal Church too, should suffer harm in the great and terrible struggle which had been begun in 1860-61, and was to be fought out to the bitter end. It was but natural that the bishops in the Southern dioceses should begin to meet and act separately, as if the dismemberment of the United States was a completed fact. They did so by organizing a council, framing a constitution and canons, etc.; and for a time there was grave apprehension lest the Church should be deprived of its union and communion as heretofore. The General Convention of 1862 met in New York, with much reduced numbers, of course; and this subject came before the convention, and was fully debated. Resolu-
choirs, additional vestments freely used in some churches, and such like; and they recommended the appointment of three bishops, three presbyters, and three laymen to consider and report upon these matters to the convention then in session. Such a committee, consisting of able and well-tried men, was appointed, and, through bishop Whittingham and Dr. W. C. Mead on behalf of the committee, reported a "covenant of ritual. In this proposed law it was inserted that "this Church recognizes no other law of ritual than such as it shall itself have accepted or provided;" and the provisions for ritual in this Church were stated to be (1) the Book of Common Prayer, with the offices and orders there contained; (2) the laws of the Church of England in use in the American provinces before 1780, and not subsequently superseded, altered, or repealed by legislation, general or diocesan, of this Church; (3) the legislative or judicial action or decisions of this Church in its conventions, general or diocesan, or by its duly constituted authorities. Animated discussions followed in the House of Deputies. Amendments and substitutes were proposed again and again, and though the House of Bishops passed the canon reported by the joint committee, the lower house did not see fit to agree to the compromise. It was attempted to postpone indefinitely the whole matter, but without success. The favorers of ritualism endeavored to get the convention committed to some action in accordance with their views; the opponents of the movement were equally eager in seeking to obtain legislation directly condemnatory of numerous acts and observances peculiar to the ritualistic party. A very prominent advocate of the system (Dr. De Koven, of Wisconsin) made a speech against the canon as adopted by the House of Bishops. He called strange and even offen- sive the language in support of his sentiments and opinions, and challenged any one who pleased so to do to present him for trial, he having boldly adopted and uttered as his own the words of one of the most ultra-ritualists in England: "I believe in the real, actual presence of our Lord, under the form of bread and wine, upon the altars of our churches. I myself adore, and would, if it were necessary or my duty, teach my people to adore, Christ present in the elements under the form of bread and wine." The discussions, though exciting and continued from day to day, were conducted with good temper and general fairness. As on the whole, where neither side in a controversy is willing to yield, it is usually found to be the easiest way to get out of present difficulty to pass some comprehensive resolutions, which may mean more or less according to the manner in which the days of the day are divided. Such was the case. It passed the course now adopted. It was finally "Resolved, that the House of Bishops concurring, that this convention hereby expresses its decided condemnation of all ceremonies, observances, and practices which are fitted to express a doctrine foreign to that set forth in the authorized standards of this Church. Resolved, That, in the judgment of this house, the paternal counsel and advice of the right reverend fathers, the bishops of the Church, are deemed sufficient, at this time, to secure the suppression of all that is irregular and unseemly, and to promote greater uniformity in conducting the public worship of the Church and in the administration of the holy sacraments." Thus, as we have intimated above, the real question at issue was postponed rather than ad- judicated. Ritualism went on its course with additional vigor and confidence, and its opponents became more and more dissatisfied with the existing state of things. Consequently the struggle, as was to be expected, was renewed again when the General Convention met in New York in October, 1874. Memorials were presented from various quarters on this subject, resolutions were introduced bearing directly upon it, and legislation was earnestly called for in order to restrain what was termed excess of ritual in the public service of the Church. In the House of Deputies the question of confirmation of the bishop elect (Dr. G. F. Seymour) of Illinois came up. He was charged with being an active member of the ritualistic party, but the advances of three bishops, three presbyters, and three laymen to consider and report upon these matters to the convention then in session. Such a committee, consisting of able and well-tried men, was appointed, and, through bishop Whittingham and Dr. W. C. Mead on behalf of the committee, reported a "covenant of ritual. In this proposed law it was inserted that "this Church recognizes no other law of ritual than such as it shall itself have accepted or provided;" and the provisions for ritual in this Church were stated to be (1) the Book of Common Prayer, with the offices and orders there contained; (2) the laws of the Church of England in use in the American provinces before 1780, and not subsequently superseded, altered, or repealed by legislation, general or diocesan, of this Church; (3) the legislative or judicial action or decisions of this Church in its conventions, general or diocesan, or by its duly constituted authorities. Animated discussions followed in the House of Deputies. Amendments and substitutes were proposed again and again, and though the House of Bishops passed the canon reported by the joint committee, the lower house did not see fit to agree to the compromise. It was attempted to postpone indefinitely the whole matter, but without success. The favorers of ritualism endeavored to get the convention committed to some action in accordance with their views; the opponents of the movement were equally eager in seeking to obtain legislation directly condemnatory of numerous acts and observances peculiar to the ritualistic party. A very prominent advocate of the system (Dr. De Koven, of Wisconsin) made a speech against the canon as adopted by the House of Bishops. He called strange and even offen- sive the language in support of his sentiments and opinions, and challenged any one who pleased so to do to present him for trial, he having boldly adopted and uttered as his own the words of one of the most ultra-ritualists in England: "I believe in the real, actual presence of our Lord, under the form of bread and wine, upon the altars of our churches. I myself adore, and would, if it were necessary or my duty, teach my people to adore, Christ present in the elements under the form of bread and wine." The discussions, though exciting and continued from day to day, were conducted with good temper and general fairness. As on the whole, where neither side in a controversy is willing to yield, it is usually found to be the easiest way to get out of present difficulty to pass some comprehensive resolutions, which may mean more or less according to the manner in which the days of the day are divided. Such was the case. It passed the course now adopted. It was finally "Resolved, that the House of Bishops concurring, that this convention hereby expresses its decided condemnation of all ceremonies, observances, and practices which are fitted to express a doctrine foreign to that set forth in the authorized standards of this Church. Resolved, That, in the judgment of this house, the paternal counsel and advice of the right reverend fathers, the bishops of the Church, are deemed sufficient, at this time, to secure the suppression of all that is irregular and unseemly, and to promote greater uniformity in conducting the public worship of the Church and in the administration of the holy sacraments." Thus, as we have intimated above, the real question at issue was postponed rather than ad- judicated. Ritualism went on its course with additional vigor and confidence, and its opponents became more and more dissatisfied with the existing state of things. Consequently the struggle, as was to be expected, was renewed again when the General Convention met in New York in October, 1874. Memorials were presented from various quarters on this subject, resolutions were introduced bearing directly upon it, and legislation was earnestly called for in order to restrain what was termed excess of ritual in the public service of the Church. In the House of Deputies the question of confirmation of
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on the other, they may reasonably be expected to shrink from pressing too severely upon those who carry ritualistic practices to more or less of excess. The opinion may here be expressed—simply as an opinion, without reference to the merits of the questions at issue—that ritualistic observances are liable to have been made that considerable, perhaps even great, good has resulted and may yet further result from this movement, it will not be likely again to assume any special prominence in the history of the Protestant Episcopal Church.

The bringing of this question to the reader in continuous order, from its rise to the present time, has necessarily led to the omission of a number of interesting historical facts and incidents in the progress of the Church of late years: these are herewith succinctly presented in their proper sequence and connection. On a previous page has been noted the action of the General Convention on the subject of liturgical relaxation and Church comprehension. This was in 1856 and 1859. At the convention of 1868 various "memorials" were presented pleading for larger latitude in the use of the Book of Common Prayer. This was reported against by the House of Bishops, and the following resolution was unanimously adopted: "Resolved, That, in the opinion of this house, such latitude in the use of the Book of Common Prayer as the memorialists ask could not be allowed with safety, or with proper regard to the rights of others." The result of all these turned services came up, but no definite action was had. The convention expressed its sense by resolution simply, "That nothing in the present order of Common Prayer prohibits the separation, when desirable, of the Morning Prayer, the Litany, and the Order for the Administration of the Lord's Supper into distinct services, which may be used independently of each other, and either of them without the others: provided that when used together they be used in the same order as that in which they have been commonly used and in which they have been approved by the last General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church."

The next convention (October, 1877), the committee on canons in the House of Deputies reported in favor of an "order concerning divine service," more especially for shorter services on other days than Sundays and the greater festivals and fasts. To the bishops declined to agree, and by general consent a joint committee was appointed to sit during the recess on the matter of providing shortened services, by rubric or otherwise, this committee to report in 1890. In a country such as ours, where laws regulate and divorce differ considerably in different states, the defects of most necessarily cause much perplexity and annoyance to the clergy, unless they have some law of the Church to guide and control their action. This was long felt throughout the Protestant Episcopal Church, and in hope of some remedy or aid the matter was brought before the General Convention of 1868. A canon was enacted forbidding a clergyman to solemnize a marriage where there is a divorced wife or husband of either party still living, with a proviso in favor of the innocent party in a divorce for the cause of adultery. In 1877 the canons was put in its present shape, as follows: "No minister, knowingly after due inquiry, shall solemnize the marriage of any person who has a divorced husband or wife still living, if such husband or wife has been put away for any cause arising after marriage; but this canon shall not be held to apply to the innocent party in a divorce for the cause of adultery, or to parties once divorced seeking to be united again. If any minister of this Church shall have reasonable cause to doubt whether a person desires of being admitted to holy orders shall be taken, and all such church and civil communication that has been married otherwise than as the Word of God and discipline of this Church allow, such minister, before receiving such person to these ordinances, shall refer the case to the bishop for his godly judgment thereupon: provided, however, that no minister shall, in any case, refuse the sacraments to a penitent person in imminent danger of death." Questions touching the facts of any case named in the former part of the canon are to be referred to the bishop, and he is required to make inquiry such as he deems expedient, and to deliver his judgment in the premises. At the same convention (1877), an effort was made to have the term "United Degrees," contained in the English Prayer-book, inserted in the American Book of Common Prayer, but it did not meet the approval of the convention. Some extravagant and unwarranted assertions having been made at various times as to the meaning of "regenerate," and its effects, etc., in the offices for infant baptism, there was issued, at the General Convention of 1871, the following "declaration of the bishops in council:" "We, the subscribers, bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, being asked, in order to the quieting of the consciences of sundry members of the said Church, to declare our conviction as to the meaning of the word regenerate in the offices for the administration of baptism of infants, do declare that, in our opinion, the word regenerate is not there so used as to determine that a moral change in the subject of baptism is wrought in the sacrament" (signed by all the bishops present, forty-eight in number).

The movement begun in Germany in 1870-71 by Dr. Dillingen and others has been watched by the Protestant Episcopal Church with deep interest and earnest hope that it might be that the Church in the provinces would follow. Continental churches now in communion with Rome. In the convention of 1871, the bishops recorded their hearty sympathy with the heroic struggle then being made for religious liberty on the part of the Old-Catholic Congress recently assembled in Munich; and in 1874 it was "Resolved, That this house, with renewed confidence, reiterates the expression of its sympathy with the bishop and synod of the Old-Catholic communion in Germany, and the promise of its prayers for the divine blessing and direction on their work; also, that these bishops have no objection to this house to keep up fraternal correspondence with the bishop and synod, for exchange of information and consideration of overtures for reconciliation and intercommunication between kindred churches."

The course pursued by the highest legislative authority on the subject of churches or congregations established in foreign lands in communion with the Protestant Episcopal Church illustrates the views and principles on which this Church deems it right to act. Twenty years ago, the Rev. W. O. Lamborn began services in Paris, specially to serve foreign countries, and their friends. The Church has been there ever since, intending to visit that city. The General Convention of 1859 recognised the propriety and lawfulness of having Protestant Episcopal churches abroad. Congregations accordingly have been organized during the interim since 1859 in Rome, Florence, Dresden, Geneva, and Nice, making six in all at this date (1874). At the General Convention of 1877 the matter was carefully regulated by canon, which says, "It shall be lawful, under the conditions hereinafter stated, to organize a church or congregation for the foreign country (other than Great Britain and Ireland, and the colonies and dependencies thereof), and not within the limits of any foreign missionary bishop of this Church." In order to secure proper and legitimate action, and also suitable control over these foreign churches or congregations, the canon goes on to state fully the mode in which they may be organized and conducted—viz., they must recognise their allegiance to the constitution of the American Church; must produce, proper certificates; must be in canonical submission to a bishop, who is in charge of all such churches in the communion; must be under the direction and control of some bishop, who has been specially appointed; and they must conform to the provisions laid down for discipline, in case it become necessary. The bishop in charge at this date (1878) is the Rt. Rev. Dr. Littlejohn, of Long Island.

An association taking its rise in Europe, and calling itself the "Evangelical Alliance," held its sixth General
CONFERENCE IN NEW YORK, OCT. 2-12, 1873. It was composed of delegates from various Protestant denominations, foreign as well as American, who claim to be considered "evangelicals" in the proper and precise sense of the term, and the leader of the movement was the Very Rev. R. Payne Smith, D.D., dean of Canterbury, who brought with him a letter of sympathy from his grace, Dr. Tait, archbishop of Canterbury. The dean took part in the work of the Alliance, as did also a very few of the American Episcopal clergy; having fraternized with the Presbyterians at a public communion service, he was called to account by Dr. Tozer (recently an English missionary bishop in Africa, and just then on a visit to New York), and was censured through the minutes of the Assembly of the American Unitas Fratrum of Kentucky by Dr. Cummins, likewise joined in this irregular service, and thereby foreshadowed what soon after took place —viz., the commencement of the schism to which his name has been attached. He had become greatly discontented with the state of affairs in the Protestant Episcopal Church; he was impressed with the fact, as he esteemed it, that this Church is too exclusive and in continual danger of going over to Rome, and so he made up his mind to abandon it to its fate and set up a new organization of his own, a sort of half-and-half Episcopalian and Protestant Methodist. Under date of Nov. 10, 1873, he addressed a letter to bishop Smith, his diocesan, in which he enumerated various reasons or causes for the course he had resolved upon. He declared that his conscience was burdened with being compelled to officiate as bishop in ritualistic churches in Kentucky; that he had lost all hope of seeing eradicated from the Church's standards and services acerb-dotalism and ritualism; that he was much hurt at being blamed for sharing in the service above alluded to in a Presbyterian place of worship, and that, consequently, he had determined to transfer his "work and office" to another sphere. Dr. Cummins was entirely right in abandoning the Church if he could not stay in it with a clear conscience, and labor in it in accordance with his solemn vows at ordination, one of which was especially, "With all faithful diligence to banish and drive away from the Church all erroneous and strange doctrine contrary to God's Word." Inasmuch, however, as he had abandoned his post, and was soon after degraded from the ministry, he had no "office" to carry with him, though he assumed that he had, and under that title, or as the successor to the former, he addressed Bishop Smith of Kentucky (who was also senior bishop), on receiving Dr. Cummins' letter, immediately in- stituted proceedings in accordance with the canon; Dr. Cummins was at once suspended from all exercise of the ministry; and the six months of grace allowed for retraction having passed away, the formal deputation took place June 24, 1874 (ratified afterwards in full house of Bishops at General Convention in October, 1874). See REFORMED EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

The "Cheney case," as it has been called, may properly be dealt with in connection, especially as Mr. Cheney has become quite prominent in the schismatical body which Dr. Cummins originated. The case, in substance, is as follows: The Rev. C. E. Cheney, of Christ's Church, Chicago, Ill., having mutilated the service for public baptism by omitting the words regenerate and regeneration wherever they occur, was brought to trial and suspended by bishop Whitehouse, February 18, 1871, the suspension to last until he should repent and amend. Mr. Cheney refused obedience; and the vestry of Christ's Church having invited him to continue with them, he continued to serve them, according to their wishes. The result was that he was tried by an ecclesiastical court for contumacy, and, on the 24th of June, was finally degraded. But the vestry continuing to hold on to the property of Christ's Church, contrary to law and justice, Mr. Cheney has the right of the property, as the holder of such church lands, as well as the followers of Dr. Cummins and his movement. The question of the right to the property being a very serious one, as involving the whole subject of the right of religious bodies to hold property and prevent its alienation, the case of Christ's Church, Chicago, was carried to the courts, where, in accordance with precedent in like cases, the lower court was reversed, and judgment was given in favor of the vestry and congregation as against the diocese. So far as this particular piece of property is concerned, the matter is of no great importance; but the principle involved is of the greatest moment. It has been decided, over and over again, that all ecclesiastical organizations shall possess the power to be governed by their own laws, so long as those laws do not interfere with the established law of the land; and, consequently, that all property belongs, of right, to those who adhere to and sustain the laws and principles of their respective organizations. If church property, by the action of vestries and congregations, can be legally diverted from its rightful ownership, in the way in which this in Chicago has been taken away from the Church, then there is no tenure safe, and every church property issue has aroused attention among other Christian bodies, who are quite as much interested as the Protestant Episcopal Church can be in the fundamental question at issue. It is to be hoped that the Supreme Court of the United States will be called upon to interpose, and settle fully and clearly a point of so great moment to all Christians or religious associations of every name.

In regard to the "provincial system," so called, we may briefly state that, as early as 1850, a motion was made in the House of Bishops by bishop Delaney to appoint a committee of five bishops, five clergymen, and five laymen, "to report to the next triennial General Convention on the expediency of arranging the dioceses, according to geographical position, into four provinces, to be designated the Eastern, Northern, Southern, and Western Provinces, and to be united under a General Convention or Council of the Provinces, having exclusive control over the Prayer-book, Articles, Offices, and Homilies of this Church, to be held every twenty years." In 1859 no action was had; but the committee was continued, and the matter handed over to the next General Convention, to which it was indefinitely postponed by the bishops. The subject was brought up again in 1874, was warmly discussed, and again indefinitely postponed. In 1877 a preamble and resolution were offered in the House of Deputies expressing a desire to obtain "an authoritative recognition of the provincial system," and to establish a special committee on canons "to inquire into the expediency of repealing the prohibition against suffragan bishops, and making such canonical provisions as will enable dioceses (just before described) to give the name and style of provincial or co-provincial bishops to such bishops who may be elected and consecrated to assign- ed districts within their respective jurisdictions." The resolution was adopted; but in the House of Bishops the entire subject was again committed to a special committee, to report at the convention of 1880. Then the matter comes up to the present. It remains to be seen whether the Church will deem it best to adopt this system, or to continue under the arrangement now in existence. A canon was adopted in 1866 authorizing federal councils, as follows: "It is hereby declared lawful for the bishops in their capacity as such, within the limits of any state or commonwealth, to establish for themselves a federal convention, or council, representing such dioceses, which may deliberate and decide upon the common interests of the Church within the limits of such dioceses; and to the proceedings of such convention, or council, shall be had, the powers proposed to be exercised thereby shall be submitted to..."
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the General Convention for its approval. Nothing in this canon shall be construed as forbidding any federal council from taking such action as they may deem necessary to secure such legislative enactments as the common interests of the Church in the state may require.

No definite action under this canon has as yet been carried in the Council of any state. The subject has been discussed, quite largely, and the various propositions connected with it now rest with the same committee who have the provincial system in hand and are to report in 1880. An earnest and interesting communication to the present Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Maryland was made in 1871, by Bishop Wilberforce, of Winchester, in relation to the work then commenced in England for the revision of the authorized version of the Holy Scriptures. At the General Convention held the same year, it was, in the House of Bishops, Resolved, That the Rev. the Presiding Bishop be, and hereby is, requested to return to the Rev. the Lord Bishop of Winchester a courteous and brotherly acknowledgment of his communication relating to a revision of the English of the Holy Scriptures, stating that this house, having given all the attention we were capable of giving to this said work of revision, is not at present in a condition to deliver any judgment respecting it, and at the same time expressing the disposition of this house to consider with candor the work undertaken by the Convocation of Canterbury, whenever it shall have been completed. The attitude thus taken by the bishops in behalf of the Church is one of cautious reserve, but perhaps not too much so, considering the importance of the subject.

The Protestant Episcopal Church having made considerable progress in Hayti (numbering eleven clergy in 1874), and needing episcopal supervision and aid, was supplied with a bishop, under the arrangement of a "Covenant" entered into with the Church in that republic, and the Rev. Dr. J. T. Holly was consecrated as first bishop, in November, 1874. The terms of the covenant made it the duty of the Church in the United States to extend its nursing care to the Church in Hayti during its early growth and development; and four bishops, with the bishop of Hayti, were constituted a commission to take episcopal charge of the Church in Hayti, and secure its maintenance of the doctrine, worship, and discipline of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, until such time as there should be three bishops resident in Hayti, and exercising jurisdiction in the Church there. When that time arrives, this Church will draw from all further charge or care of the Haytian Church.

The General Convention of 1877 met in Boston, Mass., on Oct. 3 for the first time that it met in that city since its organization after the civil war. It was very largely attended, and was marked by a spirit of good-will and earnest effort to promote in every way the interests of Christ's kingdom here on earth. There were no specially exciting topics on hand (as ritualism, etc.); and the action of the convention, so far as our present purpose is concerned, can be summed up in a brief space. Probably the most important step taken was the reorganization of the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society. Heretofore there had been a Board of Missions (a very large and rather cumbersome body), appointed triennially, and acting in the respective departments at home and abroad. After much discussion, the following canon was adopted: "Constitution of the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, as established in 1830, and since amended at various times.”

"A. Art. I. This society shall be denominated,” etc.

"A. Art. II. This society shall be considered as comprehending all persons who are members of this Church.

"A. Art. III. There shall be a Board of Managers of such society, composed of the bishops of this Church, and the members for the time being of the House of Deputies of this Church, bishops and deputies sitting apart as in General Convention, or together when they shall so desire. The Board of Missions thus constituted shall convene on the third day of the session of the General Convention, and shall sit from time to time as the business of the board shall demand.

"Art. IV. There shall be a Board of Managers, comprising all the bishops as members ex officio, and fifteen prebendaries and fifteen laymen, to be appointed by the General Convention, at its next meeting, to manage the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society of the Protestant Episcopal Church, who shall have the control and management of the general mission of this Church, and shall remain in office until their successors are chosen, and shall have power to fill all vacancies which may occur in their number. Eight clerical and eight laymen shall constitute the Board of Managers.

This board shall, during the recess of the convention, exercise all the corporate powers of the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society of the Church, and shall make and do all report to the General Convention, constituted as a Board of Missions, on or before the third day of the session of the General Convention.

"Art. V. The Board of Managers is authorized to form, from its own members, a committee for domestic missions and a committee for foreign missions, and such other committees as it may deem desirable to promote special missionary work, and is also authorized to appoint such officers as shall be needful for carrying on the work.

"Art. VI. The Board of Managers is intrusted with power to establish and regulate such missions as are not placed under episcopal supervision, and to erect and stock, which it may deem expedient, new bishoromatic appointments, and for the government of its committees; provided always that, in connection with all diocesan and missionary jurisdictions and activities, the bishops having such jurisdiction shall be made in gross to such diocesan and missionary jurisdictions, to be disburmd by the local authorities thereof. The board shall not be entitled to the fees and expenses of the Episcopal Church in the United States for missionary work.

"Art. VII. The Board of Managers is authorized to promote the formation of auxiliary missionary associations, whose contributions, as well as those specially appropriated by individuals, shall be received and paid in accordance with the wishes of the donors, when expressed in writing. It shall be the duty of the Board of Managers to arrange for public missionary meetings, to be held at the same time and place as the General Convention, and at such other times and places as the board may determine upon, to which all auxiliaries approved by the Board of Managers, may send one clerical and one lay delegate.

"Art. VIII. The Board of Managers may be authorized at any time by the General Convention of this Church. All canons, and all action by or under the authority of the General Convention, so far as the constitution and provisions of this canon and such amended constitution, are hereby repealed. This canon shall be in full force and effect shall in any manner impair or affect any corporate rights of the said society, or any vested right whatever. This canon shall take effect immediately.

The principal and immediate effect of this reorganization was, on the part of the Board of Managers, a resolution to reduce central expenses connected with the mission work. Thus the department of home missions to colored people was assigned to the care of the committee on domestic missions; a very considerable reduction in the amount of expenses was made in connection with the work among the Indians; several officers were dispensed with, and in answer to the will of the donors, when expressed in writing. The result was a saving of some $12,000 per annum. It deserves also to be stated here that the American Church Missionary Society, the special agency of those of the clergy and laity who were in former connection with the Board of Missions, now accorded to the wish long before expressed by the board. The society continued its organization as a society; the work in Mexico, which had been very largely sustained by it, was handed over to the foreign committee. The work on the continent of North America was resolved that, in general, its members should hereafter act in concert with the Board of Managers of the newly organized Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society of the Protestant Episcopal Church. This was deemed a happy resolve on their part, and excellect results are expected to follow in consequence.
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For some years past there has been a growing desire to add greater effectiveness to the labors of godly and devoted women in the Church. The matter was brought up at the General Convention of 1874, but no action was obtained. In 1877 it came again before the convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and after three critical and three long debates, to inquire and report to the next General Convention what legislation may be necessary and expedient for the authorization and regulation of women working in this Church under the name of deaconesses or sisters. Thus the matter lies over till 1880.

As the Church of England recently adopted a new Lectionary, it was deemed advisable by the convention of 1877 to place this revised Table of Lessons for Sundays and holydays before the Protestant Episcopal Church. Accordingly, it was formally resolved by both houses that the Lectionary be permitted to be used until the next General Convention. This Table, therefore, not only of Lessons for Sundays and holydays, but also of Daily Lessons, and Lessons for Lent and for Ember Days and Rogation Days, is allowed to be used by any clergyman in place of those in the calendar in the Prayer Book, either at his own discretion or at the instance of any clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church. Whether it will be found to be so great an improvement upon the existing Table of Lessons as has been supposed by many may be doubted. The trial, however, of three years will lead to some settled agreement upon a matter so largely affecting the question of how to obtain the greatest edification in the reading of Holy Scripture in the public worship of the Church.

At the close of the convention of 1877 a joint resolution in the convention was adopted, the purpose of which was to extend the important benefits of a secular education to all our citizens, and of discussing side by side with these as many of the influences and institutions as are possible to supplement them with thorough Christian teaching elsewhere, and to add proper Church schools and tuition for the whole, and more complete work of education, wherever they are needed and the means for their support are commanded.

Resolved, That it is the solemn conviction of this General Convention, in both houses, that it is the duty of the clergy and laity of the Church to take, so far as the opportunity is afforded them, an active interest in the public schools, with the purpose of extending the important benefits of a secular education to all our citizens, and of discussing, side by side with these as many of the influences and institutions as is possible to supplement them with thorough Christian teaching elsewhere, and to add proper Church schools and tuition for the whole, and more complete work of education, wherever they are needed and the means for their support are commanded.

Resolved, That, with the concurrence of the House of Deputies, a joint committee, consisting of two bishops, two clergymen, and two laymen, be instituted to consider this matter during the recess of the convention, to collect facts and prepare suggestions for the next General Convention, and to promote, by any means deemed advisable, the general work of Christian education.

II. Fundamental Principles, Constitution, Government, etc.—From what has already been stated, it is clear that the Church of England, while holding in common with other Christians evangelical doctrines—as the incarnation, the divinity of our Lord, the atonement, the inspiration of Holy Scripture, salvation through faith in Christ, and all such like—at the same time takes the ground that it is the American branch of the "one holy Catholic Church" spoken of in the Nicene Creed. It was planted on these Western shores, under God's good providence, to be what it aims to be—the National Church of the United States. It is a historical Church. It traces its lineage through the Church of England directly back to the apostles of our Lord; and it gives, as its deliberate judgment, that "it is evident unto all men, diligently reading Holy Scripture and ancient authors, that from the apostles' time there have been these several orders of ministers in Christ's Church—bishops, priests, and deacons. It is not a new or recently formed denomination, and in this respect differs from the great bulk of Protestant Christian bodies, whatever titles they may give to their respective organizations. Its creed is the same creed which has been in use substantially in the same form since the very beginning—viz., that which is commonly called the Apostles' Creed and the Nicene Creed. It has not been altered in the United States in the 4th century, and received everywhere by all throughout the Catholic Church. Its liturgy is the very concentration of the deep piety, soundness in the faith, earnestness, zeal, and fervor of the wise and holy and good of all ages. It contains the reading of the scriptures, services of prayer and praise, combining the use of this liturgy with the continual and frequent reading of Holy Scripture in men's ears, are in the truest and highest sense of the word evangelical, and calculated to set all the longing of the pious soul for spiritual communion with God our Father, through our Lord Jesus Christ, and through the quickening energy of the Holy Ghost.*

The position of the Protestant Episcopal Church relatively to Protestantism, on the one hand, and Romanism, on the other, is somewhat peculiar, but yet daily marked out and defined. It cannot consistently exist, recognise the validity of the ministry of the great body of Protestant denominations, whether Presbyterian or Congregational, for it distinctly enunciates that the only lawful ministry is that in the three orders. Hence it cannot have communion with them, or interchange of services, or similar arrangements of any kind. It is true, the validity of the episcopate in the Roman Catholic Church, but at the same time it positively and unequivocally repudiates the errors in doctrine and worship of that system. It is true, the validity of the presidency in the Episcopal Church in Italy, but also wherever, in violation of the ancient canons, it has spread itself. The Protestant Episcopal Church has no sympathy with, but is in direct antagonism to, the claims of Rome in regard to the denial of the sufficiency of Scripture, the ultra-sacrament of transubstantiation, sacrifice of the mass, purgatory, celibacy of the clergy, elevation of the Virgin Mary into a sort of goddess to be worshipped, the absolute supremacy of the pope by divine right over all the world in civil as well as religious matters, etc. Hence it cannot act in any concert with the Roman Church, or further its plans and purposes in any wise.

The constitution, framed for the purpose of uniting the Church in working together as one body, we give in full. It was adopted in October, 1879, and has remained unaltered, except for a few alterations which became necessary in consequence of the growth of the Church, the increase of the episcopate, and the formation of several dioceses within the limits of the larger and more populous states.

Art. I. There shall be a General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America on the first Wednesday in October in every third year, from the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and forty-one, and in such place as shall be determined by the convention; and in case there shall be an epidemic disease, or any other good cause to render it necessary to alter the place fixed on for any such meeting of the convention, the presiding bishop shall have it in his power and discretion to appoint another convention in any place as he shall think proper; and in case there shall be an epidemic disease, or any other good cause, at any other times, in the manner hereafter to be provided for; and this Church, in a majority of the dioceses which shall have adopted this Constitution, shall be represented before they shall proceed to business, except that the representation from two dioceses shall be sufficient to adjourn the business of the convention; and when there shall be no debate shall be allowed.

Art. II. The Church in each diocese shall be entitled to a representation of both the clergy and the laity. Such representation shall consist of not more than four persons, and of the following description: three persons to be the representatives of the resident clergy, and of the bishop, dean, or warden of the diocese; and two persons to be the representatives of the residents in the diocese, and chosen in the manner prescribed by the convention thereof; and in all questions when there shall be more than one diocese represented from any diocese, each order shall have one vote; and the major vote of the convention shall be necessary to a determination.

* This statement of course represents our contributor's opinion; but the paragraph contains several points upon which much might be said on both sides. — Es.
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to dates are added, so that any particular canon upon
any subject legislated upon by the Church may be
traced from its origin through all its modifications to
the present time. Title I is "Of the Orders in the Min-
istry, and of the Doctrine and Worship of the Church."
There are twenty-four canons under this Title, and they
cover fully and explicitly all questions relating to can-
didates for orders, examinations, ordination of deacons,
owakening of priests, general regulation of ministers and
their duties, qualifications, consecration and work of
bishops, domestic and foreign missionary bishops, modes
of securing an accurate view of the Church, the use of
the Book of Common Prayer, etc. Title II is "Of Discip-
line." There are thirteen canons under this Title, re-
lating to offences for which ministers may be tried and
punished, dissolution of pastoral connection, renuncia-
tion of the ministry, abandonment of the communion
of the Church by a bishop, the trial of a bishop, judicial
sentences, regulations respecting the laity, etc. Title
III is "Of the Organized Bodies and Officers of the
Church." There are nine canons under this Title, hav-
ing reference to meetings of General Convention, stand-
ning committees, trustees of the General Theological Sem-
inary, congregations and parishes, organization of new
dioceses, etc. Title IV relates to "Miscellaneous Pro-
visions." It has four canons, in reference to repeated
orders of ordination, etc., of the Church, and when new can-
ons take effect. Our limits do not admit of printing
these canons in full, nor is it necessary, inasmuch as
they are readily accessible to all interested in their
contents.

III. Statistics.—As showing the steady increase and
spread of the Protestant Episcopal Church, we give the
bishops, clergy, and dioceses by decades since 1820, as
follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Bishops</th>
<th>Presbyteries and Deacons</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Dioceses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1040</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1057</td>
<td>1068</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1115</td>
<td>1127</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1135</td>
<td>1148</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the Church Almanac, we learn that in 1869
there were nearly 8800 parishes, with churches and
chapels, in the Protestant Episcopal Church in the
United States.

Baptisms during the year (in infant and adult). 68,534
Confraternies during the year. 18,646
Marriages. 15,420
Sunday-school teachers. 42,000
Baptized children. 40,000
Communicants. 87,457
Contributions for missionary and church pur-
poses. 614,488,841

Home missionary bishops nine, exercising jurisdiction
in the great territories as well as several of the Western
states, in Texas, and on the Pacific coast. Their sala-
ries and travelling expenses (amounting to at least
$30,000 per annum) are paid by the domestic commit-
te. There are over 200 missionaries at work in
these fields. Foreign missionary bishops three—one
in China, one in Japan, one in Africa (to which added
bishop in Haiti). There are in these jurisdictions, in
addition to the bishops, thirty-five other clergymen
(foreign and native), together with about 200 assist-
ants, mostly native catechists, lay readers, and teachers.
The mission work in Greece is simply educational,
and is conducted by 12 native lay readers. In the
Mexican Church there are at work the Rev. H. C. Riley, D.D., and P. G. Hernandez (bishi-
ops elect), with four other presbytery, two ladies, and 79
lay readers. The number of communicants in foreign
fields is about 4000. There are also 81 day-schools
with 1800 scholars, and 18 Sunday-schools with 861
scholars.

Theological seminaries and schools (in 15 dioceses
and 1 missionary jurisdiction). Church colleges (in 12 dioceses and 3 missionary jur-
dictions). Academic institutions (in 26 dioceses and 3 missionary jurisdictions). Other educational institutions (in 13 dioceses). Church hospitals (in 20 dioceses and 3 missionary jurisdictions). Church orphan asylums (in 20 dioceses and 3 missionary jurisdictions). Church boarding schools (in 12 dioceses). Periodicals devoted to the interests, support, and de-
fence of the Protestant Episcopal Church: The Churchman (weekly), New York; The Southern Churchman (weekly), Alexandria, Va.; The Episcopalian (weekly), Philadelphia, Pa.; The Western Churchman (weekly), Cleveland, O.; The Church of the Cross (weekly), Milwaukee, Wis.; The Pacific Churchman (weekly), San Francisco, Cal.; Our Dioceses (weekly), Detroit, Mich.; The Spirit of Missions (monthly), New York; The Church Magazine (monthly), Brooklyn, N. Y.; The Church Eclectic (monthly), Utica, N. Y.; The American Church Review (quarterly), New York.

IV. Authorities.—Works used in the preparation of
the present article: [By.], Memoirs of the Pro-
estant Episcopal Church (1866, 5vo); Wilson, Life of Bishop Wine (1889, 5vo); Wilberforce, History of the Protestant Episcopal Church (1849, 12mo); An-
derson, History of the Church of England in the Colon-
ies (1868, 3 vols. 12mo); Hawkins, Missions of the
Church of England in the North American Colonies
(1845, 12mo); O'Callaghan, Contributions to the Historical History of the United States (1856, vol. 1, 8vo, Virginia; 1839, vol. ii, 8vo, Maryland); id.; Constitution and Can-
ons of the Protestant Episcopal Church (1841, 8vo); Sprague, Annals of the American Pulpit (Episcopal), 1859, 3 vols.; Cope, Robinson, and Hoffman [Murray], Law of the Protestant Episcopal Church (1850, 8vo); id.; Ecclesiastical Law in the State
of New York (1866, 8vo), and The Episcopalian Law of the Church (1872, 8vo); Vinton, Canon Law and the Constitution of the Protestant Episcopal Church (1876, 8vo); Perry [By.], Handbook of the General Conven-
tions, 1785-1877 (12mo); and Hawks and Perry, Jour-
nals of General Convention from 1785 to 1881, 1861, vol.
8vo, with notes.)

Protestant Episcopal Church of Ireland.

Until 1671 this body formed an integral part of the
United Church of England and Ireland. It is still call-
ed by a majority of its members the Church of Ireland.
Its official title is "The Irish Church."

Of the first introduction of Christianity into Ireland
we have written under the article IRELAND (q. v.). It
has been noted before that the Roman Church did not
succeed in establishing her hierarchical power in the
12th century, and that even after the Reformation in
England the Irish Church remained attached to Rome,
and only by the influence of the bishop of Rome, first
felt in the island through the Danes, who made their
earliest settlements on the east coast at the close of
the 8th century. Bishop Malachi, who filled successively
several sees in Ireland, and who was full of enthusiasm
for papal authority, strove hard to induce the Irish bish-
ops to accept palms from the pope. But it was not till
after his death in 1152 that, at the Synod of Kells, the
four archbishops received these honors, which, though
ostensibly marks of distinction, were in reality badges
of servitude, binding Ireland to the feetotul of the pa-
archy. Three years later, pope Adrian IV, the only Eng-
lishman ever to be crowned triple crown, sent Henry
II of England a bull, authorizing none to invade Ire-
land. What the papal see then thought of the relig-
ous condition of the Church of Ireland may be learned

* The above article was originally written for our pages by the Rev. J. A. S. Jameson, D.D., of New York city, and was afterwards thoroughly revised and corrected, in another work which he was then editing. We have slightly modified one or two expressions to which many of our readers might take exception.—Eo.
from a bull published in 1172, confirming that of 1158. The pope states the object of permitting the invasion of Ireland to be that "the filthy practices of the land may be abolished, and the barbarous nation which is called by the Christian name may, through your clemency, be established in Christ's faith." It was also declared that when the Church of that country, which has hitherto been in a disordered state, shall have been reduced to better order, that people may by your means possess for the future the reality as well as the name of the Christian faith.

In the reign of Henry VIII, papal supremacy was abolished in Ireland, the bishops and clergy all accepting the king as head of the Church. Queen Mary re-established the pope's authority, but Elizabeth's reign gave a distinctively Reformed character to the Church. Many rebellions occurring among the native Irish during this reign, and Rome stoutly throwing all her weight against England, the Reformation came to be regarded as essentially English, though the leading clergy of the time assozzed to the change. The pope took advantage of the anti-English feeling by sending to the island multitudes of missionary bishops and priests, who succeeded in holding the native Irish within the pale of Roman Catholicism. During the two following centuries, the Protestant Episcopal Church (to which we now give this name, as during this period the Protestant Church had no distinct existence) suffered many vicissitudes; but by the Revolution of 1688 and the battle of the Boyne it was placed in a position of assured stability as a Protestant body. Still, the very intimate connection between the Church and the government, necessitated by the hostile elements with which both had been surrounded, had exercised upon the former a very unwholesome influence. The Church had been treated as little more than a mere department of government. "Many of the bishops, during this period, seem to have held High-Church views; and, with some, the excessive influence of the government in religious matters prevailed, and along with it an indisposition to tolerate dissent in any shape whatsoever. This deadness of religious life characterized all the churches in the reigns of Anne and the Georges, though bright examples may be cited of the contrary spirit. The names of Richardson, Atkin, and Brown may be mentioned with honor as those of clergymen who, in the early part of the 18th century, took an active interest in the work of evangelizing the native Irish. Among these, the Augustan Bishop Boulter, bishop Berkeley, and others may be noted among the members of the Episcopal bench who exhibited an earnest spirit of devotion and practical godliness. Wesley and his followers among the Methodists did much by their labors, first in Ireland and then outside the Church, to awaken evangelical life among all ranks of the national clergy. But English influence was, during this period, too often used in a wrong direction. English clergymen were frequently thrust into the best Church livings in Ireland, and Irish bishops were filled with Englishmen, while the earnest parochial clergymen of the land were neglected and despised. Dean Swift's witty description of the honest clergymen nominated to Irish bishoprics was waylaid and murdered by highwaymen on Quinnaval Heath, who then seized on their 'letters patent,' came to Ireland, and got consecrated in their room, shows what was thought, in some quarters, of many of the men who, at this dark era, bore spiritual rule in the Church of Ireland." (Wright's Lecture on the Church of Ireland.)

There is no other Church in Christendom so much influenced by the Wesleyan revival of religion. The evangelical leaven imparted at that time, assisted by an intense antipathy to Romanism, has spread through the whole Church, so that Ritualistic and Broad-Church elements are almost unknown within its bounds. This fact is the more striking as some of the most influential prelates have been, and are, Englishmen of High-Church tendencies.

By Gladstone's disendowment act, known as the "Irish Church Act, 1869," it was provided that on and after Jan. 1, 1871, the "Church of Ireland" should cease to exist as a body corporate. At this time, "the Commissioners of Church Temporalities in Ireland," was appointed, to which body were intrusted all the temporal affairs of the Church, until such time as the representative body of the Church should supersede them. This commission was endowed with extensive powers for carrying out the purposes of the act. They were freed from all restraints of the courts of law, and received all the powers and privileges of the High Court of Chancery. The Commissioners were ordered to ascertain the amount of yearly income which any person, lay or clerical, derived from the Church, and to pay each year to every such holder an annuity equal to the amount of yearly income so ascertained. This annuity was to continue, even though the annuitant should become disabled from attending to the duties of his office, "by age, sickness, or permanent infirmity, or by any cause other than his own willful default." All laws were repealed which would hamper the Church in exercising the utmost freedom in self-government. The ecclesiastical laws existing at the time of the disestablishment, including "articles, doctrines, rites, rules, discipline, and ceremonies," were abrogated, and neither the members of the Church, as if subsisting "by contract," except that nothing in these laws "should be construed to confer on any bishop, etc., any coercive jurisdiction whatsoever." It was also provided that no change should be made in the laws of the Church, so as to deprive any person of his annuity.

By a convention of bishops and representatives of the Church, held in Dublin in 1870, a constitution was agreed upon. The preamble asserts a belief in the inspiration of the Bible, and a determination to preserve the "three orders of priests, deacons, and bishops." It contains also a protest "against all those innovations in doctrine and worship which, at the Reformation, this Church did disown and reject."

The supreme court of the Church is the General Synod. It consists of three orders, viz., bishops, clergy, and laity. It is also divided into two houses, viz., the House of Bishops and the House of Representatives; the former consisting of all archbishops and bishops, and, of the latter of 200 representatives, 111 of the representatives of the laity, all these to be elected for three years. "The bishops shall vote separately from the representatives; and no question shall be deemed to have been carried, unless there be in its favor a majority of the bishops present, if they desire to vote, and a majority of the clerical and lay representatives present, voting conjointly or by orders; provided always that if a question affirmed by a majority of the clerical or lay representatives, voting conjointly or by orders, but rejected by a majority of the bishops, shall be affirmed at the next ordinary session of the General Synod by not less than two thirds of the clerical and lay representatives, it shall be deemed to be carried, unless it be negative by not less than two-thirds of the then existing order of bishops." The General Synod has power to alter, abrogate, or enact canons, and to control any regulation made by a diocesan synod, so far as may be necessary to provide against the admission of any principle inexpedient for the common interest of the Church.

The Diocesan Synod consists of the bishop of the bishopric and licensed clergymen of the diocese, and at least one layman, called synodman, for each parish in the diocese. The bishop, clergy, and laity sit and debate and vote together; but six members of either order may call, upon any question, for a vote by orders. If the bishop dissent from the other two orders with respect to any proposed act of the synod, all action there-
upon is suspended until the next annual meeting of the synod; and should such act be then reaffirmed by two thirds of each of the other orders, and the bishop still dissent, it is submitted to the General Synod, whose decision is final.

The representative body consists of the archbishops and bishops, of one clerical and two lay members for each diocese, and of such number of other persons elected as shall be equal to the number of dioceses. This body is a Board of Trustees, holding the temporalities of the Church.

There is a Committee of Patronage in each diocese, consisting of the bishop, one lay and two clerical members. In each parish there are three persons named parochial nominators. When an incumbent is to be appointed, the Committee of Patronage and the parochial nominators form a Board of Nomination, presided over by the bishop, who has an independent and also a casting vote. This board nominates a clergyman to the bishop, who, if he decline to institute the nominee, must give him, if so required, his reasons in writing for so declining. Bishops are nominated by the diocesan synods, and confirmed by the Bench of Bishops.

The diocesan Church has already taken advantage of its freedom to revise carefully the Book of Common Prayer. Some extracts from the preface to the Revised Prayer-book, to be printed during this year (1875), will show the objects and aims of the revision: "When this Church of Ireland ceased to be established by law, and thereupon some alteration in our public liturgy became needful, it was earnestly desired by many that occasion should be taken for considering what changes the lapse of years or exigency of our present times and circumstances might have rendered expedient." "We now afresh declare that the posture of kneeling prescribed to all communicants is not appointed for any purpose of adoration of Christ's body and blood, but only for the sake of bread and wine, but only for a signification of our humble and grateful acknowledgment, and for the avoiding of such profanation and disorder as might ensue if some such reverent and uniform posture were not enjoining." "In the Office for Visitation of the Sick we have deemed it fitting that absolution should be pronounced to penitents in the form appointed in the Office for the Holy Communion."

The portions of the Apocalypse which were in the Table of Lessons have been expunged, and the rubric has been omitted which directed the use on certain days of the Roman Canon.

The following are the numerical statistics of the Irish Protestant Episcopal Church as compared with other religious denominations in the island. The total number of clergymen is about 1900.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Roman Catholics</th>
<th>Protestant Episcopal</th>
<th>Non-Protestant Prot.</th>
<th>Other Christian Pers.</th>
<th>Jews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leicest.</td>
<td>1,258,563</td>
<td>1,141,401</td>
<td>391,020</td>
<td>101,188</td>
<td>636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munster</td>
<td>1,490,076</td>
<td>1,202,497</td>
<td>433,500</td>
<td>13,500</td>
<td>624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulster</td>
<td>3,266,612</td>
<td>1,054,209</td>
<td>2,212,704</td>
<td>686,843</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connaught</td>
<td>856,093</td>
<td>833,583</td>
<td>37,808</td>
<td>5,240</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6,008,260</td>
<td>4,141,893</td>
<td>608,857</td>
<td>556,435</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rate per cent. Decrease, 363.393 Decrease, 10.962 1.45 Decrease, 22,916 8.34 Increase, 440 3.47 Decrease, 133 3.35

The only divinity school in Ireland available for theological students of the Protestant Episcopal Church is that of Trinity College. The Church has no official voice in the management of this school, but, under certain conditions, it accepts the theological degree from it, without signing the Thirty-nine Articles. In Nov., 1876, a statute was passed by the senate of the university abolishing this test and admitting even laymen to degrees. The board of Trinity College has also lately provided by Christian Church of the land may establish a theological faculty alongside that of the Protestant Episcopal Church.

The act of disestablishment technically decreed also disendowment, but by far the greater part of the endowment of the Church was absorbed by the compensations granted. Most of those who were entitled to annuities commuted their income, or compounded with the ecclesiastical commissioners for a sum arranged as to leave a large capital sum for church endowment, and this endowment was augmented by large donations, amounting, in the first five years of disestablishment, to £1,180,106. As an example of composition, the town of Down in Derry was entitled to an annual income of £13,781. Upon compounding, he received £101,493, leaving a balance to the Endowment Fund of the Church of £200,288. The present endowment of the Church is upwards of £7,000,000.

See Dr. Todd, St. Patrick; Kilian, Ecclesiastical History of Ireland; King, Church History of Ireland; Froude, History of England; Godkin, Ireland and her Churches; pamphlets by Dr. C. H. H. Wright, on The Divinity School of Trinity College, The Church of Ireland, etc.; The Irish Ecclesiastical Gazette, from 1871 to 1874; The Irish Church Directory; Lanigan, Ecclesiastical History of Ireland. (G. C. J.)

Protestant Episcopal Free-Church Association. This body, formed in 1875 within the pale of the Protestant Episcopal Church, advocates the freest system for houses of worship, and has grown to so large a proportion that it is necessary that it should be beyond its originally intended mission and assumes the work of Church extension also, i.e. it affords help to feeble churches, provided they do not rent or sell pews. The secretary of the society reported at its third annual meeting (May 13, 1876) 286 clerical, 12 life, and 126 annual contributors. Twenty-one of the bishops of the Church are patrons.

Protestant Friends. See Free Congregations; Rationalism.

Protestant Methodists. See Methodism; Methodist Prot. Protestants.

Protestant Union of Germany is a body composed of the members of the Evangelical Protestant Church. It has been in existence since 1863. Its aim is the complete separation of the Church from the state: a synodal Church system for all Protestant Germany: the union of religion and intellectual culture, faith and science, i.e. the advancement of the Christian religion in harmony with free investigations and ever-advancing intellectual culture, and the warring against the existing hierarchical as well as against the radical denials of religion. It was projected in 1863 in the duchy of Baden, and in 1864 its headquarters were established at Heidelberg, where the annual meetings of the Union, called

The Protestant Union, so held and all business of the body was transacted. At present the headquarters of the Union are at Berlin, and since the unification of Germany the purpose is to organize a German National Church, for which all application of the tax upon every member and recognise the organisation by collecting the tax so obtained. Every person belonging to this Church of the nation is to enjoy liberty of thought and utterance, giving even greater breadth of freedom than the members of the Anglican communion enjoy. See Dr. Lindley, Letter from Germany, in Zions Herald, Boston, Oct. 5, 1876. See also Prussia. (J. H. W.)
PROTESTANTISM

Protestantism. See Protestant Union of Germany.

Protestantism is the advocacy of the authority of the Sacred Scriptures above and without any other. The Romanist and Jew hold to tradition (q. v.) as having the warrant of authority, but the Protestants refuse to look to authority above the Bible. It proceeds directly back from the sacred Word of God. There arise, of course, various questions as to what this Word is, and how it is to be interpreted. In regard to the former, the Protestant holds that the Holy Bible is composed only of the canonical writings of the Old and New Testament [see CANONS], while the Roman Catholics also ascribe canonical authority to the so-called Apocrypha of the Old Testament. See APOCYPHTA. The right of interpretation the Roman Catholic Church claims to be hers alone, while the Protestant Church concedes this right in a stricter sense to every one who possesses the requisite gifts and attainments, but in a more comprehensive sense to every Christian who seeks after salvation, proceeding upon the principle that Scripture is its own interpreter according to the analogia fidei. See ESTABLISHMENT. The principle of the authority of the Roman Catholic Church that the Vulgate version, which it sanctions, is to be preferred to all other versions as the authentic one, and is thus to a certain extent of equal importance with the original, while Protestants regard the original only as authentic.

The name Protestantism repels everybody on whom it falls from that ecclesiasticism which the primitive Church was unaccustomed with, and which owes its origin and development to the medieval Church. "The Reformation, viewed in its most general character," says Ullmann (Reformer before the Reformation, i. 18), "was the reaction of Christianity as Gospel against Christianity as law." It is therefore inconsistent for Anglican High-Churchmen and their followers on this side of the Atlantic to assert that Protestantism is simply negative. It is positive enough, for it only discards one interpretation of Christianity, but expounds another. It denies the right of the Church to stand in authority of the individual, but it gives a circumscribed and well-defined liberty to the individual—not absolute license. "The liberty which the Reformers prized first and chiefly," says Prof. Fisher (Hist. of the Ref. p. 2), "was not the abstract right to choose one's creed without constraint, but a liberty that flows from the enforced appropriation by the soul of truth in harmony with its inmost nature and its conscious necessities." The nature of Protestantism is to be found in the principle that in the Protestant Church is freedom, but freedom only from the restraints of man, from a tyranny of conscience, from all systems which had previous to the great Reformation been imposed upon man without any divine warrant. It is freedom on the basis of obedience to God and to his holy Word. It is that freedom which consists in the cheerful and ready obedience to the divine Word and to the divine Will. It is the freedom of the republic, and not the license of the commune; it is the liberty of common-sense, and not the enthusiasm of the idealist. The principle of Protestantism is the highest expression of the philosophical idealism of the “Romantic movement.” This idealism is of two kinds: (a) a negative idealism, expressed in the thought of Schaff, "is evangelical freedom in Christ, its aim to bring every soul into direct relation to Christ. Romanism puts the Church first and Christ next; Protestantism reverses the order. Romanism says, Where the Church is (meaning thereby the papal organization), there is Christ; Protestantism says, Where Christ is, there is the Church; Romanism says, Where the Catholic tradition is, there is the Bible and the infallible rule of faith; Protestantism says, Where the Bible is, there is the true tradition and the infallible rule of faith; Romanism says, Where faith is, there is justification and good works. Protestantism throws Mary and the saints between Christ and the believer; Protestantism goes directly to the Saviour. Romanism proceeds from the visible Church (the papacy) to the invisible Church; Protestantism from the invisible Church (the true body of Christ) to the visible; Romanism works from without, and from the general to the particular; Protestantism from within, and from the individual to the general. Protestantism is a protest against the tyranny of man on the basis of the authority of the Bible, to be explained by the rule of Christian faith and practice, and teaches justification by grace alone, as apprehended by a living faith. It holds up Christ as all in all, whose word is all-sufficient to teach, whose grace is all-sufficient to save. Its mission is to rescue the true Church of God and kingship of all believers by bringing them all into direct union and fellowship with Christ" (Christian Intelligencer, Jan. 14, 1869). Dr. Hagenbach objects to this reduction of Protestantism to one fundamental principle, and offers three as its basis—viz. (1) the real principle, living faith in Christ; (2) the formal principle, the authority of the Scriptures as a rule of faith; (3) the social principle, forming a community, of which Christ is the individual head, and of which all the members are priests unto God (see Theol. Studien u. Kritiken, January, 1854). In this exposition every essential characteristic of Protestantism seems to have been considered by this master theologian.

Romanists charge against Protestantism that its re-
but too often the step of aggression from the Protestants. (5.) The disjointed condition of Protestantism; its constant warfarings of brother with brother; the absence of a tolerant spirit for difference of opinion in non-essentials, that is, in the advancement of their common salvation, still further strengthened by persecution.

(6.) The inability of Protestantism to turn to the best account the wide diversity of talents and character which is constantly developing in evangelical Christianity. In Romanism Ignatius and Bellarmine can vie with the greatest Protestant Whedon and Whitefield must become the founders of new sects.

(7.) The disposition of races. Montesquieu, in his *Esprit des Lois*, remarks that Protestantism is prevalent in Northern Catholicism in Southern Europe, and explains most judiciously, "C'est que les peuples du nord ont un esprit d'indépendance et de liberté, que n'ont pas les peuples du midi."

An interessant problem, if it has its interest in its successes. These are well set forth in the following extract from Prof. Fisher's address at the Evangelical Alliance Congress, 1874:

(1.) Its whole character is favorable to civil and religious freedom and the promotion of the multiplied advantages of the Reformation spirit. The man of New Testament Catholicism man was deprived of his personal rights under Protestantism he regained them. The progress of civil liberty after a step of history is marked by the growing respect paid to the rights of the individual, and the idea is afforded for unfoldng of the power for the realization of his aspirations. A new sense was something imposing in those huge despotisms—England, Spain, and so forth, the most powerful and multifarious human beings were welded together under an absolute master. Such empire were an advance upon a primitive state of things, where every man's hand was against his neighbor. Yet they were a crude form of crystallization, and it was the spirit of the didactic cities of Greece, with their freer political life, and the larger scope which allowed for the activity and the culture of the individual, and the separation of mind and body that formed the match for the colossal might of the East. Among the Greeks and Romans, however, although governments of law and reason were in the horizon, the State was the end and to the State the individual must yield an exclusive allegiance. It was a great gain when the Christian Church arose, and when the individual became conscious of an allegiance of the soul to a higher kingdom—an allegiance which did not supersede his loyalty to the civil authority, but limited while it sanctioned this obligation. But the Church itself at length erected a supremacy over the State, the Church made the State subject to the free action of reason and conscience, and even stretched that supremacy so far as to make it the great central power. It reared its thronocracy, and subjected everything to its unlimited sway. The Reformation gave back to the individual his proper autonomy, and infused in his intellect a new interest in intellectual activity, a development of inventive capacity and of energy of character, which give rise to such achievements in the life of the Church as are found in political and in every other line of men where self-sufficiency and personal force are called for. And again, if a nation is to be made, the mind of man, the welfare of the nation, the power of the nation is what counts. In the period immediately following the Reformation, signals proofs were afforded of this truth. The little states of Holland, for example, proved their ability to cope with the Spanish empire, to gain their independence, and to acquire an opulence and a culture which recalled the best days of the Greek republics. They beat back their invaders from their soil, and sent forth their victorious navies upon every sea, while at home they were educating the common people, fostering science and learning, and building up universities famous throughout Europe. England, France, and Spain, in the past, and England in the present, have been evidencing the same ascendancy; the period, likewise, of Shakespeare, Bacon, and Raleigh. Who can doubt that the United States of America are, not indeed wholly, but in great part, indebted for their position, as contrasted with that of Mexico and all the political communities of South America, to this expansion of the power of the individual, which is the uniform and legitimate fruit of Protestant principles?

(2.) The spirit of Protestantism favors universal education. To possess the Scriptures, to take part in the administration of government in the Church, must not be an illiterate people. The rights and privileges under the Protestant system, are indispensable. The weight of personal responsibility for the culture of his intellectual and spiritual life, rests upon every individual. If education is to be a matter of universal concern. Far more has been done in Protestant than in Roman Catholic countries for the instruction of the whole people. It is enough to refer to the communicational system of Holland, of New England, and to Protestant Germany, to show how natural it is for the disciples of the Reformation to provide for its great national foundation.

"The free circulation of the Bible in Protestant lands has disseminated among all classes of the population, as of religious improvement, the good effect of which is immeasurable. As a repository of history, biography, poetry, ethics, temptation, and a guide to heaven, the Bible has exerted an influence on the common mind, to all Protestant nations, which it would be difficult to equal if not in the influence but in the extent of its circulation. The Bible and of exploring its pages for fresh truth affords a mental stimulant of a very high order. Many writers have the Scriptures carried into the cottage of the peasant a breadth and refinement of intellect which otherwise would never have been acquired, and which are not produced by the Roman Catholic system, in relation to the same social class, has ever been able to engender.

(3.) That Protestantism should be more friendly to civil and religious liberty than the Roman Catholic system would be unanswerably proved from the nature of the two forms of faith. Protestantism involves, as a vital element, an assertion of personal rights with respect to religion, the highest concern of man, that Protestantism casts off the yoke of priestly rule, and puts ecclesiastical government, in due measure, into the hands of the laity. We have already said, that the Church against the laity against a usurped ecclesiastical authority. The Church of England is now, under the ancient binding duty is to bow with unquestioning docility and obedience to their heaven-appointed superiors. How is it possible to give the people a sense of mind which is incompatible with a patient endurance of tyranny at the hands of the civil power? How can a people who have been accustomed to fail to bring it, eventually at least, a corresponding respect for all kinds of arbitrary power, and a readiness to submit to the exercise in legislation? How can men who are accustomed to judge for themselves and act independently in Church affairs maintain a slavish spirit in the political sphere? On the contrary, the habit which Roman Catholicism nurtures, tends to beggar men to servility in the obedience to the ruler as long as an alliance is kept up between sovereign and religion and personal freedom can accommodate itself to any of the various types of political society. Her doctors have at times preached an extreme theory of popular rights and of the sovereignty of the people. While the State is subordinate to the Church, of any government of form, may he be tolerable there may be an interest in the part of the priesthood in inculcating political theories which operate, in their judgment, to weaken the obligations of loyalty towards civil magistrate, and to exalt by contrast the divine authority of the Church. When the civil magistracy presumes to exercise prerogatives, or to ordain measures, which are deemed fraught with the ecclesiastical interest, a radical question of the doctrine of the Church is raised. It is feared that the philosophy, and in the pulpit of the most conservative of religious bodies. Generally speaking, however, the Church of England, in the exercise of a perfect influence on the political institutions, is left free to exercise all kinds of tyranny, without any check from the ecclesiastical. The State, it is said, proves omnipotent; the civil magistrate is delivered from the wholesome dread of ecclesiastical censure, and is left free to exercise all kinds of tyranny, without the powerful restraint to which he was subjected under the mediceo system. He may even violate the rights of conscience with impunity. The State, it is sometimes said, when released from its subordinating influence in the Church, a good example of her people was reinforced in a remarkable degree by the stimulus derived from the peculiar genius of the Protestant system of the period with which she was supplying her naval ascendency; the period, likewise, of Shakespeare, Bacon, and Raleigh. Who can doubt that the United States of America are, not indeed wholly, but in great part, indebted for their position, as contrasted with that of Mexico, as the political communities of South America, to this expansion of the power of the individual, which is the uniform and legitimate fruit of Protestant principles?"

(4.) The spirit of Protestantism favors universal education. To possess the Scriptures, to take part in the administration of government in the Church, must not be an illiterate people. The rights and privileges under the Protestant system, are indispensable. The weight of personal responsibility for the culture of his intellectual and spiritual life, rests upon every individual. If education is to be a matter of universal concern. Far more has been done in Protestant than in Roman Catholic countries for the instruction of the whole people. It is enough to refer to the communicational system of Holland, of New England, and to Protestant Germany, to show how natural it is for the disciples of the Reformation to provide for its great national foundation.

"The free circulation of the Bible in Protestant lands has disseminated among all classes of the population, as of religious improvement, the good effect of which is immeasurable. As a repository of history, biography, poetry, ethics, temptation, and a guide to heaven, the Bible has exerted an influence on the common mind, to all Protestant nations, which it would be difficult to equal if not in the influence but in the extent of its circulation. The Bible and of exploring its pages for fresh truth affords a mental stimulant of a very high order. Many writers have the Scriptures carried into the cottage of the peasant a breadth and refinement of intellect which otherwise would never have been acquired, and which are not produced by the Roman Catholic system, in relation to the same social class, has ever been able to engender.

(5.) That Protestantism should be more friendly to civil and religious liberty than the Roman Catholic system would be unanswerably proved from the nature of the two forms of faith. Protestantism involves, as a vital element, an assertion of personal rights with respect to religion, the highest concern of man, that Protestantism casts off the yoke of priestly rule, and puts ecclesiastical government, in due measure, into the hands of the laity. We have already said, that the Church against the laity against a usurped ecclesiastical authority. The Church of England is now, under the ancient binding duty is to bow with unquestioning docility and obedience to their heaven-appointed superiors. How is it possible to give the people a sense of mind which is incompatible with a patient endurance of tyranny at the hands of the civil power? How can a people who have been accustomed to fail to bring it, eventually at least, a corresponding respect for all kinds of arbitrary power, and a readiness to submit to the exercise in legislation? How can men who are accustomed to judge for themselves and act independently in Church affairs maintain a slavish spirit in the political sphere? On the contrary, the habit which Roman Catholicism nurtures, tends to beggar men to servility in the obedience to the ruler as long as an alliance is kept up between sovereign and religion and personal freedom can accommodate itself to any of the various types of political society. Her doctors have at times preached an extreme theory of popular rights and of the sovereignty of the people. While the State is subordinate to the Church, of any government of form, may he be tolerable there may be an interest in the part of the priesthood in inculcating political theories which operate, in their judgment, to weaken the obligations of loyalty towards civil magistrate, and to exalt by contrast the divine authority of the Church. When the civil magistracy presumes to exercise prerogatives, or to ordain measures, which are deemed fraught with the ecclesiastical interest, a radical question of the doctrine of the Church is raised. It is feared that the philosophy, and in the pulpit of the most conservative of religious bodies. Generally speaking, however, the Church of England, in the exercise of a perfect influence on the political institutions, is left free to exercise all kinds of tyranny, without any check from the ecclesiastical. The State, it is said, proves omnipotent; the civil magistrate is delivered from the wholesome dread of ecclesiastical censure, and is left free to exercise all kinds of tyranny, without the powerful restraint to which he was subjected under the mediceo system. He may even violate the rights of conscience with impunity. The State, it is sometimes said, when released from its subordinating influence in the Church, a good example of her people was reinforced in a remarkable degree by the stimulus derived from the peculiar genius of the Protestant system of the period with which she was supplying her naval ascendency; the period, likewise, of Shakespeare, Bacon, and Raleigh. Who can doubt that the United States of America are, not indeed wholly, but in great part, indebted for their position, as contrasted with that of Mexico, as the political communities of South America, to this expansion of the power of the individual, which is the uniform and legitimate fruit of Protestant principles?
tichristian institution. The fact that a layman can be as good a Christian as a priest is overlooked. The Christian layman who has to rely on the commonwealth, on the Christian magistrates who are set over them, are quite as able to dispose of his rights, and he can do it for the common weal, as if they were subject to an organised priesthood. Since the Reformation a layman has his Church in the Bible Church State, and civil magistrates in England have borne a part in ecclesiastical government. Without entering into the question of the righteousness or expediency of establishments, or broaching any of the controverted topics connected with the doctrine of Zwingle about the Eucharist shall be prohibited; (3) the Anabaptists shall not be tolerated; (4) libels against religious parties and about religious matters are interdicted. These articles did not meet the pretensions of Luther's followers. The Lutheran states asserted that in matters of faith a majority of votes was not decisive, and that the resolutions of 1526, unanimously voted, could only be abrogated by a unanimous vote. They, in consequence, protested against the resolutions of the diet, and it was thus that the followers of the Reformation were in derision called Protestants. They declared their readiness to abandon their emperor and the diet in all "suitful and possible matters," but against any order considered by them repugnant to "God and his holy Word, to their soul's salvation, and their good conscience," they appealed to the emperor, to the free council, and to the imperial parlements. The essential principles involved in the protest against this decree and in the arguments on which it was grounded were (1) that the Catholic Church cannot be the judge of the Reformed churches, which are no longer in communion with her; (2) that the authority of the Bible is supreme, and above that of councils and bishops; (3) that the Bible is not to be interpreted and used according to tradition, or use, and wont, but to be explained by means of itself, its own language, and connection. As this doctrine—that the Bible, explained independently of external tradition, is the sole authority in all matters of faith and discipline—is really the foundation-stone of the Reformation, the term Protestant was extended from those who signed the Spires protest to all who embraced the fundamental principle involved in it. The protesting parties were as follows: John, the elector of Saxony, the landgrave of Hesse, the marquess of Brandenburg-Bayreuth, a prince of Anhalt, a number of Frankish and Suabian imperial cities—Nuremberg, Ulm, Kempten, Nördlingen, Horb, and Oriental parts of Germany, Brandenburg, Windsheim, Strasburg, Constance, Lindau, and Memmingen. The four last named had joined the protest on account of the interdict of Zwingle's doctrine, which interdict met with the entire approval of Luther and his adherents, excepting the article against the Anabaptists, and, while Luther approved of the protest, he exhorted at the same time the Protestant powers to destroy the impious Anabaptists with fire and sword, and accept the resolutions of the diet in this respect. Now, the new doctrines being in possession of a name which indicated their common hostile relation to the Roman Church, the schism became less curable, and reconciliation was therefore less practicable than ever. See Reformation.

The term Protestant, which thus came to be synonymous with non-Romanist, was applied, first, as a convenient historical term designating collectively all who deny the usurped supremacy of the pope; secondly, as a term of controversy implying (1) a condemnation of alleged Romanist errors and superstitions, and sometimes (2) a yet further restriction of certain tenets supposed to be of the essence of Protestantism. The principle of Protestantism is the sufficiency and authority of the Scriptures as a religious rule of faith and practice. Those, on the one hand, who deny its sufficiency are not in principle Protestants. The former include not only all members of the Roman Catholic church, but also the authority of the Church to speak for God, either in adding to the doctrines of the Bible or in giving them a
blending and authoritative interpretation; and those, on the other hand, who deny its divine authority are not properly Protestants; and the latter embrace all those who think that man alone can make the all-sufficient guide and standard in religious faith and practice, and that the Bible is only to be used like other books—as a light, but not as an authority. In 1659 it was stated in Milton's "Treatise of Civil Power in Ecclesiastical Causes" that the so-called "all sound Protestant writers that neither traditions, councils, nor canons of any visible Church, much less edicts of any magistrate or civil session, but the Scripture only, can be the final judge or rule in matters of religion, and that only in the conscience of every Christian to himself." Therefore, in the name of Protestantism, had never been recanted this doctrine, which prefers the Scripture before the Church, and acknowledges none but the Scripture sole interpreter of itself to the conscience. If by the Protestant doctrine we believe the Scripture—not for the Church's saying, but for its own word as the Word of God—then ought we to believe in what we believe the Church to say, though the visible Church with all her doctors gainsay. To interpret the Scripture convincingly to his own conscience none in the way of the Holy Ghost, guided by the Spirit, and under the light of the Word so guided, more than be to himself can be a worse deceiver. This is not the doctrine of the Church of England. If the Church have authority in controversies of faith, it is a matter of conscience to submit one's private judgment to that authority. There exist in the world two authorities mutually corroborative, and independent of each other, and, so far as individual interpretation of each, mutually corrective of each other—the inspired Word and the inspired Church; the inspired Word receiving its canonicity, its interpretation, from the Church, and the inspired Church tested in its development by the inspired Word." (Bishop Forbes, on Thirty-nine Art. p. 95). Of course, since Protestantism recognizes the right of private judgment in the interpretation of Scripture, it allows a wide divergence of theological views, and such a divergence actually exists. At the same time, the differences in the belief of the various Protestant sects generally relate to minor points, as of worship, ceremonial, and form of ecclesiastical government, nearly all the great Protestant denominations being substantially agreed respecting the fundamental points of doctrine as taught by the Word of God. Mr. Chillingworth, addressing himself to a writer in favor of the Church of Rome, speaks of the religion of the Protestants in the following excellent terms: "Know then, sir, that when I say the religion of Protestantism is to be preferred before yours, on the one side, I do not understand by your religion the doctrine of that which is not taught by any other body of Christians. I do not mean the doctrine of the Sarbonne, or the Jesuits, or of the Dominicans, or of any other particular company among you, but that wherein you all agree, or profess to agree, the doctrine of the Council of Trent; so, accordingly, on the other side, by the religion of Protestants, I do not understand the doctrine of Luther, Calvin, or Melanchthon, or the Confession of Augsburg, or Geneva, or the Catechism of the Church of England. No, nor the harmony of Protestant confessions: but that in which they all agree, and which they all subscribe with a greater harmony, as a fect rule of faith and action—that is, the Bible. The Bible I say—the Bible only—is the religion of Protestants. Whatever else they believe beside it, and the plains, the intransigent, inadmissible consequences of it, well may they hold to the utmost height, and still entertain a terror of opinion; but of an authority, or a matter of faith and religion, neither can they with their conscience to their own grounds believe it themselves, nor require belief of it of others. With which high end, nor other, nor any other, are the Scriptures taught the doctrine of predetermination and others connected intimately, if not necessarily, with it. From him sprang the Arminians, who, as a sect, are reduced to an insignificant number. The Socinians, or Unitarians, are accepted in the main by the Methodists, by most of the Episcopalians, and by many in other denominations. The Socinians denied that the doctrines of the Trinity, the atonement, and the proper deity of Jesus Christ were to be found in the Bible. They thus revived the views of the earlier Arians, while at the same time they carried their denials much further. Their views have found expression in one wing of the Unitarian and Universalist churches of the present day. Their most general acceptance is in New England and in parts of Great Britain; but there are some churches in this country—so far as to secure its independence of the church, and the movement was too deep and powerful for him to control; but the royal and ecclesiastical influence combined to retain the Episcopal form of government and
the union of Church and State. Both are still preserved in the Church of England, and the former in the Episcopal Church of this country. Its symbols of doctrine are equal in importance to Armenians and.t Smith's civil and religious controversies which, a few centuries later, plunged England into civil war, gave impetus to the idea of absolute ecclesiastical independence. The result was the organization of churches which were mainly Calvinistic in belief, but in which the absolute right of the people of each Church to manage their own affairs was maintained. In England they took the name of Independents, in the United States that of Congregationalists. As early as the days of Luther, the Reformers were divided on the question of baptism; those who maintained that baptism should be administered only by immersion and to adults took the name of Baptists, which they retain to this day. The 18th century witnessed a general revival of religious spirit, especially in England and the United States, differing from that which characterized the Reformation in that it was less a battle against error in doctrine, and more a simple awakening of Christian zeal to use for the redemption of the masses the truths which the Reformation had brought to light. Out of this awakening grew Methodism, which is essentially Arminian in doctrine and Episcopal in government, and differs from the Episcopal Church, from which it came out, rather in the spirit and character of its adherents than in theology. These churches represent the chief forms of Protestantism. There is also a large number of minor groups, and most of them are offshoots from these great branches.

The total Protestant population of the world is estimated in 1890 to be more than 120,000,000, a little more than half the Roman Catholic population. It is thus divided:

- United States: 35,000,000
- British America: 2,000,000
- Mexico: 9,000
- South America: 70,000
- Dutch American possessions: 25,000
- Danish and Swedish possessions: 55,000
- Haiti: 12,000
- Spain: 9,000
- Portugal: 1,000
- France: 2,000
- Austria: 8,000
- Prussia: 15,949,528
- Rest of Germany proper: 11,134,440
- Italy: 103,000
- Switzerland: 1,667,195
- Holland: 2,831,330
- Great Britain and Ireland: 24,000,000
- Denmark: 9,080,000
- Sweden and Norway: 6,580,000
- Russia: 4,000,000
- Turkey: 15,000
- Greece: 3,000
- Austro-Turkish India: 45,000
- China: 24,500
- Japan: 30,000
- East and Farther India: 400,000
- United States: 20,000
- Persia: 1,500
- Arabia: 2,000
- English Africa: 1,000
- Algeria: 9,000
- Egypt: 9,000
- Abyssinia: 50,000
- Madagascar: 100,000
- Australia and Polynesia: 2,000,000

The population connected with or under the influence of Protestant churches at the close of 1874 was about as follows:

- America: 33,000,000
- Europe: 71,000,000
- Asia: 1,000,000
- Africa: 1,000,000
- Australia and Polynesia: 1,000,000

Total: 119,000,000

See Protestantism; Reformation.

Protestants. See Resolutionists; Scotland, CHURCHES IN.

Protevangelium, a spurious gospel ascribed to James, containing an account of the birth of Mary and of Christ. It is supposed to have been written in repro.

Prothode, Sr., a French prelate who flourished near the opening of the 7th century; he died before 625. He has been called son of the patrician Prothode, but without proof. It is at least certain that he was the successor of St. Nicephore in the metropolitan see of Besançon. He compiled a ritual for the use of the two cathedral churches at Besançon—St. Étienne and St. Jean, which has not reached us without interpolations; it has recently been published by the abbé Richard.

Prothero, AMOS SUMMERS, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Clarke County, Ind., April 17, 1832. He went to Iowa when quite young, and with his parents settled near Libertyville, Jefferson County. He was converted in 1846, and at once joined the Methodist Episcopal Church. His convictions of duty pointed him to the ministry as a life-work, and, the better to fit himself for the sacred office, he entered the Mount-Pleasant Collegiate Institute, afterwards the Iowa Wesleyan University, in 1852, where he continued his studies until 1857, when he graduated. He was licensed to preach while at college. After graduating he was immediately employed on the Dodgeville Circuit by the presiding elder, and in 1857 joined the Iowa Conference. His appointments were Denmark, Wapello, Dodgeville, Grand View, Crawfordsville, New London, Kossuth, Montezuma, New Sharon, and Birmingham. At the last-named place he died, April 1, 1873, greatly respected by his own people and the Church generally.

Prothéseis (1), a small altar in Greek churches corresponding to the credence table. The name is taken from the shew-bread, which was called ἡ πρόθεσις τῶν ἄρτων—the setting-out of the loaves. (2) A small side-altar in a Cucigna church, on the epistle side, at which the ministers of the altar, on Sundays and festivals, partake of both kinds, using a silver calamus to drink of the chalice.

Protonotary, a word that has a different signification in the Greek Church from what it has in the Latin; for in the first it is the name of one of the great officers of the Church of Constantinople, who takes rank next to the patriarch, and writes all despatches he sends to the grand seignior; besides which he is empowered to have an inspection over the professors of the law, into purchases, wills, and the liberty given to slaves; but in the Roman Church they were formerly called protonotaries who had the charge of writing the acts of the martyrs and circumstances of their death, a title of honor whereunto are ascribed many privileges, as legitimizing bastards, making apostolic notaries [see Protonotarius Apostolicus], doctors of divinity and of the canon and civil law: they are twelve in number.

Proto (from). This adjective is prefixed to the name of several officers in the Greek Church, denoting that he who holds it is the chief or classe.

Protodiacon. The protodiacon, or archdeacon, holds the first rank among the deacons employed in the Episcopal Church to assist the bishop during worship and in the exercise of his office. He is next in rank to the bishop near the person of the bishop or archbishop, and stands at his side while he is performing the liturgical rites or conferring holy orders. The splendor of the episcopal
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dignity reflected on this office, and the influence which the archdeacons in all times exercised upon the bishop, made of the protonotary the arch-deacon in the Greek-Russian Church a very important person. In larger parishes several deacons are employed, but only the first deacon of an episcopal church is distinguished by the honorary title of archi- or proto diaconus.

Protonotarius Apostolicus is a notary appointed by the papal see. The qualification of πρωτοπήγα (primus) is but honorary. In the apostolic chancery rules the word "protope" is regularly employed, but the papal bulls and rescripts call the same functionary "notarius apostolicae." The papal notaries appointed in the city of Rome (in curia), and forming, twelve in number, a special college of prelates, are distinguished by the addition "Notarii "de numero participantium" from those appointed abroad (extra curiam), who are simply notarii or protonotarii, sometimes with the specification "extra numerum." The former are the regular and paid, the latter the extraordinary and titular notaries. The origin of the papal notariate is assigned to the 1st century, for pope Clement I is said to have employed seven of them in noting the memoriabila of the Church, and composing trustworthy accounts of the various manners in which the martyrs were brought to death. In later ages it became the business of the protonotaries to write the biographies, canons of the councils, draw up autographs of the acts of the Consistory of Cardinals, especially in cases of Beatification, canonization, etc. Their college was increased to twelve members and endowed with great privileges by pope Sixtus V. They precede in the papal chapel at different solemnities the Auditorius R. Rotae, all cameral ecclesiastics and lower prelates, and the genera of orders. Formerly they often enjoyed precedence over bishops, but Paul II declared that at Rome and abroad they should step after the episcopate. Only in public consistories and in processions the cavalesc for protonotaries take their place immediately after the assistant bishops of the pontifical chapel, and consequently in front of the episcopate. They are, moreover, not subject to the jurisdiction of the ordinaries, but are placed under the immediate protection of the pope; they can freely dispose by testament even of their beneficial fortune to the amount of 2000 ducats; they receive all messages and graces of the pope free of tax and stamp; they have free access to the papal chancery, to the public consistories, and to the cardinal consistories, debates of the emperor, or beatification or canonization. They are entitled, under certain restrictions, to use portable altars in saying mass, and at certain festivals to wear the pontifical badges (comp. Sixt. V, Const. "Romanus Pontifex" and "Laudabilis"). They have also the peculiar privilege of creating annually six doctors, who enjoy all the rights of regularly graduated doctors; but only residents of Rome can be thus promoted (Bened. XIV, Const. Inter Consipicuos, d. iv Cal. Septbr. 1744). These distinctions belong exclusively to the regular protonotarii appointed by the pope himself. Those "extra statum," and the titular notaries, who can be appointed not only by the pope, but also by his legate a latere, and, with some restrictions, by the college of real protonotaries, occupy in the scale of rank the degree next to the canons of a cathedral, and only if they are theologically provided with a canonical have they precedence over the other members of chapters. They wear the violet talarium, with the mantel of the same color. In the performance of Church functions they are permitted the ring, but without jewel.—Wetzer u. Wele, Kirchen Lexicon, a. v.

Protopappas is the archpriest in the Greek Church who stands on the left hand of the patriarch (q. v.), his dignity consisting in the administration of the holy sacrament to the patriarch at all high and solemn masses, and receives it from him. He is the head ecclesiastical dignity not only with respect to his peculiar privileges, but to his right and title to precedence.

Protoprobyter (πρωτοπροβυτερος, usually called protopope) is in the Russo-Greek Church an immediate decree between the bishop and the simple priest. The situation and functions of the protopresbyter are essentially the same as those of the former archpriests of the episcopal cathedrals, and of the deans in the country. Each cathedral has its protopresbyter, but the same dignity exists in other important churches of large cities where several popes are employed. The title belongs also to such popes of the first rank as exercise some rights of supervision and administration over several surrounding parishes; for every diocese or eparchy in Russia is divided into several protopopes (as in the Roman Catholic Church into deaneries). This class of dignitaries forms, in litigious and disciplinary matters of ecclesiastical resort, the first instance in the diocese. In important cities the protopopes are generally employed as counsellors, assessors, or secretaries in the episcopal consistories or other ecclesiastical colleges. The distinguishing garment of the protopopes is the so-called epigonation. The protopresbyterate is the most influential of the lower clerical functions, and the highest degree open to a secular ecclesiastic; for in the Greek Church the episcopate, and the still higher dignities, can only be occupied by unmarried priests, or such as are separated from their wives by death or voluntary renunciation, and who belong to the monastical order, mostly archimandrites (aboba) and hegumenos (priorm).—Wetzer u. Wele, Kirchen Lexicon, a. v.

Protopsaltes is the chief singer or master of the choir in Greek churches.

Protosynceulius is the vicar or assistant of a Greek patriarch, who generally resides along with him in his palace.

Protosynthinos is in the Greek Church, the name of the first bishop of an ecclesiastical province; he holds the first rank after the patriarch or after the metropol. At the death of either of these latter dignitaries, the protosynthinos assumes his jurisdiction until a successor is installed.

Prototypos is a term used in theology to designate the original type (q. v.) or form of anything, and especially in the following dogmas: The prototypal form is which Adam was created was the image of God; is Christ that image is restored; and it is the hope of the Christian that this form will be his also when he wake up after God's likeness and is satisfied with God. It is therefore, that has an anthropological, Christological, and a eschatological character, as referring to Adam, to the Redeemer, and to the redeemed. Now, in what does that likeness consist? Not surely in outward form, but in spiritual attributes, for God is Spirit. But those attributes pertain to the soul invested in body, which God has not; therefore the likeness of God must be restricted to such divine attributes as are reflected in man independently of his material nature, such as a love for all that is good and holy, right, reason, and free-will, which constitute in him the "likeness and glory" of God (1 Cor. xi, 7; see Glory), and exclusive of other attributes that serve only to mark the imperfection of the creature. When Irenæus, therefore (c. Haer. v, 6, speaks of the image of God as being similitudo of a bodily character, he may express correctly the philosophical idea of God the Deity, and therefore the divine likeness, as derived from ancient schools, but he hardly speaks with the authority of Catholic antiquity on a point which had as yet received but little consideration. Our only safe guide is the apostle, who expresses himself with self when he says: the image of God is the very "image of God" (2 Cor. iv, 4), "in the form of God" (Phil. ii, 6), and the "express image of his Person," as well as the "brightness of his glory" (Heb. i, 9),
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Seminary in 1826. After a brief pastorate at Newburyport, Mass., he was elected professor of ancient languages in the University of the City of New York, where he remained from 1838 until 1838. He then spent some time in Europe, and in 1841 accepted the professorship of Latin and Greek literature in the University of Cambridge. In 1854 his chair was confined to Greek literature alone. He resigned in 1851, and transferred his ecclesiastical relation in 1864 to the Presbyterian Church.

After a second protracted residence in Europe, he enlisted in the service of his country, and his war was an exceedingly devoted and useful chaplain to the soldiers of the U.S. Army, being located on Bedloe's Island, in New York Harbor. After his return from the war he lived in New York City. He was a sincere and devout believer in the religion which he preached. His daily walk seemed to be "close with God," until, at last, "God took him." He died of pneumonia, March 3, 1870, after a very short illness, perfectly submissive to the will of the Lord and happy in the prospect of heaven.

Dr. Proudfit was an eminent classical scholar and divine. His mind was highly cultivated, his tastes were refined, and his public life was distinguished by his devotion to literary and theological pursuits. He was a frequent contributor to religious newspapers, and to the Princeton Review and other serial publications. At some time he was a contributor to the Brunswick Quarterly Review. In these periodicals he was actively engaged in the discussion of the exciting controversies connected with what is known as "Mercersburg theology." He edited an edition of Plautus and other classical works. His scholarship was far greater than the ability as a practical teacher of youth. His sermons were always carefully elaborated in style, elegant in expression, and evangelical in spirit, but his quiet delivery failed to give them the power to which their real merits entitled them. Some of these were published by request, among which may be noted: "Harvards Discourse to the Graduating Class of 1841 in Rutgers College," one of the best specimens of his pulpits efforts. Dr. Proudfit was unusually tall and slender, dignified in appearance, with an intellectual head, benevolent face, and polished manners. He excelled as a conversationalist, being full of anecdote and illustration, and happily interweaving his reminiscences of public men and incidents of travel in foreign lands. He took a deep interest in the evangelization of the papal nations of Europe, and was familiar with the great religious questions of those lands. (W. J. T.)

Proudfit, Robert, D.D., an eminent American divine and educator, was born at Hopewell, Pa., June 6, 1777, and graduated at Dickinson College, Pa., in 1788. In 1801 he was ordained, and installed as pastor of the Associate Reformed Church at Brooklyn, N.Y., in which charge he continued until 1818, when he accepted an invitation to the professorship of Greek and Latin at Union College, Schenectady, which situation he filled with distinguished ability until 1849, when, by an act passed by the board of trustees of that college, he was relieved from active duty, and assumed the title of emeritus professor in the same institution. During the whole time in which he was in active duty as professor, Dr. Proudfit did not neglect the call of his sacred profession, and, while his health permitted, he ceased not to preach the Gospel whenever he had opportunity. The zeal and earnestness with which he labored for the Master's cause gained him many admirers. Dr. Proudfit's memory is in the hearts of many made happy by his agency. He died at Schenectady, N.Y., Feb. 11, 1882. See Wilson, Prebys, Hist. Almanac (1882), p. 506.

PROUDHON, Pierre Joseph, a noted French socialist, was born of humble parents, July 15, 1809, at Besançon.

After a rudimentary education, he engaged in printing, and soon became an authority on "Essai de Grammaire Générale," for which he received a
pension. In 1840 he published his work entitled Que'est-ce que la Propriété, which eventually became infamous from the answer which it gave to that question—"La Propriété, c'est le Vol!" and caused him the loss of his pension. During the Revolution he edited an inflammatory paper, which was soon suppressed, but gave him such popularity that he was elected to the Assembly. His notorious principles of anarchy prevented his being heard in the debates, and the papers which he issued in revenge were suppressed for their insurrectionality. In 1849 he started a Banque du Peuple to carry out his communist ideas, but it was closed by the authorities, and he fled to Geneva, but on his return to Paris he was imprisoned. During his three years of incarceration he made the acquaintance of several eminent political works. He died in obscurity at Paris, Jan. 19, 1865. His social theories are of the most extravagant and dangerous character, greatly resembling the radical and immoral principles of the communist revolutionists who are now agitating Europe and this country. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, s. v.

Provender (מִכְַלָם, milap), fodder for cattle (Gen. xxiv, 23, 32). In the account of king Solomon's stables, in 1 Kings iv. 26, we read, "barley, also, and straw for the horses and dromedaries, brought they unto the place where the officers were, every man according to his charge." Harmer remarks upon this passage: "Besides provisions for themselves, the Orientals are obliged to furnish for the beasts of burden which they ride or carry their goods. That food is of different kinds. They make little or no hay in these countries, and are therefore very careful of their straw, which they cut into small bits, by an instrument which at the same time threshes, as in the corn; this chopped straw, with barley, beans, and balls made of bean and barley meal, or of the pounded kernels of dates, are what they are wont to feed with. The officers of Solomon are accordingly said to have brought, every man in his mouth, barley and straw for the horses and dromedaries; not straw to litter them with, there is reason to think, for it is not now used in those countries for that purpose, but chopped straw for them to eat, either alone or with their barley. The litter they use for them is their own dung, dried in the sun, and bruised between their hands, which they heap up again in the morning, sprinkling it in summer with fresh water, to keep it from corrupting. In some other places we read of provender and straw, not barley and straw; because it may be other things were used for their food anciently, as barley now, besides barley and chopped straw, belli, one of the words used for provender (Isa. xxx, 24), implies something of mixture, and the particle of the verb from which it is derived is used for the mingling of flour with oil; so the verb in Judges xix. 21 may be as well translated 'he mingled [food] for the ass's as 'he gave him provender,' signifying that he mixed some chopped straw and barley together for the ass. Thus also barley and chopped straw, as it is just after reaping, unseparated in the field, might naturally be expressed by the Hebrew word we translate provender, which signifies barley and straw that had been mingled together, and accordingly seems to be so. 'They reap every one his corn in the field' (Job xxiv, 6), 'Hebrew, mingled corn or dregle,' says the margin. What ideas are usually affixed to secondary translation I do not know, but Job apparently alludes to the provender, or heap of chopped straw, lying mingled together in the field, to be gleaned unites the threshing instrument, to which he compared the spoils that were taken from passengers so early as his time by those who lived somewhat after the present manner of the wild Arabs, which spoils are to them what the harvest and barley are to us. With this agrees the passage of Job where this work occurs (xxi, 6), 'Will the ox low in complaints over his provender? or [fodder], as it is translated in our version, when he has not only straw enough, but mixed with barley.' Travellers in the East, wherever they mention the subject, use much the same terms as Walpole, who, in his Journals, remarks, 'Neither the Turks, nor oasis are known to the Turks; for any nation in the East ever used them for their homes.' See FODDEN.

Provensale, David ben-Abraham, who flourished in the 16th century, was a preacher at Mantua, and was so eloquent that he was styled נבוי ומל, יואל כפרסי, i.e. the prince of preachers in his generation. He wrote: ד"ה יתנ, a commentary on the Pentateuch from an archaological point of view: יתנ ומכ, a commentary on the Song of Songs: יתנ ומכ, a comparative lexicon, Hebrew, Latin, Greek, and Italian: יתנ ומכ, a Hebrew grammar. See Fürst, Bibl. Jud. iii. 128; De Rossi, Dizionario Storico degli Autori Ebrei, p. 272 ( Germ. transl. by Hamberger); Ehrlich, Introduction to Jewish Literature, p. 286, Steinshneider, Jewish Literature, p. 239. (B. P.)

Proverb. מָחֵץ, mashāḥ, rendered in the A. V. 'by-word,' 'parable,' 'proverbi' (rapaḇolāj, ḫāḇūrōj), expresses all and even more than is conveyed by these its English representatives. It is derived from a root מָחֵץ, mashāḥ, 'to be like' (Arab. makhāth, to 'resemble'), and the primary idea involved in it is that of likeness, comparison. This form of comparison would very naturally be taken by the short, pithy sayings which passed into use as popular sayings and proverbs, especially when employed in mockery and sarcasm, as in Mic. ii. 4; Hab. ii. 6, and even in the more developed taunting song of triumph for the fall of Babylonia in Isa. xiv. 4. Probably all proverbial sayings were at first of the nature of similes, but the term mashāḥ soon acquired a more extended significance. It was applied to denote such short, pointed sayings as do not involve a comparison directly, but still convey their meaning by the help of a figure, as in 1 Sam. x. 12; Ezek. xii. 22, 25; xvii. 2, 3 (comp. waḵaḇolāj, Luke iv. 23). From this stage of its application it passed to that of sententious maxims generally, as in Prov. i. 1; x. xxxv; x. 1; xxxv; x. 7, 9; Eccles. xii. 9; Job xii. 12, many of which, however, still involve a comparison (Prov. xxx. 3, 11, 13, 14; xxxi. 1, 2, 3, etc.). Such comparisons are either expressed, or the things compared are placed side by side, and the comparison left for the hearer or reader to supply. Next we find it used of those larger pieces in which a single idea is no longer exhausted in a sentence, but forms the germ of the whole, and worked out into a didactic piece. Many instances of this kind occur in the first section of the book of Proverbs; others are found in Job xxxvii and xxxix, in both which chapters Job takes up his mashāḥ, or 'parable,' as it is rendered in the A. V. The 'parable' of Balaam, in Num. xxiii. 7-10; xxxiv. 5, 15, 18, 20, 21-22, 23-24, are prophecies conveyed in figures; but mashāḥ also denotes the 'parable' proper, as in Ezek. xxi. 2, xx. 49 (xxi. 5); xxxiv. 3. Lowth, in his notes on Isa. xiv. 4, speaking of mashāḥ, says: 'I take this to be the general name for poetical style for the Hebrews, including every sort of it, as ranging under one, or other, or all of the characters, sententious, figurative, and sublime; which are all contained in the original notion, or in the use and application of the word mashāḥ. Parables or proverbs, such as those of Solomon, are always expressed in short, pointed sentences; frequently figurative, being formed on some comparison, both in the matter and the form. Such, in general, is the style of the Hebrew poetry. Balaam's first prophecy (Num. xxiii. 7-10) is called his mashāḥ, although it has hardly anything figurative, and is written in that beautiful sententious style, and, from the very form and manner of it, has great spirit, force, and energy. Thus Job's last speeches, in answer to the three friends (ch. xxvii-
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xxxii, are called *maskulit* from no one particular character which discriminates them from the rest of the poem, but from the sublime, the figurative, the sententious manner which equally prevails through the whole poem, and makes it one of the first and most eminent examples extant of the truly great and beautiful in poetic style." Sir W. Jones says, "The moralists of the East have in general chosen to deliver their precepts in short, sententious maxims, to illustrate them by sprightly comparisons, or to inculcate them in the very ancient forms of agreeable apologues; there are, indeed, both in Arabic and Persian, philosophical tracts on ethics written with sound ratioincation and elegant perspicuity. But in every part of the Eastern world, from Pekin to Damascus, the popular teachers of moral wisdom have imperiously been poets, and their works would be no end of enumerating their works, which are still extant in the five principal languages of Asia." See PARABLE. Our Lord frequently employed proverbs in his public instructions; and the illustration of these proverbs has occupied many learned men, who proceeded partly by the aid of similar passages from the Old Testament, and partly from the ancient writings of the Jews, especially from the Talmud, whence it appears how much they were in use among that people, and that they were applied by Christ and his apostles agreeably to common usage. The proverbs contained in the New Testament are collected and illustrated by Drusius and Anastasius Chocius, whose works are comprised in the ninth volume of the *Critici Sacri*, and also by Joachim Zehrer, who elucidated them by parallel passages from the fathers, as well as from heathen writers, in a treatise published at Leipsic in 1601. The proverbs which are found in the New Testament have been illustrated by Vorstius and Viscar, as well as by Lightfoot and Schöttgen in their *Nora Hebraica et Talmudica*, and by Buxtorf in his *Lexicon Chaldeicum Talmudicum et Rabbinicum*, from which are quoted Bicknell, Mezulain, Dr. Whitby, Dr. Adam Clarke, and other commentators, who have derived their illustrations of the Hebrew parables and proverbs. See Kelly, *Proverbs of all Nations* (Lond. 1839, 8vo); Sterling, *Literature of Proverbs* (ibid. 1860, 8vo); Bohm, *Book of Proverbs*. See Proverbs, Book of.

Proverbs, Book of, the 20th book of the Old Testament, according to the arrangement of the English Bible, where it is placed between the Psalms and Ecclesiastes, doubtless from its presumed relation to the other works of Solomon; and which, while it is likewise follows the Psalms as part of the Kethubim, or Hagiographa. In the German MSS. of the Hebrew Old Testament, the Proverbs are placed between the Psalms and Job, while in the Spanish MSS., which follow the Masoretic, the order is Psalms, Job, Proverbs. This latter is the order observed in the Alexandrian MS. of the Sept. Melito, following another Greek MS., arranges the Hagiographa thus: Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, Job, as in the list made out by the Council of Laodicea; and the same order is given by Origen, except that the book of Job is separated from the other by the prophets Isaiah, Jeremiah, Daniel, and Ezekiel. But our present arrangement existed in the time of Jerome (see Pref. in *Liber Regum*, iii:1:1: "Tertius ordo dyuōγεσεν posse: et primus liber incipit ab Job, Sequenda a David... Tertius est Solomon, tres libros habens: Proverbin, quum illi parabolis, id est Maashaloth appellat: Ecclesiastes, id est, Coeleth: Canticum Cantorum, quem titulus Sir Asirim promotori"). In the Peshito Syriac, Job is placed before Joshua, while Proverbs and Ecclesiastes follow the Psalms, and are separated by one of the Long Songs of Solomon, and Gregory of Nazianzum, apparently from the exigencies of his verse, arranges the writings of Solomon in this order: Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, Proverbs. Pseudo-Epiphanius places Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Song of Songs between the two last, 2d book of Kings and the minor prophets. The following article treats of the book both from an internal and an external point of view. See Bible. I. Title.—As in the Pentateuch, the book of Proverbs takes its Hebrew title from its opening words—רֶוֶם מִלָּהָה הָרֶוֶם, or רֶוֶם מִלָּהָה, mislish, simply. From this are directly derived the titles it bears in the Sept. (εὐεργεθείσας Μαιά, and Vulg. *Liber Priscus, Liber Priscus, Libri Priscus, Hebræi, Μιᾱς appellavit, and the name by which it is universally known in English. Another title, perhaps more appropriate to the book as a whole, is derived from its chief subject, "Wisdom." In the Targum to Baba Bathra (fol. 14 b), we find Proverbs and Ecclesiastes combined under the name רֶוֶם מִלָּה, "the book of wisdom," and this title appears to have passed thence into the early Church. Clemens Rom. (Ep. ad Cor. i., 57) when quoting i, 23-31 says, εὑρέθηνεν αὐτὸς λευκὸς τὸ παράδει γος σοφία, a name which, according to Eusebius (H. E. iv. 22), was adopted by Hegesippus, Ireneus, and "the whole band of the ancients," following the unwritten Jewish tradition, and by Clem. Alex. (Strom. ii. 23). It is styled by Gregory Naz. (Orat. xi) πατριαγωγική σοφία, and by Dion. Alex. σοφία βιβλική. In the catalogue of canonical books compiled by Melito of Sardis preserved by Eusebius (H. E. iv. 26), we find Πατρι αγωγική σοφία, εὐεργεθείσας Μαιά, as well as Semiparous, a name which, as we have seen, is of frequent occurrence in the early fathers (see Cotelier in Clem. Rom. L. c.; Vales. ad Eusch. L. c.), though by no means restricted to the book of Proverbs, being equally used, as Cotelier proves, of "Ecclesiasticus" and "The Wisdom of Solomon," a circumstance from which some confusion has arisen.

The word רֶוֶם, maschil, by which the so-called "Proverbs" of Solomon are designated (Prov. i, 1, 6; x, 1; xxv, 1; and 1 Kings iv, 82 [v, 12]), is more appropriately translated in the Vulgate "parabolam." It is akin to the verb רִכָּה, corresponding with the Arabic matathah and the Syriac mathah, "to be like," and primarily signifies "a comparison," or "a similitude," "parable" (Ezek. xxvii, 2; xxiv, 31; whence it easily passed to those pithy, sententious maxims so often in the East appearing in the form of a terse comparison, of which many are to be found in the book before us—e.g. xxvi, 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 14, 17—and then to "proverbs" in general, whether containing a similitude or not (1 Sam. x, 12; xxiv, 18 [14]; Ecclus. xii, 9). Its scope was still further enlarged by its application to longer compositions of a poetical and figurative character—e.g. that of Ballam (Numm. xxxii, 7, 18, etc., and Job xxvii, 1; comp. Ps. xliii, 5; lxvi., ii, 2), and the occasional taunting songs of the soldiers against their fallen enemies—e.g. against the king of Babylon (Isa, iv, 4), the Chaldeans (Hab. ii, 6; comp. also Mic. ii, 4; Deut. xxvii, 97; 1 Kings ix, 7). See Proverbs.

But the book of Proverbs, according to the introductory verses which describe its character, contains, besides several varieties of the maskulit, sententious sayings of other kinds, mentioned in i, 6. The first of these is the שֵּׂפֶת, chiddah, rendered in the A. V. "dark saying," "dark speech," "hard question," "riddle, and once (Hab. ii, 6) "proverb." It is applied to Samson's riddle (Judg. xiv), to the hard questions with which the queen of Sheba tried Solomon (1 Kings x, 6; Comp. Job, i, 1), and is used almost synonymously with maskulit in Ezek. xvii, 2, and in Ps. xliii, 4 (5); xxxivii, 2, in which last passages the poetical character of both is indicated. The word appears to denote a knotty, intricate saying, the solution of which demands much thought and skill: that it was obscure is evident from Num. xii, 8. In addition to the chiddah was the addressing, melethah (Prov. i, 6, A. V. "the interpretation," marg., "an eloquent speech,"") which occurs in Hab. ii, 6 in connection both with chiddah and maskulit. It has been variously explained as a mocking, taunting speech (Ewald); or a speech dark and involved, such as needed a melitah, or interpreter (comp. Gen. xlii, 28; 2 Chron. 29, 2; 2Chron...
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xxiii, 31; Job xxxvii, 28; Isa. xxxii, 27); or again, as by Delitzsch (Der Prophet Habašuk, p. 59), a brilliant or splendid saying ("Glowes- oder Wohlkreden, orato splen-
didum, elegans, luminosus ornatu.") This last interpretation
is not altogether free from the use of the aorist in modern He-
brew, but it certainly does not appear appropriate to the
Proverbs; and the first explanation, which Ewald adopts,
is as little to the point. It is better to under-
stand it as a dark, enigmatical saying, which, like the
moral, might assume the characters of sarcasm and
irony, though not essential to it. See "PAREMAE."  

As might be expected from the nature of the work
contemplated, the proverbs before us almost exclusively
bear reference to the affairs of this life; but while a fu-
ture existence is not formally brought to view, yet the
consciousness of such an existence runs throughout, and
forms the basis on which many of the strongest, most
decisive, and oft-repeated declarations are made. For
example, ch. xi, 7 has no meaning except on the sup-
position that the writer believed in a future life, where,
if not here, the hope and expectation of good men
should be realized. If death were, in his judgment,
annihilation, it would be equally the overthrow of the
expectation of the righteous as of the wicked. See also,
as affording similar indication, ch. xiv, 32; xxiii,
17; xliii, 21. See "IMMORTALITY."  

II. Canonization.-The canonical authority of the book
of Proverbs has never been called in question, except
among the Jews themselves. We learn from the Tal-
mud (Shabbath, fol. 90 b) that the school of Shammai,
thus early adopting the principle of the free handling
of Scripture, was led by some apparent contradictions
in the book (e.g. Prov. xxvi, 4, 6) to question its
inspiration, and to propose to cast it out of the canon.
It is indeed certain, if we credit the Jewish tradition, that
it did not at once take its place on a level with the
other canonical Scriptures, but, like the Antilegomena
of the New Testament, remained for a time in suspense. Ac-
cording to Wolf (Bibl. Hebr. i, 119) and Zunz (Gott.
Vorträge, p. 14), it was not till the period of the Persian
rule that "the men of the great synagogue" admitted it
to an equal rank with the other Hagiographa. In the
remarkable passage of the Talmud, however, which
contains the most ancient opinion of the Jews on the
formation of the Old-Test. canon (Baba Batra, p. 14,
apud Westcott, "Bible in the Church," p. 36), its recogni-
tion is fixed earlier: the Proverbs ("Meshebaim") being
included in the "mother" ("Shir Hashirim"), and Eccelesiastes
("Koheleth") in the "father." The latter, however, the
inscription, and to propose to cast it out of the canon.

I. History of the Text.—The variations from the
existing Masoretic text of the book of Proverbs
presented by the versions of the Sept., the Peshito-Syriac,
the Targum, and to some extent by the Vulgate, bear
witness to the former existence of copies differing in
many and not unimportant points from that which has
become the authoritative text. The text, as preserved
in these ancient versions, differs from that of our He-
brew Bibles both in excess and defect. They contain
clauses, verses, and sometimes paragraphs not to be
found in our extant copies, for the existence of which it is
difficult to account, unless they formed part of the
book which was before the translators; while other
portions are wanting, for the absence of which no sufficient
account can be given, except that they were not read
in the ancient Hebrew MSS. they employed. The very
large number of minor discrepancies, both in language
and arrangement, by which we meet with in the versions
form this view, and it well deserves consideration what

quotations; in the others there is a more or less direct
allusion. See "WISDOM PHYSICIZED."  

III. Divisions.—The thirty-one chapters of the book
of Proverbs may be roughly divided into four sections:
1. The Proverbs of Solomon (i-ix); 2. The first col-
lection of "the Proverbs of Solomon," properly so called,
with its appendices (x-xxiv); 3. The second collection,
compiled by Hezekiah's scribes (xxxv-xxxvii); 4. An ap-
pendix by different writers.
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Influence those variations, which every student knows are not confined to this book, should have on the ordinarily received hypothesis of the integrity and purity of the present Hebrew text. This, however, is not the place for the prosecution of this investigation. We shall content ourselves with pointing out the principal points of the discussion.

1. To commence with the Sept., the earliest of the existing versions. The translation of this book, like that of Job, proves a more competent acquaintance with the Greek language and literature than is usual with the Alexandrian translators. The interpretation is more formal than literal, giving what the writer conceived to be the general spirit of the passage without strict adherence to the actual words. Bertheau remarks that the version of this book appears to have been undertaken rather with a literary than a religious object, as it was not read in the synagogues or required for their internal regulation. It is to this freedom of rendering that not a few of the apparent discrepancies are due, while there are others which are attributable to carelessness, misconception of the writer's meaning, or even possibly to a difference in the text itself. In some instances it has been thought necessary to condense or abbreviate the original, and to add some words that are not in the Hebrew. The result is that the Sept. represents a middle ground between the Greek of the LXX and the Hebrew, and therefore deserves consideration for the history of the text.

In the first division (i-ix) these variations are less considerable than in the second. Two verses appended to ch. iv remove the abruptness of the close and complete the sense. To the simile of the ant (vi, 8), that of the bee is added. The insertion after viii, 21 seems out of place, and disturbs the continuity. In ch. ix there are two considerable additions to the description of the wise and foolish women, which seem to complete the sense in a very desirable manner. The variations are much more considerable in the section x-xvii. A large number of verses are wanting (xi, 4; xii, 6; xvi, 1-4; xvi, 23; xiv, 1-3; xiv, 14-19; xvi, 5; xvi, 6; xvi, 11; xxv; xxv, 23—which comes in very awkwardly in the Hebrew text; xxv, 8); the arrangement of others is dislocated—e.g. ch. xv closes with ver. 29, ver. 30, 32, 33 standing at the beginning of ch. xvi, while a verse very similar to ver. 31 is found after xvi, 17; xix, 8 stands as the last verse of ch. xviii; in ch. xx. ver. 22 comes between ver. 19 and 20. The most extraordinary dislocation, hardly to be ascribed to anything but an error in the translation, is that of xv, 16. After xv, 16 is introduced xvi, 27, to which succeed four district descriptive of the wrath of a king and urging attention to the writer's words, not found in the Hebrew. We then find xxi-xxxi, 9 (i.e. the prophecy of Agur and of Lemuel), with the remainder of ch. xxiv, fused in between ver. 14, 15 of ch. xxx. The remainder of ch. xxxi, the ascription to a virtuous woman, stands in its right place at the end of the book. The additions in this section are also numerous and important. We find proverbs intercalated between the following verses: x, 5, x, vi, 11; xiii, 4, 5; xiv, 12; xiv, 13, 14; xvi, 1-4; xvi, 5, 6; xvi, 11, 12; xvi, 13, 14; xvii, 16, 17; xvii, 20; xvii, 21, 22; xviii, 5, 8, xii, 1, 2, 9 (found with slight variations in 2 Cor. i, 7); xii, 9, 10; xii, 14. In the dislocated ch. xxvi five or perhaps six new proverbs appear. Interca-

lated proverbs are also found in the section xxv-xxix—e.g. xvi, 10, 11; xxvi, 11, 12 (found also in Eccles. iv, 21); xxvii, 20, 21; xxvii, 21; xxviii, 25, 26. Besides these, a careful scrutiny will discover a large number of interpolations throughout, many of which are only explanatory clauses.

To specify the words and clauses which vary from the Hebrew would carry us far beyond our limits. For these and the comparison of the two versions generally, the student may be referred to Jeger, Observ. in Prov. Salom. vera. Alex., and Schlesser, Opusc. Critic. In many of these cases the Sept. has probably preserved the true reading (e.g. x, 10, b), but, on the whole, Ewald and Bertheau agree that the Masoretic text is the better and purer.

2. The Peshito-Syriac version, like the Sept., while it is agreed with the Hebrew text generally, presents remarkable deviations in words and clauses, and contains whole verses of which there is no trace in the Hebrew. Some of the variations only prove a different interpretation of the text, but others are plainly referable to a difference in the text itself—e.g. xiv, 5, 14; xv, 4, 15; xvi, 20; xxii, 16; xxiv, 21, etc.), and thus confirm the view that at the time the version was executed—i.e. anterior to the 4th century—the present Hebrew text was not universally recognised.

3. The Vulgate translation of Proverbs, hastily executed by Jerome in three days (together with Ecclesiastes and Canticles), offers largely the same phenomena as the Sept. version. Many of the additions of the Sept. are to be found in it—e.g. g. x, 4; xii, 11, 13; xv, 5, 27 (comp. xvi, 6); xvi, 5, etc.; and in one or two places Jerome has translated words which are, in the Masoretic text, xvi, 1, 20, etc.). Its similarity to the Peshito is too remarkable to be accidental (i, 2, 8, 5, 6, 8, 10, 12, 13; ii, 9, 10, 18-15; iii, 2-9, etc.), and is probably to be accounted for by the suppression of a subsequent recension of the text, which is very corrupt, based upon that version. See Wolf, Biblioth. Hebr. i, 1176; Dathe, De Rat. Consens. vera. Chald. et Sph. Prov. Salom.; Zunz, Gotth. Akadem. Vorträge.

V. Form and Style. 1. The difference of style and structure between the first and second divisions is apparent on the most cursory perusal. Instead of the detached gnomes of the latter, we find a succession of homiletic addresses, varying in length and differing in subject, though for the most part on the same plan and treated with the same spirit. After viii, 10, the whole does not so much define wisdom as enlarge upon the blessings to be derived from its possession, and the lasting misery which is the consequence of the violation of its precepts, and in the most powerful and moving language urges the young to the earnest pursuit of it as the best of all good things. Whether originally written as a proem or introduction or not, it is certainly well fitted to occupy its present place, and prepare the mind of the reader for the careful consideration of the moral and practical precepts which follow. The style is of a much higher and more significant character than in the succeeding portions, the language is more rhythmic; it abounds in bold personifications and vivid imagery. The concluding chapters (viii, ix) are cast in the grandest mould of poetry, and are surpassed in true sublimity by few portions of Holy Scripture. At the same time, when this portion is viewed as a whole, the poet's poetical skill is discoverable. The style is sometimes diffuse and the repetitions wearisome. The writer returns continually on his steps, treating of the same topic again and again, without any apparent plan or regular development of the subject.

As regards the form, we find but little regularity of structure. The paragraphs consist sometimes of no more than two or three verses (i, 8-9; iii, 11-12; vi, 1-5, 6-11, 12-15, 16-19); sometimes the same thought is carried through a long succession of verses, or even
an entire chapter (ii, 1-22; v, 1-20; vi, 20-85; vii, viii, ix). A very favorite arrangement is a paragraph of ten verses (i, 10-19; ii, 1-10; 11-20; iv, 10-19; viii, 12-21; 22-31), a form which, if we may trust the Sept. version, existed also in the copies employed by them in iv, 20-27; v, 6-11; and, according to the Feshito-Syr., in iv, 8-9, a circumstantial expression like a daggers for times maintained, but frequently neglected. The parallels are usually synonymous (e.g., 8, 9, 11, 12, etc.). The antithetical parallels found in iii, 32-35 belong to a series of gnomes which disturb the harmony of the passage, and appear to belong in their appropriate place. It may be remarked that the name "Elohim" occurs only six times in the whole book, and twice in this section (ii, 5-17; iii, 4). The other places are, xxv, 2; xxx, 5-9. Other unusual words are דְּנָרִים, "wisdoms," for wisdom in the abstract (i, 20; ix, 1; found also in xxiv, 7); יִזְרִי, "the strange woman," which occurs repeatedly (e.g., ii, 16: v, 3, 20, etc., found nowhere else save in xxii, 14; xxiii, 23); and הַיְּלִים, "the stranger" (ii, 16; vii, 5, etc.; found also in xx, 16; xxii, 27; xxvii, 18); or in the pagan prostitute, then a term now lurking at the dark corners of the streets, taken as the representative of the harlot sense seducing the young and inexperienced from true wisdom. Ewald also notices the unusual construction of וְנַעֲשֵׂה, a dual fem. with a verb in the masc. plur. (v, 2); while in the next verse it has properly a fem. plur., and the usual plur. וְנָעֲשֵׂה (viii, 4).

2. In the second division, "the Proverbs of Solomon," which form the kernel of the book, (x-xii, 17), we find a striking similarity of structure throughout. Every verse (reckoned by Delitzsch at 373) in its normal form consists of two members, each containing three, four, or more rarely five short words. (The one exception to this rule [xix, 7] is probably due to the loss of a member, which is supplied by the Sept.) Every verse is independent, with no necessary connection with those that precede or follow, and, generally speaking, no attempt at arrangement. Ewald's theory of a continuous thread of connection running through this collection in its original form, and binding together the scattered sayings, has absolutely no evidence in its favor, and can only be sustained by supposing an almost total dismemberment of this portion of the book. It is true, as Ewald says, that the proverbial form recurs in two or three successive verses (e.g., x, 2-5; 18-21; xi, 4-8; 24-26), but these are the exceptions, and only occur, as Ewald elsewhere allows, when, from the studied brevity of the proverbial form, a thought cannot be expressed in a single sentence. The cases in which the same characteristic word or words recur in successive proverbs are more frequent (e.g., x, 7; 8; 10; xi, 5, 6; 10, 11, etc.). But in every instance each verse gives a single definite idea, nor do we ever meet with two verses so connected that the latter contains the reason of the counsel, or the application of the illustration given in the former.

Nearly the whole of the proverbs in the earlier part of this division are antithetical; but after the middle of ch. xv this characteristic gradually disappears, and is almost entirely lost in the concluding chapters. A large number are synonymous (e.g., xi, 7, 25, 30; xii, 14, 28; xiv, 13, 17, 19, etc., some aphoristic (e.g., xi, 31; xiii, 14), especially with the comparative and יִבְּלָל (e.g., xii, 9; xv, 16, 17; xvi, 8, 9, etc., or יִבְּלָל, "much more" (e.g., xii, 31; xv, 11; xviii, 7). Others are synthetic (x, 18; x, 29; xiv, 17, etc.); only two are parabolic (x, 26; xi, 29, 29). The style is lower and more prosaic than in the former section. Ewald regards it as an example of the most ancient and simplest poetical style, full of primitive terseness, and bearing the visible stamp of antiquity in its language and imagery without any trace of later coloring. He remarks very justly that the proverbs in this collection are not to be looked upon as a collection of popular sayings, embodying mere prudential wisdom, but that they belong to the higher life, and are as broad in their grasp of truth as in their range of thought. The germ of many of them may have been found in popular sayings: but the skill and delicacy with which they have been shaped is in the highest degree wonderful, though of the simplest kind, display the hand of a master.

Ewald remarks the following peculiar phrases as occurring in this section. "Fountain of life," x, 11; xii, 14; xiv, 27; xvi, 29 (comp. Psalms xxxxi, 9 [10]): "tree of life," i, 18; x, 20; xiii, 12; xvii, 2, 4: "sorrows of death," xiii, 14; xiv, 27 (comp. Psalms xxxii, 5 [6]): and the following favorite words—בַּעֲלָה, "healing," in various similes and applications, xiii, 18; xiii, 17; xvi, 24 (but this also occurs in the former section, iv, 22; vi, 15) יִכְרֹשׁ, "destruction," x, 14, 15, 29; xiii, 3; xiv, 28; xviii, 7; xiii, 15; and only in four other places in the whole Bible: יַעֲבֵר, from the root יָבִא, "to blow," xii, 17; xiv, 5, 20; xiii, 5-9 (comp. vi, 19; Psalms xii, 6; xxvii, 11): the unfrequent roots צִכְבַּר, "perverseness," xi, 8; xv, 4; and the verb צַכְבַּה, "to pervert," "to destroy," xiii, 6; xii, 5; xii, 12; xii, 12: the phrase הַיּוֹם הַגֹּאֵל, "the day of retribution," xii, 4; xiii, 5 (comp. xxvi, 20; vii, 29: נָעֲשֵׂה, "we shall render", xi, 19, 21; xii, 21; xxv, 9; x, 7 (comp. xxviii, 19), and nowhere else. Ewald instances also as archaic phrases not met with elsewhere, יִכְרֹשׁ, "but for a moment," xiii, 19: יִכְרֹשׂ, "hand join in hand," xi, 21; xv, 5: יִכְרֹשׂ, "meddled with," xii, 14; xviii, 1; xx, 3: יִכְרֹשׂ, "whisperer," xii, 28; xviii, 8 (comp. xxvii, 20-22). The word יִכְרֹשׁ, "there is," though frequent elsewhere, scarcely occurs in Proverbs, save in this section, xi, 24; xii, 18; xiii, 7; xiv, 12, etc.

8. With xii, 17, "the words of the wise" (comp. i, 5), we are carried back to the style and language of the proem (ch. i-i), of which we are also reminded by the continued address in the second person singular, and the use of "my son." There is, however, a difference in the phrasingology and language; and, as Maurer remarks, the distinction is not unfelt in the rugged and awkward, and somewhat labored. Parallelism is neglected. The moral precepts are longer than those of ch. x-xii, but not so diffuse as those of the first section. We find examples of the diisich, xxii, 28; xxvii, 8; xxviii, 7-10: the tristich, xxi, 29; xxiv, 29: but the most frequent is the favorite form being that in which the second member gives the grounds of the first, xxi, 22, 23; 24, 25; 26, 27, etc., etc. We also find proverbs of five members, xxiii, 4, 5; xxiv, 3, 4: several of six, xiii, 1-3, 12-14, 19-21; xxiv, 11, 12: and one of seven, xxvii, 6-8. We have a longer strain, xxiii, 28-35, against drunkenness.

4. The short appendix, xxiv, 28-34, comprising more "words of the wise," can hardly be distinguished in style or form from the preceding. It closes with a "proverb" in the form of the proverbs on the evils of sloth.

5. The second collection of "the Proverbs of Solomon" (ch. xxv-xxvii), transcribed (יִכְרֹשׁ, Sept. יֵכְרֹשׁ, Aq. μεταφΘαρμός; Gr. Μεταφάρμασθαι; comp. Pusey, Daniel, p. 882 note) by the scribes of Hebrewia, closely resembles the former one. They are, according to Pusey, "identical in language." It has, however, some very decided points of difference. The "parable" proverb is much more frequent than the "antithetical," the two members of the comparison being sometimes set side by side without any connecting link (e.g., xxv, 12, 18), which is in other cases given merely by "and," or "or," "so" (xxvi, 1, 2, 18-19; xxvii, 8, etc.). The parallelism is sometimes strict, sometimes lax and free. There is a want of the sententious brev-
it of the former collection, and the construction is looser and weaker. The proverbs are not always completed in a single verse (xxv, 6, 7; 9, 10; 21, 22; xxvi, 18, 19); and more frequently than in the former section we have series of proverbs with an internal connection of subject (xxvi, 23-25; xxvii, 15, 16, 23-27), and others in which the key-word recurs (xxvi, 5-12; 13-16). This is not found so often after xxvii, 8; but a close examination of the text suggests the idea that this may be due to a disturbance of the original order (comp. xxvii, 7, 9; xxviii, 4, 7, 9; xxix, 8, 10, etc.).

Ewald discovers a want of the figurative expression of the earlier collection, and a difference of language and phraseology, while Rosenmüller remarks that the meaning of the proverbs is more obscure and enigmatical. The greater part of them are moral precepts. "The earlier collection may be called 'a book for youth' that height and dignity wanting the use of the term καλοί (comp. Isa. xiii, 1; Hab. i, 1, etc.) applied to them. In the words of king Lemuel we find much greater regularity. The parallelism is synonymous, and is maintained throughout. The alphabetical ode in praise of a virtuous woman—a golden A B C for women (Döderlein)—has all its verses of about the same compass. The parallelism is very similar to that of the Psalms, especially those in which the same alphabetical arrangement is found.

VI. Authorship and Date. On these points the most various opinions have been entertained, from that of the rabbins and the earlier school of commentators, with whom some modern writers (e.g. Keil) agree, who attribute the whole book to Solomon (even ch. xxx, xxxi) to the authorship, to the work of his hand (Deut. xxxii, 12); to others, to the authorship of Agur, to whom the teacher replies. The difference between the enigmatical sayings of Agur (which find a counterpart in the collections of Oriental proverbs) and the simple admonitions of Lemuel's mother is very great if we assign them to one author. In ch. xxx we have, in Ewald's words, instead of moral aphorisms, a succession of elegant little pictures illustrative of moral truths, evidencing a decay of creative power, the skill of the author being applied to a novel and striking presentation of an old truth. The ancient terse proverbial form is entirely lost sight of, and the style is bright and dignity wanting the use of the vocabulary of wisdom (comp. Isa. xiii, 1; Hab. i, 1, etc.) applied to them. In the words of king Lemuel we find much greater regularity. The parallelism is synonymous, and is maintained throughout. The alphabetical ode in praise of a virtuous woman—a golden A B C for women (Döderlein)—has all its verses of about the same compass. The parallelism is very similar to that of the Psalms, especially those in which the same alphabetical arrangement is found. From the earliest times as to give any sufficient grounds for questioning the accuracy of the superscription (xxv, 1). The title itself informs us that the compilation was not made till four centuries after Solomon, and the differences are not greater than might be looked for in sayings that had been so long floating about among the common people, and thereby subjected to disfiguration and change. The indications of an altered state of society and a decrease of confidence in the rulers, in which Ewald discovers such unmistakable proofs of a later date, are hardly adequate to throw much light on to himself. We know too little of the internal economy of Solomon's reign to enable us to pronounce authoritatively that such and such expressions are inconsistent with the state of the people and tone of thought at that period.

The objection brought by Eichhorn and others against assigning the proverbs in the two collections to Solomon, that the genius of no one man, not even one as divinely gifted with wisdom as Solomon, is sufficient for the production of so large a number, is perforce in the extreme. Those who concede to any thousand ascribed to him (1 Kings iv, 32), and scarcely give twenty for each of the forty years of his reign. The general didactic tone of the book is asserted to be more consistent with the character of a prophet or priest than that of a king (Davidson). To this it is replied
that this is true of kings in general, but not of such a king as Solomon, to whom God gave a wise and understanding heart, whose proverbs are eminently didactic, and who has in 1 Kings viii discussed on the divine economy towards man in a way that no prophet or prophetess has surpassed. The grace of monogamy, and the strict injunctions against adultery, are urged by Berthold as reasons why Solomon, a polygamist himself, and Bathsheba's son, could not be the author of this section. It is, however, a remarkable feature of the Old Testament, in general, and not peculiar to this place, that polygamy, however generally practiced, is never praised; that invariably where the married state is spoken of in terms of praise it is the union of one man to one woman that is held up to honor. Besides, the force of this objection is considerably modified by the reflection that precepts are here given for the mass of men, with whom monogamy is the general rule, though polygamy may be common among the richer classes (Wilkinson's Egypt, ii, 62); and also that the contrast here drawn (Prov. v, 16, etc.) is not between monogamy and polygamy, but between the marriage tie and adulterous connection. As to the supposition that the repeated warnings against adultery could not come from one whose own mother fell into that sin, no great weight can be attached to it; for a moral and religious teacher must be prepared to consider the sin which would influence other men. The allusions to deeds of violence (i, 11-12; ii, 12, etc.) are supposed by Ewald to indicate a state of confusion inconsistent with that state of peace and social security which marked the reign of Solomon (1 Kings iv, 20). To this it is replied that a condition of great private wealth, such as was the condition of Solomon's times, always tempts needy and unprincipled men to acts of unlawful violence; and that nothing beyond crimes which are committed in the most civilized and best-regulated countries are referred to in the passages. Besides, Judaism is always afforded in its caverns and wildernesses peculiar facilities for robbers (Judg. vi, 2; 1 Sam. xxiv, 1). From a supposed degeneracy of style, Ewald attributes this section to the earlier part of the 7th century B.C. But other critics do not see this. Davidson thinks it indicates a flourishing state of Hebrew literature, and refers it probably to the 9th century B.C., an opinion in which he coincides with Hitzig. The grounds on which Ewald relies for his alleged degeneracy of style seem weak. Thus, he asserts that the plural ishah (Prov. viii, 4) is so rare as to indicate a very extraordinary, and certainly very unusual, for it occurs only three times (First). From these, however, we cannot argue as to the date, as the one is in Isaiah, another in Psa. cxli, 8, attributed to David, and the third in the passage above referred to. Similar and equally futile objections have been based, by Berthold and others, on the familiarity displayed in the proverbs with circumstances and conditions in life with which it is supposed that Solomon as a king could have had no experimental acquaintance. For example, it is maintained that Prov. xvi, 8-11, 14, 20, 21, 24, 25, 28, 29, 30, 31; xv, 8-11; xxii, 11, 12, 13, etc., must have been written by a landowner or husbandman; x, 15, by a poor man; xi, 14; xiv, 19, by a citizen of a well-ordered state; xi, 26, by a trader; xii, 3, 4, by one who was not a polygamist; xiv, 1-4, 25; xvi, 11; xvi, 2, 4, 12, 16, 31; xix, 18, 14; xx, 10, 14, 18, 20, by an ordinary citizen; xxv, 2, 7, 9, by a king, but by one who had lived some time at a court; xxvii, 11, by a teacher of youth; xii, 23-27, by a scribe who lived a nomadic life; xxviii, 16, by one free from those errors which weakened Solomon's throne, and robbed his son of his kingdom. With such points as these, the weakness of these fancied arguments which would affect no one who had not a theory of his own to support. They are akin to those which have been used with as little success to prove that no one man could have written the plays of Shakespeare, and they display the most marvellous ignorance of that many-sidedness and keenness of perception and insight which are characteristic of the highly gifted among mankind.

As little weight is to be assigned to the objections drawn from the repetitions. It is true that we find the same idea, and even the same words, recurring not only in the ten collections, but also in the twenty-four (xv, 8; xvii, 22; xxiii, 3, xxvii, 12; xlii, 18, xlv, 13; xix; 24, xlv, 15; xix, 1, xxviii, 6), but in the same collection (e.g. xiv, 12, xvi, 25; x, 1, xv, 20; xvi, 1, xx, 2; x, 2; x, 3; xii, 14, xiv, 27; xxvi, 12, xxix, 20). This latter is, however, more an Umbricht remark, than is natural in such a compilation, in the formation of which one is very apt to forget what had already been set down; while the former class of repetitions is easily to be accounted for by the anxiety of the collectors to lose nothing which had the stamp of Solomon's authorship, even though the same idea had already been expressed in the earlier collection; and it goes far to confirm the view that Solomon was the composer of the whole.

The internal evidence—derived from language, construction, ideas, historic background, and the like—varies with every successive critic, and is entirely inadequate to warrant any decisive verdict. Its precariousness is proved by the opposite results to which the same data lead various commentators. Kilgoby maintains that every part of the book, with the exception of the last two collections, speaks the corresponding to ch. i-xxix; while Ewald, Hitzig, and Bertheau, and other minor critics, arrive at conclusions expressed with equal confidence and at variance with these and with one another. There is, however, one evidence which speaks strongly in favor of an early date—the entire absence of all reference to idolatry. The form of religion appearing throughout is purely Jewishistic (as we have elsewhere said occurs only four times in the body of the work), and false gods and foreign faiths are not even referred to.

The above remarks refer chiefly to the collection of proverbs properly so called, which we have no difficulty in ascribing, on the whole, to Solomon as their ultimate author. We may, if we choose, suppose that the men of Hesekiah made a collection of unwritten proverbs current among the people, and by them supposed, truly or not, to have come down from Solomon; but the men of Hesekiah, or whoever wrote the superposition of the last two collections, must have been content with the words written, or the material from written records. Assuming this to be the correct view, the difference between these proverbs and those which went before is, that whereas in Solomon's time the latter were arranged as we have them, the former were in Hesekiah's time selected from more ancient written records and added to the existing collection. It gives us the idea, which is itself an extremely probable one, that voluminous records were made in Solomon's time of the wise king's sayings, either by himself or by scribes. This idea derives considerable confirmation from the notice in 1 Kings iv, 20-24, of 1 Kings ix, 20-24, that the king of Israel, and under his inspection, the choice would naturally fall upon him. The weakness of this might be made by their actual author, these would tend to bring them into a still more finished form. Accordingly, we find in the more ancient collection a certain tastefulness and polish which the others do not possess. In the former each verse contains its own perfect sense, and this usually comprised in a certain number of words,
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varying from seven to nine, beyond which they very rarely extend. In the latter, while the sense is generally contained in one verse, it not infrequently runs through the bulk of the chapter. Expansion from them might easily be produced as concise and perfect in form as the others (e.g. xxv, 3, 14); but very commonly the sense is brought out in a much more diffuse manner (e.g. xxv, 6, 7, 10, 21, 22; xxvi, 18, 20; xxvii, 15, 16, 25). In the former case one also has occasion sometimes a far greater number of words than are ever admitted into those of the older collection (e.g. xxv, 7, 29); and the parallelism, which never fails in the verses of the earlier, is often wanting in those of the later division (xxv, 5, 21, 22; xxvi, 10; xxvii, 1). This agrees with the idea which we think portrayed by a comparison of xxv, 1 with 1 Kings iv, 32, 38, that the proverbs in this collection are probably much as they fell from Solomon's lips, and were first committed to writing by himself or others under him; and that while the former collection received his own final corrections, the men of Hezekiah simply copied from the text before them, but did not venture upon any alteration in the form.

The case is somewhat different with regard to the introductory chapters (i-ix), and there is more ground for the discussion of opinion as to their date and authorship. It is certainly quite possible that the whole or a considerable portion of this section may have been written by Solomon. The differences of style, of which Ewald makes much, are, as Bertheau has shown, somewhat exaggerated by him, and are in many cases no greater than may be accounted for by the different nature of the compositions. The terse simplicity of a proverb would be out of place in a series of homoratical addresses such as those which characterize this section. Ewald dwells with emphasis on the internal evidence of a later date afforded by the state of society, and the tone of thinking thus portrayed. But we repeat our former remark, that we know too little of the internal history of Judaean times to allow us to speak with so much confidence on these points, and express our conviction that the conclusions drawn by Ewald are not warranted by the premises. The imagery all points to a large and populous city, such as Jerusalem may well have become during the middle of Solomon's prosperous reign; and the vivid representation of the habits of the foreign pleasure-seekers, its freebooters with their streets of jinling, its streets is hardly more than could have been attained by one who, like Hardin Alarisch, was fond of laying aside his kingly state and visiting his city in disguise.

It is evident, from what we have remarked in a former section, that we regard the poem (ch. i-ix) in its present form a composite work, the imitative passages proceeding from one pen. The similarity of style, subject, and treatment, is strongly in favor of unity of authorship, while the internal evidence favors the view that it is compiled of various disconnected members, collected and arranged subsequently to the time of their composition. The date of this compilation it is impossible to fix. The evidence on this point is faint and untrustworthy, and has led different investigators to very opposite conclusions. Ewald places it in the 7th, Hitig in the 5th century B.C., while Keil, as we have seen, assigns it to the time of Solomon. The resemblance that may be traced in this portion of the work to the spirit and teaching of the book of Job, and the recurrence of some of the words and images found there, is employed both by Hitig and Ewald to aid in determining the date of this section (comp. Job xxv, 7 with Prov. viii, 25; Job xxi, 17, Prov. xiii, 9; Job xxviii, 18, Prov. viii, 16; Job v, 17, Prov. iii, 11; see Pusey, Daniel, p. 523, note 7). But as there is no unanimity as to the date of the composition of Job, little help is to be expected from this source, nor can we be surprised at the diversity of opinion among those who have employed it: Ewald maintaining that the writer of Proverbs had read and made use of Job: Hitig, on the contrary, believing that the former is the earlier work, and that the author of Job borrowed from Proverbs. The adoption of such evidences proves most forcibly the complete want of any decisive and true test which will enable us to arrive at any trustworthy conclusion as to the date of this section. In the midst of this uncertainty, the above solution is as probable as any other,—namely, that it is due to Solomon's authorship out of materials existing at his time.

The similarity in style between i-ix and the appendix to the first collection of proverbs (xxii, 17-xxiv) appears to favor the view that this supplement is due to the same person by whom the poem was prefixed to the book. Ewald enumerates several reasons for assigning the whole of it to the same writer (p. 42), all of which decide against the unity of authorship. The proverbs themselves, designated as 'words of the wise,' are evidently distinguished from those of Solomon, and are probably to be regarded as the adages of other sages, which the compiler of the work thought too valuable to be lost, and therefore appended to his larger collection. The short supplement (xxiv, 23-34) is accounted for by Umbreit on the supposition that the compiler had laid aside his work for a time, and took it up again on the discovery of fresh sayings worthy of preservation. He renders דַּפְנֶה, 'for,' not 'of the wise,' and regards them as directed to the compiler's scholars. Ewald, Bertheau, Delitzsch, etc., defend the received translation.

It only remains for us to speak of the threefold supplement (xxx, xxxi), with regard to the authorship and date of which again nothing can be determined. It would be hardly profitable to discuss the marvellous fabric of fanciful history and biography which has been evolved from the scantiest materials by Hitig, Bunsen, and Bertheau. Those who desire it may refer to their works to see the grounds on which 'Massa' (A. V. 'the prophecy') is identified with a district in Arabia (Gen. x, 30; xxxv, 14; 1 Chron. i, 50) of which Lemuel was king, and Agur with a descendant of the Simeonites, who in the reign of Hezekiah drove out the Amalekites from Mount Seir (1 Chron. iv, 42); or, again, on which it is sought to prove that Agur and Lemuel were brothers, sons of the reigning queen of Massa. We would rather commend to our reader Eichhorn's sensible words that 'Agur should remain Agur, and belong to the wise men of the old world of whom history gives us no further information,' and with him deprecate 'spinning a long thread of tedious conjectures about a name, which does not advance us an inch towards a right insight into the literature of the old world, or any profitable learning.' As little to the purpose is the fancy of Dörderlein that the opening part of ch. xxx is a dialogue: that Ithiel is a heathen: Agur a much valued servant of Ithiel, to whom, as his master, his prayer (v, 7-9) is addressed. Many are content with saying that Agur was an unknown Hebrew sage, the teacher of Ithiel and Ucal—names from which, also, many unprofitable speculations have been built—and that he lived subsequently to the reign of Hezekiah. Still more probable do we regard the view which identifies him with Solomon himself under a fanciful name. See Agur; Massa.

Lemuel—'to God,' 'devoted to God,' after the analogy of בַּגַּי, Numb. iii, 24 (Pusey)—may certainly be regarded as a figurative name descriptive of an ideal king, 'a monarch as he should be' (Ewald; Eichhorn; comp. Pusey, Lect. on Daniel, p. xiii, note 1, p. 529, note 6). See Lauxmus.

The alphabetical lay which concludes the whole has usually been thought to belong to the latest period of Hebrew poetry, and hardly to be placed higher than the 7th century. Its style and language seem to distinguish it from the words of Lemuel, with which it has sometimes been confounded, but it is armed against the precariousness of such grounds of argument as to authorship.
The results of our inquiry may be thus summed up. The nucleus of the book is the larger collection of proverbs (Hezxi, 16). These may safely be regarded as really what they profess to be, "the proverbs of Solomon." Whether they were arranged as we now have them and published by him, there is not sufficient evidence to determine. It is probable, however, that the collection was completed either contemporaneously or not long subsequent to him. The greater part of the hortatory introduction (i-x) may also be, with great probability, ascribed originally to Solomon, though we incline to the belief that its present form is due to a later compiler, who collected the admonitions of the wise king, and prefixed them to his name. The earliest part of this book of proverbs also appears to have added the appendix (xxii, 17; xxiv, 22), containing proverbs of which Solomon was not the proper author, but perhaps only the earliest collector, and after this from similar sources were supplied the few supplementary sayings (xxiv, 23-34). The time when this was done cannot be fixed, but there are cogent arguments in favor of a late date. The second collection, as its name declares, was formed by the scribes of Hezekiah, cir. B.C. 725. The last two chapters contain neither of these periods seems due to Solomon, for which nothing certain can now be known. They, too, may have been in some important sense due to Solomon, but were probably inserted by a later editor.

It will not be worth while to enumerate the many and widely varying theories of recent critics as to the date and composition of the different parts of this book, and the time when it assumed its present form. One or two of the most characteristic may be specified. Suffice it to say that Ewald would place the publication of x-xii, 16 about two centuries after Solomon, and i-x in the first half of the 7th century. Not much later the second collection of proverbs (xxv-xxix) was added, the sections xxii, 17-xxiv being due to the same compiler. Hitzig, on the contrary, views i-x as the earliest part of the book; x-xii, 16 and xxvi, 17-xxix being added about B.C. 750. Twenty-five years later Hezekiah’s collection followed; the gaps being filled up and the volume completed by some unknown compiler at a later period. The theory of Delitzsch (Hertzog, Eucalyptos, a. v. Sprichle) is marked by mere calm sense, but even this is not without a little fanciful or conjectural. Strictly regarding x-xii, 16 as the kernel of the book, and mainly composed by Solomon, he divides the whole into two portions (1) i-x, xxiv, 22 put forth in the time of Hezekiah; the introduction (i-x) and appendix (xxv, 16-xxiv, 22) being written by him; and in the latter of whom he regards a highly gifted didactic poet, an instrument of the spirit of revelation,” and (2) xxiv, 23-xxixi, published in the reign of Hezekiah; the introductory and closing portions (xxiv, 23-34, and xxxi, xxxi) being set on either side of the collection of Solomon’s proverbs to serve as a kind of foil. The two periods which are generally selected in opposition to the above views of the Solomonic authorship for the composition of various parts of the book are the reign of Hezekiah and the times subsequent to the captivity. These latter scenes seem to suit the general character of Proverbs at all as well as the reign of Solomon. Hezekiah found his kingdom in great domestic misery—immersed in idolatry and subject to foreign rule. At home his pre-eminent character was that of a social and religious reformer, struggling against the sins and evils of his times; abroad the most active period of his reign was distinguished by a series of wars, during some of which his kingdom was reduced to the verge of ruin, the whole land overrun by hostile armies, its fenced cities taken, and the king forced to submission. The result was an Asian invasion to hang over the land for years. The later period of his reign, indeed, was peaceful; but the evils of preceding reigns were far from being eradicated, and he had before him the certain prospect, conveyed by prophecy, of the utter proscription of his kingdom. His chief works seem to have been the making a pool and conduit to bring water to Jerusalem. On his death Judah relapsed into idolatry. The times subsequent to the captivity were marked by equally strong characteristics, and chiefly of a mournful kind—a feeble, struggling, and too often languid and depressed remnant, striving amid many difficulties to maintain what they could from time to time disencourage. With neither of these periods does the general character of Proverbs agree. Royalty marks it throughout, sharply distinguishing it from any period subsequent to the captivity; as by other marked features it bears the impress of a time different from Hezekiah’s. Its warnings are as if the same as those which grace that period, nor are its consolations suited to the public trials which were threatening to bring both king and kingdom to the ground. It pointed allusions to a powerful monarchy, a numerous and wealthy people, and such sins as readily spring up in a time of plenty; its fine lines of Egypt, its high places thronged, its roads covered with travellers, its gates and cities crowded and rejoining, its precious stones and fine gold and architectural illustrations, its people living beneath the eye of their monarch and subject to his good-will, all seem to mark a reign when an absolute monarch ruled over a great and wealthy people, who lived at ease at home, and had no dreaded enemy on their borders; who traded to distant lands and brought their products into common use; and when the worship of Jehovah prevailed in a spirit of due veneration and love; when wisdom sat on the throne, personified in Solomon, and the evils which must ever exist while man is a fallen being were evils inapprehensible from any condition of humanity, and especially from one abounding with the elements of material prosperity. See Solomon.

VII. Commentaries.—The following are the special exegetical helps on the whole book; a few of the most important of them are designated by an asterisk: Origen, Commentary in (Opp. vol. iii); also Scholias in (Bibl. Patriq. Gallandii, vol. xi); Basili, Commentary in (Opp. II, 17); Bede, Expositio (in Opp. vol. i); also in Works, vol. ix); Honorius, Commentary in (Opp. p. 1140); Balag [Levi ben-Gershon], 77smb [with Ben- Meira’s commentary], J. Bafoles [Leiria, 1492, fol.]; afterwards in the Rab. Bibles; also [with Aben- Ezra, etc.] in Latin by Ghigbeo, Amst. 1658, 4to; Arama, 77smb [Constantiniton. a. a. 4to; with notes by Berlin, Leips. 1585, 8vo]; imm. ben-Salomo, 77smb [with Kimchi on Ps.] (Naples, 1496, 4fo); Shalem ben-Abraham, 77smb [Salonica, 1522, fol.]; also in (Frankfort, 1573); Melanchthon, Exposition (1525, 8vo); Murer, Abotiones (Basil. 1525, 8vo); Jos. ibn-Jachia, 77smb [with Job, etc.] (Bologna, 1588, 8vo; also in Frankforter’s Bible); Cajetan [Rom. Cath.], Emntratio (Lux. 1545, fol.); Fabian, 77smb * (Constantinop. 1548, 4to); Arboreus [Rom. Cath.], Commentary (Par. 1549, fol.); Malvenda [Rom. Cath.], Exposition (in Opp. Lux. 1560, fol.); Payne, Commentary (Par. 1565, fol.); also in the Orsiniit, vol. iii); Laverzer, Commentary (Tyr. 1569, 4to, 1565, 1572, 1568, 4vo); Strigel, Scholia (Leips. 1585, N. 1571, 1580); Janmesius [Rom. Cath.], Abolutiones (Loran. 1568, 8vo, and elsewhere later, with Ps. etc.); Sininianus [Rom. Cath.], Commentary (Mog. 1570, fol.); also in Job (Amst. 1651, fol.); Cope, Exposition (transl. by Outreind, Lond. 1580, 4to); Mard. ben-Jakob, 77sm [Cra- cow, 1589, 4to]; is. ben-Mose, 77smb [Lublin, 1592, 4to]; Dribit, Anelegy (Erz. 1585, 8vo); Musset, Commentary (Lond. 1586, 8vo); Wilcock, Commentary (in Works); Aspech, 77smb [Ven. 1604, 4to; and elsewhere later, fol.]; Cleaver, Explanation (Lond. 1608, 1615, 4to); Doh, Exposition [on ch. ix-xvii] (Lond.
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intervals, the currents of the atmosphere shift to their ever-changing conditions, the endless procession of life keeps pace with the dead-march of decay, and all the varied phenomena of the world disappear. Viewing these wonderful complications in the light of their necessary dependence upon the self-existent, God's handwork is plainly evident in the complexities of their multi-form evolutions, the equipose of their contending forces, and the continuity of adjustment, which proclaim unceasing watchfulness and care.

(3.) From the moral faculties of men. Conscience, which utters its authoritative "ought" or "ought not" concerning suggested actions, must be delusive, if there be no Providence to note its verdict. But if our sense of responsibility be false, and we must hereby disregard the affirmations of our highest faculties concerning ourselves, then is all truth visionary and all knowledge misleading.

Further, we have a faculty the legitimate expression of which is worship; hence all nations have their forms of devotion. But to stand in awe of the Creator's justice, to trust in his goodness, to submit to his will, to pray to him for the supply of our wants, to depend upon his wisdom for direction—all these acts of worship are not only unauthorized but absurd, and our noblest instincts in the colloquy of them, by being superseded and supplied by the Providence by which his responses may be indicated.

(6.) From the system of compensations which prevails, embracing recompense for suffering, compensation for loss, and retribution for wrong. In this system, the compensation includes the natural benefits of discipline, and such compensating provisions of grace as the reason recognizes as matters of fact in present human experience. The compensation comprises the reparative processes by which loss in one direction is made up by increased efficiency in another, as in the added keenness of the sense of hearing and touch attending the loss of sight. The retribution comprehends not only the natural operation of the law, "As a man soweth, so shall he reap," but all those special illustrations of that law in marked and impressive judgments upon wrong-doing which occasionally occur, and which bear such likeness to the sin that men agree to call them retributions. In all these a Providence is implied. The doctrine is further proven—

2. From the Scriptures. (1.) By a class of passages which declare in general his preserving power (Gen. xiii, 2), Job vii, 20; xlix, 12; xxxii, 18; xxxvi, 5; xxxvi, 6; lxix, 9; Isa. xlvi, 8—Matt. x, 29; Luke xii, 6; Acts xvii, 29; Col. i, 17).

(2.) By a class of passages which assert God's control of the regular operations of nature (Exod. ix, 18; xxxii, 13; John vii, 26; Jer. xxvii, 22; xxxvi, 24—27; xxxvi, 29-32; xxxvii, 6-16; xxxviii, 25; Ps. lix, 17; lxix, 9, 10; Prov. xxvii, 24—30; cv. 82; cxxxv, 6-7; cxxxvii, 25; cxiv, 15—16; cxvii, 8-9; cxviii, 8; Isa. xlv, 4; Jer. xxxii, 24—27; xxxii, 25-28; xxxviii, 1-9; xxix, 10; xxxiv, 11-15; Ps. xcv, 1; Zech. xiv, 1; Matt. vi, 26—28; Acts xiv, 17).

(3.) By a class of passages which specifically declare his sovereignty over birth (Gen. xxxviii, 5—8; xviii, 9; Josh. xxiv, 3, 4; 1 Sam. i, 27; Job x, 19; Ps. lxvi, x, xxviii, 15-16; Isa. xi, 3, 9; Jer. viii, 7, 10; 2 Sam. xii, 22; Job vii, 1, 6; xv, 4—9; xxx, 1-7; Ps. xxi, 24; xxxii, 1-12; Eccl. ix, 17; 1 Cor. xii, 34, 35; 1 Cor. xxi, 2).

(4.) By a class which aver his government of chance and accident (Exod. xvi, 3, 5, compared with Deut. xix, 4—5; 1 Kings xxii, 54, 38, compared with xx, 15; Prov. xxxi, 33).

(5.) By a class which proclaim his use of noxious animals for the purposes of his government (Exod. xxxii, 38; Lev. xxvi, 21—22; Deut. vii, 20; Josh. xiv, 12; Job x, 23; Jer. v, 6; Hos. ii, 2; Joel iii, 25; Amos iv, 9; v, 11).

(6.) By a class which affirm his righteous retributions (Lev. x, 3; xxxvi, 14—39; Deut. xxv, 17—19; xxvii, 23—24; 2 Sam. iii, 39; 2 Kings i, 30, 31; xiv, 25—26; 2 Chron. vii, 15—27; Jer. v, 13; x, 14; xxxiv, 11; Psa. xxxv, 6—8; lxv, 6—8; xxxvii, 30—32; xcv, 23; civ, 33—34; Isa. v, 11—16, 22; xxv, 13—14; xiii, 11; xxviii, 15. Comp. xxix, 6; Jer. xxii, 21—22; Ezek. xxi, 21; xxvi, 2—21; xxxv, 1—15. Dan. v, 18, 30; Amos iv, v; Obad. 10—15; Zeph. i, 17; ii, 8—10; Hag. i, 10—11).

(7.) By a class which affirm that which ascribe the delay in the accomplishment of the promises which are delivered, to God (Josh. xxiv, 5—11; 2 Kings v, 1; Ezek. xxxiv, 12, 16, 30; xxxvii, 22—24; xxxviii, 21—23).

(8.) By a class which declare his supreme authority over men (Psa. vii, 8; ix, 8; x, 16, 28; xxxvii, 2—7; 2 Sam. ii, 24, 25; xxvi, 2—3; Isa. i, 10; xxxix, 9—10; Eccl. i, 1; Isa. x, 5; xiv, 26—27; Ezek. xiv, 4; Dan. iv, 36; Rom. vii, 21).

(9.) By a class which affirm his dominion over national prosperity and adversity (Exod. xv, 14; xxiii, 23—30; Deut. vii, 15; 2 Sam. xx, 15; Ezra x, 12; Ps. xxvii, 14; Isa. v, 3—9; xili, 1, 6, 8—9; xiv, 7; Jer. xxvii, 8—12, 18; xlix, 16; Dan. i, 20, 21, 35, 37, 58, 59, v, 21; Amos iii, 6; Obad. 1—4; Hag. ii, 17; Zeph. i, 14—18; ii, 1–15; iii, 14—20; Acts xvii, 26).

(10.) By a class which declare that he sends bad laws and base rulers, as well as good, and sends adversity (Judg. xx, 23; 1 Kings xi, 14, 23; xix, 15; 2 Kings vii, 11; xvii; xxiv, 25; xxiv, 20; 2 Chron. xvi, 5—6; Ps. xxv, 20; Isa. xxi, 17—19; xxxvii, 26, 27; Jer. xxvii, 6, 7; xxviii, 14; xliv, 11, 12; iii, 8; Lam. ii, 7; Ezek. xx, 24—26; Dan. iv, 17; Hos. xiii, 11; Mic. i, 12).

The teaching of the more than five hundred passages cited might be confirmed, were it necessary, by nearly as many thousands more, showing with what emphasis the Scriptures proclaim the doctrine of divine providence.

II. The Doctrine Explained. 1. As Preservation, or that by which all things are kept in being, with their several essences and faculties, and are enabled to act according to their respective natures (Heb. i, 3).

2. As the organic relation of all the several spheres of being and acting, and directing them to the ends which he proposed to himself in their creation. This government is—

(1.) Immediate; as in the direct control of the material universe by those modes of operation called forces of nature, such as gravitation, electricity, etc.

(2. Mediate; as (a) in the vegetable world, by the laws which regulate the germination, growth, and decay of its organizations; (b) in the animal kingdom, by their controlling instincts; (c) in intelligent and moral creatures, by means of motives. This last is evidently the most important, as well as the most incomprehensible field of divine providence.

The motives which a righteous and benevolent Being places before his creatures can be only those which will direct them to secure their happiness and happiness. But, as freedom of the will, in the sense of possible alternative moral action, is one of the endowments of such creatures, as it is well the motives are so constructed as to surpass them in value. Hence it follows that those holy motives may be disregarded. But there must be no abandonment, or punitive and reformatory measures must be instituted that will originate a different class
of motives to reinforce those which have proved insufficient. Hence, the system of natural evil is placed over against creature-freedom, both as a check and a corrective, and in itself no arrangement of God's goodness, since it is a necessary means to a higher good. But the very fruit of freedom in the volition in man is the vexed question of the ages; yet, in point of principle, it is settled in the fact of the creation of intelligent beings with a capacity to sin and liability to become sinners. Hence the vindication of the divine character is legitimately the work of Theophysics, while the doctrine of providence need only explain God's conduct.

All moral evil consists in a wrong determination of a free will. God's purpose to preserve his creatures pledges his concurrence in such action of the will only so far as such concurrence may be necessary to enable the will to act according to its freedom. The moral character of the determination is fixed by the creature, and he alone is responsible for it. But when the choice is made, the moral character of the determination is complete; and neither the occurrence nor non-occurrence of a resulting outward action can change, add to, or take from the moral quality of the original volition wherein the sin originated and was completed. As soon, however, as the execution of a determination is attempted, the creature steps outside of his own independent and responsible sphere, and enters the realm of God. From that moment the problem of all events is involved.

The actions of men (in distinction from their determinations), his control of the Church and of nations, special providences, the course of nature, and the works of grace are all included under the general term events, for which God takes the absolute responsibility. Hence it will be seen that the distinction often drawn between the permissive and active providences of God is of no practical value; and if any such distinction be allowed, it must be by confining the word "permissive" strictly to the free volitions of the will, and extending the word "active" to the conscious acts of God, acting of his own will.

In this way alone can the emphatic statements of the Scriptures, as classified above, be explained in harmony with other passages which distinctly deny his complicity with evil, i.e. in the sense of moral wrong. We first bring fully into view the seeming impeachment of his attributes contained in the classes of passages above referred to, which may be epitomized, in principle, as follows: Exod. iv. 21; vii. 13; x. 1, 20; xiv. 7; Deut. ii. 30; xiii. 1-3; Josh. xi. 20; 1 Sam. xvi. 14; xvii. 1-5; 1 Chron. xvii. 22; 22, 27; Ps. Ixxviii. 49; cv. 25; Isa. vi. 9; x. 10; xiv. 14; xvii. 14; Jer. vi. 21; Ezek. iii. 20; iv. 9; Amos iii. 6; Zech. viii. 10; 2 Thess. ii. 11, 12; 1 Pet. ii. 8; Rev. xvii. 13. In striking contrast with these stands the revelation of his character and works in the following: Lev. xi. 46; Deut. xxxiii. 4; 1 Sam. vi. 20; Job viii. 3; xxxiv. 10, 12, 23; xxxvi. 3; Ps. v. 4; xi. 7; xxxiii. 5; lxxxix. 14; xcii. 15; xviii. 2; cxix. 137; Isa. v. 16; Ezek. xviii. 39; Hab. i. 13; Zeph. iii. 5; Rom. ii. 2, 5, 6; James i. 13; 1 Pet. ii. 15, 16; Rev. xvi. 7.

Truth cannot be inharmonious, much less contradictory; therefore, there must be some possible reconciliation of these apparently conflicting statements. We find that reconciliation in the divided sovereignty which allows man to be supreme within the sphere of his volition, and attributes all outside of the mere mental fact of free-will determinations to the will and operation or cooperation of God. Upon any other hypothesis it is not possible to draw the dividing line between divine and human responsibility; and therefore, if this be denied, the idea of the two-in-one doctrine of divine providence must be abandoned.

III. Some Objections Considered.—Objection 1. If providence be the care exercised over his creatures by a God of infinite goodness and purity, he cannot be implicated in the wicked actions of men. Answer. As a matter of fact, he is concerned in them, else they could not exist; for, were he to refuse the concurrence of his upholding power, men would drop into non-existence. Again, the objection is destroyed by considering that actions have no moral character whatever, as between the creature and the Creator, such character being vested entirely in the will, and the will with the results. Therefore, God can use the wicked actions of men as he does any other indifferent thing, provided that his own purpose in using them be right, which no one disputes.

Objection 2. God's majesty is degraded by the assumption contained in the doctrine of providence, viz. that he is interested in all the minutiae of nature. Answer. If he has created faculties or forces, nothing that they can evolve can be unworthy of his care; besides, things which seem to men most insignificant are often causatively linked with stupendous results. Again, the revelations of the microscope prove that the infinitesimal are embraced within the sweep of the same laws that pervade the infinite, and hence are under the same benign care. Further, the impression of the grandeur of the Infinite Intelligence, comprehensive as it may be, from the contemplation of the rolling spheres and interlocking systems of the universe, is, after all, less profound than that which results from tracing his handiwork in the conformation of the beautifully wrought shells of the animals, and their exquisite life-appliances and adjustments, which only the most powerful glasses can reveal to human sight.

Objection 3. The prosperity of the wicked and the affections of the righteous are inconsistent with the supposition of a just and holy providence. Answer. The equal dispensation which the objection assumes to be necessary under the government of God is an impossibility; for the affections and interests of men are so interlinked that exact justice could rarely, if ever, be meted to the transgressor without involving consequences to others which would be undeserved. Again, the prosperity of the wicked, if it should be due to evil courses, is always a curse to them in the end; and God's processes should not be condemned until their final issue is known. On the other hand, the adversities of the righteous have attending or following compensations which satisfy them that all is right; and if those who are chiefly interested are content, the objection of the mere observer should be esteemed of little weight.

Objection 4. It is alleged that the laws of nature sufficiently account for the order and necessity of the world; hence providence is not necessary. Answer. The laws of nature are only the regular order which is found to subsist, termed laws because of the uniformity of the changes which occur, and signify certain results of power, but not power itself—effects, but not their causes. These uniformities are, therefore, only modes in which the self-existent controls the contingent, the manner in which God manipulates his material creation.

IV. History of the Doctrine.—The idea of a superintending or controlling Providence has appeared under various forms, sometimes scarcely recognizable, depending largely upon the culture of the age and the state of philosophical speculation at the time.

1. The primitive view, held during the childhood of superscription, identified the gods with the elements of nature. Thus Zeus, or Dis, originally meant sky, and was worshipped as a god, afterwards known as Jupiter, or Jove, and by the Canaanites and Babylonians called Baal, Bel, or Belus. The earth was also worshipped as Demeter and Cybele, called by the Anglo-Saxons Hertha; the sea as Neptune; the sun as Phoebus, or Apollo; the moon as Selene; and the stars as the Muses. Fire as Agrild and summer heat as Dormer, or Thor, are other instances, in various localities, of the worship paid to the elements or forces of nature as gods, each being accredited a providence of its own. In the childhood of Occidental philosophy also, the Ionian philosophical physicists of Greece, in their search for the principle whose
to which he belongs, Schweizer and Dr. Emmons, classifies them practically with the Occasionalists.

6. Leibnitz rejected the concursus and Cartesian views, and proposed a new view of the Providence. He eschewed the "pre-established harmony" somewhat akin in its radical idea to the "Anima Mundi" of Pythagoras, Plato, and the Alexandrian School; the "Archéis" of Cornelius Agrippa, Paracelsus, and Von Helmont; the "principium hylarchicum" of Henry More; the "plastic nature" of God worth, and the "pre-established harmony" lately advocated by Dr. Laycock and Mr. Murphy. This theory holds that there are two worlds, matter and mind, each incapable of acting upon the other, yet both so adjusted to each other by a divinely pre-ar ranged harmony that volition and muscular contraction are contemporaneous. The volition would exist just the same without the contraction, and the muscular movement would take place just the same without the volition, each being moved by a force within, but the prearranged harmony secures that they shall seemingly stand related as cause and effect. God is a being of infinite perfections, and the imperfections of creation are accounted for by the nature of the monads of which souls and bodies are composed.

7. Durandus, in the 14th century, proposed the mechanical view of the universe. He held that the activity of God's creatures in the use of powers given to them at their creation—like a wound-up clock which goes of itself. It has been advocated by Scotus, Richard Baxter, and others. Closely akin to this is the theory of such writers as Prof. Tyndall, Dr. H. Bence Jones, and Dr. Bastian, connecting "molecular attractions and repulsions communicated to matter at the creation." Its extreme pantheistic development is found in the "self evolving powers of nature" of Owen, Huxley, and Baden Powell.

8. Another view represents God as an all-perfect being, the upholder of all things, but denies his interference with the laws of nature in miracles, and maintains that his only interposition is by using natural causes to effect his purposes. Thus providence is law, and no interpositions are possible unless provided for in the nature of the uniformities. Thus Hippocrates, the contemporary of Socrates, regarded all phenomena as both divine and scientifically determinable. Anaxagoras, in his "Arranging Intelligence," held substantially to this view. Duncanson (Providence of God) is a strong modern disciple of this theory.

9. The Mind-efficiency Theory denies that there are any physical forces apart from mind, either divine or created. The only efficiency in the material universe is the ever-operating will of God. Dr. Samuel Clarke, Dr. Le Bœuf, Samuel Secker, Arnaud, Remonstrants, Harris, Young, Whedon, Channing, Martineau, Hedge, Whewell, Bascom, Prof. Tulloch, Sir John Herschel, the duke of Argyll, Mr. Wallace, Proctor, Crockett, and many among the ablest recent writers have defended this view.

10. The true doctrine represents God as a being of infinite perfections, upholding all things by a direct exercise of his potency; the uniformities of nature as his ordinary method of working; its irregularities his method upon occasional conditions; its interferences, his method under the pressure of a higher law, which is the necessary manifestation of his own nature. It thus adopts the Judaic view of God's perfections, and the complete subervience of nature to his will: admits the general concursus, especially as it relates to the freedom of the finite will, accepts the Law theory in its application to miracles, and sustains the Mind-efficiency theory, with the distinct disclaimer of pantheistic leanings in the admission of the separate existence of material substance.

IV. Upon Particular Providences.—Providence has been defined as the wisdom and power which God continually exercises in the preservation and government of the world for the ends which he proposes to
accomplish. Special providence consists in such particular exhibitions of his wisdom and power in emergencies as are calculated to awaken the conviction of his interest in and guardianship over his creatures. 

1. PROVIDENCE.—29. It exists for his interpositions. Abraham, after Mount Moriah; the three Hebrews, after the fiery furnace; Daniel, after the lions' den; Eliajah, after Cherie's cave, never failed to look for other deliverances in the time of need. 

2. It gives the assurance that all is right in our present circumstances, in view of the discipline needed; and the final adjustment of rewards and penalties. 

3. It leads to cheerful trust in all trials, and thus sweetens the bitter draughts of life. 

4. It inspires with hope in emergencies, and thus enables the believer to meet unforeseen exigencies with all his resources of mind and faith at hand, confident, buoyant, and if possible conquering. 

5. It imparts a patience that outlasts adversities, a fortitude that yields to no disaster, and a confidence that emerges unfathered from all furnaces of trials—

VII. Literature.—We cite in alphabetical order a portion only of the very numerous works extant on this subject: Aquinas, Summa Theol. p. i, q. 15, art. iii; Backer, De Dei Providentia circa Mul. Baires, De Proc. Dei circa Fecuta HommA; Beza, De Dei Proc. circa Res Temporales; Bormann, Lehr de der göttlichen Vorsehung; the same, Betrochtungen über die wichtigsten Warheiten der Religion; Chrysostom, De Dei Providentia; Clement, Strom. vi. 17, p. 821 sq.; De Marée, Gottesertheil- digung über die Zulassung des Bienen; De Vries, Eremit- tutiones Rationales; Feldmann, Monats oder über die gött- liche Vorsehung; Für Anbeter Gottes (Lond. 1780); Gomari Conciliatio Doct. Othodoxo de Providentia; Hugo of St. Victor, De Sacram. c. 19-21; Jacob, Betrochtungen über die weisen Absichten Gottes: Jerome, Comment. in Abarac, c. 1; Janullius, De Partibus Logicae, lib. ii, c. 8 sq.; Krehl, Gesch. des Reichs der göttlichen Weisheit; Laertius, De Vita Dei, c. 13; the same, De Opificio Dei, De Formatione HomHnis, c. 5-17; Leibnitz, Essais de Théodie; Martinit Com. de Gubernatorum Mundi; Müller, Briefe über das Studium der Wissens- schaften, besonders der Geschichte (Zürich, 1798); Neumeier, De Natura HommA, c. 42 sq.; Plutarch, De Sera Numinis Viudicta; Rechenbergius, De Proc. Dei circa Minima; Salvianus Massiliensis, De Gubernatione Di- sire de Proc.; Sanders, Uber die Vorsehung; Schröcl, De Proph. Historico, quodcumque clarum locatur (Viemberg, 1778); Seneca, De Providentia, De Beneficia; Theodoret, Sermones de Pro- videntia; Turrentini Dissertationes, diss. 4, 5, 6, 6; Twiase, Viudictio Providentiae Dei; Viret, De la Providentia; Weinsmann, De Proc. Dei contra a Dei Philosophos, Betrachtungen über den Einfluß des Vorsehers in der Welt. (S. H. P.)

Providence, Nuns of, a community of young women at Paris, established about the year 1647 by Madame Palisson for the reception of poor virgins who might otherwise be exposed, through poverty, to the temptations of the world. This pious lady, having formed the design, was discouraged from prosecuting it by several persons, who represented to her that she had not a fund sufficient to carry it on; to whom she replied that Providence should be her fund; and accordingly, having succeeded in her undertaking, she gave to her community the name of The Nuns of Providence.

Providence, properly an outlying portion of an extended empire as the Persian of old; but intended here to do more than indicate the points of contact which this word presents with Biblical history and literature. 

1. (.buf, medijah; Sept. χωπά; Vulg. provinciaria.) In the Old Test. this term first appears in connection with the wars between Ahab and Ben-hadad (I Kings xv, 14, 15, 19); and between the king of the former and the king of the latter: "by the young men of the princes of the provinces," i.e. probably of the chief tribes of the Gilead
PROVINCE

PROVISION

country, recognising the supremacy of Ahab, and having a common interest with the Israelites in resisting the commands of the king. 30. Now the inhabitants of Samaria were specially distinguished in verse 13 from "the children of Israel." Not the hosts of Ahab, but the youngest warriors ("armor-bearers," Keil, ad loc.), of the land of Jephthah and Eliezer, fighting with a fearless faith, were to carry off the glory of the battle (comp. Ez哇d, 32, 21). But just as in refining, it is easy to see, in the inducting itself of the nail, character at once must be, so it was necessary for the Sanbedrim to gain Pilate's consent to the execution of our Lord (John xviii, 31). The strict letter of the law forbade governors of provinces to take their wives with them, but the cases of Pilate's wife (Matt. xxvii, 19) and Drusilla (Acts xviii, 24) show the facts are the same. Tacitus (Ann. iii, 33, 34) records an unsuccessful attempt to revive the old practice. See PROCONSUL.

PROVINCIAL. The local superior of the monasteries (abbot, guardian, prior, etc.) stands under the supervision of the district superior, or dekanizates; these are subordinate to the governors of the province, or provincial, who are themselves under the direction of the general of the order, the head of the whole community.

PROVINCIAL COUNCILS are the name given to the synods held by the bishops of a single ecclesiastical province, and presided over by the metropolitan. The ecclesiastical superior of the province convokes the council. The council, under the presidency of the king's councilors (βουλευτες, the ἄγγελος of Herod. viii, 98) conveyed his letters or decrees (Esth. i, 22, 13). From all provinces concumbences were collected for his harem (ii, 8). Horses, mules, or dromedaries were employed on this service (viii, 10). (Comp. Herod. viii, 98; Xenoph. Cyrop. viii, 6; Herren's Peritia, ch. ii.) The word is used, it must be remembered, of the smaller sections of a sestry rather than of the sestry itself. While the provinces are 127, the sestries are only 20 (Herod. iii, 89). The Jews who returned from Babylon are described as "children of the province" (Esth. ii, 1; Neh. vii, 6), and had a separate governor (see DIASPORA) of their own race (Esth. ii, 68; Neh. vi, 14; viii, 9), while they were subject to the sestry (τηντός) of the whole province west of the Euphrates (Esth. v, 7; vi, 6).

2. (Ἐπαρχία.) In the New Test. we are brought into contact with the administration of the provinces of the Roman empire. The classification given by Strabo (xvii, p. 84) of provinces (ἐπαρχίες) supposed to need military control, and therefore placed under the immediate control of the Censor, and those still belonging theoretically to the republic, and administered by the senate, and of the latter again into proconsular (ἐπαρχίαι) and praetorian (στρατηγαις), is recognised, more or less distinctly, in the Gospels and the Acts (see PROCONSUL). Cyrenius (Quirinus) was the ἐπαρχῆς of Syria (Luke ii, 1), the word being in this case used for preses or proconsul. Pilate was the ἐπαρχῆς of the sub-province of Judaea (Luke iii, 1; Matt. xxvii, 2, etc.), as procurator with the power of a legatus; and the same title is given to his successors, Felix and Festus (Acts xxiii, 24; xxv, 1; xxvi, 30). The governors of the senatorial provinces of Cyprus, Asia, and Africa, on the other hand, are rightly described as διάθεσιν, proconsuls (Acts xiii, 7; xviii, 12; xix, 38). In the two former cases the province had been originally an imperial one, but had been transferred to Augustus (Dio Cass. liv. 4), Asia by Claudius (Sueton. Claud. 25)—to the senate. The στρατηγαις of Acts xvii, 22 (A. V. "maggistrates"), on the other hand, were the διωμυστερια, or praetors, of a Roman colony. The duty of the legati and other provincial governors to report special matters is recognised in Acts xxv, 20 and furnished the groundwork for the spurious Actus Pilati. See PILATE. The right of any Roman citizen to appeal from a provincial governor to the emperor as asserted by Paul (xxv, 11). In the council (συνεδρίασις) of Acts xxv, 12 we recognise the assessors who were appointed to take part in the judicial functions of the governor. The authority of the legati, proconsul, or procurator, extended, it need hardly be said, to capital punishment (subject, in the case of Roman citizens, to the right of appeal), and, in most cases, the death of a person was inflicted judicially. It was necessary for the Sanhedrim to gain Pilate's consent to the execution of our Lord (John xviii, 31). The strict letter of the law forbade governors of provinces to take their wives with them, but the cases of Pilate's wife (Matt. xxvii, 19) and Drusilla (Acts xviii, 24) show the facts are the same. Tacitus (Ann. iii, 33, 34) records a unsuccessful attempt to revive the old practice. See PROCONSUL.

PROVINCIAL SYNOD. See SYNOD.

PROVINCIAL CANON. See PROVISION.

PROVINCIAL COUNCIL. See PROVISION.

PROVISION. (Lat. provvisorio) is, in canon law, the bestowal of an ecclesiastical benefice (q. v.).

1. In the Roman Catholic Church it involves the regular collation (q. v.) of the ecclesiastical functions. Any of its ecclesiastical offices can only be thus lawfully obtained from a competent superior.

2. Extent and Classification. (1.) The "provision" includes three stages—(a) the designation of the person on whose behalf the benefice is bestowed (provisor persona); (b) the collation of the office itself (collatio sive institutio canonical); for higher offices by papal confirmation, for inferior functions by episcopal institution; and (c) the act of putting the nominee in possession of the office or of confirming the provision, when he is a canon or other prebendary, installation. The election or designation confers on the candidate only a right of priority: the complete lawful possession can only be acquired by the canonical confirmation or institution.

2. There is an ordinary and an extraordinary, a free and an obligatory, a full and a partial provision. (a) When, as the rule requires, higher functions are conferred by the pope, lower ones by the bishop, this is called ordinary provision (provisorio ordinario); but if by some special lawfull title, a third person, or by the law of deposition the successor super legatus clerical function, or in consequence of special reservation the pope is possessed of the right of collation, this is an extraordinary provision (provisorio extraordinario). (b) If the ordinary collator is free and bound by the obligation and the person of the nominee, the collation is called collatio libera; but if he is bound by the right of designation enjoyed by a third person, the provision is restricted, and inasmuch as the collator, if all canonical requirements are met, is held to admit the proposed person to the office, it is an obligatorius type (provisorio necessario). (c) If the collator is entitled to all three acts of a full collation, his right of provision is called a full one (pro
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PROVINCIAL SYNOD. See SYNOD.

PROVINCIAL CANON. See PROVISION.

PROVISION. (Lat. provvisorio) is, in canon law, the bestowal of an ecclesiastical benefice (q. v.).

1. In the Roman Catholic Church it involves the regular collation (q. v.) of the ecclesiastical functions. Any of its ecclesiastical offices can only be thus lawfully obtained from a competent superior.

2. Extent and Classification. (1.) The "provision" includes three stages—(a) the designation of the person on whose behalf the benefice is bestowed (provisor persona); (b) the collation of the office itself (collatio sive institutio canonical); for higher offices by papal confirmation, for inferior functions by episcopal institution; and (c) the act of putting the nominee in possession of the office or of confirming the provision, when he is a canon or other prebendary, installation. The election or designation confers on the candidate only a right of priority: the complete lawful possession can only be acquired by the canonical confirmation or institution.

2. There is an ordinary and an extraordinary, a free and an obligatory, a full and a partial provision. (a) When, as the rule requires, higher functions are conferred by the pope, lower ones by the bishop, this is called ordinary provision (provisorio ordinario); but if by some special lawfull title, a third person, or by the law of deposition the successor super legatus clerical function, or in consequence of special reservation the pope is possessed of the right of collation, this is an extraordinary provision (provisorio extraordinario). (b) If the ordinary collator is free and bound by the obligation and the person of the nominee, the collation is called collatio libera; but if he is bound by the right of designation enjoyed by a third person, the provision is restricted, and inasmuch as the collator, if all canonical requirements are met, is held to admit the proposed person to the office, it is an obligatorius type (provisorio necessario). (c) If the collator is entitled to all three acts of a full collation, his right of provision is called a full one (pro
of those attributes, he has only a partial right (jus provisionis minus plenum).

2. Requisites. An ecclesiastic function can only be bestowed on a person possessing certain qualities, and must be occupied within a certain period and in a certain manner.

(a) In regard to the qualifications of the candidate, the canons require that he be capable and worthy (ideos et dignus); that not only he have an unimpeached reputation, but also the required age, the necessary orders, and the instruction demanded by the office. The required qualifications are as follows:

(1) The candidate must belong to the clergy, and, in consequence, must be at least tonsured, and be advanced enough to be able to get the necessary orders within a year (Clem. c. 2, "De Act. et Qual."); Conc. Trid. sess. xxii. c. 4, "De Ref."). In ancient law the candidate, if his office required higher orders than those of a subdeacon, could receive a dispensation for seven years, to give him time to complete his scientific education, and the benefice meanwhile might be administered by a vicar (Sext. c. 34, "De Elect."); 6). The modern law reduces this term to one year, which runs from the day of possession fully obtained (Sext. c. 35, "De Elect."); 6). If during this period the orders have not been conferred, the benefice is held over (Sext. c. 35, "De Elect."); 6), otherwise only after previous warning (c. 7, x, "De Elect."); 6; Sext. c. 22, cod. i, 6); but in the latter case the bishop may grant a second dispensation of one year (Conc. Trid. sess. vii. c. 12, "De Ref."). To get into possession of a bishopric, the elected person or nominee must have obtained the subseconatea six months before his election or nomination (Conc. Trid. sess. xii. c. 2, "De Ref."). Abbotts, holders of dignities, and functions with which jurisdiction and charge of souls are connected must be priests (c. 2, x, "De Act. et Qual."); 14), and archbishops and all principal chapters, half of the canons must be prebendaries (Conc. Trid. sess. xxiv. c. 12, "De Ref."), although in the time of the Council of Trent already many chapters—for instance, those of Cologne, Tréves, etc.—were exclusively composed of priests, which is now always the case. (c) The candidate must possess the scientific requirements required by the office. The Tridinium decrees declare that the bishop must have shown his capacity at some university (or lyceum) as a teacher, or by degrees obtained in theology or canon law, or other academic studies (Conc. Trid. sess. xxii. c. 2, "De Ref."). The functions of several canon scholars, of penitentiaries, and in general of all dignities and half of the canons, can only be bestowed upon graduates (ibid. sess. xxii. c. 18, xxxiv. c. 8, 12, "De Ref."). For candidates to prebends implying charge of souls (curates, preachers) a trial is instituted, and held by the bishop or his vicar-general and at least three other examiners chosen by the diocesan synod and put under special oath (Conc. Trid. sess. xxxiv. c. 18, "De Ref."); comp. Pli V "In Conferendis," d. 18. May, 1666. The trials of the member of the benedictine sisterhood "Clem. ii. d. 14 Dec. 1742.". As the diocesan synods, the collatio, the consistorium, the insti- tution and collation, have only been revived of late, the papal see has conferred full powers on the bishop (modo provisionis), and, until the regular synods should be re-established, to nominate himself, these synodal examiners and take their oath. Besides this examination required by the Church, most civil governments in Germany prescribe a similar examination for the candidate to the functions of curate or preacher.

(b) In regard to the time and manner of the provision, the following is the law generally; the newly established clerical function must first be endowed; an office subsisting already must not be only really, but lawfully vacant. Even to give expectancies, or promises of provision in case of vacancy, is prohibited. Every clerical office must be filled in a given period of time—higher offices within three months; inferior offices, the provision of which is left to the free collation of the Bishops or chapters, six months (c. 2, x, "De Concessa. Prerb."); 8) from the day their vacancy was first known (c. 3, x, "De Suppl. Negl. Prerb."); 10). If the offices to be filled are patronal benefices, the lay patron is allowed a term of four months (c. 3, x, "De Jun. Patron."); 10). By making his presentation, the clerical patron a term of six months; the latter being lawful even in cases where a layman has transferred his right of presentation to a church or ecclesiastical corporation (Sext. c. un. "De Jur. Patron."); 19), where the patronate is mixed. However, the civil legislation of several countries disagree in many cases with these rules. If the election, postulation, nomination, or presentation have not taken place within the allotted term, it is, for this case, lost to the patron, and devolves upon the superior clerical authority. (b) The benefice must be filled according to the canons; consequently, with complete independence both of the collator and the receiver (c. 2, x, "De his qua VI."); 40), without diminution or heavier taxation of the prebend (c. un. x, "Ut Benefice sine Diminut."); 12), and without simony. The admission of the state, and, often of individuals, to a share in the provision of ecclesiastical benefices gave rise in the mediæval Church to the contention for insti-tuutum (q. v.), and remains as yet unsettled. In some countries it was set at rest by concordat; in others it is still unregulated, though the principle of the right of free provision is not lost. The right of the pope is long to the pope. In most Roman Catholic countries the crown elects to bishoprics, and the pope is bound to confirm the nominee of the crown, unless canonical cause of rejection should appear. In Germany, the contest with the papacy has on this account left vacant several important provisions.

3. Form of the Provision. (1) Concerning the ordinary collation (n) of higher offices. Archiepiscopal and episcopal sees, abbacies, and other prelatures are filled by election, postulation, or nomination. (b) The other offices are filled by collation, and consequently the pontiff is the only one who can bestow benefices and benefices are only bestowed, not by the pope, of which the right of filling the vacant places is entirely free, or it is more or less circumscribed by the rights of third persons or by the peculiar situation of the chapter, especially by the right of presentation of the patrons. (2) An extraordinary provision takes place (n) or jure decolato, when the person entitled to fill the vacant office does not fulfil the canonic conditions of the provision, or jure reservato, when the prebend is one of those the collation of whom is reserved to the pope.

4. Institution and collation. (1) The lawful collation of the office in question by the competent clerical superior, which alone entitles to the possession of the office and to the exercise of the rights of consecration and jurisdiction connected with it, is made, for episcopates and prelatures, by the pope, by confirmation of the elected or postulated person or nominee; for other functions, by the bishop (c. 3, x, "De Inst.""); iii. 7; Conc. Trid. sess. xxiv. c. 13, "De Ref."); through canonic institution. The phrase institutum canonicum appears in Sext. c. 1, "De Reg. Jur.""); 12, and has since prevailed; the expression Benedicti XIV, "Cum illud," d. 14 Dec. 1742). As the diocesan synods, the collatio, ins- titutio verbis, institutio vocatoriam, institutum, are somewhat erroneously employed as synonymous with it. Collatio beneficis ought to be used only for prebends freely conferred by the clerical superior, as here the collation of the office makes one with the presentation, both being included in the decree of collation. If the office belongs to that class to which third persons (physically and morally qualified) have a right of election or presentation, then institutio is the right word, and, better, the following, to indicate that this institution is made by the competent clerical superior is alone the lawful collation; or institutio collatutis, to indicate that the office is really conferred only by the institution; institutio verbis, to distinguish this verbal delivery of the office from the act of putting a person in possession of it (instalation). While the liber cargo was always, and is, an ab-
solately personal right of the bishop, neither the vicar-general (sede plena) can perform it without special powers, nor the chapter, nor the capitular vicar appointed by it (sede aequitatis). The institutio canonicus, or colectio, or cerebula, was formerly a regular official right of the archdeacon (c. 6, x, "De Instit. ii, i, ii), and is still a right comprised in the general powers of the vicar-general. This right of institution to offices connected with no charge of souls can exceptionally belong even to other ecclesiastical persons or corporations, either in consequence of special favor or of prescription (c. 18, x, "De Praes. ii, 26; c. 2, § 2, "De Privill. v, 83). By this canonical institution the nominate obtains the full right to his office and to the attributes of jurisdiction over possesses distinctions connected with it, but no right to take charge of souls: for this he needs a special authorization, for which he must apply within in a period of two months from the day when the decree of presentation or collation has been received (II V "In Conferenda," d. 8 Mart. 1667); and this is called the institutio, in a narrower sense, or institutio auctoriosissima, i.e. the special collation of the charge of souls. The collation of the cura aminarum is, again, so exclusively a right of the bishop that neither the archdeacon nor the vicar-general, unless he be well pleased, can confer it (c. 4, x, "De Off. Archidic."") ii, 28), nor, in general, any third person even possessed of the full right of provision. Now the institutio auctoriosissima goes regularly together with the institutio collatio, and is given at the episcopal residence (Conc, Trid. sem. xii, c. 13, "De Ref.) and approbation, by means of symbolic performances, by dressing the candidate in the chasuble and barret (hence the name institutio), receiving his profession of faith and oath of obedience, and delivering the benefice a deed thereof, called "letter of investiture." This institutio auctoriosissima can be made by the bishop himself for his vicar-general, who needs no longer a special mandate for it (Benedict XIV "De Syn, Dioc."") ii, ii, c. 8), and, sede vacante, the chapter, or the capitular vicar appointed by them (Sext. c. 1, "De Instit. iii, i, 6), (2.) The introduction into the office and prebend, or putting into possession (institutio corporalis), is called (a) for the bishop inunctionem, and consists in this, that the consecrated bishop, in his badges, takes solemn possession of his cathedral or an assigned residence. It is combined, if the bishop be consecrated in his own church, into one act with the consecration; but if the consecration take place extra diocese — in the metropolitan church, or cathedral, of the consecrate delegate by the pope, then, according to the traditional custom and practice in pastoral hands, the bishop, or the diocesan vicar, is received at his arrival in the benedict of his seat by the chapter and the clergy of the city and surrounding country, and escorted to some church situated in the neighborhood, where, after a short prayer, he is clothed in the pontifical robes and badges, he is seated on the solemn procession, all bells ringing into his cathedral. Here he is greeted with the hymn Ecce sanctus magnum, and while the clergy and the people sing the Te Deum, he takes his seat, gives the episcopal benediction, and is then escorted to his residence, the cross being carried before him. (b) The solemn admission of a canon of a cathedral or collegiate chapter is called installment. The beneficiary, in the house of the chapter, is clothed in the choir garments, and the capitular cross is appended to his neck, whereupon he recites the Credo and swears the capitular oath. He is then led to his seat in the chapter (sedes in capitulo), escorted to the church, and here, also, shown his place in the choir (salmum in choro, hence installatio). (c) With canons and other beneficiaries, the institutio corporalis (not called installation) is performed at the place of residence, the introduction into the office (immissio in spiritualibus beneficii) by a legate of the bishop, and the putting in possession of the prebend (immissio

In Austria, every ecclesiastical, upon getting into office, after receiving spiritual investiture at the hands of the bishop, has, before his installation, to sign a written declaration to the effect that he does not belong, nor will ever belong, to any secret society. The spiritual installation is performed, in the name of the ordinariate, by the vicar of the district or dean the first holyday after the arrival of the ecclesiastic at the place of his benefice; the worldly installation, in the name of the government, by a higher functionary commissioned thereto; in pastoral prebends by the patron, according to the prevailing custom. In Prussia, the prebendary is generally put into possession of the spiritual investiture in common with the patron or with the Landeshof, if the curacy be one of those to which the government has the right of nomination. The deed of confirmation is read in the presence of the community, the curate is introduced, and put in possession of his residence with approbation. A new curate in the oath is exacted, after which the dean proclaims to the spiritual performance in the church, where he introduces the new curate to his community. From the church he is led again to his residence, where he is introduced to the community by the royal commissary. Then the people are dismissed, and the same ceremony, in the presence of the episcopal plenipotentiary and the civil functionaries and church trustees, delivers the keys of the house to the new curate. In Baden, the curate is put in possession, in the name of the grand-duke, by the grand-ducal commissary; in the district, but only mediately, by a written order of these officers; but a solemn institutio corporalis takes place in the church in the presence of the archiepiscopal dean. Similar dispositions prevail in Wurttemberg in the kingdom of Saxony and Grand Duchy of Hess, and in Nassau—Wetzlar u. Wels, Kirchen-List, etc. II. In the Church of England, the bishop is nominally elected by the chapter; but, in reality, the members of the chapter are only permitted to name the particular person whom the crown presents to them for election with the congé d'élire. In the Roman Catholic Church of England and of Ireland, the parochial clergy, together with the canons, recommend three candidates, one of whom is commonly, although not necessarily, appointed by the pope. III. In the Russo-Greek Church, the candidates are presented by the holy synod, and the cæsar names the bishop from among them. See Harewood, Hist. of the Reformation, 1, 350. 

Provisor. (1) a chamberlain; (2) the Cluniac bailiff of the ville or manor and receiver of rents—Walcott, Sacred Archeprology, &c. 

Provisors, Statute of. Clement V, in the beginning of the 14th century, went beyond all his predecessors by declaring that the disposal of all ecclesiastical benefices belonged to the pope. The pope accordingly made reversionary grants, or provision, as they were called, during the lives of the incumbents; and he reserved such benefices as he thought fit for his own peculiar patronage. England in particular suffered greatly from these grants. These encroachments during the reign of Henry III. The parliament assembled at Carlisle in the thirty-fifth year of Edward I sent a strong remonstrance to pope Clement V against the papal encroachments. But this remonstrance produced no effect. The first prince who was bold enough to assert the power of the legislature to restrain these encroachments was Edward III. After complaining ineffectually to Clement VI of the heinous abuse of papal reservations, he procured the famous statute of Provisors (25 Edw. III, stat. 6) to be passed (A.D. 1350). This act ordained that all elections to any ecclesiastical benefices should from henceforth be made by the court of Rome of any archbishopric, bishopric, dignity, or other benefice, the king
The same Prowe, it is believed, was also worshipped under a different form: he stands on a column, his nude form in a pair of boots; a bell lies at his feet. This is asserted by the chronicle of Botho, which calls the god Prowo, and speaks of him as being the idol of Atenburg or Stargard. This may possibly be mistaken for Pervul, this booted deity with Prowe: other idols besides the latter may have been worshipped at Stargard; perhaps the chroniclers mistook one of them for the god of Justice.

*Thorpe, Northern Mythology* (see Index in vol. iii.).

Proventius (from Greek προφετής, for, εὐφή, learn, i.e. for learned bread) is a term meaning correctly, respectfully, by the Western Church to the adherents of the Greek Church because they contended for the use of leavened, or common, bread in the Eucharist. The Latin Church were *Asynites* (q. v.). See also Eucharist.

Præhemia, the first fabulous duchess of Bashem, the husband of the celebrated Libussa. His name is synonymous with that of Prometheus: it means he who thinks in advance, probably because Præhemia was a seer, a great prophet.

Præhippægas, a warlike deity in Slavic mythology, sanguinary as were his priests and all the gods of the Slavonians. The Christian prisoners were beheaded in front of his image, and their blood was presented to him to drink.

Puorden, Nechemiah, a New England minister of the Gospel, flourished near the close of the last and the opening of this century. He was born about 1750, and was educated at Yale College. He became pastor of a church at Enfield, Conn. He died in 1816. He is the author of *Moral and Divine Letter of a Deacon* (1810); *Sermom to a Missionary Society* (1815). See Bacon, *Hist. Discourses*, p. 55 sq.

Prudence is the act of selecting words and actions according to the circumstances of things, or rules of right reason. Cicero thus defines it: "Est rerum expetendarum vel fugiendarum scientia"—the knowledge of what is to be desired or avoided. Grove thus: "Prudence is an ability of judging what is best in the choice both of ends and means." Mason thus: Prudence is a conformity to the rules of reason, truth, and decency, at all times and in all circumstances. It differs from wisdom only in degree; wisdom being nothing but a more consummate and prudential habit. Prudence is a lower degree or weaker habit of wisdom. It is divided into, 1. Christian prudence, which directs to the pursuit of that blessedness which the Gospel discovereth by the use of Gospel means; 2. moral prudence, which has for its object peace and satisfaction of mind in this world, and the greatest happiness after death; 3. civil prudence, which is the knowledge of what ought to be done in order to secure the outward happiness of life, consisting in prosperity, liberty, etc.; 4. munificent, relating to any circumstances in which a man is not charged with the care of others; 5. economical prudence, which regards the conduct of a family; 6. political, which refers to the good government of a state. The idea of prudence, says one, includes due consultation—that is, concerning such things as demand consultation—in a right manner and for a competent time, that the resolution taken up may be neither too precipitate nor too slow; and a faculty of discerning proper means when they occur. To the perfection of prudence these three things are further required, viz. a natural sagacity; presence of mind, or a ready turn of thought; and experience. Plato styles prudence the leading virtue; and Cicero observes that "not one of the virtues can want prudence;" which is certainly most true, since, without prudence to guide them, piety would degenerate into superstition, zeal into bigotry, temperance into austerity, courage into rashness, and prudence itself into folly. The labours of men were performed till an advanced hour of the night.
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the vowel, the latter the consonant. The latter cannot be
to the right (reduced to practice) but by means of the
former. See Watts, Sermons, ser. 28; Grove, Moral
Philos. vol. ii, ch. ii; Mason, Christian Morals, vol. i,
ser. 4; Evans, Christian Temper, ser. 38; Coleridge,
Aids to Reflection, i, 18, 21 sq.

Gottschalk. Although Prudentius put his name to
these "quatuer capitula," he soon afterwards endeavored
to refuse them by writing a Tractatus Epistola adr. 4
Capit. Convent. Curia. It is possible that he signed his
name at Chieri by demand of king Charles the Bald.
In the later development of this contest, Prudentius
seems to give up his position. For, up to his death in
861, and is revered as a saint in Troyes. The Bolland-
ists do not recognise his title to sanctity. Although
Prudentius held himself against opposing heresies, and
particularly against the doctrines of the Pelagians and
Semi-Pelagians, he felt, and some authors have
to conceal the truth in the profession of error,
and Les Annales de St. Berlin accuse him of having
written articles against the faith. From a letter of
Sertorius Lupus to Prudentius, we learn (Fp. 63) that
these two men were sent by king Charles to visit and
reform the monastery of France. See Gallia Christi-
ana, iii; Breyer (canon at Troyes), Life of Pruden-
tius (1725); Gfrörer, Gesch. der Corudinger (1849), i,
210 sq.; Wenck, Das Fränkische Reich nach dem Ver-
trag von Verdun (1851), p. 582; Milman, Hist. of Lat-
in Church and States (1849), ii, 211 sq.; Neff, Lehrbuch
Christlichen Theologie; Manguin, Thèse, Acta
acad. scient. in Sec. IX de Prudentius,
scripturas Opera et Fragmenta. (Paris, 1850, 2 vola. 4to);
Kurtz, Ch. Hist. to the Reformation, § 91; 4;
Hardy, Ch. Hist. (Middle Ages), p. 163 sq.; Heftle,
Cicilienphasis, iv, 124 sq.; Jakob fuer deutsch. Theol. 1859,
200.

Prudentius, Aurelius Clemens, one of the earliest
himnists of the Latin Church, is greatly cele-
brated in ecclesiastical history, though generally over-
rated. Bendley calls him "the Horace and Virgil of
the Christians," not even qualifying them as Latin
Christians. There were certainly many himnists previ-
sious to Prudentius, and they sang in the tongue of Homer,
Plato, and the New Test. The very thoughts, and fre-
quently in the very words, of evangelists and apostles.
The homilies of Ephraim the Syrian had the sound as
well as the sense of those of the children of Jerusalem;
and Clement of Alexandria, Gregory of Nazianzum,
and the unknown earliest singers of the Oriental Church
linked the passing hours with heaven by the sublimity
of their language and the simplicity of their faith. As
the truths of Christianity first flowed in Greek from
inspired lips, so the songs of the Church came first in
Greek. When, finally, the mighty new thought had been
fitted to the comparatively stiff and narrow mold of human speech, it was not the tongue of Pru-
udentius that gained around it the most dis-
siastic associations of centuries. The rugged grandeur
of expression, the calm and steady glow that wins for
the majesty of heaven, came rather in the Latin hymns
of Ambrose, Augustine, and Hilary of Poitiers. In
the words of an eminent critic, "The fire of Berelva-
trion, in its strong and simple energy, by which, as it
were, it rends the rock, and bursts the icy barriers of
the human heart, predominates in those oldest pieces
of the sacred Latin poesy which are comprised in the
Ambrosian hymns."

Life—Prudentius was born in A.D. 348, probably at
Saragossa, in Spain. Nothing is known regarding him
except what he has himself told in a poetical autobiog-
ography prefixed to his works. From this we learn that
he received a liberal education, was admitted to the
Roman bar, practised it as a pleader, and some authors
have distinguished himself in his profession, as high civil
offices were twice offered to him. He was even called
upon to occupy a military post at the court of the
emperor Theodosius I. He was already fifty years of age,
when, in a fit of passion, he took a vow to renounce
all ties to the world. At times, he was agitated by earnest misgivings as to
"what all the honors and joys of this world might do for
him in eternity. In them he could not find God to
whom he belonged" (Prof. Cathem., v, 28-34). Hence
the resolution: "Let the soul, at the boundaries of life,
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renounce her folly and sin. Let her praise her God at least by her songs, as she cannot do it by her virtues. Let the day be spent in sacred hymns, and let not even night interrupt the praises of God. I will struggle against her, and I will boast that I resist the sacrifices of the pagans, destroy thy idols, O Rome. I will praise in my songs thy martyrs, glorify the apostles (L. c. ver. 35-42). These words indicate all the different tendencies in his literary productions, which reflect them.

Works. — We have from Prudentius's pen between 385 and 388 poems, a number of which bear Greek titles. The principal are — 1. Cathemerinon Liber (Book i.e. of hymns) for Daily Use), being a series of twelve hymns, the first half of which were reckoned by the author suitable for devotional purposes at different parts of the day, and which the Latin Church has preserved in some of its collections. 2. Apotheosis, Αψυστος (a defence of the doctrine of the Trinity against heretics, which are being intermingled various discussions on the nature of the soul, on original sin, and on the resurrection). 3. Hymnariaen, Αψυστος (On the Origin of Evil, a polemic, in verse, against the Marcionites and Manichaeans). 4. Psychomachia, Ψυκομαχια (The Combat of the Mind against the Passions, or the Triumph of the Christian Graces in the Soul of a Believer, Liber 1, Contra Symmachum, Liber 2 (a polemic against a petition of the Roman senator Symmachus for the restoration of the altar and statue of victory cast down by Gratian). Prudentius supports in these two poems the arguments set forth by Ambrose against the proposition of Symmachus. The first book shows the shameful origin of the old idolatry, exposes the absurdity and abominations of the heathen mythology, the corruption resulting from the want of a moral check, and how happily Rome was insulted by a Christian. The second book he examines the reasons alleged by his adversary, eloquently descants upon the cruel practice of gladiators' combats for the amusement of the people, and, in order to show their brutalizing influence, he instances a vestal attending in the amphitheatre, and witnessing the struggles and agonies of the fallen gladiators in the arena, exclaiming with joy that such sights were their delight, and giving without compunction the signal to dispatch the fallen. Ambrosius (bk. iv. 14) says that he left the vestal upon the vestalas. As, in both books, the subject was of a nature to allow full scope to the genius of the poet, being eminently favorable to enthusiastic apology, this is the best of all his apologetical poems. 5. The Enchoriolum ætusque Testamenti s. Dionysii (forty-eight poems of a devotional character, of which the walls of a uniform tenor, relating to some of the most remarkable events of the New and Old Test., as Adam and Eve, Abel and Cain, Joseph recognised by his brothers, the announcement, the shepherds taught by the angels, etc. Gennadius includes 70 verses under the other poems of Prudentius (De Script. Eccles. 13); but its authenticity has been questioned, chiefly because it is less abundant in ideas than the others. The following are decidedly authentic, and, besides, excellent compositions: 8. Fourteen poems, Hymni S. Vergili, Peri Stephanon Liber, in honor of the martyrs for the faith — Laurentius, Eulalia, Vincent, Hippolytus, Peter and Paul, Agnes, etc.; full of warm feeling and splendid narratives. To the Christian lyrical poetry belong, 9, the twelve songs Κανδυμα τος, mostly destined for the daily prayer-hours, which were exactly observed in olden times. The first relates to the dawning of the day (as galli cantum); Christ, the rising light of the world, chases the dark powers of night. Let him banish them also from our heart and pour new light into our souls! The second is likewise a morning-song. The third and fourth, the middle-prayer, 10, the fifth is to be recited at the lighting of the candles; the sixth upon retiring for the night; the seventh and eighth while and after fasting; the ninth, an encomium on the Saviour, at all hours. To these are added Songs for Exequies (on the Resurrection), on the feast of Christmas ("octavo Calendias Januarii") and Epiphany, and which reflect the Christian spirit; they show the rich symbolism of the Christian life of old, and are therefore of great archaeological importance. Several passages of them and of the hymns Hymni Vergili have been put into the Breviary among the Church hymns. Prudentius cultivated, as we have seen, the two fundamental kinds of Christian poetry, the didactic-panegyric and the lyric, which were the necessary consequences of the historico-dogmatic and mystical character of Christianity, and borrowed their forms from the ancient Roman poetry, which is also chiefly didactic-panegyric or panegyric. The poetical form was employed at a very early period for the popular interpretation and defence of the Christian dogmas against pagans and heretics. Prudentius achieved in a short time a great reputation in the Church. Sidonius (Epist. 41) compares him with Horace, who was his chief model in a formal point of view; yet Prudentius moves in the classical forms with incomparably greater ease than his predecessors, Juvenal and Victorinus; he borrows more than the theme from the ancients, and gives to the Latinity, to keep the expression of his thoughts free from all pagan coloring. His phrases, it is true, show the decay of letters and of good Latin, yet many parts of his poems display taste as well as delicacy; for instance, his stanzas, Sabina, flores maritimae, to be found in the Roman Breviary for the feast of the Holy Innocents. We are, however, at a loss to understand how any scholars of our critical age can bestow unqualified praise on Prudentius, and place him first in the list of Christian versifiers. Nor are we ready to shut our eyes to the fulness of all beauty in Prudentius's verse, and declare his hymns simply "didactic essays, loaded with moral precepts and doctrinal subtreasures." His lyric style is good, and his hymns are good specimens of the best Christian song of the Latin Church in that early age. "The stanzas," says Milman (Hist. of Latin Christianity, viii, 290), "which the Latin Church has handed down in her services from Prudentius are but the flowers gathered from a wilderness of weeds." Prudentius, even in Germany, was the great popular author of the Middle Ages; no work but the Bible appears with so many glosses (interpretations or notes) in High German, which shows that it was a book of Groksleitung (comp. Raumer, Einwirkung des Christentums auf die Althochdeutsche Sprache, p. 222). Had Ambrose lived earlier, Prudentius would not have been remembered at all; but as his contemporary he deserves a place beside that other great poet of the Middle Ages, beyond excelled, but sometimes equalled as a hymnologist. The earliest edition of Prudentius's works is that of Deventer (1472). By far the best is that of Faustinus Arrevalius (Rome, 1788-89, 2 vols, 4to), but excellent editions are also those by Valin (Hamburg, 1829); 23 editions (in usum Delphini, Paris, 1867, 4to); and Gallandius, Bibl. Patr., vol. viii. The newest and handiest is that of Obbiansis (Tubing, 1844), whose Prolegomena embrace a large amount of information condensed into a small compass. See Gennadius, De Vita Illustr. 13; Ludwig, Daseinet, de Vita A. Prudentii (Viterb, 1842, 4to), Le Clerque, Vie de Prudence (Amst., 1690); Middeldorp, Comment. de Prud. et Thol. Prud. (Vratisl., 1823-27); Schaffer, Chr. Hist. vol. iii; Christian Life in Song, p. 74 sq., 99, 110 sq.; Saunders, Ewings with the Sacred Poets, p. 34; Maitot, Hesperia Latia, p. 1 sq.; Daniel, Theaurus Hymnol. ii, 102 sq.; Smith, Dictionary of Gr. and Rom. Biog. s. v.

Pruning-hook (περικομολής, mozerdách; Sept. ἤρμος; Isa. ii. 4; xviii. 5; Joel iv. 10; Mic. iv. 3), a knife for pruning the vine. The manner of trimming the vine (περικομολού, zamaré), signifying clipping, and also .
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The singular instrument of the vine-dresser, were well known even in the time of Moses (Lev. xxv. 3, 4), and no doubt both were similar to those employed by the Egyptians. See KNIFE; VINE; VINEYARD.

Prussia (Ger. Preussen) is a kingdom of the new German Empire, virtually embracing within its own limits the story of the whole empire in which it is the guiding and ruling power. Before its recent aggrandizement, it consisted of two large tracts of land extending from Russia on the east to Holland and Belgium on the west, south of the Baltic and north of Saxony, Thuringia, Bavaria, etc., but separated from each other by the kingdoms of Hanover, the duchies of Mecklenburg and Oldenburg, the electorate of Hesse-Cassel, duchy of Nassau, and some minor states. In 1866, Prussia received large acquisitions of territory, having annexed the kingdom of Hanover, the duchies of Hesse-Cassel, Nassau, and Silesia and Holstein, the free city of Frankfurt, and some districts of Bavaria and Hesse-Darmstadt. The area of Prussia was thus increased from 108,212 Eng. sq. miles to 137,066, and the population from 19,304,943 to 24,106,847, of whom 23,746,790 formed the civil population, and 916,056 the military; the literacy of the latter was 76 per cent, and of the former 72 per cent.

The variation in density is considerable, the greatest being in the manufacturing district of Dusseldorf, in the Rhine province, where it is four times the average, and smallest in the district of Kiel in Schleswig-Holstein, where it amounts to three fifths of the average. Prussia is now divided into eleven provinces and three annexes with a population, according to the official census for 1885, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Pop. Dec. 1885</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Prussia</td>
<td>5,056,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Posen</td>
<td>1,716,618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Pomerania</td>
<td>1,266,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Hanover</td>
<td>1,060,572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Brandenburg</td>
<td>1,024,411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Saxony</td>
<td>767,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Pomerania</td>
<td>720,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Rhine province</td>
<td>654,927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Hesse-Nassau</td>
<td>582,404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Hanover</td>
<td>558,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Silesia</td>
<td>552,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Princ. Hohenzollern</td>
<td>483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. City of Berlin</td>
<td>3,152,207</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

About 88 per cent. of the population are Germans. Of the Slavonic tribes, the most numerous are Poles, numbering two and a quarter millions. In Brandenburg and Silesia there are about 85,000 Wends, and in East Prussia upwards of 147,000 Lithuanians; while Wends and Lithuanians have largely more than doubled by the use of the German language, intermixed in its general German population, and Silesia has nearly 59,000 Bohemians or Moravians—making in all two and a half millions who do not use the German language, or who employ it only as secondary to their native tongues.

Three distinct classes are recognised in Prussia—namely, nobles, burghers, and peasants. To the first belong about 177,000 persons, including the high officials of the state, although that number does not comprise the various mediatised houses, of which sixteen are Prussian, and others belonging to different states, but connected with Prussia by still existing or former territorial sessions. The burgher class includes, in its higher branches, all public-office holders, professional men, artists, and merchants; while the peasantry—to which being Tolstoyan where engaged in agricultural pursuits are divided into classes, depending on the number of horses employed on the land, etc.

1. History and Religion.—The lands bounded by the Baltic and now constituting East Prussia, and the adjoining territory on that side of the Oder, form the origin of the Prussians with which they now occupy. These lands were early occupied by Slavonic tribes, nearly allied to the Lithuanians (q. v.) and the Letts. It is conjectured that they were visited by Phcenian navigators in the 4th century B.C., but beyond the fact of their having come into temporary conflict with the Goths and other Teutonic hordes prior to the great exodus of the latter from their northern homes, little is known of the people till the 7th century, when they first appear in history under the name of Borussi, or Prussians. They were then a small but vigorous nation, and had made their homes in the Oder, and their neighbors by bold inroads, when the race of the heroes and sea-kings arrived from Norway and Sweden. Scandinavian Goths settled in the country, and the southern shores of the Baltic sounded with the praise of the exploits of Skarkodder and Ragnar Lodbjorg.

1. Mythological Period.—In the oldest historic times, doubtless, the primitive inhabitants—Prussians, Lithuanians, Umlaragusians, Curlanders, Livonians, etc.—were shipwrecked the sun, the moon, the stars, and the powers of nature generally. The Scandinavians, who were the first advanced in the arts of war and of peace, better armed, and skilled in agriculture, then brought in new gods, among whom the three supreme rulers, Perkuno, Poivrepo, Pikolos, and most probably all their other deities. Much has been written and argued on the question whether the three mentioned names, or gods to whom they are said to have belonged, really existed, or whether they were mere inventions of some imaginative chroniclers. There are even writers who have discovered in them the three persons of the Holy Trinity. We shall not speculate on this speculative theory, but believe that the three gods are, or at least were, what we positively know of the ancient mythology of a people which occupies such a high rank among the nations of Europe. Besides the three mentioned, there was another important deity, called Curko, the giver of food. His image stood at the foot of a holy oak. There was one at the place where the city of Heiligenbeil was afterwards built. The apostle of the Prussians cut the venerable tree with a hatchet, and this circumstance gave the town its present name. There were spread over the whole country sacrificial stones, crosses, to which animals, fish, meat, etc., were offered to the god. Every year his image was made anew, out of wood, on the consecrated spots; it was clothed in goat-skins and crowned with herbs and ears. Then it was carried about amid the shouts of the populace; dances and sacrifices ensued. The inferior gods, in large number, have been divided, not, perhaps, very properly, into gods of the heavens, of earth, of the water, of men, of the cattle, of the lower world, into gods of labor, gods of trade, into good and bad gods. This was, no doubt, a kind of worship of nations, in which Wallonians and Russianized nations. The holiest place in the land was Romwe. Only a priest was allowed to approach it. There were but few exceptions. Thus, by special favor, a powerful ruler was permitted to come near the consecrated spot, and to speak to the gizwe, or high-priest. But not even those great personages were suffered to come near the sanctuary, the ever-verdant oak, and the gods that stood below it; for it was surrounded with a fence formed by long pieces of white linen, something like a most primitive tabernacle. To a great distance the land around the circle was not circled, it was consecrated. No one could enter this forest, which occupied many square miles; and if, unwittingly, some wretch put his foot into it, his life was forfeited to the offended deities. No tree was felled there, no wild animal chased. Besides the celebrated Romwe, there were other places of the same kind spread all over the country, and whose names, commencing with Romas, and partly preserved to our day, are expressive of calm and holiness. We find quite a number of such names in Lithuania. In Prussia the trees were held holy, as among the ancient Germans, the Anglo-Saxons, the Rugians, Holsteinians, and kindred peoples. There existed also single oaks and Linden-trees which were held in particular estimation as being the seats of some divinity; they were approached with pious horror and deep reverence. The oak of
Heiligenbeil, with a circumference of forty feet and a diameter of nineteen, was the most celebrated. Some mountains enjoyed the same honors. The best-known of them was near Brandenburg, at a short distance from the Friesche Haft. Near the holy woods and trees there was always a rich deposit of gold and silver poured by the plough. We also find holy springs, from which no one could take water unless he previously offered a sacrifice: their water was believed to be a sure medicine against certain diseases. There were also holy lakes, either in a separate place or connected with the sanctuaries and forests: no one was allowed to fish in their waters.

The gods adored in those consecrated places were, besides those already named: Okopins, the god of the air and of temperate; Sopins, the god of the stars; a most important god in the North, with its long winter nights; Bankowitsa, the god of the sea; Antrimo, the angry god, who excites the waves; Wurkselte and Stwezamborte, the protectors of cattle and poultry, worshiped extensively in the whole country; Gurdelsa and Jomotekite, the protectors of oxen and sheep; Per dosits, the god of trade, who made the sea propitious to the mariner, and was especially honored on the sea-coast; Puskowitsa, the god of woods and trees, who lived under the foliage, and whose dwelling-places were held particular honor by the god; and through the country, number of sanctuaries, where he was attended by a multitude of strange, dwarf-like beings, which the imagination of the people had fitted out and ornamented in the most fantastic manner. Peryouboris gave fertility to the fields; Zonewitsa strewed the earth with seeds, and covered it with flowers and herbs; Polaritsa filled with riches the houses and the barns; Aunewitsa was the god of health, restored to the sick and invalid.

To these must be added quite a number of female deities. Joweleno, watched over the germination and growth of all plants, and caused flowers and gardens with herbs and grass; Struita was the goddess of the flowers; Gojoginsa was the goddess of riches and opulence; Guze led the wanderers through deserts and gloomy forests; Sveeianskow; the bride of the star-god, directed the heavenly bodies on their path; Laima was the obstetric goddess, and fixed the destinies of the new-born. The bad goddesses were, the sanguinary Gittine, who brought painful death; Mgolda, the wrathful deity, who visited cruel misfortunes upon those whom she disliked; Laune, who intervened in human affairs—now sparingly, now cruelly. The wild, the feral, and the savage, were—all was fair—this was the case. The act of killing and consumption of the flesh of these monsters was in honor of the three great gods; the throwing of the cup was the sacrifice brought to them, which human hands durst not touch. After this ceremony the cup circulated from mouth to mouth. Each worshipper took it between his teeth, emptied it, and with his teeth on the neighbor took it from him. Finally, the benediction was given to the people; a banquet ensued, in which intoxicating beverages were so plentifully tasted that the solemnity generally ended in bloody work, as is the case, even in our days, with Poles, Lithuanians, and other nations.

2. Introduction of Christianity. We here substantially give the account found in Wetzer u. Weltc, Kirchen-Lexikon, s. v.

"Several attempts to introduce the Christian religion into Prussia had been fruitless. St. Adalbert, bishop of Prague, died April 25, 997, a martyr to his faith, while endeavoring to convert the people to Christianity, from the family of the Barons von Querfurt, who, after removing his cause and entering the Benedictine congregation of Hirsau, had repaired to Poland, with a view to preach there the Gospel and convert those pagan tribes, also suffered martyrdom (Feb. 11, 1000). The endeavors to Christianize the Prussians by force were still more unsuccessful. As the acceptance of the Christian religion had been made a condition of peace by Boland, duke of Poland, about 1018, they considered the Christian communion as an ominous consequence of unhappy persons, in the capacity of Christ and they shook it off every time when they felt strong enough to do so. Thus the dispensation to the Prussians continued to increase continually, until it reached the very pitch of
of Westphalian birth, was not only a distinguished war-
rior, but also a scholar and statesman of the highest
worldly matters; a plumed knight, too, who during a space
of ten years had administered the possessions of the
order in German and other countries assigned to him,
with the full confidence of the grand-master. All other high
Prussian families were considered to be inferior to equality
sons, who, with a few knights and a considerable body of
knights, set out on their way to Prussia. They arrived in
1228 in the Dienzenhofen, and in the north as well as in
the south, as their host, yet the Prussians counted a thousand
warriors where they counted one. Conrad could resist
them with his own, but not with the Prussians, who, under
the influence of his forces, his weakness being the very cause
which was turned to his advantage, had made their attack
by its unceasing troubles, and, besides, engaged in per-
tual warfare with their neighbors. Pomerania itself of-
tered no resistance to the Prussians; they were welcomed
but hostile relations with Conrad, and with Poland in
general. It was a terrible harbinger in the Teutonic Order
to engage in their expedition under such unfavorable cir-
stances. They began the war without delay, joined by
use of the crossing forces through the XIX part of a
warfare on crusade against Prussia with unswerving zeal.
The land of Calm was occupied, with the help of Swantepol
of Pomerania, in spite of the desperate resistance of
the Prussians. The order, at the same time that it construc-
ted forts to secure the new conquests, helped German colon-
ists in building cities in well-protected and fertile
places. Thoro was reared first, soon afterwards Calm,
both in 1233. In 1238, the Catholic Christianity had been
introduced into Pomerania and Li-
va, and an order of Christian knighthood had been formed for
its furthering and maintaining. The prospects for Prus-
a also seemed to brighten. Although the exer-
citions of Gottfried, abbot of the monastery of Cystersian
of Tannenberg, and of fellow-monk Philip, who suffered martyrdom, were not attended with
any results, the efforts of the initiative princes
converted. A few years afterwards appeared the man
who was reserved the glorious achievement of intro-
ducing Christianity to Prussia. It was the Cistercian
monk Christian, of the monastery of Oliva, a man distin-
guished by every virtue, and speaking fluently the Ger-
man, Latin, Italian, and French languages. In 1230 he
had obtained permission from pope Innocent III to go to
Prussia to convert the heathens. The pope and his efforts
were crowned with such brilliant success that in the fall
of 1234, or at the beginning of 1235, he was appointed
bishop of Prusien. The battle was a bloody one, and the spot where it had
raged was, long after the event, called 'The Field of the
Deeds.' At the same time, his bitterest enemies, the
members of the order, were committed to the pastoral care of the
archbishop of Gne-
osen. The number of the converted Prussians was consid-
erable and two of the princes, Warpod, the bishop of
Landsau, and Swabuofo, who reigned in the land of
Lobos, had made provisions for the maintenance of the
bishop.

This partial triumph of Christianity excited the anger of
the heathenish Prussians, who, were, besides, amassed
by the expeditions of Conrad, duke of Masowia. Help
from abroad was sorely needed. Crusades, however,
continued to be.put off. The monks of the order led the
Knights of Christ, called also Brother-knights of Do-
brin, engaged in the conversion of Lithuania. The
pattern of the Knights of the Sword, was no match for
the savage fury of the Prussians: at the very begin-
ning, even if the knights, were stalled in a battle
bottle near the spot where Strasbourg was afterwards
built. By bishop Christian's advice, the Teutonic Order
was divided into four grandes of bishops. In 1238,
Hermann von Salza, asked consent of Frederick II, who
was not a bishop, but also he had been elevated to
bishop, and confirmed the donations of land formally made
in the order by duke Conrad of Masowia. After four years
of negotiations, duke Conrad made a solemn grant to the
order of the whole land of Calm, between the Vistula,
Drewenz, and Ossa, with all the conquests they should
add to it; while a another a bishop, the Bishop Christian,
Gäther, bishop of Plock, renounced in their favor all
their possessions, revenues, and patronal rights in those
countries, reserving only their episcopal jurisdiction and
their pontifical. At the same time the pope, Gregory
IX, had arranged the IV in 1234, the order and
and future conquests of the order of the papal see
('in jure et proprietatem B. Petri apostolicae et sum episcoporum Sclaviae et Polesiae
et toda territorii ab episcopis et oecumenicis.

... nonnulla quosam subjecitur domino potestatis... que vero in futurum... de terra paganorum in eadem
prima sedes situs, adhibitis... sumptibus, consensu
vestrae successionis sub jure et proprietate Sclavia et Polesiae.

... de omnibus statu, principatuum, concesionibus, etc.,
de omnibus statu, principatuum, concesionibus, etc.,

domini potestatis... que vero in futurum... de terra paganorum in eadem
prima sedes situs, adhibitis... sumptibus, consensu
vestrae successionis sub jure et proprietate Sclavia et Polesiae.

... de omnibus statu, principatuum, concesionibus, etc.,
de omnibus statu, principatuum, concesionibus, etc.,

domini potestatis... que vero in futurum... de terra paganorum in eadem
prima sedes situs, adhibitis... sumptibus, consensu
vestrae successionis sub jure et proprietate Sclavia et Polesiae.

... de omnibus statu, principatuum, concesionibus, etc.,
de omnibus statu, principatuum, concesionibus, etc.,

domini potestatis... que vero in futurum... de terra paganorum in eadem
prima sedes situs, adhibitis... sumptibus, consensu
vestrae successionis sub jure et proprietate Sclavia et Polesiae.
the work of confession, was selected for the diocese of Cölln. From the time of his election, a friend and companion of Heidenreich, who had, like him, worked many years for the expansion of Christianity, was selected as his vicar-general. The brother-priest of the Teutonic Order, Henry of Stratech, was appointed bishop of Ermeland. The diocese of Ermeland received in 1245 a new chapter of canons at Fliechmühlen, then in 1250 at Königsberg. The bishops, owing to various impediments, did not occupy their seats at a regular pace. The diocese of Ermeland, as far as I can ascertain, was consecrated by the pope himself at Lyonna, probably in the course of the year 1245. By this time the legate, William of Modena, had arrived also at the court of Rome, and was soon promoted to the episcopate of Salis. It was no easy matter to find a successor to a man who had played such a prominent part in the religious organization of the north—in Prussia, Livonia, Courland, and Estonia, and displayed as much zeal, independence, and energy in the most intricate affairs. The bishops of Prussia needed, above all, a man who had insight and influence enough to draw positive limits between the dioceses, and render final decisions in a number of concerns where no rules had as yet been agreed upon. In the year 1244, pope Innocent IV thought he had found such a person in the person of the admiral and lord of the diocese of Liebe, Eberhard—formerly bishop of Armg, livonia, and Estonia, and, still earlier, bishop of Prussia of Prussia, Livonia, and Estonia. That the new bishop might have an influence proportionate to his power, was formally committed to him by his episcopal see of Chios, of which he had just become vacant, and enjoined the bishop of Salzburg to deliver into the hands of the future bishop of Prussia, Livonia, and Estonia. Towards the end of April, 1246, the pope sent him the following letter:

"Be it therefore known to the people of Russia, and the church of Liebe: Forasmuch as there was no time left for the bishop of Prussia, Livonia, and Estonia, that the new bishop might have an influence proportionate to his power, was formally committed to him by his episcopal see of Chios, of which he had just become vacant, and enjoined the bishop of Salzburg to deliver into the hands of the future bishop of Prussia, Livonia, and Estonia. Towards the end of April, 1246, the pope sent him the following letter:

"Be it therefore known to the people of Russia, and the church of Liebe: Forasmuch as there was no time left for the bishop of Prussia, Livonia, and Estonia, to make use of it during his sojourn in Russia, and in the church of Liebe: But this right was not to be extended to the church of Liebe. At the same time Ebert wanted to return to Russia, to promote the fusion of the Russian and the Roman Church; and pope Innocent IV recommended to him also the goal of the Teutonic Order, and in such cases both parties were to express this in writing by appointing one of the priests of their order to one of the positions in the diocese. For the purpose of this mission, the pope took the administration of the diocese. The country had been devastated and neglected, was scantily populated, and churches were rare and separated by large intervals. The bishop had to induce colonists to settle in his diocese, and as the result of five or six years he could think of the establishment of a cathedral church. The cathedral was consecrated at Culf in 1247, and received the same of the Holy Trinity; at the same time a chapter was founded, under the rule of St. Augustine, and so richly endowed that, as soon as the remains of the bishop could be collected, a cathedral might be built. Besides the churches, the number of which was continually increasing in church and village, there were also the houses of the more important Augustinian, for instance, a Dominikan monastery at Culf, and a Franciscan
cathedral of the bishops of Pomesania is little known in the first years of its existence: we only know that it had been possession of the Teutonic Order, An- selm, who had had a considerable share in the work of conversion and in the victories of the order. The division of the land was made in 1225: the bishop chose the middle part, in which the city of Brandenburg was situ- ated. Bishop Anselm displayed indefatigable activity in the discharge of his duties: took wise measures for the education of the clergy, and made provision for the admission of cripples, etc. The bishops of Prussia lived for a long time in very dis- trict, and owing to the seclusion of the city, Brandenburg, was situated. Bishop Anselm displayed indefatigable activity in the discharge of his duties: took wise measures for the education of the clergy, and made provision for the admission of cripples, etc. The bishops of Prussia lived for a long time in very dis- trict, and owing to the seclusion of the city, Brandenburg, was situated. Bishop Anselm displayed indefatigable activity in the discharge of his duties: took wise measures for the education of the clergy, and made provision for the admission of cripples, etc. The bishops of Prussia lived for a long time in very dis- The division of the land was made in 1225: the bishop chose the middle part, in which the city of Brandenburg was situ- ated. Bishop Anselm displayed indefatigable activity in the discharge of his duties: took wise measures for the education of the clergy, and made provision for the admission of cripples, etc. The bishops of Prussia lived for a long time in very dis-
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the countries of the Baltic a firmer support, bishop William of Sabina directed, in the pope's name, that the seat of church in Bremen, which was in many respects the most important and finest city in those parts. After the death of this bishop, in 1510, how- ever, it seems to have been vacant for a long time, and again in 1514, and perhaps even earlier, the See became vacant, in all other words, the Church of Bremen should become archiepiscopal, and be transferred to the Prussian territory, which could be ins- talled in the situation of the bishop of Riga, and the arch- bishop should exercise in his diocese only his archiepiscop- cal rights. It is true, bishop William of Sabina was appointed in 1514, and 1515, established himself in Livonia, and resigned into the hands of the 

But in Prussia, his ordinances in ecclesiastical matters were not immediately carried out. The old, legal, and ancient rights of the church went on, with some obstacles: there were the liberties and privileges granted to the order by the popes; there were the privileges of the CHAPTERS, the rights of the bishops, the old feudal laws, with which they were in fact as old as the land itself. The grand-master of the Teutonic Order, margrave Albert von Brandenburg, endeavored in 1515 to shake off the control of the feudal enperors of the Teutonic Order, and the Hohen zu Brandenburg, according to Luther's advice, "the foolish, nonsensical rule of the order," taking a wise, and understanding Prussians a wisely principality, induced him, after the peace of Cracow, in 1525, to accept Prussia from the crown of Po- land as a new state.

Freeseing that an example so momentous to the ecclesiastical dignities of Germany could not but bring many advantages against him, duke Albert looked about for allies, married the daughter of the king of Denmark, in 1526, and, by promising Roman Catholic, entered into the closest relations with the Protestantism of Germany. Under the protection of King Sigismund of Poland he could stand firm. He could not have created a new state and of the members of the order, spoiled of their rights was just as ineffectual as the "Acht" pronounced against the Pope in 1520 by the Diet of Augsburg. Con- tradictions between the Pope and the Emperors of the Holy Roman Empire, the German princes, with Con- tradictions between the Pope and the Emperors of the Holy Roman Empire, the German princes, with Con- tradictions between the Pope and the Emperors of the Holy Roman Empire, the German princes, with Con- tradictions between the Pope and the Emperors of the Holy Roman Empire, the German princes, with Con- tradictions between the Pope and the Emperors of the Holy Roman Empire, the German princes, with Con- tradictions between the Pope and the Emperors of the Holy Roman Empire, the German princes, with Con- tradictions between the Pope and the Emperors of the Holy Roman Empire, the German princes, with Con- tradictions between the Pope and the Emperors of the Holy Roman Empire, the German princes, with Con- tradictions between the Pope and the Emperors of the Holy Roman Empire, the German princes, with Con- tradictions between the Pope and the Emperors of the Holy Roman Empire, the German princes, with Con- tradictions between the Pope and the Emperors of the Holy Roman Empire, the German princes, with Con- tradictions between the Pope and the Emperors of the Holy Roman Empire, the German princes, with Con- tradictions between the Pope and the Emperors of the Holy Roman Empire, the German princes, with Con- tradictions between the Pope and the Emperors of the Holy Roman Empire, the German princes, with Con- tradictions between the Pope and the Emperors of the Holy Roman Empire, the German princes, with Con- tradictions between the Pope and the Emperors of the Holy Roman Empire, the German princes, with Con- tradictions between the Pope and the Emperors of the Holy Roman Empire, the German princes, with Con- tradictions between the Pope and the Emperors of the Holy Roman Empire, the German princes, with Con- tradictions between the Pope and the Emperors of the Holy Roman Empire, the German princes, with Con- tradictions between the Pope and the Emperors of the Holy Roman Empire, the German princes, with Con- tradictions between the Pope and the Emperors of the Holy Roman Empire, the German princes, with Con- tradictions between the Pope and the Emperors of the Holy Roman Empire, the German princes, with Con- tradictions between the Pope and the Emperors of the Holy Roman Empire, the German princes, with Con- tradictions between the Pope and the Emperors of the Holy Roman Empire, the German princes, with Con- tradictions between the Pope and the Emperors of the Holy Roman Empire, the German princes, with Con- tradictions between the Pope and the Emperors of the Holy Roman Empire, the German princes, with Con-
time, deprived the electorate of some of its original dominions, as, for instance, the margraviate of Ansbach, which passed, on the death of the elector Albert Achilles, in 1568, to the elector John Sigismund, through his marriage (in 1569) with Anne, daughter and heiress of Albert Frederick, the Joanne, elector of Prussia. In the next reign, the confusion increased: the countships of Ravensberg, the Mark, and Limburg, and the possession of the duchy of Prussia, now known as East Prussia, became incorporated with the Brandenburg territori

was more than doubled in area. The electron, formerly John Sigismund's son, George Wilhel

Prussia (1619-40), was distracted by the miseries of the Thirty Years' War, and the country was alternately the prey of the Bohemian and Dutch. In this, in the succession of George Wilhelm's son, the great elector Frederick William (1640-88), the electorate was reduced to the lowest depths of social misery and financial embarrassment. But so wise, prudent, and vigorous was the government of the prince, and so successful were his policies, that in 1660 the number of the population of one and a half million, and an area of 42,000 square miles, had been raised by his genius to the rank of a great European power ("chambery"). His successors, Frederick III (1688-113) and Frederick William I (1713-40), each in his own way increased the power and credit of Prussia, which had been united and strengthened to the title of a kingdom — a most significant change not only in the secular, but also in the ecclesiastical history of that country. Sweden had been at peace with the eminence of the Swedes had for a time the leading Protestant power in the North; Prus

3. Reformation Period. — The religious history of this early period of Prussia's aggrandizement is as full of interest as the secular. Its people, among whom, even in the 16th century, heathenish customs maintained their place side by side with Christian usages, were among the first to look upon the movement upon the new Gospel movement. The German order they had learned to despise, and, looking upon Christianity and knighthood as synonymous, they had steadfastly opposed conversion. But now, when a gospel was preached dispensing and opposing the papacy and all its agencies, the people became ready converts; and the princes, accepting this great popular movement as insurmountable, suffered themselves to be borne along with the tide. In Prussia the priests even favored the new departure. "From the success of the Reformation the princes expected the forfeited property of the Church, which their expected wives, and the people freedom." So says Marx (Ursachen der schnellen Verbreitung d. Ref, [Mayence, 1834]).

In Prussia, even the bishop of Samland, George of Polentz (q.v.), and soon afterwards Queis, bishop of Pomerania (q.v.), but the former finally placed himself at the head of it, and proclaimed on Christmas-day, 1529, in the cathedral of Königsberg, with great joy, that the Saviour had been born once more for his people. In 1525 the progress of the new opinion was so great that when the country was converted into a secular duchy the entire populace signified their cordial acquiescence, and rejoiced to rank themselves among the followers of Luther. A German liturgy was soon afterwards introduced, adhering as closely as might be to the ancient forms; the convents were changed into hospitals; and by the help of pastors (q.v.), or expository discourses on the epistles and gospels, regularly sent from Wittenberg, the doctrines of the clergy were kept in general harmony with each other, and also with the tenets advocated in the Lutheran metropolis. The two bishops, together with three evangelical pastors of the city of Brandenburg, Spiegler, Seren, and Ponander — had prepared a Church discipline (Lepold), and caused its adoption, under the title "Artikel der Cernemonien u. anderer Kirchenordnung," by Parliament (Landtag) in December, 1525. In 1540 the discipline was further augmented and ele

in 1530 a confession of faith, consisting of eleven articles, was promulgated, under the title "Art

domhill Locupletati," by a general synod at Königs-

berg. This was the first corpus doctrinale. While the "De Agudio Confusione" (published 1530-31), Albert sent for a copy and caused it to be introduced into the Prussian Church by episcopal decree. But in 1544 Al

bert determined upon the future independence of the Prussian Church from Wittenberg, and to this end en

courage the Reformation in Germany. It was to be

a high school which was destined not only to play a great part in the history of Prussia and of Germany, but of Poland also; for from this university much Scriptural knowledge spread to Poland, and gave rise to a strong reformatory movement there (comp. Krasinski, Hist. of the Ref. in Poland, vol. 1., p. 178). This movement was the

source of a very serious theological controversy, which came very near destroying the Protestant Church of Prussia and seriously damaging the evangelical cause in all Germany. We refer to the Osiaender (q.v.) controversy. It began in 1549. Osiaender was that year lecturing at Konigsberg de lege et evangelio, and next year de justificatione. He died in 1552, but his son

law, Funk, continued to espouse Osiaender's views, and in the controversy which ensued so much bad blood was raised that in 1553 the leaders of opposition were obliged to leave the country; and the title turned against the Osiaandrians, Funk himself and two other leaders paid for their distinction with their lives, in 1556. See Funk; J. H.; Möhring, Joachim.

Duke Albert then set about restoring the peace of the Church, and thus himself able to undertake the far-reaching theological, anthropological, and soteriological questions which the Osiaender controversy had raised. He had as suddenly turned from one side to the other as the prosperity of the Church seemed to demand. He had unsettled all and settled none, but he had, at least, the satisfaction of seeing one good result from the agitation. It made evident the need of a generally accepted "Confession," and he intrusted its preparation to Möhring and Chemnitz, and in 1567 they brought out the Corpus Doctrinae Protestantiae, also called Reptatio Corporis Doctrinae Christianae, which became the symbolical text-book of Prussia. Although it had been intended to abide, so far as the cultus was concerned, by the regulations of 1544, a revision was called for after the publication of the Reptatio, and in 1568 was brought out another Kirchenordnung u. Ceresmonier wie es in Uebung geht (1568), with a number of commentaries.

In 1549 the reforming party in Prussia was greatly strengthened by the arrival of multitudes of Hokian brethren, who were ordered, under most severe penalties, to leave their country within forty-two days (May 4, 1548). Duke Albert offered them an asylum in his states, whither they migrated under the guidance of Mathias von Simson, the bishop of the whole community.

Polish or West Prussia, together with the minor states of Courland and Livonia, gradually underwent a similar transformation, owing to many favorable influences. Luther's pamphlets, exposing the weaknesses of the papacy and of Romanism, had free entrance in these countries. The bishop of Ermland, Fabian, not only raised no opposition himself, but, as the Romanists claim, was even anxious that the reform movement should succeed. Then the government of the Polish sovereign, Sigismund Augustus, by granting plenary freedom of religion to the town of Danzig, Thorn, and Glogau, gave a great step towards the triumph of Protestant opinions, which was effected about the year 1566. Germany, at last, had conquered for herself by the Reformation the valiant Prussians, and in the borders of Slav and Roman influence had firmly planted the seed of German culture and German Protestantism, which will never die out and spread so marvellously. The evangelical Church of Prussia, which was always after close intercourse and most active co-operation with German Prot-
estantism, to which it owed its origin, had nevertheless its own peculiar formation, and took for its development its own peculiar way. Most remarkable is the fact that the prince under whom the Prussian evangelical Church first arose and lived itself to see it rooted and grounded in doctrine, cultus, and discipline. Duke Albert died March 20, 1568.

4. Modern Period.—Frederick I was distinguished for his rigid economy of the public money and an extraordinary penchant for tall soldiers, and left to his son, the great Frederick II, a compact and prosperous state, a well-disciplined army, and a sum of nearly nine million thalers in his treasury. Frederick II (1740-86) desperately availed himself of the extraordinary advantages of his position to raise Prussia to the rank of one of the great political powers of Europe. In the intervals between his great wars, he devoted all his energies to internal improvement, by encouraging agriculture, trade, and commerce, and reorganizing the military, financial, and judicial departments of the State. By his liberal views in regard to religion, science, and government, he inaugurated a system whose results reacted on the whole of Europe; and in Germany, more especially, he gave a new stimulus to thought, and roused the dormant patriotism of the people. Frederick was not over-scrupulous in his means of enlarging his dominions, and it is said that in 1743 he and the Archduke Joseph of Austria were the first to put an end to the partitions of Poland in 1772, when he obtained as his portion nearly all West Prussia and several other districts in East Prussia. His nephew and successor, Frederick William II (1786-97), aggrandized his kingdom by the second and third partitions of Poland in 1792 and 1795. Frederick William III (1797-1840), who had been educated under the direction of his grand-uncle Frederick the Great, succeeded his father in 1797, at a time of extreme difficulty, when Continental rulers had no choice beyond being the opponents, the tools, or the victims of French revolution. By endeavoring to maintain a neutral attitude, Prussia lost her political importance, and gained no real friends, but many covert enemies. But the calamities which this line of policy brought upon Prussia roused Frederick William from his apathy; and, with an energy, perseverance, and self-denial worthy of all praise, he devoted himself, with his minister, count Hardenberg, to the reorganization of the State.

In the ten years which succeeded the battle of Waterloo, Prussia underwent a complete reorganization. Treaties were concluded with various commercial treaties made with the maritime nations of the world; the formation of excellent roads, the establishment of steam and sailing packets on the great rivers, and, at a later period, the organization of the customs treaty, known as the Zollverein, between Prussia and the other states of Northern Germany, and through the formation of an extended network of railways. The most ample and liberal provision was made for the diffusion of education over every part of the kingdom and to every class.

In like manner, the established Protestant Church was enriched by the newly inaugurated system of government supervision, churches were built, the emoluments of the clergy were raised, and their dwellings improved; but, not content with that, the king wished to legislate for the Church in accordance with a set plan, and determined to force a union of the Lutherans and the Reformed, whose unhappy separation was painful to the devoted king. This union scheme was not new. A union tendency had shown itself early in the German Church, and attempts were made to bridge over the gulf by concordats, treaties. The union proposed in the Reformed in consequence of the differences on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. The so-called Concordia of Wittenberg in 1536 and the Augusta Varista of 1540, with which also the Reformed Synod agreed, are properly regarded as the foundation of this. For nearly half a century, John Durm (died 1650), an eminently zealous and an apostle of union, travelled about for the accomplish-

ment of his great object; but each of the three great Protestant churches—Lutheran, Reformed, and Anglican—contended not only for a faith in the Christ revealed in the Scriptures, which was the only basis of their union instinctively by its dogmas, but for its ecclesiastical institutions which separated it from the others. An agreement for mutual ecclesiastical recognition (tolerantia ecclesiastica) was formed on the principles of Calvin at the religious conference at Cassel in 1661, and resulted in the transfer of the University of Rostock to the Reformed Church. But notwithstanding these concessions, which gave the appearance of a unionistic and tolerating tendency, the Lutheran divines, according to Tholuck, declared that they would rather hold communion with the pacifists, and regarded the hope that even Calvinists might be saved as a temptation of the devil (Gratet u. luth. Theol. Wittenberga, p. 115, 169, 211). Yet, after the Peace of Ryswick, when it became urgently important to have fraternal connections between the Protestant nations as a security against the dangerous exaltation of the Catholic powers, the house of Prussia took upon itself the task of adjusting the disunities which prevailed, principally among the Lutherans, by a union of the two Protestant churches. The elector John Sigismund of Brandenburg, while accepting the Reformed creed in 1614, did nevertheless adhere to the Augsburg Confession. His son, the Augsburg Confession, on the other hand, was an active supporter of the Hesian theologians at the Leipsic colloquium in 1631—and his successors, the princes of Brandenburg and Prussia, who remained in the Reformed communion, always cherished a desire to bring their evangelical people to a better understanding, and, if possible, a union in the government and worship of the churches. The appointment of a few bishops constituted a part of the ceremonial at the coronation of the first king of Prussia (1700), but this suggested the idea of a union by the introduction of the form of government which prevailed in the Anglican Church. Temples of peace and union churches were, however, consecrated in vain. Leibnitz succeeded in breaking off the negotiations. There was, none the less, full confidence that the object would one day be brought of itself to a successful conclusion.

The wars with France ended so favorably, the king thought the day auspicious for the consummation of the dream of his reigning anacy, and by royal decree of Sept. 27, 1817 (the Jubilee of the Reformation), king Frederick William III declared the union effected. But the various nationalities of the kingdom, the hostility in the Utopian union prescribed for them. New difficulties arose. The tendency to over-legislation was long the predominant evil feature of Prussian administration. The State, without regard to the incongruous elements of which it was composed, was divided and subdivided into governmental departments, which, in their turn, under some head or other, brought everyone individual act under governmental supervision, to the utter annihilation of political or mental independence. The people, when they gradually began to comprehend the nature of this administrative machinery, saw that it made no provision for political and civil liberty, and demanded of the king the fulfillment of the promise he had given in 1815 of establishing a representative constitution for the whole kingdom. This demand was evasively met by the king, who professed to take high religious views of his duty as a sovereign; its fruits were strenuous efforts on his part to check the spirit of liberalism. Every measure taken by other sovereigns to put down political movements was vigorously abetted by him. siding with the pietists of Germany, many of whom he cultivated, the Count officers and Landsknechte, or provincial estates, organized in accordance with the system of the Middle Ages, were the sole and adequate mode of representation granted to Prussia in that reign, notwithstanding the pledge made to the nation of a general representative form of government. A further attempt made forcibly to unite Lutheran and Reformed churches by royal decree of Feb.
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28, 1834, excited universal indignation, while the imprisonment, at a later period, of the archbishops of Cologne and Gnesen for their conduct in regard to the vexed question of mixed marriages involved the king in a long and power struggle with the pope. In this issue of ecclesiastical regulations, the king was generally assisted by the gentle Altenstein, his minister for public worship, with whose preferences for the Hegelian philosophy in the Church and in the schools he was often displeased, but whom he never would quite abandon. When the powers of the Holy See were to be employed in Germany, it was the leaders of the Liberal movement who were the leaders of the Church. In 1817, a law was passed for the establishment of provincial consistories, whose duties were confined to matters exclusively spiritual, and did not include the location of clergymen; district and provincial synods, composed only of clergymen, and sequestered within a narrow circle of duties, but intended to be an introduction to an imperial synod; and a ministry for public worship, which was to be the organ through which the royal authority was exercised over the Church. The oath which the clergymen were to take bound them to be the servants of the State as well as of the Church. The development which had taken place in the principles of Protestantism, and the modes of speech occasioned by the new scientific and literary education of the people, next rendered some alteration of the language of the Church services necessary. New liturgies were therefore introduced into some established churches without attracting much attention. A common form of worship seemed to become necessary by the union which by the year 1821 had been outwardly effected. The theological commission appointed for composing such an instrument in Prussia accomplished nothing. The king then published an Agenda which had been adopted by his cabinet (1822) for the use of the court church, gave orders that it should be introduced into the garrison churches of his kingdom, and recommended it to all the churches of the realm; instead of the confessional and arbitrary forms which had previously been used in the different provinces. But it met with much opposition. The Reformed complained that it savored too much of the old ecclesiastical formula. They objected, too, to the burning of candles in broad daylight, and the kneeling and singing of the preacher before the altar, and the like, which seemed to them to betray a Roman Catholic spirit. The rigid Lutherans complained that it was not sufficiently orthodox, and was too much reformed. On the other hand, the adherents of the Evans of Hamburg, and it too orthodoxy, too much in sympathy with the old ecclesiasticists. They did not perceive in it their own theological opinions, but just the reverse; and it was from their standpoint that they very properly hesitated to make use of confessions and ceremonies with which they could connect no other sense than one contradictory to their convictions. Some, also, were displeased with a heterogeneous political element which they discovered in it. But no general opposition to it was apparent until the government took some steps to draw over the churches by various means or by coercion, and some authors contended that a strict conformity to the liturgy should be required by a law on the territorial system. In the midst of this confusion, no synodal constitution was carried into effect; for even the victorious political party took no pleasure in a measure which so forcibly reminded them of the promised representative system. It was only in Westphalia and the Rhenish provinces that a synodal form on the basis of ancient usages was introduced (1835), but even then there the system left as much to be desired as it actually fulfilled. The establishment of general superintendents (1829), with means at command for a very extensive sphere of personal influence, was looked upon as a restoration of the titular bishops to their former prelatical position, and hence as the commencement of a Protestant episcopacy. This movement became now legal, and the pastors and theologians promoted the different controversies in answering the question as to how far the king, as the prince of the country, was authorized in prescribing his ecclesiastical usages to the people and in foisting a particular service upon them. It was only after new negotiations and a new understanding of the question that consideration was shown for personal wishes and the traditions of the country, that the liturgy entered into full force (1830) as that of the United Evangelical State Church. By the union it was opposed even after this; and, as we have already seen, a second decree was necessary (1843) to enact the government's will as far as to the effort. The result was a public outbreak. In Silesia, especially, there was much trouble, and the refractory spirit assumed an alarming form. Removals, military force, and emigration were the sad results; and finally there were the proceedings of the synod, and the dissensions of the Lutherans themselves—some yielding to the force of circumstances, others pushing their cause to the utmost, and still others going to ruin in sectarianism. See Lutheranism.

The accession of Frederick William IV, in 1840, seemed to open a better prospect to the friends of constitutional freedom, but the reality was scarcely equal to the expectations which had been warranted by the professions of the government. Still, new hopes and requirements had been excited, and a new life was infused into every department of the State. Every branch of science and the arts of life was stimulated by the attentive consideration of the sovereign, who professed to be actuated by a love of universal progress. He made similar professions in regard to religious toleration, but the Pietistic tendencies of his government exerted a forced and prejudicial influence in public administration everywhere. The king, at an early period of his reign, the king had expressed his determination to allow the Church, over which the crown had acquired supreme power during the Reformation, freely to form for itself its own external organization, and to subside under the Protestant constitution, and to the province of the government, was in 1843, composed of the superintendents of each of the six eastern provinces, and a clergyman chosen from each diocese, the king called a General Synod at Berlin—not of representatives, but of distinguished persons in the Church, thirty-seven of whom were clergymen and thirty-eight were laymen. The synod held its sessions in public worship, during a session continued from June 2 to August 8, 1846, "this body," says Hase, "which made no pretensions to a legal authority, but had no restraint on the expression of its opinions, and acted on conclusions drawn therefrom, presented its views of the existing wants of the Church. Its plan for a future ecclesiastical constitution combined the consistorial administration proceeding directly from the crown with the synods proceeding directly from the congregations in regularly ascending circles. The assembly had not been convened without some reference to its nature, and only a single voice was raised in it in behalf of undisguised rationalism. But as the great majority there, as well as in the previous provincial synods, declared itself against not only unconditional freedom of instruction, but the compulsory obligations of creeds, the party led by the Evangelical Church Journal found itself in a decided minority. The moral impossibility of compelling men to adhere to the old creeds was conceded; and yet it was thought indispensable to the completion of the union that a confession of faith should be formed, to serve as a formula for instruction. But the confession then composed expressed only those sentiments which are essential to Protestant Christianity in Scriptural language, and without the precision of theological science. The orthodox minority (fifteen to forty-eight), therefore, had reason to complain, notwithstanding all that was said for their satisfaction at
the adoption of the new confession was a virtual abrogation of the old. The only concession to those congregations and patrons who were especially attached to the Lutheran or the Reformed type of doctrine or worship was the assurance given them that they should have no immediately hostile persecution or interference in the legislation and existence of the union, to use their respective confessions, if they wished, in a regular manner, to bring those clergymen whom they called under obligation to some creed. But the orthodox opposition from without, in whose eyes such a body seemed a robber-synod, in which Christ was denied, was powerful enough, at least, to postpone the execution of these enactments, although the ecclesiastical authorities had given them a unanimous concurrence, and had pronounced them of urgent importance. The superior Consistory was the only court finally formed under them (January, 1848), but as this was not sustained by any contemporary synodal regulations, it was looked upon as a mere party authority.

While the government and the Church gained so little, the people became more and more restless. There was a general displeasure against the bureaucratic spirit of over-governing which characterized the administration and became daily more irksome to the nation. In the Church it resulted in the successful formation of free churches. Protestant communities espousing the interests of a rational form of Christianity, with the equalitarian excitement which had arisen in the Roman Catholic Church, as the result of the schismatic movement due to the stand taken by the chaplain Ronge on the exhibition of the so-called holy cloth (q.v.) at Treves, further complicated the ecclesiastical relations. In the State, revolution ensued. The king and his advisers, undertaking the importance of the movement of 1848 in Germany, thought they had satisfied the requirements of the hour by granting a few important reforms such as the abolition of guild ordinances. When at length, however, the citizens and troops came into collision, and blood was shed, Frederick William came forward as the proposed regenerator of his country, offering to lay down his royal title and merge his kingdom in the common fatherland, for the salvation of which, he recommended a confial union of all German princes and people in one bond, and proposing himself as the leader and guide of this new German. His own subjects, and at first many Germans in other states, were carried away by these Utopian schemes. The power and influence of public opinion in this liberal ministry, the recognition of a civic guard, the retirement of the prince of Prussia, the heir presumptive — with whom every arbitrary measure of government was believed to originate — and the summoning of a representative chamber to discuss the proposed constitution — all tended to lay aside the general discontent. But when the National Assembly at Frankfurt-on-the-Main, in 1831, in disregard of the wishes of the Prussian king, declined to accept his proffered services, and elected the archduke of Austria as lieutenant-general of Germany, his influence in the conduct of affairs ceased, his pledges to his own subjects were evaded as long and as completely as the occasion permitted, and his policy became more strongly tinged than before with the jealousy of Austria. His powerful co-operation in putting down the insurrection in Poland and the democratic party in Baden gave, however, ample proof of his determined opposition to every popular demonstration against absolutism. The only exception during his reign is the action of the Prussians in the war of the Slavonic Holstein duchies, when the Prussians, acting in concert with the Dutch and the United Provinces of the Netherlands, occupied the ducal provinces in the name and on behalf of the diet. But this was the work rather of him who is now emperor of Germany, and is capable of explanation even from a ultra-royalistic standpoint. The latter years of the reign of Frederick William IV were characterized by great advance in the material prosperity and internal improvement of the country. Extensive lines of railway and post-roads were opened, the river navigation was greatly facilitated, treaties of commerce were formed with foreign countries, great expansion was given to the Prussian and North German Zollverein, the army was put upon the modern footing with its unprecedented efficiency of arms and artillery, and the educational system of the country was still further developed. The political freedom of Prussia cannot, however, be said to have made equal advances. The Chambers which met for the discussion and framing of a constitutional mode of government were continually interrupted and obstructed in the prosecution of their task; and the constitution, which is now established by law, was modified every year between 1850 and 1867, until it may be said to retain few of its original features.

In the Church also the great storm of 1848 wrought destructively. An ecclesiastical administration became odious, and count Schwerin, the minister for public worship, saw himself obliged to keep watch over the actions of the consistory, which finally so displeased him that he dissolved the superior consistory. He then appointed a committee to devise a synodal constitution, to be submitted to an imperial synod which should soon after be convened, that thus the Church might construct her future organization for herself. The outline of the electoral law for the appointment of synods was published, and defended by the publication of a pamphlet on the ecclesiastical law. It proposed that the deputies should be elected by the congregations, but that the existing synods should be made use of in the western provinces, and that district and provincial synods should be arranged so as to serve for electoral bodies in the eastern. Before the appointed synod could have its meeting, the revolution was throttled, and the government again abandoned all these liberal measures. It even denounced the clamor for a synodal constitution as an ill-conceived fury of the people, and the statement of the reason why the people as a demigod of God (1). The constitution of Jan. 31, 1850, retained, with respect to religion, the whole essential spirit of the German fundamental laws. A collegiate supreme ecclesiastical council to decide internal affairs of the Church was formed by order of the king from the evangelical portion of the ministry of public worship, and a system of rules for the regulation of congregational affairs was bestowed upon the six eastern provinces. The supreme ecclesiastical council from that period governed the Church in the king's name, and Von der Goltz, as president of the council, in the presence of the Chambers, declared that the new doctrine was that the Evangelical Church exercises her constitutional right independently to regulate and administer her affairs, by entire separation from and consequent independence of the State, and by government according to her ancient constitution by the sovereign as her most prominent member. By this happy thought anxiety for the independence of the Church was tranquillized, and the Chambers succeeded in repelling all complaints about violations of those articles of the fundamental law of the nation which relate to the independence of the Evangelical Church. The plan for congregational government, which was looked upon as the basis of true ecclesiastical freedom, contained a suspicious limitation of the power of choosing the vestries and an extraordinary requisition that the private members should be bound by the three principles of the confession of the Reformation, and certain general laws for the Church which were yet unknown. In some of the eastern provinces this plan was protested against by parties opposed to each other, but it was at last gradually admitted into the constitution of Denmark, occupied the ducal provinces in the name and on behalf of the States. It was called the work of the regency of Frederick William IV, and is capable of explanation even from a ultra-royalistic standpoint. The latter years of the reign of Frederick William IV were characterized by great advance in the material
political societies. These proceedings were partially confirmed by the judicial courts; but some measures of the police seemed so inconsistent with the freedom of conscience guaranteed by the fundamental laws that inquiries were instituted respecting them even in the Chambers (1852), where the government had avowed its determination to exterminate by every legal means the whole system of dissent. The supreme ecclesiastical council communicated all the free congregations, without reference to the various tendencies among them, and proscribed their baptism invalid, while the civil courts punished every official act of their ministers as an invasion of the clerical office. Still there was conflict between civil and ecclesiastical authorities, and the crown saw itself perplexed daily with the disadvantages of dissent. By royal edicts of March 6, 1852, and July 12, 1853, the union movement was again given a new lease of life, the king having determined to do away with religious differences among all Protestants. The result was far from gratifying. In the very next fall (October, 1853) Dr. Rupp started a new congregation, in which the Bible was accepted as the original source of truth, and the imitation of Christ was made the supreme end of life. All ecclesiasticism was ignored. In 1856 (Nov. 4-Dec. 5) a general conference assembled to remedy these dissensions, but it failed to do anything. The king remained summo episcopo, but the Protestants retained by the constitution of Jan. 31, 1850, tit. ii, art. 12, liberty of conscience, and the more recent immigrations from foreign lands have made Prussia the home of Protestants of all shades of religious opinion.

The obvious benefits of the presidential and synodal constitution in the Rhenish and Westphalian churches, the fuller co-operation there of ministers and elders, the greater activity of the laity, the room afforded for the exercise of discipline, the variety of home mission work, and the necessity for checking rapidly the rationalistic tendencies, which had given the Rhenish and Westphalian branch of the Prussian Church so great a power and influence, were so apparent that it would have been impossible for the leading authorities of the Prussian Church not to desire to extend this form of government, modified by the constitutional constitution, over all her old provinces. Consequently a royal order of June 29, 1850, introduced the institution of the general Church courts, and by another of Sept. 10, 1873, it became definitively the platform for the congregations and synods there, while an extended general synod for these provinces was announced. This synod was appointed by royal decree, to consist of the eleven general superintendents, of twelve deputies of the theological and the juridical faculties, of thirty members to be elected by the king, and of 150 members of the eight provincial synods, who were to be composed of not less than one third laity and one third ministers. This general synod met for the first time from Nov. 24, to Dec. 18, 1875. The new ecclesiastical constitution of Prussia provides for a regular meeting of this general body at the call of the king every six years, and is represented in it by the president of the Oberkirchenrath, the highest Church tribunal in the state. The jurisdiction and competency of the general synod, as summarized by a correspondent of The Central Christian Advocate, are shown by the following, which indicates also the nature of the connection between Church and State:

1. The general synod co-operates with the king's functions for promoting the interests of the State Church on the one hand and the ecclesiastical rights and ecclesiastical law on the other.

2. Laws enacted by the king, as head of the Church, must have its assent. It may also propose new measures, but there can be no laws, laid before the king for his assent until the ecclesiastic minister has examined them and found nothing incriminating to the interests of the State in them. It legislates exclusively on the amount of liberty of teaching within the Church; religious qualifications and ordination of the ministers and of the laymen of the ministry; liturgies, hymnals, and catechisms; holy days to be introduced or abolished; and the form of discipline for refractory Church members and ministers.

3. It controls the funds which the Oberkirchenrath had, and also the expenditure of the appropriations for the Church from the national treasury, which has been in the hands of the Church since 1817. Regular and periodical budgets upon the congregations for Church purposes can only be levied by its consent. It can substitute in the king's commissions (Oberkirchenrath and consistories) to greater activity by taking the initiative in proposing new measures as are conducive to the Church's welfare. The Oberkirchenrath cannot reject them without giving its motives. It preserves the union of the free churches by invoking any such conditions of a prominent synod as may be incompatible with the Church at large.

The Advocate continues as follows:

"The king, as summo episcopo, governs the Church indirectly through its consistories—one in each province—composed entirely of theologians, except the president, who is a layman elected by the Free Church, and directly through the Oberkirchenrath—the highest Church tribunal, in the state—to whose consistories are responsible.

Between the sessions of the general synod a cabinet, composed of seven members, carries out the measures of the general synod, and conforms with the Oberkirchenrath respecting new measures.

It is not difficult for the members of the Lutheran and the evangelical few Reformed churches in Prussia to meet in the same synods, because the union movement has not only given rise to a common legislative and administrative basis, but prepared the members and congregations, notwithstanding all the value they assign to theireditary distinctions, to feel the sense of that which they have in common than upon that on which they differ. The Lutheran churches have the Consistor Augustanae Incurantiae from June 25, 1580 (or the Augustanae Varianta from 1540), the Apologia Confessionis Augustanae, the Articuli Smalcaldici, the Confessionis Augustanae Minor and Major Lutheri, and the Confessio Concordiae (1577). The Reformed Church has the Heidelberg Catechism (1563), which it highly values. The authority of these creeds—the Minor Catechism and the Confession Augustana perhaps excepted—is not binding upon the synods, and so the same body, the Oberkirchenrath, whose only function is to give a declaration of allegiance to the symbols is expected from the young minister, so that some of the creeds have nearly disappeared. So thoroughly has the old spirit of division died out that there is no longer any opposition to communion of the two bodies in the same church. Nor is this practice confined to the United Church of Prussia; it is equally prevalent in the other union churches of Germany, in the former duchy of Nassau, in Anhalt-Bernburg, Dessau, Birkenfeld, Bades, in the former electorate of Hesse, in Saxe-Weimar; in some, as in the electoral Hesse, the differences between these provinces were behind the duchy of the grand-duchy of Hesse. In East Friesland the union has extended only to the government, and not to worship or doctrine. In Rhenish Bavaria, in the union deed, stress is laid on the common scriptural grounds of the common life of God's people. With the accession of king William I, Prussia's most brilliant page of history opens. The civil and ecclesiastical affairs of that country now became the history of a united, prosperous, and powerful people. Though Bismarck, as premier, himself controls pretty much all the essential ecclesiastical affairs of the state, the king is indicated by his lines of action a policy of absolutism and bureaucracy, time has unfolded a liberal and practical tendency in the government, and the only real opposition now encountered is from the low social democracy—in this country known as Communism—and from the ultra-Romish subjects, who wage war against the repressive measures adopted by the government against Ultramontanism and Jesuitism, because of the dangers they brood against the State. See Ultramontanism. The war of 1866 with Austria established the superiority of Prussia in Germany; the war with France in 1870 solidified the work of the intervening years, and gave to the little kingdom the imperial power on the 170th anniversary of the day when the elector of Brandenburg assumed the crown of Prussia.

II. Religion. From Statistics, and General History. According to the census of 1865, of the 28,818,470 inhabitants of
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Prussia, 18,244,405 returned themselves as belonging to the Evangelical National Church: of these, 13,266,620 are of the United Church, 2,905,250 Lutherans, and 465,129 of the Reformed Church. Of these latter, 24,580 are of the Reformed Church of Westphalia, 40,630 Lutherans, 33,000 Reformed, 7,518 Moravians, 3,028 Irvingites and Baptists, 36,668 Mennonites, 4693 Anglicans, Methodists, etc., 9,620,326 Catholics, 1487 Greek Church, 10,860 German Catholics, 21,825 Freethinkers, etc., 366,576 Jews, and 2584 of various other bodies. The Old Catholics are mentioned below. The Roman Catholic population of Prussia decreased so rapidly after the introduction of Protestantism that at the accession of Frederick II in 1740 there were only 50,000 Catholics in a population of 2,150,000 souls; the proportion of the Catholics to the Protestants was, in other words, one to forty-three. The kings did not recur to coercive measures, but the majority of the inhabitants of Prussia hated Romanism, and caused it to undergo heavy trials. When Prussia acquired Silesia, and after the division of Poland, it was less of a Protestant power. The number of the Catholics was so considerably increased, especially after the treaty of Lunéville (1801), that both communions were represented by nearly equal numbers. This was again changed by the treaty of Tilsit, the cession of Polish and Posen between 1795 and 1807 to Russia. At present the Evangelical Church constitutes a majority in the provinces of Schleswig-Holstein (99 per cent.), Pomerania (57), Brandenburg (95), Saxony (93), Hanover (87), Hesse-Nassau (70), and Prussia (70); the Roman Catholic Church in Hohenzollern (80 per cent.), the Rhine provinces (73), Posen (84), Westphalia (55), and Silesia (51). Of the Jews, fully one half live in the eastern (formerly Polish) provinces. The members of all churches recognised by the government enjoy equal civil rights. The Old Catholics (q.v.) have been recognised as a part of the Roman Catholic Church, and the bishop elected by them as a bishop of the Catholic Church. Other denominations (Baptists, Methodists, German Catholics, and Free Congregationalists) are barely tolerated, though the constitution guarantees full religious liberty. The Greek Church is also represented in Prussia. One of the Greek communities belongs to the Philippians (q.v.), a branch of the Greek Raskolniks, who seceded in the 17th century from the Orthodox Greek Church. Like the Mennonites, they refuse the military service. Their principal colony is at Alt-Utko, in the kingdom of the Grand Duke of Hesse-Cassel. The Greek government has restricted their privileges; they cannot increase their real estate, because the military service is in contradiction with their religious opinions. They are in consequence in a state of emigration, and their number decreases. Since 1830 there were 22 Greek churches. The Evangelical Churches of Jesus Christ are the subjects of the Roman Catholic Church is directed by the two archbishops of Poznan and Gnesen, and Cologne, under whom stand the four bishops of Culm, Minden, Paderborn, and Treves. The two episcopal sees of Breslau and Ermland are directly under the jurisdiction of the pope; while the diocese of Glatz, in Silesia, belongs to the archbishopric of Prague, and Katscher, in Upper Silesia, to that of Olmutz. In 1864 the Protestants had rather more than 3000 licensed places of worship, with 6500 ordained clergymen; and the Roman Catholic Church nearly 9000 churches and chapels, with upwards of 6000 priests. In 1867 there were 24,362 churches of all denominations, and 224 monastic or conventual establishments, with 5619 inmates, mostly devoted to purposes of education, or nursing the sick. 2. Education. — Education is compulsory in Prussia, and its management and direction are under the control of the State. In no country are better or cheaper means supplied for the diffusion of knowledge among all classes of the community. Prussia has nine universities, viz., Königsberg, Berlin, Halle, Heidelberg, Bonn, Kiel, Göttingen, Strasburg, and Marburg, with 12,823 students, and two Catholic colleges at Braunschweig and Minden. At the close of 1889 there were in Prussia 87,000 schools and educational establishments of every kind, exclusive of the universities; and of these 787 were colleges or gymnasia, about 1000 classical private schools, 58 normal, about 700 art, trade, and industrial schools, and about 50,000 private schools. The total number of teachers and about 4,000,000 scholars. (See below.) The management of the elementary national schools is in the hands of the local communities; but the State appoints the teachers, and in part pays their salaries, the remainder being supplied by the public. In addition to the libraries of the several universities, there is the Royal Library of Berlin, with 750,000 volumes and about 16,000 MSS. Among the numerous scientific, artistic, and literary schools and societies of Prussia, the following may be mentioned : the most distinguished: the Academy of Arts, founded in 1699; the Academy of Science; the Natural History, Geographical, and Polytectnic societies of Berlin; the Antiquarian Society of Stettin; the Breithaupt Natural History and Historical societies, etc. 3. Church. — Prussia has a large number of benevolent institutions, towards the maintenance of which the State gives annually about £16,000 sterling. In 1661 there were about 1000 public civil and military infirmaries, in which upwards of 170,000 patients were under treatment, and about 7700 nurses. In Prussia there are 7000 houses; while 800,000 poor received support through these institutions or by extra-religious charity. Prussia is supplied with asylums for the deaf and dumb, the blind and the maimed, and has good schools for training midwives, nurses, etc. 4. Churches. — We append a sketch of the principal German churches, because it will in some manner enrich the article, and will, besides, greatly add to what has been said in the article Germany. The sketch and the statistics are taken from the report of the Pan-Presbyterian Council in Edinburgh in 1877. 1. Constitution. — Each German state and each free city has a Church of its own, in which the royal magistrates, by whose cooperation the churches are reformed, have to some extent, since the Diet of Speyer in 1826, enjoyed the supreme administrative power. This power they generally exercise by proxy, i.e. through the minister of worship (Prussia, Baden, Saxony, Mecklenburg, Grand-duchy of Hesse, Mecklenburg, Würtemberg), in other cases through the Supreme Church Council, or Oberkircherrat (Prussia, 1849, 1860; Mecklenburg-Schwerin, 1849, Baden), or through the general superintendents, the consistory, and superintendents. To some extent, likewise, for the twenty-one German states which some governments have shared the administration of the Church with the district bishops, and general superintendents (Prussia, Württemberg, Baden, Bavaria, Oldenburg). This form of Church government is called the consistorial (Konsistorialreform). The German churches have derived much benefit from the breadth of the Church, and the requirement that each church exercise the right of control has often hindered the development of the energies, the liberality, and the practical sense of the lay element and the members of the congregations at large, as well as prevented the co-operation of the ministers and the people in Church work. Like the noble King Frederick William IV of Prussia, who longed to resign his episcopal functions into the proper hands, some of the best minds have felt the necessity of giving more self-government and liberty to the churches, and the presbyterian and synodal constitution in the newly developed form in which it has been given in Prussia is an endeavor in this direction. In some of the Reformed churches, as in the Palatinate, the mode of government is similar to that of the Lutheran churches; but in others the presbyterian and synodal constitution is adopted. The presbytery and synodal constitution was transplanted by fugitives, members of the French and Walloon congregations, who migrated to Prussia, where-butch John Calvinesque uses were accepted according to the form he had set up in East Friesland, to the lower part of the Rhine, to the duchies of Jülich, Cleves, Mark, and Berg, which make up the western half of Rhinish Prussia, and a part of Prussian Westphalia; it was adopted and developed in the Church of Weel (1626) and the Synod of Emden (1711), was introduced into the duchy of Nassau (Synod of Hildesheim, 1656), and with modifications in the 18th century, adopted even by the Lutherans in the territories of Cleves and Mark. This form of Church government was in 1835 confirmed by the Kirchenordnung for the churches in Rhein-
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In Prussia and Westphalia. These churches, the Lutherans as well as the Reformed, are essentially Presbyterian. In the Lutheran parishes, each congregation has a body of elders and one deacon. The duty of the elders is, among other things, to watch over the spiritual welfare of the ministers, elders, and deacons. But despite the close relationship of the ministers, elders, and deacons, the congregation is the church body, and the clergy are elected from among the congregation. Besides the presbytery, there is, in larger congregations, a more numerous representative body (the Representatives), which varies according to the size of the congregation, and may amount to sixty, seventy, or more members. This body has the power to consult and deliberate in matters affecting the church. The members, especially the elders or deacons, are elected by the congregation. In the Reformed Calvinistic Lippe, for example, such a representative body was instituted besides the presbytery.

In each Prussian province there is a synod, and the Evangelical churches in the eight old provinces are again divided into synods under the presbyterian order. In the Synod of Rhenish Prussia, with its headquarters at Halle, there are 81 superintendents. In the other three synods there are 30 superintendents. Each minister has an average of 1511, each church 1116 Evangelical ministers, and 1516 superintendents.

1. Statistical Notices. (a.) Churchmen. (1) Evangelical Church. - In 1751, there were 1,771,711 Prussian Evangelicals, or 118,466 Evangelical parishes, 1,116 Evangelical ministers, and 164,859 electors of the Evangelical Church in Prussia. In 1867, there were 5,667,215 electors, or 1,013,859 Evangelical parishes, or 1,116 Evangelical ministers, and 164,859 electors. In 1867, there were 5,667,215 electors, or 1,013,859 Evangelical parishes, or 1,116 Evangelical ministers, and 164,859 electors.

2. Catholic Church. (a.) Roman Catholic. - The Roman Catholic Church in Bavaria is the Church of the Roman Catholic Church, with 183,611 parishes, and 1,116 Evangelical ministers; each has the average of 1,116 Evangelical ministers, and 164,859 electors. In the Synod of Rhenish Prussia, with its headquarters at Halle, there are 81 superintendents. In the other three synods there are 30 superintendents. Each minister has an average of 1511, each church 1116 Evangelical ministers, and 1516 superintendents.
In Bavaria, 16,110; in Hesse, 10,948; in Oldenburg, 2,449; in Württemberg, 2,352. Of these, 32 were in Prussia 32 congregations, 3,050 independent members, and 18,700 persons in Baden, 35 congregations, 4,571 independent members, and 14,500 persons in Saxony, 18,000 persons; in Germany, 15,000 independent members, 47,373 persons; 54 missionaries.

**Universities.**—In the winter session of 1875-76 there studied theology at Leipzig 357; at Tübingen 737; at Berlin 1,757; at Halle 746; at Bonn 46; at Münster 1; at Jena 56; at Strassburg 30; at Munich 46; at Konstanz 44; in Breisach, 39; Greifswald, 33; Kiel 32; Göttingen, 7; Heidelberg, 9, together 2,087. In the summer session of 1875 there were 1,037 students of the degree.

**In the German Empire are 20 universities, which had in 1880, 48,580 students; the polytechnic schools had 860 students.**

In the Russian universities, the academy at Munich, and the lyceum at Braunschweig, there were, in the winter session of 1875-76, 970 teachers and 8,926 students; in Berlin alone, 2,490; in Breisach, 1,219; in Göttingen, 991; in Halle, 854; in Bonn, 793; in Tübingen 25; 450 studied Evangelical theology, 274 Catholic theology, 4,385 law, 1,392 medicine, 1,044 philology; and besides the students, 2,024 bearers attended the lectures.

**2. High Schools.**—The kingdom of Prussia has, according to Dr. Wiese's historical statistical work on the higher education in Prussia, 182 Educational, 250 Catholic, 104 mixed, 337 Gymnasia, 36 Realschulen (in which languages, the arts, and sciences are taught)—17 Evangelical, 27 Catholic, 210 mixed. In the other middle-class or lower-class schools, provided with trade-schools, 91 seminaries for young teachers (61 Evangelical, 19 Catholic, 11 mixed), 57 schools for young ladies (the German term is used also for schools for girls), 35 institutions for the deaf and dumb, 14 for the blind, 5 social (or what are called social), 173 other schools—1,218 in all. Of these, 153 are in Berlin, 250 in the province of Brandenburg, 236 in Silesia, 236 in Hanover, 230 in Hesse-Nassau, and 123 in the Palatine. The number of gymnasia and Realschulen in these high schools amounted in 1874 to 128,000, of which the teachers of 69,890; the cost was 3,194,079.

**3. Christian Associations.**—(1) Mission to the Heathen. Germany has eight of the sixty-three Evangelical Mission Societies for the heathen, of which only the Moravian Mission stands in an immediate connection with the Church. Of the 539 mission stations and 1,133 mission societies, Germany supports 274 stations and 470 mission societies; Germany and German Switzerland, 593 mission societies. Germany contributed for mission purposes in 1872-73 £31,700.

**In 1890 the German mission had—**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>Missionaries</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Books</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In West Africa</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>166,799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In South Africa</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>8,951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In China</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Dutch India</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Japan</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>4,293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In West Indies</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>32,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Australia</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>3,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Other</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3,183</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**This represents about 500 stations, 855 missionaries, 745,000 communicants, 125,000 members, 43,000 scholars, and £1,070,000 expenses.**

**The Basel Mission (established 1818) has 309 missionaries and 46 principal stations in West Africa, East Africa, India, and China, and about £20,000 expenses.**

**The female Mission of the Basel Mission (established 1818) has 70 missionaries, 66 stations in America, Africa, East India, Asia, and China, and about £20,000 expenses.**

**In the Zeno Mission (established 1867) in China, there are 50 missionaries, 106,000 natives under its care, and 353 children in the schools; expenses £36,000.**

**The Rhine Mission Society (established 1818 in Bremen) has 131 missionaries, 56 principal stations in Africa, China, and East India, and about £18,000 expenses.**

**The female Mission of the Rhine Mission (established 1818) has 70 missionaries, 66 stations in America, Africa, East India, Asia, and China, and about £20,000 expenses.**

**The Berlin Mission Society (established 1871) has 471 stations in Africa (Cape-dale, Orange, Frome, Capetown), 20,000 natives under its care, and an income of £1,456.**

**The Berlin Mission Society (established 1871) has 471 stations in Africa (Cape-dale, Orange, Frome, Capetown), 20,000 natives under its care, and an income of £1,456.**

**The Mission to the Heathen (established 1838 in Berlin) has 17 missionaries, 13 stations among the Khois and Hidius,** 85,000 persons under its care, and an income of about £8,000.
visit the people from house to house, go to the poor and the sick, help the ministers in large parishes, hold Bible-classes, sing in church, attend Sunday School and Young Men's Associations, and other meetings. The Evangelical Society has now 22 colporteurs and city missionaries, and some traveling preachers. It has in its last year begun popular apologetical lecture in large towns with much success, and it is quite certain that much more could be done by it if more money could be raised.

"It is encouraging to think that about 45 ordained ministers in the German Protestant Church in that province are in many ways corrupt and unfaithful. They objected particularly to the Lutheran view of the sacraments, altars, images, and candles which the Lutherans retain; to the prevalent neglect of the doctrine of redemption, and the rejection of the king as chief bishop of the church. Not being prepared to join the Reformed Church of East Prussia, in consequence of their principles, and for fear of censures and discipline, they formed themselves into the Free Evangelical Church of Germany. There are ministers of this Church, who have just formed themselves into a presbytery. There are deacons and elders in the congregations, and a presbyterical conference has adopted the Westminster Shorter Catechism. The members of this church aim at the conversion both of Jews and Gentiles. The church has been fostered by one, himself a convert of the Jewish mission at Breslau, who takes a deep interest in Jewish missions."

III. Literature.—See Kurz, Organismus u. Statistik des preuss. Staates (Leips. 1843, 3d ed.);Franz, Hundb. des preuss. Staates (Quedlin. and Leips. 1843-53); Hase, Church Hist., § 289, 374, 458, 456; Hagenbach, Church Hist. 16th and 19th Cent. (see Index); Alzog, Universal Kirchenkunde. (see Index in vol. ii); Scriptores Rerum Prussicarum (Lips. 1688 sqq.); Voigt, Gesch. Preussens, vol. i, iv; Biewer, Die lteren Preussischen Urkunden (Brunn. 1865); Heiligenthier, Kirchenkunde des 19ten Jahrhunderts (Augsb. 1853); Ellendorf, Die kathol. Kirche Preussens (Rudolstadt. 1857); Ranke, Memoiren der Hohen von Brandenburg und Hist. of Prussia (Lond. 1819, 3 vols. 8vo); Krabbe, Geschichte der evangel. Kirche in Preussen (Berlin. 1849); Kurz, Church Hist. ii, 56, 357, 401; Bain, Religious Life in Germany (Lond. 1870, 2 vols. 8vo); Brünt and For. Rev. Oct. 1875, art. iv; Dorsen, Hist. of Prot. Theol. ii, 400 sqq; Edinb. Rev. April, 1867, art. iii; Lond. Qu. Rev. April, 1874, art. i; Chamber's Cyclop. s. v., which we have used in the treatment of secular history, though without accepting its extreme anti-Prussian expressions.

Prynne, William, famous in the history of English Puritanism, was born of a good family at Swanswick, in Somersetshire, 1600, and became a barister-at-law and member of Lincoln's Inn at the time when Dr. Preston, a celebrated Puritan divine, was lecturer there. It was the period when the illegal operations of the Star-chamber and the courts of high commission had reduced England to a despotism equal to that of France, while the manners of the age were a scandal to religion and good morals. Marshal, Manton, Calamy, Burton, and other divines in London kept alive the spirit of earnest piety and love of freedom which soon after pro-
duced the Commonwealth, when the mere sight of Bur-
ton, as Neale remarks, was a sermon against oppression. Prynne was a person of sour temper and austere practices, remarkable for his indefatigable devotion to his book, and the same severity appears in his re-
ports of his time, and he never practiced at the bar to any considerable extent. He applied himself prin-
cipally to the study of controversial divinity, and became a devoted follower of Dr. John Preston (q. v.). In ac-
 accordance with the doctrines of the Puritans respecting religious freedom, he opposed the Courts of Oyer and Terminer, to which some of his friends came to Lincoln's Inn, several tracts against Arminianism and against prelatical jurisdiction, by which, as well as by promoting and encouraging motions in the superior courts for prohibitions to the High Commission Court, he greatly exasperated archbishop Laud and the clergy against him. He was himself universally regarded as Prynne was as unspiritual in his religion, and as unsympathizing with the amenities of human nature. He tried all things by the dry logic which was to him all-
sufficient. Sometimes he would find a terrible sin in the wearing of long curls—love-locks, as they were called—by men, sometimes in wrong opinions on the sub-
ject of predestination. In 1632 he suddenly made his appearance with a virulent treatise entitled Hiatri-
mastik, or a Scourge of the Stage-players, a tedious work of more than a thousand pages, full of learning and curious quotations, and written against plays, masks, dancing, and especially against women-actors. There was much room for the scourge of the satirist in the degraded state of the morals of the stage. Vile indecency tainted the highest dramatic efforts of the time, and no man of sense had ever been introduced upon the stage unless they were smothered in a foul moras of seething corruption. But Prynne's work was too severe and too general in its sweeping denun-
ciations to convince any one not convinced already. Bringing every challenge under the sun to the play-
ers indifferently, he held them responsible for every sin which the pages of history revealed to have been committed by their predecessors in Greece or Rome; but all this could not have brought the sad con-
sequences that followed. Some passages in this work were supposed to be leveled against the queen, who had acted in a pastoral performed at Somerset House; and the language of the book was certainly, like most others of that age, anything but refined and complimentary. The real cause of offence, in the eyes of the archbishop Laud, who originated the prosecution against Prynne, was, of course, far other than this libellous matter—namely, the oppression of Prynne and his entire par-
ty to the Arminian system and the jurisdiction of the bishops. The information included both the aspersions of the author against the queen and the lords of the council in the divination of the stationers, and his commendation of "factious persons." The cause was tried before the Star-chamber, and the condemna-
tion of Prynne was a matter of course. After a full hearing, he was sentenced to have his book burnt by the common hangman, to be debarred from all public service, and turned out of the society of Lincoln's Inn, to be degraded at Oxford, to stand twice in the pillory at Westminster and Cheapside, and to lose one of his ears at each place, to pay a fine of £2000, and then to be imprisoned for life. This must have been a moderate sentence in the eyes of some of the lords of the council, for the earl of Dorset addressed the prisoner in these words: "Mr. Prynne, I declare you to be a schis-
maker in the Church, a sedition-sower in the common-
wealth, a wolf in sheep's clothing; in a word, the
name of avaricious sanguinary. I shall fine him £10,000, which is more than he is worth, yet less than he deserves. I will not set him at liberty, no more than a plagiarist, or a mad dog, who, though he can't bite, will foame. He is so far from being a social soul that he is not a re-
ponsible man. He is no son of Coriolanus to give the spirit of prey as wolves and tigers like himself; therefore, I condemn him to perpetual imprisonment: and for cor-
poral punishment I should have him branded in the forehead, slit in the nose, and have his ears chopped off."

Prynne's sentence, outrageous as it was, under the current general relation which it would have called forth two or three years later. The final
of Court, who had been rouzed by his wholesale condemnation of the drama to spend thousands of pounds on a gorgeous mask, which they presented to the king, and some who afterwards took the foremost part in resistance to the court, joined now in approval of their master's easement. The Prince of Wales, who lived at his new house in the City of London, had nothing to do with Pryne's enormous folly, however, in nowise tamel this most obstinate and narrow-minded of men. Three years afterwards, while in the Tower under the above sentence, he issued from its walls a new tract, attacking the bishops as elevating vultures and lords of Lucifer. It was entitled "News from Ypresich," and sorely reflected upon Laud and the hierarchy generally. For this publication he was again prosecuted in the Star-chamber, and sentenced to pay a fine of £5000, to be set in the pillory, to be branded on both cheeks with the letters S. and L. (Seditionis Libeller), to lose the remainder of his ears, and to be closely imprisoned for life in Caernarvon Castle. The usual consequence of undue severity appeared in the popular sympathy and party spirit which these outrageous sentences excited. The Puritan friends of Pryneocked to Caernarvon Castle in such numbers that it was thought unnecessary to change the scene of his confinement; and after he had been at Caernarvon about ten weeks, he was illegally removed, by a warrant from the lords of the council, to the castle of the Monte Orgueil, in the island of Jersey. Here he remained until the beginning of the Long Parliament, and then, upon his petition to the House of Commons, he was released by a warrant from the Speaker, and resolutions were passed declaring, very truly, both the sentences against him in the Star-chamber to be contrary to law. Clarendon and Anthony Wood describe the extraordinary demonstrations of popular feeling in his favor on his landing at Southampton and on his journey to London ("History of the Rebellion," i, 199; "Athena Ozonienese," iii, 848). Soon afterwards he was returned as a member of Parliament for Newport, in Cardiff, and about the same time he made a benefice at Lincoln's Inn. Besides, Parliament voted him, and the famous preacher Burton, and the physician Bastwick, two Puritans who were included with Pryne, money in compensation; but this they never got, in consequence of the disturbed state of the times. One of the principal fruits of this high-handed proceeding of the law was the raising of the nation to indignant protests against those in authority, and preparing the way for the changes of government that ensued; yet to the credit of Pryne he said that, notwithstanding all the injustice done to him, he was well satisfied with the result. He took no part in the violent proceedings of the later years of the Long Parliament. Quite to the contrary, immediately before the king's trial Pryne was ordered into the custody of the sergeant-at-arms for "denying the supremacy of Parliament" in a pamphlet entitled "The Memento" (Rushworth, "Collections," ii, 1389). On Dec. 6 he was arrested by the army, and, together with many of his party, ejected from the House of Commons. From this time he became a bitter enemy of Cromwell and the army party; and in consequence of his writings against them, he was again imprisoned for several years at Dunster Castle, in Somersetshire, and Pendennis Castle, in Cornwall. He was expressly disabled by Parliament "to officiate or be in any office concerning the administration of justice within the commonwealth." In the early part of the year 1660, having returned to his seat in the House of Commons as an excluded member, he is said, in a letter to General Monk (Winwood, "Memo- rials," vol. iii), to have "exceedingly asserted the king's right," but with so much of his characteristic bitterness and arrogance that Monk sent for him and admonished him to be quiet. Upon the dissolution of the Parliament, in March, 1660, he was elected to serve in the new Parliament for the city of Bath. Soon after the Restoration he was appointed keeper of the records in the Tower, an office for which his habits of study peculiarly fitted him, and which furnished him with the opportunity of compiling his laborious and useful collections respecting constitutional and parliamentary history. He died in that office in 1669. Wood calculates that he wrote a sheet of MS. for every day of his lifetime at that occupation. His custom was, when he studied, to put on a long quted cap, which came an inch over his eyes, serving as an umbrella, to defend them from too much light; and seldom eating a dinner, would every three hours or more be munching a roll of bread, and would read and then refresh his exhausted spirits with ale. To this (says the editor of Neale) Butler seems to allude in his address to his muse: 'Thou that with ale or viler liquors Didst quench Thine Withers, Pryne's Pears, And teach them, though it were in spite Of nature and their stars, to write.'


Prytanæum (pripæz) was the common house of an ancient Greek city or state in which a sacred fire was kept constantly burning in honor of Vesta. It was an appropriate building, where, in the name of the city or state, the magistrates, known as the Prytanes, brought suitable offerings to the venerable goddess. The fire-service observed in honor of Vesta was distinguished by the name of Prytanemis. The temple which was called prytanæum was of a round form, in order, as some have supposed, to represent the figure of the earth, and, according to others, to represent the centre of the universe. "It was called a "march through to the reign of Eliyas,' says the same writer, 'that Numa built the temple of Vesta, where the perpetual fire was to be kept, in an orbicular form, not intending to represent the figure of the earth, as if that was meant by Vesta, but the frame of the universe, in the centre of which the Pythagoreans place the element of fire, and give it the name of Vesta and Unity, because they suppose not to be without motion, nor situated in the centre of the world, but to make its revolution round the sphere of fire, being neither one of the most valuable nor principal parts of the great machine. Plato, too, in his old age, was reported to have been of the same opinion, assigning the earth a different situation from the centre, and leaving that, as the place of honor, to a nobler element." If the sacred fire in the prytanæum was accidentally extinguished, or even if it continued burning, the vestal virgins invariably renewed it every year on the calends of March by collecting the solar rays in a concave vessel of brass. From the fire which was kept burning in the prytanæum of the parent state, the sacred fire was supplied to each of its colonies or auxilia. Thucydides says that, before the time of Theseus, a prytanæum was to be found in every city or state of Attica. The prytanæum of Athens was originally built on the Acropolis, but afterwards it stood near the agora, or forum.

Psalm. See PSEDOMY; PALMS, BOOK OF.

Psalmenazar, George, a remarkable impostor in the religious and literary world, was born, probably, in the year 1650, and was of French origin. He received
emotion, we do not restrict it to praise, although praise is the most natural and prominent form of it. Deep sorrow and earnest prayer may also find their fitting expression in musical song. Augustine thus defines the meaning of a liturgical hymn: "Hymnus est cantus cum laude Dei; si cantus est et non laudas Deum, non dicis hymnum; si laudas aliquid quod non pertinet ad laudem Dei, non dicis hymnum" (Ps. citiviii). Church song is restricted to lyrical poetry, for this alone can express the untrammeled emotion of a congregation. It excludes, therefore, didactic poetry, which expounds doctrine or analyzes feelings or incites duties; and it excludes dramatic poetry, which expresses passion by action. It is also more than mere lyrical poetry: it is lyrical poetry which assumes the pure truth of God, and gives expression to the deep religious feeling which it excites. A hymn is an outburst of religious life.

In its form, worship-song may be either rhetorical or metrical; the former was its primitive and more uncultivated form; the latter is its subsequent and more artistic form. The former is exemplified in the Hebrew psalms and the Greek Christian hymns; the latter in the Latin hymns of Ambrose and Gregory, and in the subsequent hymnology of the Western Church. Each of these requires a special treatment. The rhetorical hymn, a musical and ad libitum recitative, closing with a cadence, technically known as a "chant": the metrical hymn, a metrical tune. The anthem differs from both, in that it consists of certain rhetorical or metrical words set to specific music, which seeks to bring out their special emphasis, and is incapable of being used to any other. The anthem is, characteristically, the performance of choirs, and not the worship of the congregation. In public worship, sacred song may be either the singing of a choir to which the congregation are auditors, or the union of the entire body of worshippers, the choir and organ simply leading and accompanying it. Without denying to the former the character of worship, it is obvious that it is worship only in a very restricted and imperfect sense. It is worship of a much higher and more catholic character for the whole congregation to unite in the utterance of religious feeling. Hence, as a rule, no composition should be allowed in congregational worship too artistic or too intricate for congregational use. On the other hand, every kind of composition is legitimate that a congregation can use, which in the unison or by parts, expresses the emotions of its spiritual life. Neither rhetorical psalm nor metrical hymn has any natural or legislative prerogative or sacredness in the Church of God.

The manner of singing, again, whether unisonal, as in the early Church, or in parts, as in the modern Church; whether antiphonal, between choir and congregation, or between one part of the congregation and another, as in many of the Jewish psalms, or universal and continuous by the whole congregation, is immaterial, so long as the best expression of religious feeling is secured.

In the Bible, the use and importance of sacred song are fully recognised, and large provision for it is made. The earliest fragment of song in the Bible is not sacred. Lament expresses himself in a snatch of song which has all the characteristics of later Temple poetry.

The Jews seem almost to have restricted their use of poetry and music to divine worship, probably because their theocracy so identified their national and their religious life as that the expression of the one was the expression of the other. Music and song were joined in every way: there was no such thing as a mass-sung liturgy. This is the earliest specimen of choral song that the world possesses. It was probably sung antiphonally—Miriam and the women on the one side, answered by Moses and the men on the other.

We have minute accounts of the musical service of the Tabernacle and of the Temple, as recorded by David and Solomon; and especially of the great musical celebration at the dedication of the latter, when we are told that Jehovah especially responded to the invocation of worshipping song (2 Chron. v, 12-14).

Beyond all question the Temple service was the most magnificent choral worship that the world has seen. On great occasions the choir consisted of four thousand singers and players (1 Chron. xxviii, 5; xxv); the statements of Josephus (Ant. viii, 3) are evidently greatly exaggerated. Its psalmody would consist, first, of such compositions as had been written by Moses and others, with those of David, Asaph, etc. Some of David's early psalms seem to have been adapted for Temple use (comp. Ps. xviii with 2 Sam. xxii). Others were doubtless composed specially for it. Hence most of David's psalms, in the collection of Hebrew poetry so designated, are inscribed "To the chief Musician." From time to time fresh contributions of sacred song would be made. As we possess it, the book of Psalms was certainly not the Temple psalter. It is a collection, or rather a combination of four or five separate collections, of Hebrew poetry, both lyric and didactic, containing the Temple psalms, but containing also many pieces neither meant nor fit for being sung. Hence the ritual and religious absurdity of singing indiscriminately through the whole. Hippolytus, writing in the 3rd century, assigns the various characters of the collection as a reason why no author's name is affixed to it (Hippolytus On the Psalms, quoted by Bunsen, Christianity and Mankind, i, 458; see also ibid, ii, 176; Josephus, Ant. vii, 12, 3).

From the structure of some of the psalms, as well as from some expressions contained in them, it is certain that they were sung antiphonally, probably by two choirs responding to each other. Some of the psalms, the 24th, for instance, were evidently alternated between the priests and the people. Among the various suppositions concerning the meaning of the word "Selah," one is that it is the sign of a great chorus-shout of the people. See also 1 Sam. xviii, 6; Neh. ix; Ezra iii, 10; Ps. vi, 1-3; bishop Louth On Hebrew Poetry, lect. xix; Wheatley On the Common Prayer, ch. iii, § 9.

From 1 Chron. xxv, 7 it appears that Church music in Egypt was formally taught in the Jewish schools. The re-establishment of the East is implied in the ironical request of the Babylonians that their poor captives would "sing them one of the songs of Zion."

It is to be observed that the singing of the Temple was not part of the Levitical ritual; it was a fitting worship, independent of the specific economy with which it was connected. It has, therefore, a certain permanent authority as a scriptural precedent of worship-song.

Concerning the music used in the Jewish Temple we have no certain traditions. The various musical accents in the book of Psalms is unknown. Carl Engel (Music of the most Ancient Nations, ch. vi) supposes that the musical system of the Hebrews, as indeed of all the East, was derived from the Assyrians, concerning whose musical knowledge, hitherto unsuspected, much interesting information has been derived from the sculptures discovered by Mr. Layard and Mr. Botta. It is probable that David, who was musician as well as poet, composed music for the use of his psalms in public worship. From the structure of Hebrew poetry, this would be impossible, and yet there would be a music hinted at or "chant;" and as adapted for the use of worshipping thousands, it would probably be very simple in character. Whether the Jews had any form of written music or not, or whether the music of their Temple psalms was transferred or transmitted from generation to generation, is unknown. Certainly no trace of written music has come down to us. It is...
to be presumed that the music originally set to David's psalms would be perpetuated from age to age; and that therefore the music to which our Lord and his disciples sang the Hallel (the "laudation on which he was betrayed," and the music to which Paul and Silas sang their prison songs, would be the old traditional Temple music. The tradition is that the Peregrine Tone was the music to which the lesser Hallel was sung. All this, however, is pure conjecture. There is not a particle of historical proof to throw light upon it. Nor is this to be wondered at, considering the dispersions and the unparalleled sufferings of the Jews, and when it is remembered that we are equally ignorant of the music of the Greeks and the Romans.

At the dispersion, Temple-song ceased. Burney says, some Hebrew high-priest being his informant, "that all instrumental, and even vocal performances have been banished from the synagogue ever since the destruction of Jerusalem; that the little singing now in use there is an innovation and a modern license; for the Jews, from a passage in one of the prophets, think it unlawful, or at least unfit, to sing or rejoice before the coming of the Messiah, till they when they are bound to mourn and repent in silence" (Hist. of Music, i. 251). It is probable, however, that although at the dispersion the Temple music was discontinued, yet that synagogue worship would be speedily restored, and that, as far as possible, its services would be based upon the old Temple prayers and psalms, and that the traditional melodies of the latter would be sung to them.

The characteristic uninspired psalmody of the synagogue is not earlier than the 10th century, when San- dadiah Gaon first introduced rhymed into Hebrew poetry. On this subject, see Prayers of the Spanish and Portuguese Jews, with English Translation, by the Rev. D. A. de Sola; Steinschneider, Jeth. Lit. (Lond. 1857); Charal, Jewish Lit. from the 9th to the 18th Century, ch. xviii.

No existing Jewish melodies can be proved to be of any antiquity, compared with some Christian melodies. Purely traditional, their origin is unknown. The most that can be said is that for some four or five centuries they have been handed down memoriter. As we possess them they are unmistakable in modern forms; but then it is possible that beneath these modern forms there may be a very ancient substance. The H. D. A. de Sola (Ancient Melodies of the Liturgy of the Spanish and Portuguese Jews) says that a tradition exists that the "Birchat Cohanim" is identical with the melody used in the Temple for the blessing of the priests (Numb. vi. 22-25), and that it is supported by great probability, almost amounting to direct proof. The "Ysra" is the other supposed to be the melody sung by Miriam. But this is pure conjecture. See also Maimonides, ch. xiv, § 14; Lightfoot, Temple Service; Bingham, Antiquities, vol. xiv; Carl Engel, Music of the most Ancient Nations, ch. vi.

In the Sept., the word פסנוץ and its cognates are used as representing several Hebrew words; but in almost every case the reference is to songs of praise or thanksgiving to God. In the New Test. this is the variable usage of the terms.

In the Christian Scriptures very little is said concerning sacred song. Matthew and Mark very touchingly record the conformity of our Lord, not to any divine command, but to a traditional custom, when he and his disciples, after the institution of the Supper, "sang a hymn" (γενέστηκας) before they went out to the Mount of Olives (Matt. xxvi. 30; Mark xiv. 26). There is every reason to believe that what was sung on this occasion was the latter part of the Hallel, the usual Pasover psalms of thanksgiving (Psa. cxxv - cxviii). See Hallel. When Paul and Silas were imprisoned at Philippi, at midnight they praised and sang praises unto God (Acts xvi. 25). Whether what they sang were some of the ancient psalms or spontaneous utterances of adoration and worship we have no means of determining. See Hymns. In his epistles to the Ephesians (v. 19) and to the Colossians (iii. 16), the apostle Paul recognizes and enjoins the use of sacred songs of praise, as a means of sanctification. Other passages of the New Testament, such as those in Hebrews and others suppose that such passages as Acts iv. 24-30 are fragments of apostolic hymns. The Apostles' Creed contains some of the most magnificent bursts of worship-song. In the passages just cited of Ephesians and Colossians the apostle enjoins the use of hymns in the social worship of Christians, clasping, with them the psalms and spiritual songs (ψαλμοι καὶ ἵμνοι καὶ ἥμνους πνευματικοὺς). In what relation these stood to each other is a question which has occasioned considerable differences of opinion. According to some, the distinction between them was one of form, having respect to the manner in which they were sung; while others contend that the source whence they were derived, and the general character of the composition; determined the difference between them. Under these opinions, endless differences of minor opinion have been advocated. Of those who adopt the first opinion is St. Jerome, who thinks that the hymn was devoted to the celebration of the divine majesty and goodness, that the psalm was occupied with themes of an ethical nature, and that the musical style was more as above, and the sublime discussion of the concert of the world, and the order and concord of creation (Comment. in Epis. v. 19). Others, again, who hold the same general view state the difference thus: The psalm belongs to other dimensions of faith, as setting forth redemption, to theodicy; and the ode, as celebrating the works of God in creation and providence, to natural science (Thomasius, In Profectionum, p. 255). All this, however, is purely arbitrary. The second opinion was held by Augustine, Basil, Hilary, and others of the Christian fathers, and has been adopted by several in more recent times. By some who take this view, the distinction is supposed to lie in this, that the ψαλμοὶ were compositions which were chanted to the accompaniment of an instrument, the ψαλτὶς, the εὐαγγελία, the ἵμνοι songs of adoration uttered by the voice alone, and the ψαλτὴς, short chants uttered also by the voice (Augustine, Enarrat. in Ps. iu. 3; Basil. Mag. In Ps. xix.; Greg. Nyss. Tr. ii in Psalmos, ch. iii, etc.) while others think that the distinction is to be determined by reference to the Hebrew terminology בֵּית הַגּוֹתִּים, בֵּית הַנּוֹחֵי, יִשְׂרָאֵל, which is in fact determining nothing, as the distinction between these is itself entirely uncertain. The third opinion is that of Bena (Nov. Test. ad loc.) and Grotius (Comment. ad Matt. xxvi), who think that by psalms are designated the sacred songs bearing that name collectively in the Old-Test. sense; by hymns such extemporary songs of praise as we have in the utterances of Deborah, Hannah, Zacharias, and Mary, and such as the apostle and his companion sang in the prison at Philippi; and by odes premeditated compositions of a more elaborate nature and stricter form than hymns. To this, in the general, most subsequent inquirers have given their consent; only some think that the term "psalms" should not be restricted to the composition bearing that name in the Old-Test., but should be extended to all of a similar character which might be composed for the use of the Church in later times; and that by "spiritual odes" are to be understood specifically all sacred songs, of whatever kind, composed by special inspiration of the Holy Ghost (Stenerius).

The form of this modifications is rendered almost imperative by 1 Cor. xiv. 26; and the latter by the general sense of the adjective πνευματικὸς in the New Test. Not a few, despairing of satisfactorily discriminating these three kinds of sacred song, have contended that the psalms are merely an edifice of song, and a mask of force, and that no distinction between them is to be sought (Clem. Alex. Paedag. ii, 4, 565; Cericens, In Not. epist. Hesychios, ad loc., etc.); but this
otolose method of disposing of the difficulty has been repulsed by most.

For all these early hymns of the Church were composed, we have no means of even approaching a certain conclusion. Among the Jewish Christians the chanting of the psalms was familiar, and it would be easy for them to compose hymns that could be sung to their accustomed tunes; but with the Gentile converts it would be somewhat different. Among the Greeks and Romans poetry had fixed metrical forms, to which the tunes of the Hebrews could not be adapted. There is no reason, however, to believe that the early Gentile Christians followed these metrical forms in their aspired poetry. The Chryselephantine says:—

"The hymn to Christ, preserved by Clemens of Alexandria; the evening hymn, referred to by Basil as in his time very ancient, handed down from the fathers (De Spir. Sanct. c. 29); and the morning hymn, which has been incorporated with the liturgy of the Church of England—have no traces of a metrical character, but are, like the Biblical hymns, adapted only for being chanted in recitative with a few and simple cadences."

("Primitiva ecclesia ita passalebat ut modo flexu vocis faceret paullatem resonare, uta ut adamantium visibilium excelsi hymnus,


Such singing would no doubt be in keeping with the Gentile converts, but it would be speedily learned; and as they probably had very little sacred music of their own, they would haul with delight this accession to their sources of enjoyment, which served at the same time as a vehicle of the Gospel doctrine which had been kindled within them.

It has been suggested that in I Cor. xii. we have an apostolic hymn, and in Eph. v. 14; 1 Tim. iii, 16; James i, 17; Rev. i. s, 6; xv. 8, etc., fragments of hymns sung in the apostolic churches; but this is mere conjecture, though not without some probability.

The early Christians used the Jewish psalms in their worship, which would almost certainly be sung to their traditional Temple music. G. B. Martini says (Storia della Musica, i, 551):—

"This is the Hebrew chant of the psalmody which ever since the time of David and Solomon has been transmitted from one generation to another, and [therefore] goes beyond the first half of the first age of the Church. These have not materially varied, but have been substantially preserved by the Hebrew nation. Is it not, then, sufficient to convince us that the psalmsongs as brought up in the customs of their nation, went to frequent the Temple and engage in the prayers and divine praises therein recited—should retain the same method and use the same chants with which the people used to respond to the Levitical choir."

Förkel (Geschichte der Musik, ii, 188.) says:—

"The most common modes of singing with cantillation or chant has been adopted in the Christian Church from the Temple, and is still preserved in the mode of chanting the collects, responses, etc."

See also Dr. Schlabitz, Geschichte und Würdigung der Musik bei den Hebrewern, p. 61.

Thus, while the destruction of the Temple and the dispersion of the Jews suspended Jewish worship, the singing of the psalms and the traditions of their melodies would be preserved in the Christian Church. If, therefore, we possess any vestiges of Jewish music at all, they are to be found in the Ambrosian or Gregorian tunes. The Rev. J. W. Blakeley (Four Months in Algeria, p. 36) visited a synagogue in Algiers, and was surprised to find that:—

"the air to which the psalms were chanted coincided almost exactly with one of the Gregorian tunes." Hardly can we suppose that the early Christians either originated a new music or adopted heathen music.

We have no record of the introduction into the Christian Church of uninspired hymnody. It would be only very gradual that Greek hymns, with corresponding music, would come into use. At first, probably, Christian hymns would be little more than cantos of the Hebrew psalms, or evangelical imitations of them, or com-

positions after their model—the angels' song at the nativity, and the songs of Zacharias and Simeon leading the way. The earliest Christian hymns seem to have been simple glorifications of Christ.

Eusebius intimates that private individuals wrote hymns to Christ as God, which were generally sung (H. E. v. 38; vii. 24; ii. 17). In his letter to Trajan, Pliny says, "The Christians are accustomed to sing alternately between themselves, and to praise Christ as a god" (Pliny, Epist. lib. x, ep. 93), alluding probably to the Gloria in Excelsis, the morning hymn of the early Church.

The earliest extant fragment of Greek hymnody is found in the Antiphonary of Alexandria (E. P. p. 312, 313, Potter's ed.). Bunsen says, however, that this was never used in the public worship of the Church (Christianity and Mankind, i, 156).

Three early Christian hymns are preserved in the venerable Alexandrian MS. as an appendix to the Old-Test. psalms. The first is the morning hymn of the primitive Church, commencing with the introductory verse of the nativity song of the angels, hence called the Angelical Doxology. It is found in the liturgy of the Greek Church, whence, about the year 500, it was transferred by the Emperor Justinian to the communion service of the Latin Church; thence again to the communion service of the English Church.

The other two are another short morning hymn in which the verse occurs, "Vouchsafe, O Lord, to keep us this day without sin," afterwards incorporated in the Te Deum; and an evening psalm, consisting of a cento of verses of the Old-Test. psalms.

Besides these, there is an evening hymn of the Greek Christians, "Τυμχος του λαμπρου," the "Hymn of the Kindling of the Lamp," corresponding to the "Ave Maria" hymns of Italy, concerning which Basil says, it is "so ancient that he knows not who is the author of it" (Bingham, bk. xiii, ch. v, § 5, 6).

The Ter Sanctus, or Serapheric Hymn, also belongs to the first three centuries, and is found in almost all the ancient liturgies. It is little more than the Trisagium of the seraphim in Isa. vi. See Palmer, Origines Liturgici, ii, 126.

These are the only fragments of Greek hymnody that have been preserved to us. Of course they are rhythmical, and would require a rhythmical tune or chant. Much of early Christian hymnody has probably antiquity (Sozocrates, H. E. vi, 8; Theodorot, H. E. ii, 24; as also Hahn, Ueber den Gesang in der Syrischen Kirche, p. 54).

The hymnody of the Syrian churches was much more copious. They had an ampler music and poets of higher inspiration. Its invention is attributed to Ephraem Syrianus (Ephraem Syrus), and the traditional form, with cantillation or chant has been adopted in the Christian Church from the Temple, and is still preserved in the mode of chanting the collects, responses, etc. See also Dr. Schlabitz, Geschichte und Würdigung der Musik bei den Hebrewern, p. 61.

Great use was made of hymnody by the early heretics; by the Gnostic Bardians, who endeavored to supersede the Hebrew Psalms by one of his own, containing also 150 psalms (Theodorot, Heret. Fab. 269); by Paul of Samosata, who largely beguiled the faithful by his captivating hymns (H. E. vii, 30); and by the Donatists in Africa, who adapted their hymns to common airs of a wild and passionate charac-
PSALMODY

Psalms were often sung as part of the liturgy, with the Psalter being a central text. The Psalter, or collection of Psalms, was central to the liturgical and devotional life of the Church.

The Psalms were used in various ways:
- As a basis for religious songs and hymns.
- As a form of private prayer.
- As a source of inspiration for moral and ethical living.

The use of the Psalms in the liturgy was significant:
- They were used during Holy Week, particularly on Good Friday.
- They were sung during the Mass, particularly before the consecration of the Eucharist.

The Psalms were also used in various forms of devotion:
- The Psalter was used for devotional reading and meditation.
- The Psalms were sung in various forms of devotional song, such as the Responsorial Psalm.

The use of the Psalms in the Church was significant because it helped to unite the faithful in the expression of their faith. The Psalms were a way of expressing the praises of God, and the singing of the Psalms was a way of expressing the joy and gratitude of the Church.

The Psalms were also used in various forms of liturgical reform:
- During the time of the Council of Trent, the use of the Psalms was emphasized as a means of reforming the liturgy.
- The Psalms were used as a way of promoting the use of vernacular languages in the liturgy.

The Psalms were a central part of the liturgical and devotional life of the Church, and their use was significant in the expression of the faith of the Church.

For more information on the Psalter, see the book "The Psalter in the Latin Church" by John B. Haggard, or the book "The Psalter in the English Church" by John H.格雷尔. Both books provide a comprehensive study of the Psalter and its use in the liturgy of the Church.
some and meaning; thereby pleasing the ear, without raising the affections of the soul. Thus the Egyptian abbot Pambo, in the 4th century, inveighed against the introduction of heathen melodies into the psalmody of the Church. About this time Church music began to be sung in various churches of the Eastern Church, not in the Psalter and canonical singers, Church choristers were appointed, who sang sometimes alone, sometimes inter changeably with the choirs of the congregation. In the 6th century the custom began to be introduced into some churches of having a single person lead the psalmody, who began the verse, and the people joined in the close. See ACHOSTIC; HYPOSTASMA. This individual was called the phonous or precentor, and he was mentioned by Athanasius as existing in his time in the Church of Alexandria. But difficulties and abuses arose from the growing neglect of musical culti vation; and, with a view of restoring public decency and order, the Council of Laodicea, in the year 363, considered it necessary to forbid the laity to sing in church at all, except in certain simple chants of a popu lar description. One principal reason was probably the adoption of the Arians of hymnology as a means of spreading their heresy. At first the difficulty had been overcome by providing similar compositions for the orthodox. Augustine himself made a psalm of many parts, in imitation of the 119th, to preserve his people from the heresy of the Donatists. Ambrose likewise made many hymns, which were sung in their respective churches. (A complete collection of all the ancient hymns, etc., in use in the different services of the Romish Church has been published by Hermann Adalbert Daniel, entitled Thestaurus Hymnologicus, etc. [Halle, 1841 sq.] Down to the Reformation, the music of the Church was thus pretty much surrendered to the clergy and trained musicians, and there were obstacles besides the moral influences of the Church. The words of the songs were in Latin, and the music was of a nature so elaborately complex that none could take part in it unless they had studied music as a science. Yet psalmody was not entirely lost during the dark ages. The study of sacred music received peculiar attention in the 6th century, schools for instruction in this important art having been established and patronized by Gregory the Great, under whom they obtained great celebrity. From these schools originated the famous Gregorian Chant, which the choir and people sang in church. Such was the simplicity of this system, and at length became common in various parts of Europe, particularly in France and Germany. The prior, or principal, of these schools was held in high estimation, and possessed extensive information. In the 8th century pope Adrian, in return for the services which he had rendered to the pope, had paid a visit to Rome, where he kept Easter with the pope, received from the hands of his holiness the Roman Apsiphon, which was presented to him, and which was brought into his dominions. About the end of this century all opposition to cathedral music ceased, and for several centuries thereafter Church music underwent little or no change in the Church of Rome. It is a remarkable fact, however, that from the 8th till the middle of the 13th century, not only was it considered a necessary part of clerical education to understand the principles of harmony and the rudiments of singing, but the clergy were generally proficient both in vocal and instrument al music.

The Eastern Church, where sacred music, as we have seen, had its origin, there arose in the 8th century a remarkable man, John of Damascus (q.v.), who was not only a noted theologian, but a most accomplished musician. On account of his great skill in the art of vocal music, he was usually styled Melodos. To this noted master of music the Eastern Church is indebted for those beautiful airs to which the Psalms of David are sung in our day. The Greek word ψαλμός is applied among the Greeks of modern times exclusively to sacred music, which in the Eastern Church has never been any other than vocal, instrumental music being unknown in that Church, as it was in the Western Church. Sir John Hawkins, following the Roman writers in his erudite work on the History of Music, makes pope Vitalian, in A.D. 660, the first who introduced organs into churches. But students of ecclesiastical and general archeology are generally agreed that instrumental music was not used in churches till a much later date; for Thomas Aquinas, A.D. 1250, has these remarkable words: "Our Church does not use musical instruments, as harps and psalteries, to praise God withal, that she may not seem to Judeize." From this passage we are surely warranted in concluding that there was no ecclesiastical use of organs in the time of Aquinas. It is alleged that Marius Sanutus, who lived about A.D. 1290, was the first that brought the use of wind-instruments into churches, and hence he received the name of Torellus. In the East, the organ was in use in the emperor's courts, probably from the time of Julian, but never has either the organ or any other instrument been employed in public worship in Eastern churches; nor is mention of instrumental music found in all their liturgies, ancient or modern. Towards the time of the Reformation, a number of sacred music from abroad Europe, owing, as is generally supposed, to the encouragement which pope Leo X gave to the cultivation of art. It is no doubt true that Leo was himself a skilful musician, and attached a high importance to the art as lending interest, solemnity, and effect to the devotional services of the Roman Church. But to no single individual can be traced the prevailing love for sacred music in the 16th century, for, besides Leo X, we find Charles V in Germany, Francis I in France, and Henry VIII in England, all countenancing sacred music, and treating musicians with great respect.

At the Reformation a greater part of the services of the Romish Church was sung to musical notes, and on the occasion of great festivals the choral service was performed with great pomp by a numerous choir of men and boys. That abuses of the most flagrant kind had found their way into this department of Romish worship is beyond a doubt, as the Council of Trent found it necessary to issue a decree on the subject, in which they plainly state that in the celebration of the mass, hymns, antiphons, and other orders of chant were inserted into the service, and given great scandal to professors of the truth. By this decree of the council, while it arranged the choral service on a proper footing, freeing it from all extraneous matter, gave it also a sanction which it had hitherto wanted. From this time the Church of Rome began to display that profound veneration for choral music which she has continued to manifest down to the present day.

The Reformers, observing the excessive attention paid to musical services, endeavored to return to the more orderly and public, the plainness of spoong music, and to make the services of the Church more conformable to the simplicity of primitive times. There had previously been repeated efforts at such a transformation. "The Albigenses, during the hottest season of persecution, are stated to have solaced themselves, in the very prospect of death, with singing the psalms and hymns of their Church. Psalmody was cherished by the disciples of Wycliffe. The Bohemian Brethren published a handbook with musical notes, from which it appears that the melodies they used originated in the chants to which the ancient Latin hymns of the Western Church were sung" (Conder, The Poet of the Sanctuary, p. 6). That psalmody was cultivated to the persecutors of Huss's teaching is evident from the fact that a large manuscript collection of their psalms and hymnus is preserved in the library of Geneva (Monastier, Hist. de L'Eglise Vaudoise, i, 124). But it was the Reformation in the 16th century which restored to the people their right to participate in this primitive and edifying part of public wor-
ship. Psalm-singing was taken up by the Reformers, first for private devotion, and soon as a part of the service of the Church, Luther and Calvin restoring to the people the right of participating in public worship, and furnishing them with the means of performing it. From the time that psalm-singing was adopted by the Reformers, it was disowned by the Roman Catholics, and soon came to be regarded as a badge of Protestantism. Metrical versions of the Psalms of David were executed in the principal vernacular languages of Europe; and some of the venerable Reformers were regarded as having applied themselves to the study of music in order that they might be enabled to compose plain and solemn tunes in which all would be able to join. The melody qualified for leading the first psalmody of the Reformation. Not only was he a great poet and musician, but he was full of fervid spiritual life. His hymnology, and that of his confreres—Hans Sachs, Michael Weiss, Johann Kugelmann, Johann Schop, Johann Grtiger, Paul Spenerius, Justus Jonas, Nicholas Decius, and other contemporary divines and Reformers—were characterized and illustrated by some dozen magnificent chorals, which excited great enthusiasm. But psalmody, in the more modern sense, began in the 16th century, when Clement Marot, the courtier of Francis I. of France, translated fifty-two of the Psalms into French verse, dedicating them both to his royal master—whom he likened to the Hebrew psalmist—and to the ladies of France. The sacred song-book, on its first appearance, not being accompanied by music, it became the practice to sing the psalms to favorite tunes—often those of popular ballads, and for a considerable time psalm-singing became a favorite fashion among the gay courtiers of Francis. Marot's collection was continued and concluded by Theodore Beza, the psalm which had the advantage of being set to music. Beza having in this the assistance of Calvin, who secured the best composers of the day to unite his sacred songs with beautiful and simple airs of a devotional character. Luther and Calvin differed, however, in their ideal of psalmody: the former was favorable to harmony in parts, while the latter confined himself to the bare, unaccompanied melody. In 1526 Luther published his first Salmus Book for the Congregation, which was printed by Joseph Klug in Wittenberg, whence it was also called the Klugsche. This collection contained most of Luther's hymns, which may be read in an English rendering in Luther as a Hymnist (by the Rev. B. Pick, Phils., 1875).

Prior to Luther, the Moravian Brethren had published a collection of hymns (1504) compiled by their archbishop, Lucas—the first example of a hymn-book constructed of original compositions in the vernacular to be found in any Western nation which has since assumed the supremacy of Rome. Some of its hymns, composed in the Bohemian and German languages, are of older date than the Reformation, and were highly commended by Luther himself for their scriptural and devotional character. In the renewed Church of the Brethren psalms and hymns continue to form an integral part of every religious service. Count Zinzendorf, who eminently contributed to its revival in 1722, was himself a Christian poet of no common order. The German hymn-book in general use among the churches of the Brethren was completed in 1778 by bishop Gregor, and has passed through numerous editions: it contains many hymns derived from the Lutheran Church, and some even from the primitive Christian Church. Some of the best hymns in this collection have been translated into English verse, and, with the addition of some, the English hymn-book constitute the hymn-book now in use among the congregations of the Brethren in this country. The latest edition, comprising 1260 hymns, is entitled Liturgy and Hymns of the Protestant Church of the United Brethren [Lond. 1849, 8vo]. The liturgy of the Church, and the number of hymns, were limited to the Psalms. As early as 1542 the La Forme des prières et Chants... qui sont dans la Manière, etc., by Marot, was published. This collection contained only twenty-five psalms, to which Theodore Beza added several others. In 1561, at the command of the council, the reformers appeared, with the title and the title of their edition, the first printed edition of the complete Psalms in verse appeared in France in 1561, with the royal privilege, and 10,000 copies were immediately dispersed. These were speedily set to music, and were generally sung in the Protestant churches of France, Geneva, and French Switzerland, notwithstanding their condemnation by the college of the Sorbonne. Some expressions having become obsolete, the task of retouching them was undertaken, first by Valentine Convart, the first secretary of the French Academy, and by one of the elders of the church at Charlemont; and afterwards by the pastors of Geneva, who revised their undertaking, and almost restored the work of Marot and Beza. So dear, however, was the memory of these first two poets of the French Reformation that it was found necessary to preserve the names of their stanzas and the quantity of syllables of their rhymes, and the ancient form of the 16th century is to this day adapted to the singing of the revised and corrected psalms (Musée des Protestant Célèbres, vol. ii. pt. ii. p. 11, 12). Of late years the Protestant churches in France have paid much attention to the improvement of their psalmody. To the metrical version of Marot and Beza they have added collections of hymns, with music, for various occasions. The French version of Marot and Beza was translated into Dutch metre by Peter Dathan, pastor of the first Reformed church of Frankfort-on-Main, about the year 1660, and adapted to the French tunes and measure. A new Flemish metrical version of the Psalms was executed by Philip de Marnix, lord of St. Aldegonde. A Bohemian version by Stryx, said to be of high merit, was published in 1590; and a Polish version by Bernard W מוי olanka, of Cracow, was printed at Bresz, in Lithuania, about the year 1563, under the auspices of prince Radziwili (Bayle, Dictionnaire, par Des Maizeux, iv. 124; Milner, Life of Dr. Isaac Watts, p. 350, note). What Marot and Beza were to the Reformed Churches of France and Friesland was to the Reformed Church of Germany, German Switzerland, and Holland. None of the strictly Calvinistic communities have a hymn-book daring back to the Reformation. David's Psalter was the first hymn-book of the Reformed or Genevan Church. The book of Psalms, the first and only hymn-book published by any of the churches in France, Switzerland, Holland, Italy, Germany, and Scotland, adapted to grave and solemn music, in metrical translations, whose one aim and glory were to render into measure which could be sung the very words of the old psalms, was translated for the Church of England, by Myles Coverdale, bishop of Exeter, during the reign of king Edward VI. 1 published a metrical version of thirteen Goatsly Psalms and Spiritual Songs drawn out of the Holy Scripture. The first verse of each psalm is accompanied by an English hymn, and all the verses of the English hymn are such that they were designed to be sung (Coverdale's Remains, p. 533). The next attempt to verify the Psalms in English was made by Thomas Sternhold, a native of Hampshire, groom of the robes to king Henry VIII and to king Edward VI, who published nineteen psalms, most probably in 1549. This translation received a certain disapprobation by many of the clergy, who looked
upon it as done in opposition to the practice of chanting the psalms in the cathedrals. It was increased to thirty-six by 1558, which was the year in which they were translated by John Hopkins; to eighty-seven, most probably in 1561, by Sternhold and Hopkins; and in 1563 was published the entire book of Psalms, translated by Sternhold, Hopkins, and others. This version seems to have been authoritatively intoned and into the service of the Reformed Church of England, being sanctioned both by the crown and convocation; and it soon became exceedingly popular.

Vocal psalmody was soon after introduced into the church service, the choral mode of singing being still retained in cathedrals. This has since been maintained, and the liturgical hymns being retained in the Prayer-book. Public singing of psalms by the whole congregation began in the month of September, 1559, at the parish church of St. Antholin, in the city of London, whence it spread first into the neighboring churches, and from thence into distant towns. Bishop Jewell, in a letter to Peter Martyr, dated March 5, 1560, says: "You may sometimes see at Paul's Cross, after the service, six thousand persons, old and young, of both sexes, all singing together and praising God" (Zurck Letters, p. 71). Although the practice was very prevalent in the principality of Wales, we39;re well aware that the old version was published with the royal license, by archbishop Parker (1560), Henry Dod (1603), George With (1623), King James I (1631), and George Sands (1631), the "old version" of Sternhold and Hopkins continued to be used, and have been translated into the Mohawk language, but no large opposition. The following year, the book was published, and into the language of the Munceys, a native tribe of North Americans, by the Rev. Richard Flood, a missionary to them from the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts. Admiringly as many of the psalms are adapted to general use in public worship, it was yet felt, in the English churches, that some other metrical expressions of those astonishing hopes and consoling promises which the new dispensation has given to man in the N. T. would not be altogether inappropriate. The great German Reformer had written hymns, and many of the other Continental divines of the revived faith in Christ had done likewise. Yet no English People's Hymn-book was brought out until the closing years of the 18th century, i.e. none that was placed on cottage tables beside the Bible, and none for use when Christmas trees and chanted beside the grave, although they had the Te Deum and Magnificat and the Psalms. Bishop Malby published A Selection of Psalms and Hymns before his elevation to the episcopate. Various selections were made and published by various dissenting bodies (as it appears) since the year 1770, and these selections are derived from Dr. Watts's Imitation of the Psalms of David in the Language of the New Testament (1707), and from his Hymns (1719); the Hymns of the Rev. Dr. Doddridge; those of the Rev. John Newton; and the sacred compositions dispersed through the works of the British poets of the 18th century. The Wesleys, however—so it seems—were the first who really gave a People's Hymn-book to England, unless that of Dr. Watts, published about the beginning of the 18th century (in 1709), may be called so. "To Dr. Watts," says a modern biographer, "must be assigned the praise of beginning, in our language, a class of productions which have taken a decided hold upon the universal religious mind. On this account Christian worshippers of every denomination, and of every English-speaking land, owe him an incalculable debt of gratitude. Mason, Baxter, and others had preceded Watts as hymn-writers; but their hymns were not used in public worship. Prejudice prevented the use of anything beyond the Psalms, and those not yet in their Christian rendering; but Watts made the Christian hymn part of modern public worship." As a supplement to Dr. Watts's hymns, Dr. Doddridge pub-
lished a collection entitled *Hymn Founded on Various Texts in the Holy Scriptures* (1755). After these came the two Wessleys, whose hymns are sung up to this day, and John Newton and Cowper, who produced the *Olney Hymn-book.*

Of the state of psalmody among the Puritans at the close of the 17th and the first part of the 18th century, we have no certain information. During the commonwealth, William Barton published a metrical version in 1644, reprinted in 1645 with the license of the Protector Cromwell. This version was received with much favor, and appears to have retained its popularity for many years. In 1646, Francis Roux, the Presbyterian provost of Eton College, published his version of the psalms, sanctioned by the imprimatur of the House of Commons, in pursuance of the recommendation of the Westminster assembly of divines. This version was subsequently revised by William Barton for the optional use of churches in England; but it never became popular. But the greatest improvement in psalmody, not merely among Protestant dissenters, but among all English congregations, was effected by the two Mr. W., that is, Mr. W. Doddridge, and Mr. Rev. Dr. Hodges. For a just appreciation of the value of his publication the reader is necessitatedly referred to Mr. Conder's *Poet of the Sanctuary,* pp. 48-105, in which work will be found notices of some eminent versifiers of psalms and hymns, both Episcopalian and Nonconformist, who preceeded Dr. Watts. The best compositions of the learned and pious friend the Rev. Dr. Doddridge, are found in *every* selection of psalms and hymns which has been published since the year 1770. All the great bodies of dissenters from the Church of England now have denominational hymn-books, containing the best versions or imitations of the Psalms of David, together with hymns selected from the most eminent modern devotional poets.

A curious controversy on psalmody arose among the dissenters in the end of the 17th century. Whether singing in public worship had been partially discontinued during the times of persecution to avoid informers, or whether the miserable manner in which it was performed gave persons a distaste for it, it appears that in 1691, Mr. Benjamin Keach published a tract entitled *The Breach Repaired in God's Worship; or, Psalms, Hymns, etc., proved to be a Holy Ordinance of Jesus Christ.* To us it may seem strange that such a point should be disputed; but Mr. Keach was obliged to labor earnestly, and with a great deal of prudence and caution, to obtain the consent of his people to sing a hymn at the time of the Lord's Supper. Six years more, they agreed to sing on the thanksgiving-days; but it required still fourteen years more before he could persuade them to sing every Lord's-day, and then it was only after the last prayer, that those who chose might withdraw without joining in it! Nor did even this satisfy these scrupulous consciences: for, after all, a separation took place, and the inharmonious seceders formed a new church in May's Pond, where it was above twenty years longer before the praises of God were to be sung. Dr. Watts endeavored, during this period to believe it; but Mr. Ivimey quotes Mr. Crosby as saying that Mr. Keach's was the first church in which psalm-singing was introduced. This remark, however, must probably be confined to the Baptist churches. The Presbyterians, it seems, were not quite so unmusical; for the Directory of the Westminster divines distinctly stated that "it is the duty of Christians to praise God publicly by singing of psalms together in the congregation." And besides the old Scotch Psalms, Dr. John Patrick, of the Charter-house, wrote which were in very general use among dissenters, Presbyterians, and Independents before it was superseded by the far superior compositions of Dr. Watts. These Psalms, however, like those of the English and Scotch Establishment, were dawdrled out in notes of equal length, without accent or variety. Even the introduction of the triple-paced tunes, probably about the time of Dr. Watts's psalms, gave also great offence to some people, because it marked the accent of the measure. Old Mr. Thomas Bradbury used to call this time "a long leg and a short one." The beautiful compositions of Dr. Watts, the Wessleys, and others produced a revolution in modern psalmody. The versions of the Psalms, and many excellent collections of hymns, are now in use, and may be considered as highly important gifts bestowed upon the modern Church of God.

In Scotland, the early Reformers, while they banished instrumental music from churches, paid great attention to singing. In John Knox's Psalter, arranged for use in churches, the metrical psalms are set to music in harmony of four parts. Several early translations of the Psalms were produced in North Britain, that of Sternhold and Hopkins was used in worship from 1561 down to the middle of the 17th century. In 1632 an attempt was made by Charles I to supersede it by King James's version was more resolutely and decidedly opposed than in England. During the commonwealth, the opinion of the Presbytery of State was Gaits. The probably a reference made to them in August, 1649, issued on the 23rd of November following their decision in favor of the revised version of Francis Roux, a member of Cromwell's council, which Parliament had in vain endeavored to bring into general use in England. It was adopted by the Synod of State and was the only version of the Psalms for the Kirk of Scotland, not only in congregations, but also in families. Though somewhat rough and uncouth, it is sometimes expressive and forcible, and perhaps nearer the original than any other metrical translation of the Psalms. A few paraphrases and hymns have since been added, by authority of the General Assembly, and form together the psalmody in use in Presbyterian worship in Scotland. In 1706 the assembly commended the Scripture songs of Mr. Patrick Symson for use in private families; and to prepare them for public use the act was renewed in the following year, and in 1708 the commission was authorized to compare the remarks of presbyteries on these songs. Thus matters passed on for years. In 1742 the assembly anew expressed a wish for an addition to the psalmody, and in 1744 a new and fuller collection was made, twenty-two being added to the previous forty-five selections. This collection, though never formally sanctioned by the assembly, is that now in use and printed along with the Psalms in the Scottish Bible. After the Reformation, a new hymnbook was adopted in 1561. In 1564 a committee of the General Assembly, duly empowered, published a selection of *Paraphrases in Verses; Several Passages of Scripture,* to be sung in Churches. It retained, in substance, the translations which had been published in 1745, under the authority of the General Assembly, and which had been in use in several churches; and a considerable number of new paraphrases were added, chiefly from the psalms or hymns of Mr. Watts, Doddridge, and Blacklock, and Mr. Logan. In 1747 a sufficient version of the psalmody of the Church of Scotland, in the Gaelic language, was made by the Rev. John Smith, by whom it was revised and published in 1783. From 1807 to 1842 the subject of a revision of the metrical psalms was before every assembly. Sir Walter Scott, when appointed to work on the project, "for the Psalms," said he, "often possessed a rude sort of majesty, which would be ill exchanged for mere elegance." In 1869 an addition to a collection of paraphrases was published by the General Assembly. The *Relief Synod* published a *Hymn Book* in 1824, and a new version of the *Psalms* in 1822. The Burgher branch of the Secession had, in 1748, requested Ralph Earkine, the author of the *Gospel Hymns,* to undertake the duty of enlarging the psalmody, but the proposal led to no result. The United Presbyterian Church, after some years' preparation,
published, in 1851, a hymn-book for the use of their churches. The most of the paraphrases are incorporated into it. In addition to what is stated in the previous portion of this article about psalmody in Scotland, it may be mentioned that there was published at the period of the Reformation a Compendious Book of Godly and Spiritual Songs. Many of these are not sung or used now. Many are confounding songs (prophane satan) metamorphosed. The Koshmic clergy published a canon against this book—such was its popularity—and the fifth Parliament of queen Mary passed an act against such rhymes.

The first song ascribe to Almighty God in the English language, on our New-England coast, was raised by the Pilgrim fathers when they landed on Plymouth Rock. Cold, ice-bound, without a roof over their heads, they remembered their first Sabbath-day to keep it holy— 10 of December, on the Sabbath day, were rested; is the simple and impressive record of their journal.

"A mid the storm they sang,
And the stars heard, and the sea,
And the sounding aisles of the dim woods rang
With the anthem of the free."

As the first book ever printed with movable metal types was the Bible, so, as if to keep up the sacred parallel on this continent, the first book printed here was a portion of the inspired volume "done into metre." The first volume of Psalms was put up at Cambridge in 1638, by Stephen Day. His first book was The Psalms in Metre, faithfully translated for the use and edification of the saints in public and private, especially in New England (printed at Cambridge in 1640). This version was made from the Hebrew by Thomas Wolfe, of Roxbury; Richard Mather, of Dorchester; and John Eliot, the Apostle of the Indians. They were a committee appointed by the Congregational or Independent churches as early as 1638. In their preface they say, "We have respected rather a plain translation than to smooth our verses with the sweetness of any paraphrase, and so have attended to conscience rather than to elegance, and fidelity rather than poetry, in translating Hebrew words into English language and David's poetry into English metre." Three hundred acres of land were granted to Stephen Day, "being the first that set up printing." Eliot's Indian Bible, in the Nipmuck language, was printed at Cambridge in 1668, the whole of the type being set up by an Indian, and the Psalms "done in common metre"—of which the first verse from the 19th Psalm may suffice as a specimen—

<4Koov-kokottamahmon God ssussoummoom Mmamahheekeekew kurnunthkon Gohana kunnouk.>

1718 Dr. Cotton Mather issued his Psalterium Americanum: the Book of Psalms in a translation exactly conformed unto the original, but all in blank verse, fitted unto tunes commonly used in our churches. From this curious book we extract a few lines, as printed:

"PSALM XXXII.—A Psalm of David.

1. My Shepherd is th' eternal God: I shall not be in any want.

2. In pastures of a tender grass; He [even] makes me to lie down in green pastures; He leadeth me beside still waters.

3. My flesh and my wandering soul: He [kindly] doth fetch back again; in the plain paths of righteousness.

4. He leadeth me beside still waters; and guideth me along; because He knoweth me, and the name that is upon me."

In a Consideration concerning the Tunes, Dr. Mather states that "the director of psalmody need only say, 'Sing with the black letter,' or 'Sing without the black letter,' and the tune will be sufficiently directed" (see Belcher, Historical Sketches of Hymns and Hymn-writers, p. 47). Work which contains much interesting information on the whole subject of church psalmody, hymnology, and music. These and other primitive efforts to furnish an American psalmody and hymnale were not followed with success. Between the years 1706 and 1757 the version of the Psalms of 1640 was carefully re-edited by the Rev. Thomas Prince, M.A., and published in 1758. In 1783 Mr. Joel Barlow, an American statesman and poet, published a corrected and enlarged edition of Dr. Watts's version of the Psalms, and a collection of hymns, with the recommendation of the General Assembly of the Congregational Ministers of Connecticut, at whose synod this work was recommended. Many of the psalms were altered, several were written anew, and several, which had been omitted by Dr. Watts, were supplied. This collection was in general use in that state until the bad character of the author (who died a wretched indigent) brought them into disuse; and in 1808, the Rev. Thomas Dwight, D.D., president of Yale College, published a revised edition of Dr. Watts's version of the Psalms (in which he versified upwards of twenty psalms omitted by Watts), with the approbation of the General Assembly of Ministers in the state of Connecticut, at whose request it had originally been undertaken. This edition, with the contributions of Dr. Dwight, has never been adopted by the Congregationalists of this country. Many of the leading denominations in the United States of America now have their own separate psalm- and hymn-books.

In 1789 the publication of the Parthenacre, Tate and Brady was adopted entirely by the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, with the addition of a few hymns. Since the year 1826 a collection of 212 hymns has been in use under the authority of the General Convention of Protestant Episcopal dioceses of the House of Bishops and of clerical and lay delegates; and since October, 1832, under the same authority, 124 selections of entire psalms, or of portions of psalms, from the new version (with certain necessary alterations or corrections, and occasionally with the substitution of a better version) has been in use in all the churches of that denomination.

The constitution of the Reformed Church in America declares that "No psalms or hymns may be publicly sung in the Reformed (Dutch) churches but such as are approved and recommended by the General Synod." The manifest reason of this prohibition is to be found in the vital relation that subsists between the psalmody and the theology of that Church. This is further illustrated by a rule of its General Synod which forbids the issue of any edition of the psalms and hymns of this Church without the concurrence of that body, the Catechism, and the Liturgy. The history of the hymnology of this denomination, which dates back to the period of the Reformation, makes an interesting chapter of the general subject. From an elaborate report made to the General Synod in 1826 by the committee for the expense of the 'Hymns of the Church,' we condense a brief narrative: "The Church Orders ratified by the National Synod of Dortrecht (A.D. 1618–19), which are still 'recognized' as containing the distinctive and fundamental principles of our Church government, declare that the one hundred and fifty psalms of David, the Ten Commandments, the Lord's Prayer, the Twelve Articles of the Christian faith, the songs of Mary, Zacharias, and Simeon, versified only, shall be sung in public worship. The churches are left at liberty to adopt or omit that which is not in the liturgy, or that which is not common to the whole system. Praise books are prohibited. This usage, prevailing in the Netherlands, was transferred to this country. Several copies of the psalm-books which the fathers brought with them are in the hands of the committee. They are invariably bound up with the Bible, the New Testament at least, the Catechism, and Liturgy. These Psalms in Dutch are the version of Peter Dathe, the eminent Biblical scholar and critic, by whom they were translated; however, not from the original, but from the French. This was the first book in use in the Reformed Church in America. It contains, besides the Psalms, the Ten Commandments, the Song of Zacharias, the Song of the Virgin Mary, the Apostles' Creed, the Lord's Prayer, the Articles of the Christian faith (translated from the German by Jan Uytenhoven), the Morn-
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ing Prayer, the Evening Prayer, the Prayer before Sermon, Prayer before Eating, Prayer after Eating, the Evening Prayer entitled Christs qui Luz es et Dies, and a translation by Abraham Van der Meer, from the Greek Bible, of the 151st Psalm of David. Every version of prayer book contains prayers which are a set to music of a simple recitative character, in which all might join, by Cornelius Leeuw. This book was in use in all the Dutch churches in this country, until the consistory of the Reformed Dutch Church of the city of New York found it necessary to have divine service performed in the English language; and on Nov. 9, 1767, approved and recommended for the use of their Church and schools an English psalm-book, published by their order, "which is greatly indebted to that of Dr. Bray and Mr. Tate; some of the psalms being transcribed verbatim from their version, and others altered so as to fit them to the music used in the Dutch Church" (prefatory note). This book contains, besides the Psalms of David, fifteen pages of "hymns"—viz. the Ten Commandments, the Song of Zacharias, the Song of the Virgin Mary, the Song of Simeon, the Creed, and the Lord's Prayer. It was so set to the music in which all the people joined, so that the compiler could truthfully say, "A great part of divine worship consists in harmonious singing." This first book in English was the second book in use in our churches. The "Articles of Religion," in 1744, made the use of psalmody, but agree to "abide in all things" by the regulations of the Synod of Dort, herebefore quoted. In 1773 a new version of the psalms and hymns was compiled and adopted in the Netherlands, and was soon introduced into some of the Dutch churches in America, constituting the third book thus used. It differs from the preceding chiefly in the higher critical character of the psalms. In 1787 the General Synod appointed a committee to compile a psalm-book "out of other collections of English psalms in repute and received in the Reformed Church of Dort, however, to give the name of canon thereto where that of the New-York consistory is in use." Additional instructions were given the next year to print "some well-composed spiritual hymns in connection with the psalms." After approval by the Synod of 1789, this book was speedily published. It contains besides the Psalms of David, a century of hymns, of which "1 to 52 are suited to the Heidelberg Catechism, 53 to 73 are adapted to the holy ordination of the Lord's Supper, and Hymn 74, to the end, on miscellaneous subjects." Among these are such titles as "Exultation," "Ascension," "Resurrection," "Ascension," "Whitmaitude," "New Year," etc. This book, prepared by order of the General Synod, being the fourth book used in their churches, is without music, as have been all subsequent books until this time. This selection continued in use for full a quarter of a century, and is still an admirable one. In 1912, on petition of the Classis of New York, the General Synod requested the Rev. Dr. John H. Livingston to prepare an improved and enlarged selection of psalms and hymns. This was reported to the Synod of 1815, and by its order was "entirely to be exchanged into all our churches." Its use was recommended also to "all families and individuals in place of the book hitherto in use." No radical change has been made in the psalmody of the Reformed Church from that day to this—the fifth book sanctioned in the churches. It embraced 375 more hymns than the former collection. Additions, however, were made, in 1831, of 172 hymns, and published as Book II. Rev. Dr. Thomas De Witt was chairman of the committee which prepared it. This is the sixteenth book. In 1843 a book of Sabbath-school and Social Hymns, 301 in number, was published by order of the Synod. In 1845-46 a committee, of which Rev. Dr. Isaac Ferris was chairman, prepared, by authority of the Synod, a new arrangement of psalms and hymns, embracing 342 additional selections. This was soon published, and constituted the seventh book thus used in the Reformed Church in America—containing, in addition to the psalms, 788 hymns. An edition with music has been published within three or four years past, under the title of The Book of Praise. In 1862 the Fulton Street Hymn-book, which is used in the celebrated daily service in love, and numbering 826 hymns, was published, and "recommended to the churches" by the Synod. In this chronological sketch no reference has been made to books in the French and German languages; but so long ago as 1792 the Synod approved and recommended, in the German language, the psalms and hymns compiled by Theodoric de Beza and La Morat; and in the German language, the psalms and hymns, published at Marburg and Amsterdam, used in the Reformed churches in Germany, in the Netherlands, and Pennsylvania. In October, 1865, a valuable and large collection of hymns in the German language was printed by order of the General Synod, for use in the German churches of this denomination. It was compiled by the late Rev. John C. Gudin, of New York, Rev. Joseph F. Berg, D.D., and Rev. Abraham Berk. Since then a German Reformed Church has been organized, and a German hymn-book has been issued. The General Synod of 1869 sanctioned a new volume, entitled Hymns of the Church, with tunes, which is now coming in use in many congregations. The full history of the preparation of this elegant volume is given in the article under that head. In addition to its beauty, it is the most admirable collection of hymns for public worship now in use among Protestant denominations. It numbers 1007 hymns, together with many chants, sentences, etc. The music, which is designed to promote congregational singing, is of a very high order. The wide range of topics, the rich selection from the most celebrated devotional lyrics of all ages, and its fine adaptation to the great purpose of the praises of God, entitle it to a foremost place among modern collections. The committee who made the compilation were Rev. John C. Gudin, Rev. D. G. Vermilye, D.D., Rev. Alexander R. Thompson, D.D., with whom was associated, as a prominent co-laborer, the Rev. Zachary Eddy, D.D. This book and the previous one are now both in use in the Reformed Church in America. It has also been introduced into a number of churches of other denominations.

The hymn-books of the various other Christian denominations embrace a large proportion of the psalms and hymns which have become the property of the Church universal, and of these it is necessary only to give the name of each, giving a separate list of the psalm-books. But there are hymns and hymnals characteristic of the particular doctrines, ordinances, and spirit of the Methodists so distinctive in these respects that we append a history of their hymn-books, recognizing therein by the general assertion that their hymns and tunes have been among the greatest instrumentalities of their immense successes.

The origin of the first collection of hymns in use among the Methodists of this country cannot be satisfactorily ascertained. In 1778 one of Wesley's publications, divided into four books for Sunday-schools, with music, was issued. There is also an edition "revised and improved," copyrighted in 1802 by Ezeekiel Cooper. This contains 250 hymns. In 1788 a supplement was added by bishop Asbury, containing 357 hymns, the whole being published in two books. This was revised under the su-
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prevision of Nathan Bangs in the year 1820. To this
again a supplement was added in 1836. The General
Conference of 1846 appointed a committee to carefully
revise the then existing book, and to "judiciously mul-
tiply the number of hymns." Their work was com-
pleted, and approved by the Book Committee, the edit-
ors of whom were W. B. Martin, J. P. Chapman, and
E. P. Bunker, whose name is on the title page of the
book, which was a joint effort. The publication of the
1850 supplement brought the hymn book to its present
form. The number of hymns was increased from 280 to
405, and the addition of a supplement brought the
total to 450. This book was revised and published in
1885, with the addition of a new preface.

During the last twenty years nearly every religious
organization has revised its "book of prayer," and we
app

A. ENGLAND.

1. Baptist.—Psalms and Hymns for Public, Social, and
Private Worship (1857).

2. Church Hymn Book.—Year of Peace, edited by
Dean Alford (1867).

3. Psalms and Hymns for Worship, compiled by
E. Bickersteth (1838).

4. Psalms and Hymns, compiled by E. H. Bickersteth
(1808; 6th ed. 1857).

5. Church Psalter and Hymnal, by Harland (1850,
1867).

6. Selection of Psalms and Hymns, by Kemble (1855).

7. Church Psalter and Hymn-book, by W. Merer
(1864).

8. The People's Hymnal (1857).

9. The Sarah Hymnal, by Nelson, Woodford, and
Dayman (1865).


11. Congregational.—The Hymn-book, by A. Reed
(1841).

12. The Church and Home Metrical Psalter and Hymnal,
by W. Windle.

13. Psalms, Hymns, and Passages of Scripture for Chris-
tian Worship, compiled by the Congregational
Ministers of Leeds (1858).

14. The New Congregational Hymn-book, compiled by
a Committee of the Congregational Union (1839).

15. Methodist.—The Divine Worship, compiled for
the Use of the Methodist New Connexion (1856).

16. A Collection of Hymns for the Use of the People
called Methodists, by J. Wesley, with a Supplement
(1881).

(1833).

18. Presbyterian.—Psalms and Hymns for Divine Worship
for the Presbyterian Church in England (1867).

19. Miscellaneous.—Hymns for Christian Worship, by the
Religious Tract Society (1860).

20. Psalms and Hymns for Public Worship, by the
Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

21. Baptist.—Baptist Prize-book, by Fuller, Leroy, Phelps,
and others, with a supplement by Richard Fuller and J. B. Jeter.

22. Congregational.—Songs for the Sanctuary.

Plymouth Collection, by H. W. Beecher.

23. Lutheran.—A Collection of Hymns, and a Liturgy, for
the Use of the Evangelical Lutheran Churches (1860).

24. Methodist.—Hymns of the Methodist Episcopal Church
(1878).

25. Moravian.—Liturgy and Hymns for the Use of the Prot-
estant Church of the United Brethren, or Moravians
(1872).

26. Presbyterian.—Songs for the Sanctuary.

Church Hymn-book, by E. P. Hallet.

27. Hymns and Songs of Praise, by Hitchcock and oth-
ers.

28. Presbyterian Hymnal (official) (1874).

29. Protestant Episcopal.—Hymnal, according to the Use
of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United
States of America.

30. Hymns for Church and Home, compiled by Burgess,
Muhlenberg, Howe, Cox, and Wharton.

31. Undescribed.—Hymns of the Church, by Thomp-
son, Vermeule, and Rddy.

The use of this book is required in all congregations of the Reformed Church in the

C. GERMAN HYMN-BOOKS.

Germany is very rich in hymn-books, to enumerate
which would fill pages. Each state, each province, has its
own hymn-book, many containing more than 700 hymns.
The most complete collection at present extant, viz.: 1. "The Geistlicher Gesange, der von Christi Kirche zu
Use, 1828, 1865; 2. Archdeacon Knapp's evangelische Lieder-
satz für Kirche und Haus, containing 300 hymns (Stutt-
gart, 1858; 3. The church Psalter of the Lutheran
Cari Jost's Assemblies Evangelisches Gesang
and Gebet Buch (ed. Hamb. 1846, 1866). This work is
authorities have used in this country in the different
denominations:

1. Baptist.—Glasmastermum der Gemeinde des Herrn
(Hamburg, 1860).

2. Evangelische Association.—Gesangbuch der evangel-
schen Gemeinschaften (Cleveland, 1860).

3. Lutheran.—Das gemeinschafiliche Gesangbuch.

Lutherische Gesangbuch.

4. Methodist.—Deutsches Gesangbuch der Bischof
Methodisten-Kirche (Cincinnati).

5. Moravian.—Gesangbuch zum Gebrauch der evangel.
Bruderengemeine (Bethlehem, Pa.).

6. Reformierte und German Presbyterian.—Deutsches Ge-
sangbuch, von P. Schaaf. This is one of the best
German hymn-books in this country.

During the American Civil War (1861-65) many
new patriotic and Christian songs resounded through
the camps of the contending armies. The religious ser-
(hee), the labor of the chaplains and army missionaries, and of the sanitary and
Christian commissions, and other voluntary organizations for the temporal and spiritual welfare of the military and
army forces, and for hospital service, were all attended with the cheering influence of patriotic song. Few
of these new songs, whether patriotic or religious, sur-

led in the homes and churches of the soldiers in
happier times rang out their inspiring strains, and stirred
all the deepest sympathies and memories of peace and
love. Two of the little books and songbooks among
these are before us as we write—one printed for the
Union and the other for the Confederate army.

Both of them contain a majority of the same familiar psalms
and hymns, both end with "Lord, dismiss us with thy
blessing," and both have the exhortation of the "Let
us offer unto God our Thanksgiving," the same hymn.
This, therefore, is not a conventional or popular
book.
It may be proper here to allude to the large addition to our psalmody in consequence of the labors of evangelists, such as Blis and Sankey. These have produced numerous books of hymns, chiefly with the music attached, which contain, along with much that is merely ephemeral, some songs and tunes which are destined to survive the occasions that have called them forth.

We close this article with a brief reference to the great increase of hymns and tunes for children, and especially for Sabbath and mission schools. It is the more interesting in the light of the city and home missionary and Sunday-school system of the times. Advantage has been taken of the demand to flood the market with books which are utterly unworthy of their authors and unfit for use—full of trashy verses, and of tunes that are no better. But a happy reaction has begun, which will soon result in elevating the standard, purifying the taste, and ennobling this delightful branch of Christian instruction and worship. The best poetical and musical talent of the country is now engaged in the work, and we may soon look for its ripe fruit. The songs of the children, like books and addresses for them, must not be childish nor weak. If they are to bear their part in the religious training of the rising race, and in an age like this. The hosannas which were sung to Jesus in the Temple by the youthful throng were in full unison and of equal grandeur with those of the multitudes that was that followed him, and spread their garments in the way, and cried, saying, " Hosanna to the Son of David!" " Hosanna in the highest!" See Sunday School.

In the preparation of this article we have freely used the labors of other reference books. We have also had valuable contributions in sections from the pen of eminent writers. Dr. W. J. R. Taylor has greatly enriched our treatment of American psalmody, especially that treating of the Reformed Church. The Rev. Dr. Pick has aided in the bibliography. Those desiring fuller information will consult the list of works quoted in this article Hymnology.

Psalm, Book of, one of the most important of the Biblical components, standing in the English Scriptures at the beginning of the practical or experimental books, and in the Hebrew Bible of the Kethubim, or Hagiographa. In the following accounts we follow the line of the Biblical interpretation; but we have thrown some new light, we trust, especially upon the difficult questions connected with the titles of the several Psalms. See Bible.

1. General Title of the Book.—This collection of sacred poetry received its English name, Psalms, from the GreekTHEURIOS, or Hagiographa. It is the consequence of the lyrical character of the pieces of which it consists, as intended to be sung to stringed and other instruments of music. The word (from ψαλλω, to touch or strike a chord) is aptly defined by Gregory of Nyssa (Tract, ii, in Psalmos, c. 8) as melody produced by a musical instrument. Another name, Psalter, was given to this book from the Greek ψαλτηριον, the stringed instrument to which its contents were originally sung. See Psalter.

It does not appear how the Psalms were, as a whole, anciently designated. Their present Hebrew appellation is תהלים, Tehillim, elsewhere rendered "Praises." But in the actual superscriptions of the psalms the word תהלים is applied only to one, Ps. cxxix, which is indeed emphatically a praise-hymn. The Sept. (as above noted) entitled them ψαλμοι, or "Psalms," using the word ψαλμος at the same time as the translation of תהלים, miszmor, which signifies strictly a rhetorical composition (Lowth, Profect, iii), and which was probably applied in practice to any poem specially intended, by reason of its rhythm, for musical performance with instrumental accompaniment. But the Hebrew word is, in the Old Test., never used elsewhere in the plural; and in the superscriptions of even the Davidic psalms it is applied only to some, not to all; probably to those which had been composed most expressly for the harp. The Hebrew title, תהלים (Rabbinic form, with מ added, שיר לשלום, or תהלים, or תילים or תילות), signifies ἡμνημα or πρασιμ, and was probably adopted on account of the use made of the collection in divine service, though only a part can be strictly called songs of praise, nor a few being lamentations and prayers. There is evidently no proper correspondence between the title in the two languages, though each is suitable. The word answering to שיר is ἡμνημα, and not ψαλμοι, which rather (as above noted) corresponds to מזמור, psalms, or lyrical odes—a name which, though so plainly appropriate, does not appear to have been generally given to the book, at least so far as the Hebrew usages now can be ascertained. This is the more singular, insomuch as no fewer than sixty-five of the songs distinctly bear the title of מזמור, while only one (Ps. cxix, i) is styled שיר.

That the name מזמור did, however, obtain in ancient times, rather than the present title, שיר, may be presumed from the use of ψαλμοι in the Sept. and the New Test., and of מזמור in the Peshitta. See Psalms.

In Ps. lxxxi, 3, we find all the preceding compositions (i.e. the so-called Proverbs of David), because many of them are strictly prayers. And "prayer" is the preface to the most ancient of all the psalms, that of Moses (Ps. xc). But the same designation is in the superscriptions applied to only two portion of the Greek and Syriac Psalms.

The other special designations applied to particular psalms are the following: "Shir," "Song," the outpouring of the soul in thanksgiving, used in the first instance of a hymn of private gratitude (Ps. xxx); afterwards of hymns of great national thanksgiving (Ps. xlv, xlviii, lxxv, etc.); מזמור, "Instruction" or "Homily" (Ps. xxxii, lxxiv, etc.; comp. the מזמורי, "I will instruct thee," in Ps. xxxii, 3); מציון, "Private Memorial," if from the root מציון (perhaps also with an anagogical allusion to the root מציון, "to support," "to maintain"; comp. Ps. xvi, 5) (Ps. xvi, lvi-lxi); מכתיב, "Testimony" (Ps. lx, lxxx); and מיקוד, "Irreligious or Dithyrambic Ode" (Ps. vii). The strict meaning of these terms is in general to be gathered from the earlier superscriptions. Once made familiar to the psalmists, they were afterwards employed by them more loosely. (See § 4, below.)

II. Numeration of the Psalms.—The Christian Church obviously received the Psalter from the Jews not only as a constituent portion of the sacred Book of Holy Scripture, but also as the liturgical hymn-book which the Jewish Church had regularly used in the Temple. The number of separate psalms contained in it is, by the concordant testimony of all ancient authorities, one hundred and fifty; the avowedly "supernumerary" psalm which appears at the end of the Greek and Syriac Psalters, "on David's victory over Goliath," being manifestly apocryphal. This total number commends itself by its internal probability as having proceeded from the last sacred collector and editor of the Psalter. In the details, however, of the numbering, both the Greek and Syriac Psalters differ from the Hebrew. The Greek translators joined together Ps. ix, x and Ps. cxxiv, cxxv, and then divided Ps. cxvi and Ps. cxxv: this was perpetuated in the versions derived from the Greek, and among others in the Latin Vulgate. The Syriac
so far followed the Greek as to join together Ps. cxvii, cxviii, and to divide Ps. cxvii. Of the three divergent systems of numbering, the Hebrew (as followed in our A. V.) is the best. The large collection consisting in Ps. cxvii (Carmov, *Julius Dusia*, etc., ii, 107). But that the second was originally distinct from the first book is proved by the repetition of one or two pieces; thus Ps. iii is plainly the same as Ps. xiv, with only a notable variation in the divine name, *Elohim*, God, being used in the former wherever *Hashshon*, Jehovah, Lord, is found in the latter. So also Ps. lxxv is but a repetition of Ps. xli, 13-17, with the same singular variation in the divine name. This division appears by the date of its latest Psalm (Ps. lxxvii) to have been compiled in the reign of King Hezekiah. It would naturally comprise, first, several or most of the Levitical psalms anterior to that date, and, secondly, the remainder of the psalms of David previously uncompiled. According to others, this collection was not made till the period of the captivity, on the ground that Ps. xlv refers to the days of Jeremiah. The third book (lxxiii-lxxix) consists chiefly of Asaph's psalms, but comprises apparently two smaller collections—i.e., the first Asaphic (lxxiii-lxxix), the other mostly Korahitic (lxxxvii-lxxxiii). The collector of this book had not the same art to bring together aPsalm as the second was brought together by David, and therefore he put the above notice at the end of the second book (see De Wette, *Psalmen, Einleitung*, p. 21). This book, the interest of which centres in the times of Hezekiah, stretches out, by its last two psalms, to the reign of Manasseh: it was probably compiled in the reign of Josiah. In the opinion of others, the date of this collection must be as late as the return from Babylon, on the supposition that Ps. lxxxviii implies as much.

The fourth book (xc-cvi), containing the remainder of the psalms up to the date of the captivity; and the fifth (cvi-vc), comprising the psalms of the return, are made up chiefly of anonymous liturgic pieces, many of which were composed for the service of the second Temple. In the last book we have the Songs of Degrees (cxx-cxxiv), which seem to have been originally a separate collection. There is nothing to distinguish these two books from each other in respect of outward decoration or arrangement, and they may have been compiled together in the days of Nehemiah.

The five books may, with some propriety, be thus distinguished: the first *Asaphic*, the second *Korahitic*, the third *Asaphic*, and the two remaining *liturgic*. (Comp. § v, below.)

The ancient Jewish tradition as to this division is preserved to us by the abundant testimonies of the Christian fathers. Of the indications which the sacred text itself contains of this division, the most obvious are the doxologies which we find at the end of Ps. xli, lxxvii, lxxxviii, cvi, and which, having for the most part no special connection with the psalms to which they are attached, mark the several ends of the book. Four of the five are alike, and it suggests itself at once that these books must have been originally formed at different periods.

This conclusion is by various further considerations rendered all but certain, while the few difficulties which stand in the way of admitting it vanish when closely examined. Thus there is a remarkable correspondence between the several books in their use of the divine names Jehovah and Elohim to designate Almighty God. In book i the former name prevails: it is found 272 times, while Elohim occurs but fifteen times. (We here take Oehler's list of occurrences, nor yet of the occurrences of Elohim when prefixed with a possessive suffix.) On the other hand, in book ii Elohim is found more than five times as often as Jehovah. In book iii the preponderance of Elohim in the earlier is balanced by that of Jehovah in the later psalms of the book. In book iv the name Jehovah is more extensively employed; and so also, virtually, in book v, Elohim being
there found only in two passages incorporated from earlier psalms. Those who maintain, therefore, that the psalms were all collected and arranged at once, contend that the collector distributed the Psalms according to the titles of the songs to which they severally exhorted. But to this theory the existence of book iii, in which the preferential use of the Elohim gradually yields to that of the Jehovah, is fatal. The large appearance, in fact, of the name Elohim in books ii and iii depends in great measure on the period to which many of the psalms of those books belong—the period from the reign of Solomon to that of Hezekiah, when through certain causes the name Jehovah was exceptionally disused. The preference for the name Elohim in most of the Davidic psalms which are included in book ii is closely allied with that character of those psalms which induced David himself to exclude them from his own collection, book i; while, lastly, the sparing use of the JeHo\-\-vah in Ps. lxxviii, and the three introductory psalms which precede it, is designed to cause the name, when it occurs, and above all Joh, which is emphatic for JeHo-\-vah, to shine out with greater force and splendor.

IV. Super-Captivations.—All the Psalms, except thirty-four, bear supercaptivations. According to some, there are only twenty-five exceptions, as they reckon ἱλλοί, ἱλλοί, a title in all the Psalms which commence with it. To each of these exceptions the Talmud (Babyl. Cod. Abodi Saruh, fol. 24, col. 2) gives the name ἱλλοί, τάξιν, οὐρανός, Orphan Psalm. It is confess-ably very difficult, if not impossible, to explain all the terms employed in the inscriptions; and hence critics have differed exceedingly in their conjectures. The difficulty, arising no doubt from ignorance of the Temp-ple music, was felt, it would seem, as early as the age of the Sept.; and it was felt so much by the translators of our A. T. that they generally retained the Hebrew words, even though Luther had set the example of translating them to the best of his ability. It is worth observing that the difficulty appears to have determined Cowperdale (1555) to omit nearly all except names of authors; thus in Ps. ix, which is his in version, he gives only a Psalm of David.

The authority of the titles is a matter of doubt. By most of the ancient critics they were considered genuine and of equal authority with the Psalms themselves, while most of the moderns reject them wholly or in part. The difficulties have been largely rejected in the last century by Theodor of Mopsuestia, one of the ablest and most judicious of ancient interpreters (Rosenmüller, Hist. Interpretationis Librorum Sacerorum, iii, 296). On the other hand, it deserves to be noticed that they are received by Tholuck and Hengstenberg in their works on the antiquity of the antitypical doctrine, and there can be no question, for they are found in the Sept. They are supposed to be even much older than this version, since they were no longer intelligible to the translator, who often makes no sense of them. Their obscurity might, however, have been owing not so much to their antiquity as to the translator's residence in Egypt, and consequent ignorance of the psal-mody of the Temple service in Jerusalem. At any rate, the appearance of the titles in the Sept. can only prove them to be about as ancient as the days of Ezra. Then it is argued by many that they must be as old as the Psalms themselves, since it is customary for Oriental poets to prefix titles to their songs. Instances are found in Arabic poems, but these are very unlike the Hebrew inscriptions. Much more important traces of the custom may be seen in Is. xxix, xxxiii, vi, 5; Neh. iii, 1, and in 2 Sam. i, 17, 18 (Tholuck, Psalms, p. xxiv). The other instances commonly appealed to in Exod. xv, 1; Deut. xxxi, 30; Judg. v, 1; 2 Sam. xxii, 1, furnish no evidence, since they are not proper titles of the songs so much as brief statements connecting them with the verses. In 2 Sam. xxviii, 3 there is strong proof of the usage, if, with Tholuck, we take the verses as inscriptions, and not as integral parts of the songs, which most hold them justly to be from their poetical form.

The following considerations seem to militate against the genuineness of the titles: (1.) The analogy between them and the supercaptivations to the apocryphal epistles. The latter are now universally rejected: why not the former? (2.) The Greek and Syriac versions exhibit them with great and numerous variations, often altering the Hebrew (as in Ps. xxxvii), and sometimes giving a heading where the Hebrew has none (as in Ps. xxii-xcvii). Would the ancient translators have taken such liberties, or could such variations have arisen, if the titles had been considered sacred like the Psalms themselves? At any rate, the existence of these glaring variations is sufficient to induce a distrust of the titles in their present form, even though they had been once sanctioned by inspired authority. If ever Ezra settled them, the variations in versions and manuscripts (Eichhorn, Lexicon, iii, 450, 495) have tended since to make them doubtful. (3.) The order for a special occasion thought to be at variance with the contents of the Psalms. Sometimes the author is believed to be incorrectly given, as when David is named over psalms referring to the captivity, as in Ps. xiv, 7; xxv, 22; li, 20, 21; lxix, 36. It is not unlikely, however, as Tholuck has shown, that these references were added during that period to the genuine text of the royal singer. Others, as Calvin and Hengstenberg, with far less probability, take these passages in a figurative or spiritual sense. Also Ps. cxxix, it is supposed, cannot well be David's, for its style is not free from Chaldaisms. Then sometimes the occasion is incorrectly specified, as in Ps. xxx, unless, indeed, this refers to the dedication of the sacer Temple (1 Chron. xxii, 1), as Rosenmüller, Tholuck, and Hengstenberg think after Venema. The real solution of the controversy lies in the answer to this question: Do they, when individually stated, approve themselves so generally correct, and as so free from any single fatal objection to their credit, as to claim our universal confidence? This cannot be fully discussed here, although intimations are given below calculated to confirm the accuracy of the titles as found in the Hebrew and English Bible, especially as to authorship and occasion. We must simply avow our conviction, founded on thorough examination, that they are, when rightly interpreted, fully trustworthy, and that everywhere within the limits of the 40th and 45th century, and even by some of those of the 40th century, the correctness of any one of them can be fairly met. Moreover, some of the arguments of their assailants obviously recall upon themselves. Thus when it is alleged that the contents of Ps. xxxiv have no connection with the occasion indicated in the superscription, we reply that the fact of the superscription renders it improbable that the superscription should have been prefixed by any but David himself.

Of the terms left untranslated or obscure in our Bible, it may be well to offer some explanation in this place, referring to them in the alphabetical order for a special elucidation. On this subject most commentators offer instruction, but the reader may especially consult Rosenmüller, Scholia in Comp. Redacta, iii, 14-22: De Wette, Commentar über die Psalmen, p. 27-37; Ewald, Poet. Aeschyl. i, 163-180, 195. The following summary exhibits the literary and musical systems of notation found in the individual titles to the Psalms at one view, classified under the several terms and particles used to point out their bearing and significance:

I. With the preposition l, to (or by):
   a. The author: namely,
   b. Levinet: (1.) Korahites only: xiii, xiv-xv, lix, lxiv, lxxiv, lxxvii.
      (2.) Azel (else), especially as a branch of the Korah-
      1, xiii-xxxii.
V. The species of poetical composition:

1. נִפְרָדָה (niphārādah), simply an ada or lyrical piece: xvi, xlix
2. מִזְגֵּר (mizgēr), an instrumental, xlvii
3. מִזְגֵּרָא (mizgērāa), a stringed instrument: xlvii
4. מִזְגֵּרֶה (mizgērēh), an instrumet: xlvii
5. מִזְגֵּרִי (mizgērī), a stringed instrument: xlvii
6. מִזְגֵּרּוֹ (mizgērō), ascribed to David: the psalms prefixed to the book of Kings, are the most striking proofs of their unscriptural judgment. The Talmudists (Cod. Pescinius, x, 117); Augustine, who is never a good critic (De Cret. Dei, xvii, 14), and Chrysostom (Prod. ad Paulinam). But Jerome, as might be expected, held the opinion which now universally prevails (Epist. ad Sophronum). The titles and the contents of the Psalms most clearly show that they were composed at different and remote periods by several poets, of whom David was only the largest and most eminent contributor.

1. David, the sweet psalmist of Israel (2 Sam. xxiii, 1). To him are ascribed seventy-three psalms in the Hebrew text (not seventy-four, as De Wette and Tholuck state; nor seventy-one, as most others have counted), and at least eleven others in the Sept.-namely, xxxii, xlix, lvii, xciv, xcvii, cxxviii, ccxxvii; to which may be added Psa. 1, as it forms part of Psa. xxv in that version.

To these psalms the collector, after properly appending the single psalm of Solomon, has afforded the notice that “the prayers of David the son of Jesse are ended” (Psa. lixxii, 20). He is indirectly implying, at least on the prismatic view, that no more compositions of the royal psalmist remained. How, then, do we find in the later books—iii, iv, v—further psalms yet marked with David’s name? Some have sought to answer this question by a reference to the authorship assigned in the superscriptions of other psalms. If (as we shall presently see) in the times posterior to those of David the Levitical choir prefixed to the psalms which they composed the names of Asaph, Heman, and Ethan, out of a feeling of veneration for their memories, how much more might the name of David be prefixed, and to the utterances of those who were not merely his descendants, but also the representatives for the time being, and so in some sort the pledges of the perpetual royalty of his lineage! The name David is used to denote, in other parts of Scripture, after the original David’s death, the then head of the Davidic family: and so, even in the Messiah of the seed of David, who was to sit on David’s throne (1 Kings xii, 16; Hos. iii, 5; Isa. lv, 3; Jer. xxx, 9; Ezra xxxiv, 23, 24). Thus some seek to explain the meaning of the later Davidic superscriptions in the Psalter. The psalms to which these behests are thought to have been written by Zechariah, by Josiah, by Zerubbabel, or others of David’s posterity.

This view is supposed to be confirmed by various con-
2. Asaph is named as the author of twelve psalms—viz. I, lxxiii.—lxxviiii. He was one of David’s chief musicians. All the poems bearing his name cannot be his, for in Ps. lxxxviii., vii can ill: this is not reconciled with the historical circumstances of any period of David’s life, but suits exactly with those of the opening of the reign of Josiah. Some of these psalms—Ps. lxxxvi., civiti., cxxi.—are compacted of passages from previous psalms of David. Lastly, the Hebrew text [used for the Greek] in the version of the Targum of the Tenach is much fuelled by grammatical Chaldaisms, which are entirely unparalleled in Ps. i.—lxxii., and which thus afford strong evidence of a comparatively recent date. They cannot, therefore, it is claimed, be David’s own; yet it is held that the superscriptions are not on that account to be rejected as false, but must rather be properly interpreted, on the ground of the improbability that any would, carelessly or presumptuously, have prefixed David’s name to various psalms scattered through a collection, while yet leaving the rest—at least in books iv., v.—altogether unsuperscribed. Ingenious is this explanation, we prefer to adhere to the simple and obvious meaning of the titles as ascribing the psalms in question to David himself, and we do not feel constrained to seek other authors by the nature of the contents.

3. In considering secondly David’s eminence as a poet, and the delight he took in sacred song, we cannot wonder that he should be the author of so many of the Psalms—no fewer, in all likelihood, than half the collection: the wonder rather should be that we do not find more of it. It is certain he wrote some which are not in this book; see in 2 Sam. i., 19—27 his lament over Saul and Jonathan, and in xxi., 1—7 his last inspired effusion. His character and merit as the father of Hebrew melody and music—for it was in his hands and under his auspices that these flourished most—are thus set forth by the son of Sirach (xviii., 8—10). “In all his work he gave thanks: To the Holy and Most High he sang songs with all his heart in words of praise (pli: part: di: Ec.), and he loved his Maker. He set singers also before the altar, and from their music (pfi: ou) sweet melody resounded. He gave splendor to the feast, and adorned the solemn times unto perfection (pfi: ou ov:v: avx:ia avx:ia), in that they praised his holy name, and the sanctuary pealed with music from early morn.”

David’s compositions are generally distinguished by sweetness, softness, and grace, but sometimes, as in Ps. xii., i., ii., the devotional and the elevating strains are plaintive, owing to his multiplied and sore trials, both before and after his occupation of the throne. How often in his beset with dangers, harassed by foes, and chastised of God! Under these circumstances, how was he to be cheered, and gave songs of joy and sorrows on the saddened chords of the lyre! But in the midst of all he generally found relief, and his sorrow gave place to calm confidence and joy in God. What wonder that a soul so susceptible and devout as his should manifest emotions so strong, so changeful, and so various, seeing that he passed through the greatest vicissitudes of life? God took him from the shepherds to feed Jacob his people and Israel his inheritance (Ps. lxxviii., 70, 71). See Herder, Getat der ebr. Poete, ii., 257—301; and especially Thuduck (Poeunen. Einleitung, § 8), who gives a most admirable exhibition of the psalmist’s history and services. See David.

The example and countenance of the king naturally led others to cultivate poetry and music. It appears from Amos vi., 5 that lovers of pleasure took David’s compositions as a model for their worldly songs: how much more, in reference to the psalmist’s diurnal duties, may we infer from him producing sacred songs and hymns! The fine psalm in Hab. iii. is an exact imitation of his style as seen in Ps. xviii. The celebrated singers of his day were men, like himself, moved by the divine afflatus more than by the admiration of praise. These of the psalmists the names of several are preserved in the titles.
of Heman, “Maschil of Ethan,” have simply a convenient purport—the one psalm having been written, as, in fact, the rest of its superscription states, by the sons of Korah, the choir of which Heman was a member; and the others correspondingly proceeding from the third Levitical choir, which owed its origin to Ethan or Jeshurun. See Jeshurun.

Many conjectures have been formed respecting other writers, especially of the anonymous psalms. The Sept. seemingly gives, as authors, Jeremiah (Psa. cxxxviii), and Haggai and Zechariah (Psa. cxxxviii). But these conjectures are too uncertain to call for further notice in this place. Hitzig (Comment. über die Psalmen) ascribes to Jeremiah a large number of the elegiac or plaintive psalms.

More particularly, the Psalms may be arranged, according to the intimations of authorship contained in the titles, as follows:

A. Exclusively Davidic—xxxiii, xxxiv, xxxv, xxxvi, xxxvii, xxxviii, xxxix, lxxl.
B. Exclusively Levitical—xxx, xxxi, xxxii, xxxiii, xxxiv, xxxv, xxxvi, xxxvii, xxxviii, xxxix.
C. Chiefly Davidic—xxxvii, xxxviii.
D. Chiefly Levitical—xxxv, xxxvi, xxxvii, xxxviii.
E. Shorter—xxxvi, xxxvii.
F. Miscellaneous—xxxviii, xxxix, lxx.

VI. Dates and Occasions of the Psalms.—The dates of the Psalms, as must be obvious from what has been stated, are of the most various, ranging from the time of Moses to that of the captivity—a period of nearly 1000 years. In the time of king Jehoshaphat (about B.C. 896) Psa. lxxiii, setting forth the dangers of the nation, as we read in 2 Chron. xx, i–25, was composed, either by himself, or by some. Moses, and possibly, according to the title, by Jahaziel, “a Levite of the sons of Asaph,” who was then an inspired teacher (see ver. 14). In the days of Hezekiah, who was himself a poet (Isa. xxxix, 9–20), we may date, with great probability, the Korithie Psalms xlv and xlvii, which seem to celebrate the deliverance from Sennacherib (2 Kings xix, 35). In the period of the captivity we have evidently written such laments as Psa. xlv, lxxix, cii, and cxxxvii; and after its close, when the captives returned, we must manifestly date Psa. lxxiv.

Some have maintained that several psalms, especially lxxiv, were written even in the days of the Maccabees; but this is contrary to every probability, for, according to all accounts, the Canon had been closed before that time (see 2 Chron. xxxix). Moreover, the hypothesis of a Maccabean authorship of any portion of the Psalter can ill be reconciled with the history of the translation of the Septuagint. But the difficulties do not end here. How for we shall not here discuss the theories of Hitzig and his followers Lengerke and Justus Olshausen, who would represent the greater part of the Psalter as Maccaean—though it be—how that which we ascribe most naturally assign to the Maccaean period meet us not in the close, but in the middle (i.e. in the second and third books) of the Psalter? The three named by De Wette (Eicht. in das A. T. § 270) as bearing apparently a Maccaean impress are Psa. xlv, lx, lxxiv; and, in fact, these together with Psa. lxxiv, are perhaps all that would, when taken alone, seriously suggest the hypothesis of a Maccaean date. Whence, then, arise the early places in the Psalter which these occupy? But even in the case of these the internal evidence, when more narrowly examined, proves to be in favor of an earlier date. In the first place, the superscription of Psa. lx cannot possibly have been invented from the historical books, inasmuch as it disagrees with them in its details. Then the mention by name in that psalm of the Israelitish tribes, and of Moab and Philistia, is unsuited to the Maccaean epoch. In Psa. xlv the complaint is made that the tree of the nation of Israel was no longer spreading over the territory that God had assigned. Is it conceivable that a Maccaean psalmist should have held this language without making the slightest allusion to the Babylonian captivity as the cause of the complaint as if the tree's growth were now first seriously impeded by the wild stocks around, notwithstanding that it had once been entirely transplanted, and that, though restored to its place, it had been weak ever since? In Psa. lxiv it is explained that there was no prophet. Would that be a natural complaint at a time when Jewish prophecy had ceased for more than two centuries? Lastly, in Psa. lxix, the mention of “kingdoms” in ver. 6 ill suits the Maccaean time; while the way in which the psalm is cited by the author of the first book of Maccabees (vii, 16, 17), who omits those words which are foreign to his purpose, is such as would have hardly been adopted in reference to a contemporary composition.

The superscriptions, and the places which the psalms themselves severally occupy in the Psalter, are thus the two guiding clews by which, in conjunction with the internal evidence, their various occasions are to be determined. In the critical results obtained on these points by those scholars who have recognised and used these helps there is, not indeed uniformity, but at least visible tendency towards this. The following pages exhibits all that can with probability be ascertained on this head as to each psalm.

VII. Canon and Use.—The inspiration and canonical authority of the Psalms are established by the most abundant and convincing evidence. They never were, and never can be rejected, except by impious impugners of all divine revelation. Not to mention other ancient testimonies, we find complete evidence in the N.T., where the book is quoted or referred to as divine by Christ and his apostles at least seventy times. No other writing is so frequently cited, Isaiah, the next in the scale of quotation, being cited only about fifty-five times. Twice (Luke xx, 42 and Acts i, 20) we find distinct mention of the Book of Psalms (Bιβλιον Παλαιων). Once, however (Luke xxviii, 44), the name Psalms is used, not simply for this book, but for the Hagiographa, or the whole of the third division of the Hebrew Scriptures because in it the Psalms are the first and chief part, or possibly, as Haverbeck suggests (Einstellung, § xiv, p. 78), because the division consists mainly of poetry. It deserves notice that in Psa. cxvii the psalm begins, taken from the anonymous Psa. xxv, the book is indicated by David, most likely because he was the largest and most
eminent contributor, and also the patron and model of the other psalmists. For the same reasons many ancient and modern authors often speak of the book as the Psalms of David (Carpzov, Introd. ii, 98), without intending to ascribe all the productions to him.

In every age of the Church, the Psalms have been exalted for their excellence and their use for godly edifying (Carpzov, L. c. p. 109–116). Indeed, if Paul's estimate of ancient inspired Scripture (2 Tim. iii, 15–17) can be justly applied to any single book, that book must be the Psalms. Even in the N. T. there is scarcely a work of equal practical utility. Basil the Great and Chrysostom, Basil, expatiates most eloquently, and yet judiciously, on its excellence, and the close of Basil's eulogy is to this effect: “In it is found a perfect theology (κατακεχομένης τῆς θεολογίας θεοτροφίας): prophecy of Christ's sojourn in the flesh, threatening of judgment, hope of resurrection, fear of retribution, promises of glory, revelations of mysteries—all things are treasured in this book, as in some great and common storehouse.” Among the early Christians it was customary to learn the book by heart, that psalmody might enliven their social hours, and soften the fatigues and sooth the sorrows of life. They employed the Psalms, not only in their religious as secular services, of which use we find probable mention in 1 Cor. xiv, 26, but also at their meals and before retiring to rest, as Clement of Alexandria testifies (Παλαιός Θεός, τῶν ἴδιων εἰς ψαλμοδίαν, πρὸ τῆς κοι-πῆς). Of their use at meal we find an example also in the institution of the Lord's Supper (Matt. xxvi, 30). For their modern liturgical use, see PSALMODY; PSAL-TE.

VIII. Classification. Various classifications of the Psalms have been proposed (Carpzov, Introd. ii, 182–184). Tholuck would divide them, according to the matter, into songs of praise, of thanksgiving, of complaint, and of instruction. De Wette suggests another method of sorting them
ion, or the expression of some truth or maxim (Ps. i. xv, xxii, xxxiii, lxxvi, cxxxi, xxxiii). This is a numerous class.

4. Elegiac psalms, containing complaints under affliction and the persecution of enemies, and prayers for succor. This class, which comprises more than a third of the whole collection, has several subdivisions: (1) The lamentations or complaints of particular individuals (Ps. vii, xvii, xxii, lii, lii, iv, lv, cix). (2) National lamentations, mostly in a religious point of view (Ps. lixiv, lixxix, lxxx, cxxxvii). Some are both individual and national lamentations (Ps. lixiv, lixxvii, cii). Most of these psalms are of a late date.

(3) General psalms of complaint, reflections on the wickedness of the world (Ps. xx, cxxii, lixiv, xxxv). Didactic psalms, representing the goodness of God, the condition of the pious and of the godless (Ps. lixvi, lixix, lxxxii, lixiii).

5. Psalms relating to the king, patriotic hymns, etc. (Ps. xx, cxxii, lixiv, cx). 6. National psalms, containing allusions to the ancient history of the Hebrews and of the relation of the people to Jehovah (Ps. lixviii, cv, cxi, cxiv).

The Messianic psalms ought properly to constitute another separate class (Ps. ii, xxii, xl, lxxiii).

(Einleitung, p. 3), somewhat as below. It is obvious, however, that no very accurate classification can be made, since many are of diversified contents and uncertain time. The following distribution, while, perhaps, best comprise them in their general import.

1. Hymns in praise of Jehovah — Ichilim, in the proper sense. These are directed to Jehovah, from various motives and views, e.g. as the Creator of the universe and Lord of all (Ps. viii, xix, lxv, cvii, cviii, cxxix); as the Protector and Helper of Israel (Ps. xxvii, xxxii, lxvii, lxviii, lxv, lxvi, lxvii, lxxvi, lxxvi, cxxv, cxxvi); or as the Helper of individuals, with thanksgiving for deliverance (Ps. xxxvii, xxxiv, xxxiv, xl, cxxviii); while others refer to them or special attributes of Jehovah (Ps. xxvii, cxxix). These psalms contain the most sublime thoughts respecting God, nature, the government of the world, etc.; they also furnish the sources of many doctrinal ideas.

2. Temple hymns, sung at the consecration of the Temple, the entrance of the ark, or intended for the Temple service (Ps. vi, xxv, lxix, lxxvi, lxxvii, cxxvi, cxxv, cxxvi). So also pilgrim songs, sung by those who came to worship at the temple, etc. See Domo.ka.

3. Religious and moral psalms of a general character, containing the poetical expression of emotions and feelings. The subject, in that only right and therefore in God (Ps. xiii, xliii, xlii, xci, cxxvi, cxxv, cxxvi); longing for the worship of the sanctuary (Ps. xiii, xlii); and prayers for the forgiveness of sin (Ps. ii). So, also, didactic songs relating to relig-

4. Elegiac psalms, containing complaints under affliction and the persecution of enemies, and prayers for succor. This class, which comprises more than a third of the whole collection, has several subdivisions: (1) The lamentations or complaints of particular individuals (Ps. vii, xvii, xxii, lii, lii, iv, lv, cix). (2) National lamentations, mostly in a religious point of view (Ps. lixiv, lixxix, lxxx, cxxxvii). Some are both individual and national lamentations (Ps. lixiv, lixxvii, cii). Most of these psalms are of a late date.

(3) General psalms of complaint, reflections on the wickedness of the world (Ps. xx, cxxii, lixiv, xxxv). Didactic psalms, representing the goodness of God, the condition of the pious and of the godless (Ps. lixvi, lixix, lxxxii, lixiii).

5. Psalms relating to the king, patriotic hymns, etc. (Ps. xx, cxxii, lixiv, cx). 6. National psalms, containing allusions to the ancient history of the Hebrews and of the relation of the people to Jehovah (Ps. lixviii, cv, cxi, cxiv).

The Messianic psalms ought properly to constitute another separate class (Ps. ii, xxii, xl, lxxiii).

(Einleitung, p. 3), somewhat as below. It is obvious, however, that no very accurate classification can be made, since many are of diversified contents and uncertain time. The following distribution, while, perhaps, best comprise them in their general import.

1. Hymns in praise of Jehovah — Ichilim, in the proper sense. These are directed to Jehovah, from various motives and views, e.g. as the Creator of the universe and Lord of all (Ps. viii, xix, lxv, cvii, cviii, cxxix); as the Protector and Helper of Israel (Ps. xxvii, xxxii, lxvii, lxviii, lxvi, lxvi, lxvi, lxxvi, lxxvi, cxxv, cxxvi); or as the Helper of individuals, with thanksgiving for deliverance (Ps. xxxvii, xxxiv, xxxiv, xl, cxxviii); while others refer to them or special attributes of Jehovah (Ps. xxvii, cxxix). These psalms contain the most sublime thoughts respecting God, nature, the government of the world, etc.; they also furnish the sources of many doctrinal ideas.

2. Temple hymns, sung at the consecration of the Temple, the entrance of the ark, or intended for the Temple service (Ps. vi, xxv, lxix, lxxvi, lxxvii, cxxvi, cxxv, cxxvi). So also pilgrim songs, sung by those who came to worship at the temple, etc. See Domo.ka.

3. Religious and moral psalms of a general character, containing the poetical expression of emotions and feelings. The subject, in that only right and therefore in God (Ps. xiii, xliii, xlii, xci, cxxvi, cxxv, cxxvi); longing for the worship of the sanctuary (Ps. xiii, xlii); and prayers for the forgiveness of sin (Ps. ii). So, also, didactic songs relating to relig-

4. Elegiac psalms, containing complaints under affliction and the persecution of enemies, and prayers for succor. This class, which comprises more than a third of the whole collection, has several subdivisions: (1) The lamentations or complaints of particular individuals (Ps. vii, xvii, xxii, lii, lii, iv, lv, cix). (2) National lamentations, mostly in a religious point of view (Ps. lixiv, lixxix, lxxx, cxxxvii). Some are both individual and national lamentations (Ps. lixiv, lixxvii, cii). Most of these psalms are of a late date.

(3) General psalms of complaint, reflections on the wickedness of the world (Ps. xx, cxxii, lixiv, xxxv). Didactic psalms, representing the goodness of God, the condition of the pious and of the godless (Ps. lixvi, lixix, lxxxii, lixiii).

5. Psalms relating to the king, patriotic hymns, etc. (Ps. xx, cxxii, lixiv, cx). 6. National psalms, containing allusions to the ancient history of the Hebrews and of the relation of the people to Jehovah (Ps. lixviii, cv, cxi, cxiv).

The Messianic psalms ought properly to constitute another separate class (Ps. ii, xxii, xl, lxxiii).
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Ewald, Tholuck, and others, pronounce the poetry of the Psalms to be of the lyric order. 'They are,' says De Wette (Einführung in die Psalmen, p. 2), "lyric in the proper sense; for among the Hebrews, as among the ancients generally, poetry, singing, and music were united, and the inscriptions to most of the Psalms determine their connection with music, though in a way not always intelligible to us. Also, as many of these compositions deserve to be called lyric. The essence of lyric poetry is the immediate expression of feeling, and feeling is the sphere in which most of the Psalms move. Pain, grief, fear, hope, joy, trust, gratitude, submission to God—everything that moves and elevates the heart is there expressed. Most of these psalms are the lively effusions of the excited, susceptible heart, the fresh off-spring of inspiration and elevation of thought; while only a few are spiritless imitations and compilations, or unpoetic forms of prayer, temple hymns, and collections of proverbs.' For fuller information on this subject, see Porat.

X. Prophetic and Messianic Significance.—The moral struggle between godliness and ungodliness, so vividly depicted in the Psalms, culminates, in Holy Scripture, in the life of the Incarnate Son of God upon earth. It ought not to be forgotten that the Psalms themselves definitely anticipated this culmination. Now, there are in the Psalter at least three psalms of which the interest evidently centres in a person distinct from the speaker, and which, since they cannot, without violence to the language, be assigned to any but the Messiah, may be termed indirectly and exclusively Messianic. We re-
fer to Ps. ii, xlv, cx, to which may, perhaps, be added Ps. lxix.

It would be strange if these few psalms stood, in their prophetical significance, absolutely alone among the rest; the more so, as much as Ps. ii forms part of the preface to the first book of the Psalter, and would, as such, be entirely out of place, did not its general theme virtually extend itself over those that follow, in which the interest generally centres in the figure of the suppliant or worshipper himself. Hence the impossibility of viewing the psalms generally, notwithstanding the historical drapery in which they are outwardly clothed, as simply the past deviations of the historical David or the historical Israel. Other arguments to the same effect are furnished by the idealized representa-
tions which many of them present: by the outward points of contact between their language and the actual earthly career of our Saviour; by the frequent references made to them both by our Saviour himself and by the Evangelists; and by the view taken of them by several Fathers of the Church in several treatises of the Targum. There is yet another circumstance well worthy of note in its bearing upon this subject. Alike in the earlier and in the later portions of the Psalter, all those psalms which are of a personal rather than of a national character are marked in the superscriptions with the name of David. It results from this that, while the Davidic psalms are partly personal, partly national, the Levitical psalms are uniformly national. Exceptions to this rule exist only in appearance: thus Ps. lxxii, although couched in the first person singular, is really a prayer of the Jewish faithful against the Assyrian in-
vaders; and in Ps. xlii, xliii, it is the feeling of an ex-
iled company rather than of a single individual to which utterance is given. It thus follows that it was only those psalms which were types of Christ by external office and lineage as well as by inward piety that were charged by the Holy Spirit to set forth beforehand, in Christ's own name and person, the sufferings that awaited him and the glory that should follow. The national hymns of Israel are, indeed, also prospective; but in general they anticipate rather the struggles and the triumphs of the Christian Church than those of Christ himself.

We annex a list of the chief passages in the Psalms which are in anywise quoted or embodied in the N. T., showing more or less clearly this anticipative character:

Ps. ii. 1, 2, 7, 8, 9; iv. 4; v. 9; vi. 5, 8; viii. 2, 4–6; x. 7; xiv. 1–9; xvi. 8–11; xviii. 4, 49; xix. 4; xxii. 1, 8; xxiii. 5, 6, 7; xxvii. 12; xxix. 12; xxx. 8, 12–16, 20; xxxii. 9; xxxvi. 1; xxxvii. 11; xl. 6–8; xii. 9; xlv. 22; xlvii. 6, 7; xlviii. 2; li. 4; lvii. 18; lxxx. 4, 9, 22, 23, 25; lxxvii. 8; lxxix. 22, 24; lxxxi. 6; lxxxi. 9; lxxxi. 10; lxxxi. 20; xc. 4; xci. 11, 12; xcii. 7; xiv. 11; xcvi. 22; cxii. 5; cxiv. 8; cxv. 1, 6; cxx. xvi. 10; cxvii. 6, 24; cxvii. 20, 25, 26, 28; cxviii. 5; cxix. 3. See Quotations.

XI. Moral Characteristics of the Psalms.—The great doctrines and precepts embodied in the Psalms—what views they give of God and his government, of man and his sinfulness, of piety and morals, of a future state, and of the Messiah—are most ably set forth by Tholuck in his Einführung, § 4.

Foremost among these meets us, undoubtedly, the universal recourse to communion with God. "My voice is unto God, and I will cry" (Psa. lxviii. 1), might well stand as a motto to the whole of the Psal-
ter; for, whether immersed in the depths, or blessed with greatness and comfort on one side, it is to God that the psalmist's voice seems ever to soar spontane-
ously aloft. Alike in the welcome of present deliver-
ance or in the presentiments of its accomplishment, he dresses himself straight to God as the object of his praise. Alike in the persecutions of his enemies and in the deserts of his friends, in wretchedness of body and in the agonies of inward repentance, in the mo-
terms of distress and in the voice of apparent despair, it is direct to God that he utters forth his ap-
plications. Despair, we say; for, such as the de-
scription goes, is the psalmist's state in Psa. lxxxviii. But meanwhile he is praying: the apparent impos-
sibility of deliverance cannot restrain his Godward voice; and so the very force of communion with God carries him, almost unsawers to himself, through the trial.

Connected with this is the faith by which he every-
where lives in God rather than in himself. God's mercies, God's greatness, form the sphere in which his thoughts are ever moving. Even when, through ex-
cess of affliction, reason is rendered powerless, the naked contemplation of God's wonders of old forms his effect-
ual support (Psa. lxxvii).

It is of the essence of such faith that the psalmist's view of the perfections of God should be true and vi-
lid. The Psalter describes God as he is; it gives his tes-
timonies to his power and providence, his love and faithfulness, his holiness and righteousness. Corre-
spondingly it testifies against every form of idol which men would substitute in the living God's place, whet-
ber it be the outward image, the work of men's hands (Psa. cxxv), or whether it be the inward vanity of earthly comfort and beauty, to be purchased at the cost of the honor which cometh from God alone (Psa. ivv). The solemn "See that there is no idol-way (2 X X 11) in me" of Psa. cxxxix—the striving of the heart after the very truth, and taught besides—is the exact anticipa-
tion of the "Little children, keep yourselves from idols" of the loved apostle in the N. T.

The Psalms not only set forth the perfections of God; they present to us by way of warning him by the acknowledgment and adoration of his perfe-
tions. They encourage all outward rites and means of worship: new songs, use of musical instruments of all kinds, appearance in God's courts, lifting-up of hands, prostration at his footstool, holy apparel (A. V. "beauty of holiness of his house"). Among these they recognise the ordi-
nance of sacrifice (Psa. iv. v, xxxii. ii) as an expression of the worshipper's consecration of himself to God's ser-
vices. But not the less do they repudiate the outward rite when separated from that which it was designed to express (Psa. xi. lix.): "by brokenness of heart, from erring man, the genuine sacrifice which God re-
quires (Psa. ii)."

Similar depth is observable in the view taken by the
psalmists of human sin. It is to be traced not only in its outward manifestations, but also in the inward workings of the heart (Psa. xxxvii), and is to be primarily ascribed to the influence of our ancestors (Psa. lii). It is the natural outcome of the utter corruption of the ungodly world (Psa. xiv); on the other, the encouragement to genuine repentance, the assurance of divine forgiveness (Psa. xxxii), and the trust in God as the source of complete redemption (Psa. cxxx).

With regard to the last, the psalmist, while warmly acknowledging the excellency, feels yet that it cannot so effectually guide his own unassisted exertions as to preserve him from error (Psa. xii). He needs an additional grace from above, the grace of God's Holy Spirit (Psa. li). But God's Spirit is also a free spirit (ibid.); led by this, he will discern the law, with all its precepts, to be no arbitrary rule of bondage, but rather a charter and instrument of liberty (Psa. cxxx).

The Psalms bear repeated testimony to the duty of instructing others in the ways of holiness (Psa. xxxii, xxxii, ix, ixi). They also indirectly enforce the duty of love to one's neighbor, by bidding them to love their fellow-creatures (Psa. lxvii, cix, cixi; Prov. 4). On the other hand, they denounce, in the strongest terms, the judgments of God on transgressors. We here particularly notice what are called the vindictive psalms — namely, those which contain expressions of wrath and invocations against the enemies of God and his people, such as Psa. lix, cxiv, cxix, and which, in consequence, are apt to shock the feelings of some Christian readers. In order to obviate this objection, most of our pious commentators insist that the expressions are not melodictions or imprecations, but simple declarations of what will or may take place. But this is utterly inadmissible; for in several of the most startling passages the language in the original is plainly imperative, and not indicative (see Psa. lix, cxiv, cxviii, 23, 25; cxix, 6). The truth is that only a morbid benevolence, a mistaken philanthropy, takes offense at these psalms; for in reality they are not opposed to the spirit of the Gospel, or to that love of enemies which Christ enjoined. Resentment against evil-doers is so far from being sinful that we find it exemplified in the meek and spotless Redeemer himself (see Mark ii, 5).

If the expression is used in the scriptures with any especial reference to how could Paul (1 Cor. xvi, 22) wish the enemy of Christ to be accursed (καὶ ἀνατρικέονται), or say of his own enemy, Alexander the coppersmith, "The Lord reward him according to his works" (2 Tim. iv, 14); and, especially, how can the spirit of the good be the devil's? The very words of Scripture authorize, (Ps. xiv, 17;Prov. 13, 19;Is. 11, 4;Jer. 17, 5;Eph. 4, 31;Phil. 4, 8;Col. 3, 8;Rom. 15, 13;1 Peter 3, 9;James 1, 27;2 Peter 3, 13). These passages illustrate the common meaning of the word, and are in harmony with the divine law which God has given to man to judge his fellow-man in the fear of God. It is the duty of the Christian, therefore, to use wisdom and prudence in exercising this right of judgment, that he may be guided to the spirit of charity and mercy, and not to the spirit of revenge.

In the American Bibliotheca Sacra for February, 1844. Such imprecations in the Psalms, however, are usually levied against transgressors as a body, and are uniformly uttered on the hypothesis of their wilful persistence in evil, in which case the overthrow of the sinner becomes a necessary part of the uprooting of sin. They are in no inconsistent with any efforts to lead sinners, individually, to repentance. See IMPRECATION.

This brings us to notice the faith of the psalmists in a righteous recompense to all men according to their deeds (Psa. xxxvii, et seq.). They generally expected that men would receive such recompense, in great measure, during their own lifetime. Yet they felt wished that it was not then complete; it perpetuated itself to their children (Psa. xxxvii, 25; cx, 12, et seq.); and thus we find set forth in the Psalms, with sufficient distinctness, though in an unattuned, and consequently imperfect, form, the doctrine of a retribution after death.

XII. Commentaries. — The following are the special expository helps on the whole book; we designate a few of the most important by an asterisk, and we omit many that are merely practical, homiletical, and literal:

- Orig. Seleta (in Opp. ii, 510); also Scholica (in Galland's Bibl. Patr. vol. xiv); Eusebius, Commentarii (Gr. and Lat. in Montfaucon's Collecta Nota, vol. i); Athanasius (in Tsaritsyn's); also shows itself alike in deeds, in words (Psa. xxvii, cxii), and in thoughts (Psa. cxxx); nor is even the believer able to discern all its various ramifications (Psa. xix).

- Connected with this view of sin is, on the one hand, the picture of the utter corruption of the ungodly world (Psa. xiv); on the other, the encouragement to genuine repentance, the assurance of divine forgiveness (Psa. xxxii), and the trust in God as the source of complete redemption (Psa. cxxx).

- The Psalms bear repeated testimony to the duty of instructing others in the ways of holiness (Psa. xxxii, xxxii, ix, ixi). They also indirectly enforce the duty of love to one's neighbor, by bidding them to love their fellow-creatures (Psa. lxvii, cix, cxix, cxixi; Prov. 4). On the other hand, they denounce, in the strongest terms, the judgments of God on transgressors. We here particularly notice what are called the vindictive psalms — namely, those which contain expressions of wrath and invocations against the enemies of God and his people, such as Psa. lix, cxiv, cxix, and which, in consequence, are apt to shock the feelings of some Christian readers. In order to obviate this objection, most of our pious commentators insist that the expressions are not melodictions or imprecations, but simple declarations of what will or may take place. But this is utterly inadmissible; for in several of the most startling passages the language in the original is plainly imperative, and not indicative (see Psa. lix, cxiv, cxviii, 23, 25; cxix, 6). The truth is that only a morbid benevolence, a mistaken philanthropy, takes offense at these psalms; for in reality they are not opposed to the spirit of the Gospel, or to that love of enemies which Christ enjoined. Resentment against evil-doers is so far from being sinful that we find it exemplified in the meek and spotless Redeemer himself (see Mark iii, 5).

- If the expression is used in the scriptures with any especial reference to how could Paul (1 Cor. xvi, 22) wish the enemy of Christ to be accursed (καὶ ἀνατρικέονται), or say of his own enemy, Alexander the coppersmith, "The Lord reward him according to his works" (2 Tim. iv, 14); and, especially, how can the spirit of the good be the devil's? The very words of Scripture authorize, (Ps. xiv, 17;Prov. 13, 19;Is. 11, 4;Jer. 17, 5;Eph. 4, 31;Phil. 4, 8;Col. 3, 8;Rom. 15, 13;1 Peter 3, 9;James 1, 27;2 Peter 3, 13). These passages illustrate the common meaning of the word, and are in harmony with the divine law which God has given to man to judge his fellow-man in the fear of God. It is the duty of the Christian, therefore, to use wisdom and prudence in exercising this right of judgment, that he may be guided to the spirit of charity and mercy, and not to the spirit of revenge.

- In the American Bibliotheca Sacra for February, 1844. Such imprecations in the Psalms, however, are usually levied against transgressors as a body, and are uniformly uttered on the hypothesis of their wilful persistence in evil, in which case the overthrow of the sinner becomes a necessary part of the uprooting of sin. They are in no inconsistent with any efforts to lead sinners, individually, to repentance. See IMPRECATION.

- This brings us to notice the faith of the psalmists in a righteous recompense to all men according to their deeds (Psa. xxxvii, et seq.). They generally expected that men would receive such recompense, in great measure, during their own lifetime. Yet they felt wished that it was not then complete; it perpetuated itself to their children (Psa. xxxvii, 25; cx, 12, et seq.); and thus we find set forth in the Psalms, with sufficient distinctness, though in an unattuned, and consequently imperfect, form, the doctrine of a retribution after death.
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Psalter. This word is often used by ancient writers for the book of Psalms, considered as a separate book of Holy Scripture. It obtained among later Church writers a more technical meaning as the book in which the Psalms are arranged for the service of the Church. The Roman Catholic Psalter, in fact, does not follow the Scriptural order of the Psalms, but arranges them for the various services in a different manner. In the English Psalter, as it exists in the Book of Common Prayer, the Psalter is arranged in such a way as to give a reading for every day in the month, and there are also special selections to be used in the discretion of the minister. The translation is not that of the King James Version [*i.e., our common Bible], but the earlier version of Cranmer's Bible, which accounts for the difference between the Psalms of the Prayer-book and those of the original version of the Bible. The use of the Psalter as a system of psalmody seems to have been borrowed from the synagogue. The Psalter was always a favorite book, and was obtained as a most extensive use both in private and public. It was regarded as an epitome of the Bible, and as especially adapted to the use of youth and the people at large. The clergy were required to commit this book to memory. In later times, when the Bible as a whole was denied to the people, the Latin Psalter was left in their hands; and at the time of the Reformation the penitential psalms were in the hands and mouths of the people.

Sometimes the book, for the sake of convenience, was divided into five portions, to correspond with the Pentateuch, and was used in different classes according to their character, as hallelujahs, baptizal, penitential, burial psalms, etc. In the time of St. Augustine and St. Chrysostom the burial psalms were xxii., xlii., xliii., lix., cl.; in the Roman Church they are xxii., xxx., xcvii., and the seven penitentials; in the English Ch.
opened to him, and he entered like a father in the house of his sons (viii, 15-20). Once in the city, he also took the castles and became the ruler of Jerusalem with the battering-rams (viii, 21: ii, 1). Jerusalem was trodden down by the heathen (ii, 20); even the altar of God was desecrated (viii, 14: ii, 5). Three of the most prominent men and sages of the council were killed, and the blood of the inhabitants of Jerusalem was shed like the water of impurity (viii, 23). The inhabitants of the country were carried away as captives into the West, and the princes for a desolation (xiv, 10-16). At last, the dragon who took Jerusalem was killed at the mountain of Egypt on the sea (ii, 29). It hardly needs any further explanation that all these events fully agree with the history of Pompey. The princes who arrogated to themselves the throne of David are the Ausonians (v, v.), who, since the time of Aristobulus I, called themselves kings. The last princes of this house, Alexander Janneus and Aristobulus II, favored the Sadducees, and in the eyes of the Pharisaic author they are sinners and unlawful. The "foreign and strong men" whom God brings from the ends of the earth is Pompey. The princes who meet him are Aristobulus II and Hyrcanus II; the adherents of the latter admit Pompey into the city, and he soon takes the other part with force (iv, xiv, ii, 1), which was held by Aristobulus's party. All the other circumstances fully agree with the history of Pompey's campaign in Palestine; and the fact that the 2d Psalm speaks of the manner in which Pompey died, in B.C. 48, fully proves the assumption that it was written soon after this event, while the 8th and 17th psalms, as well as the greater part of the others, may have been written between 68 and 48.

The spirit which runs through these psalms is that of Pharisaic Judaism. They breathe an earnest moral tone and true piety; but the righteousness which they preach, and the absence of which they deplore, is the one which can only be attained by keeping the Pharisaic law. They are the work of a century after the death of Jesus, and are written in a century which is an encouragement to assert that the psalms were not written at Alexandria, but in Palestine.


Psalterium Marianum is the name by which the devotion of the rosary is sometimes indicated, because in it (excepting the initial prayers), instead of the 150 psalms of the Scripture, the Ave Maria, in honor of the Virgin Mary, is recited 150 times.

Psaltery, an Anglicism of the Greek ψαλτήριον, is used in the A. V. as the rendering of two Hebrew words, both of which signified stringed instruments of music to accompany the voice. In our treatment of them we observe a strictly archaeological line of investigation. See Kitto's note on Ps. xxii, 3, in his Pictorial Bible; Bible in Cyclop., i, 70, 218; and comp. Musical Instruments.

1. 29, or 2/2, nœd, is so rendered in the A. V. in all passages where it occurs, except in Isa. v. 12; xiv, 11; xxii, 24 marg.; Amos v. 28; vi, 5, where it is translated viol, following the Geneva Version, which has viola in all cases except 2 Sam. vi. 5; 1 Kings x. 12 ("psaltery"); 2 Esdr. x. 21; Zacch. xii. 21 ("psaltery"); Isa. xxii, 24 ("musick"); and Wisd. xix, 18 ("instrument of musike"). The ancient viol was a six-stringed guitar. "Viol had six strings, and the position of the fingers was marked on the finger-board by frets, as in the guitar of the present day" (ChapPELL, Pop. Mus. i, 246). In the Prayers for the Sick, the word Gratulatur (xiv, 1) is rendered "lute." This instrument resembled the guitar, but was superior in tone, "being larger, and having a convex back, somewhat like the vertical section of a gourd, or more nearly resembling that of a pear.... It had six strings, the number of which was never more than any other, the first, or treble, being sometimes a single string. The head in which the pegs to turn the strings were inserted receded almost at a right angle" (ChapPell, i, 102). These three instruments—the psaltery or psalterium, the viol, and the guitar—were mentioned in the old English poets, and were clearly instruments resembling each other, though still different. Thus in Chaucer's Flower and Leafe, p. 857—

"And before hem went ministrées many one, As harpes, pipes, lutes, and saytry;" and again in Drayton's Polyolbion, iv, 356—

"The trembling lute some touch, some straine the virgol best."

The word psaltery in its present form appears to have been introduced about the time of the 16th century, for it occurs in the unmodified form postrary in two passages of the Geneva Version (1560). Again, in North's Plutarch (Them. [ed. 1566], p. 124) we read that The mistoicale, "being mocked ... by some that had studied humanitie, and other liberall sciences, was driuen for revenge and his owne defence, to conquer with graver and stoute words, saying, that in deed he could no skill to tune a harpe, nor a viol, nor to play of a psaltery; but if they did put a citie into his bands that was of small name, weake, and little, he knew wares enough to take it with the string of his gun, the grave ψαλτήριον, from which our word is derived, denotes an instrument played with the fingers instead of a plectrum or quill, the verb ψαλειν being used (Erasp. 4. 294, p. 274) of strumming the bowstring (comp. ψαλειν το λιθον, Erasp. Ion, p. 173). But it only occurs in the Sept. as the rendering of the Hebrew נָאֶב in Neh. xii, 27.
Isa. v. 12, and in all the passages of the Psalms, except Ps. lxxvi. 22 (כָּלַחַים) and Ps. lxxvi. 2 (אָדוֹן), while in Amos v. 23; vi. 6, the general term דִּקְדְּקַבּ לָא employed. In all other cases דִּקְדְּקַבּ לָא represents דִּקְדְּקַבּ לָא or דִּקְדְּקַבּ לָא. These various renderings are sufficient to show that at the time the translation of the Sept. was made there was no certain identification of it, or Hebrew instrument with any known to the translators. The rendering דִּקְדְּקַבּ לָא commends itself on account of the similarity of the Greek word with the Hebrew. Josephus appears to have regarded them as equivalent, and his is the only direct evidence upon the point. He tells us (Ant. vii. 12, 3) that the difference between the συνάρτα (Heb. דִּקְדְּקַבּ לָא, טְוֶנָּר) and the דִּקְדְּקַבּ לָא was that the former had ten strings and was played with the plectrum, the latter had twelve notes and was played with the hand. Forty thousand of these instruments, he adds (Ant. vii. 8, 6), were made of electrum by Solomon for the Temple choir. Rashi (on Isa. v. 12) says that the דִּקְדְּקַבּ לָא had more strings and pegs than the טְוֶנָּר. That דִּקְדְּקַבּ לָא was a foreign name is evident from Strabo (a, 471) and from Athenaeus (iv, 176), where its origin is said to be Sidonian. Beyond this, and that it was a stringed instrument (Athen. iv, 176), played by the hand (Ovid, Ars Am. iii, 327), we know nothing of it; but in these facts we have strong presumptive evidence that דִּקְדְּקַבּ לָא and דִּקְדְּקַבּ לָא are the same: and that the דִּקְדְּקַבּ לָא and פַּדְּשֵׁר אֶרֶב are identical appearances from the glossary of Philoxenus, where דִּקְדְּקַבּ לָא = פַּדְּשֵׁר אֶרֶב, and דִּקְדְּקַבּ לָא = פַּדְּשֵׁר אֶרֶב, and from Suidas makes פַּדְּשֵׁר אֶרֶב and פְּדָשֶׁר אֶרֶב synonymous. Of the psaltery among the Greeks there appear to have been two kinds—the ρήριας, which was of Persian (Athen. xiv. 638) or Libyan (ibid. p. 635) origin, and the μυκάδα. The former had only two (ibid. iv. 183) or three (ibid.) strings; the latter as many as twenty (ibid. xiv. 634), though sometimes only five (ibid. p. 637). They are sometimes said to be the same, and were evidently of the same kind. Both Isidore (De Orig., iii, 21) and Cassiodorus (Pref. in Paul. c. 4) describe the psaltery as triangular in shape, like the Greek Δ, with the sounding-board above the strings, which were struck downwards. The latter adds that it was played with a plectrum, so that he contradicts Josephus if the psaltery and דִּקְדְּקַבּ לָא are really the same. In this case Josephus is the rather to be trusted. St. Augustine (on Ps. xxxvii. 13) makes the position of the sounding-board the point in which the cithara and psaltery differ; in the former it is below, in the latter above the strings. His language implies that both were played with the plectrum. The distinction between the cithara and psaltery is observed by Jerome (Paul. c. 4). From these conflicting accounts it is impossible to say positively with what instrument the דִּקְדְּקַבּ לָא of the Hebrew exactly corresponded. It was probably of various kinds, as Kimchi says in his note on Isa.

xxii. 24, differing from each other both with regard to the position of the pegs and the number of the strings. In illustration of the descriptions of Isidorus and Cassiodorus reference may be made to the drawings from Egyptian musical instruments given by Sir Gard. Wilkinson (Ant. Eg. ii. 266, 267), some one of which may correspond to the Hebrew דִּקְדְּקַבּ לָא. Munk (Palialtor, pl. 16, figs. 12, 13) gives an engraving of an instrument which Niebuhr saw. Its form is that of an inverted Delta placed upon a round box of wood covered with skin. Abraham de Porta-Leone, the author of Shitte Huppogborin (c. 6), identifies the דִּקְדְּקַבּ לָא with the Italian liuto (the lute), or rather with the particular kind called liuto chiavironato (the German mundoline), the thirteen strings of which were of gut or sinew, and were struck with a quill. See Harp.

The דִּקְדְּקַבּ לָא (Ps. xxxiii. 2; xcvii. 3 [4]; cxliv. 9) appears to have been an instrument of the psaltery kind of a peculiar form or number of strings (Forkel, Gesch. der Mus. i. 183). Aben-Ezra (on Ps. cl. 3) says the דִּקְדְּקַבּ לָא had ten plates; so that he must have considered it to be a kind of pipe. As the latter term signifies ten, and never occurs but in connection with the דִּקְדְּקַבּ לָא, the conjecture is natural that the two instruments may have differed from each other only in the number of their strings, or the openings at the bottom. Hence we meet with the Sept. translation by ἑκάστυ, and in the Chaldeer, Syriac, and Arabic words expressing an instrument of ten strings, which is also followed in the A. V. (Ps. xxxiii. 2; cxliv. 1). We see no reason to dissent from this conclusion. Pfeiffer was inclined to think that the דִּקְדְּקַבּ לָא may have been the quadrangular lyre which is represented in different varieties in ancient monuments (figs. 1 and 2 of the accompanying cut), and which has usually ten strings, though sometimes more. See Viol.

Miscellaneous Ancient Stringed Instruments.

From the fact that דִּקְדְּקַבּ לָא in Hebrew also signifies a wine-bottle or skin, it has been conjectured that the term when applied to a musical instrument denotes a kind of bagpipe—the old English cornemate, French cornemuse; but it seems clear, whatever else may be obscure concerning it, that the דִּקְדְּקַבּ לָא was a stringed instrument. In the Mishna (Kilam, xvi, 7) mention is made of a case (םַלְכָּה לָא) in which it was kept. See Bottle.

The first appearance of the דִּקְדְּקַבּ לָא in the history of the Old Test. is in connection with the "string" of prophets who met Saul as they came down from the high place (1 Sam. x. 5). Here it is clearly used in a religious service, as again (2 Sam. vii. 5; 1 Chron. xiii. 8) when David brought the ark from Kirjath-jearim. In the Temple band organized by David were the players on psalteries (1 Chron. xv. 16, 20), who accompanied the ark from the house of Obad-edom (xx. 28). They played when the ark was brought into the Temple (2 Chron. v. 12); at the thanksgiving for Jehoshaphat's

Triangular Musical Instrument from Herculanenum.
victory (xx, 28); at the restoration of the Temple under Herod (xxix, 25), and the dedication of the walls of Jerusalem after they were rebuilt by Nehemiah (Neh. xii, 27). In all these cases, and in the passages in the Psalms where allusion is made to it, the Psaltery is associated with religious services. (2) Amos vi, 2; Ezek. x, 22.) It had its part also in private festivities, as is evident from Isa. v, 12; xiv, 11; xxii, 24; Amos vi, 5, where it is associated with banquetts and luxurious indulgence. It appears (Isa. xiv, 11) to have had soft, plaintive tones. The instrumenstaries of David were made of cypres (2 Sam. vi, 5), those of Solomon of algum or almug trees (2 Chron. ix, 11). See Psal.

MOBY.

2. Among the instruments of the band which played before Nebuchadnezzar's golden image on the plains of Dura, there were the "psaltery" (Παιστρυβον, Dan. iii, 5, 10, 15; Παιστρυβον, Psaumier). The Chaldean word appears to be merely a modification of the Greek Παιστρυβον. Attention is called to the fact that the word is singular (see Gesenius, Thesaur. p. 1116), the termination "ον" corresponding to the Greek "ον". This, in a more narrow and exact sense, denotes an instrument like the cikara (Lemprid. Al Serer), played with both hands, and called the magadis, paryc (Acts iv, 33, 39); but according to Jerome (Proem. in Psalm.) it was the later Greek name for the navbar or sekel above. See Music.

PASTYRHIANS or Pastryrians, a sect of Arians, who were followers of Theocritus, a zealous paquot-cook (ψαυτρολογος) of Constantinople, who maintained the heresy of Arius in the form that the first person in the Trinity existed before the Son had a being; thus denying the eternal generation of Christ. Brought to trial in the Council of Antioch, A.D. 360, they maintained that the Son was not like the Father as to will; that he was taken from nothing, or made of nothing; and that in God generation was not to be distinguished from creation. They were also called也成为 They. See Theodorus, Hier. Hist. vol. iv.

Pisthene, NICHOLAS, a French prelate, was born in 1518 at Chaumont-sur-Aine, dioce of Verdun, of very humble parentage. He was educated by his uncle, Francois Pashane, abbé of St. Paul of Verdun, who sent him successively to the universities of Paris, Orleans, and Poitiers, and was made a priest in his favor in 1538. Soon after Nicholas took the habit of the Premonstrants. In 1548 the cardinal Jean de Lorraine abdicated in his favor the bishopric of Verdun. He assisted at the Council of Trent in 1550 and in 1562, arguing against the abuse of the regular benefices, and made for himself some enemies. He died at Verdun, Aug. 19, 1578. He gave to the world Collectio Actorum et Decretorum Concilii Tridentini (Etival, 1725), a curious journal of all that was done at the council from Nov. 11, 1562, until its conclusion, which was published by F. Hugel, abbe of Etival: Pratissel Longe de la Chane

Psarographa (ψαυτογραφος) means those writings the title (ψαυτογραφος) of which names a false author instead of the true one. This designation is often applied to the Apocrypha, although there are many Apocrypha which name no author at all in their title. A number of Protestant theologians restrict the term psarographa to such writings of the O. T. as were composed in the Greek language shortly before or after Christ, and falsely attributed to the patriarchs and prophets of the Old Covenant, as, e.g., the testament of the twelve patriarchs, the book of Enoch, etc. They designate by the name of Apocrypha the writings falsely attributed to the apostles and disciples of Jesus. See APOCRYPHA.

Psuedodox (ψαυτοδοξια, from ψευδος, false

hood, and δοξα, opinion) designates a false or deceptive opinion, and hence is employed for superstition and idolatry. The term pseudodoxa is often confused with pseudodoxi (from διασυνειδεια, instruction); as he who holds erroneous opinions (ψευτοδοξος), if he communicates them, becomes a false teacher (ψευτοδοξασκος). The opposite of these two expressions ought to be orthodoxy and orthodoxi, but the latter two words are used in a somewhat different sense. See Heresy.

The word pseudos is of recent formation, and means a general inclination to the false, which shows itself in thoughts, words, and doctrines, as well as in acts and in the social intercourse of life.

Psuedolatry (ψευτολατρεια, from ψευδος, false

hood, and λατρεια, service) designates a false worship of which the Christian writers, who seem to have first formed this word, accused the pagans, on account of their polytheism. Pseudolatry has also penetrated into the Christian Church; for wherever we find the worship of images (iconolatry, or idolatry), there is pseudolatry present.

Psedolosy and Pseudomomancy (ψευδολογια, ψευδομαντια, from λογος, speech, and μαντια, prediction) are in the mutual relation of species and genus. The former refers to false and deceptive speaking in general; the latter to the foretelling of future events, in which, in this case, there is neither truth nor freedom. The same relation exists between the pseudologist and the pseudomaniast, called also pseudo-prophet. See Prophecy. Comp. also Lucian's Pseudomastia, by which title he designates an impostor of his time called Alexander (Alexander Impostor). Pseudomancy would be simulated fortune (manta); for men were simulated as well as bodily. Both pretences are mean, the former still more than the latter: for he who pretends to be mentally disengaged plays the part of a being deprived of reason and freedom. Criminals sometimes recur to this artifice to escape the responsibility of their actions; lawyers like, in desperate cases, to resort to the plea of insanity. The judge must, where such an excuse is attempted, take the advice of the physicians, who have to examine how far such a plea is warranted by the facts, else this mode of defense would lead to the imposition of all criminals, even the most dangerous.

The words ψευδολογια and ψευδομαντια are both unknown to antiquity, although ψευτολογια was employed. Instead of ψευδολογια, the ancients used also ψευτομαντια (from μοντος = λογος); hence it would be a mistake to suppose that men who dealt in false fables, although myth is synonymous with fals.

Psalmanziers are those who maintain the extreme form of Unitarian doctrine that Christ was merely (γιος) a man (ατριφος), and not God and man (γιος ατριφος) in one person.

Psychic and Pneumatici (ψαχνοις, and πναιματοις, scil. ατριφος) are often contrasted in such a manner that the former word is employed in a lower sense, the second with a more refined and noble significance. The Montanists thus designated the orthodox, because they rejected the prophecies and pretended inspirations of their founder, and would not receive his rigid laws respecting fasting. Hence this term is constantly used by Tertullian, after he had fallen into the errors of the Montanists. He calls his own party the spiritual, and the orthodox the carnal. Tertullian, who ranged himself with the Pneumaticists, wrote a book Contur Psychicas, s. Orthodromos. But the term psychic is here used in a very proper meaning, as it is employed in our times. See ORIGIN. The latter found in the Scriptures a somatic, psychical, and pneumatical meaning, because man is composed of body, soul, and mind. The name appears to have originated with the Valentinians, who styled themselves the spiritual and the perfect, and
said they had no need of abstinence and good works, which were unnecessary for them that were perfect.

Psychism (a new formation, from ψυχή, soul) is the opinion that everything is soul. The followers of this doctrine are called Psychists. Although poets put a soul in every inanimate object, they do not belong to this sect of philosophers; for they do not think in the least of suppressing all distinction between the somatic and the psychical nature. Michel Petrus, a Hungarian, published in 1833 (Pesth, 8vo) a book in which he attempts to prove that the so-called bodily world is composed of nothing but souls. He divides the souls into two classes, the living and the dead; the latter, in a state of aggregation, constitute the bodies. This opinion is not so new as it would appear at first sight. It bears a striking resemblance to Leibnitz's monadology, and may be a branch of that tree. Leibnitz considers the whole universe as composed of monads, which he divides into conscious and unconscious, or slumbering; he also holds bodies to be aggregations of the second kind of monads. If they are consistent, the strict idealists will likewise be compelled to consider all that exists as soul or spirit, as they hold the bodies to be mere representations or ideas, to which the thinking mind lends objective existence. M. Queene (Lettres sur le Psychisme [Paris, 1802, 8vo]) teaches that there is a fluid diffused throughout all nature, animating equally all living and organized beings, and that the difference which appears in their actions comes of their particular organization. The fluid is general, the organization is individual. This opinion differs from that of Pythagorians (q. v.), who held that the soul of a man passed individually into the body of a brute. While M. Queene holds that, though the body dies, the soul does not; the organization perishes, but not the psychical, or psychical fluid. See Krug, Philos. Wörterbuch, s. v.

Psychology (from ψυχή, the soul, and λόγος, a discourse) is that branch of metaphysics which treats of the nature of relation and the relations of the human spirit. It has been divided into rational, or speculative, and empirical, or practical. (See Fleming and Krauth, Vocab. of Philos. s. v.)

Biblical Psychology is a term lately applied to the doctrines of the Holy Scriptures on the subject, especially as to the distinction between the rational and immortal soul in man (Gen. 2, 7), and the animal, sensitive, and affectional spirit (Deut. 18). The subject has been treated with great acumen by Delitzsch (Biblical Psychology, tr. from the German, Edinb. 1867); but the results are rather curious than satisfactory. (See Brit. Quatr. Rev. Jan. 1878, p. 162; New-Englander, July, 1878, art. iv.) In fact, the Bible has no scientific nomenclature, and the attempt to reduce its terms to the strict definitions of modern classification, especially on so obscure and abstract a subject, must necessarily prove abortive. See Mind.

Psychomancy (from ψυχή, soul, and μανιατίς, prediction) is the pretended art of summoning the souls of the deceased, and the psychical nature.

Psychometry (a new formation, from ψυχή, soul, and μετρέω, measure) is the art of measuring souls. It cannot give an account with mathematical exactitude of the powers of the soul and its effects; it must content itself with an approximate valuation, the soul being a quantity inexpressible to the senses, which cannot be measured like bodies. Ch. Jul. Sim. Portius, a teacher in Leipsic, invented an instrument of psychometry, which he thus describes: "The psychometer is an instrument which shows what a man is in respect to his temperament, mind, and heart. One hundred and ten different impressions can be made on the instrument. The impression made by the person whose soul is measured shows by which of the one hundred and ten qualities enumerated on a board — and most arbitrarily and illogically, as to that — "this person is distinguished from others." We may ask, Only those by which he or she is distinguished from, not also those which he has in common with, other people? But, then, the instrument could not indicate any of those one hundred and ten qualities, as each of them must be held in common by several persons. See the description of this psychometer by its author (Leipsic, 1833, 8vo).

Psychopannychism (ψυχή, soul; πᾶν, all; and νύξ, night — the sleep of the soul) is the doctrine to which Luther, among divines, and Forney, among philosophers, were inclined, that at death the soul falls asleep, and does not awake till the resurrection of the body. Calvin wrote a treatise against this view in 1534, and there is much against it in Henry Moris's Works. Pagett says, in his Heresiography, written about 1638, that this "heresy" revived in his time through the publication of a work entitled Man's Mortality. See Soul-Sleep.

Psychopneumones were those who maintained the opinion that the souls of the good, after death, became angels, and the souls of the evil became devils. See Augustine, Harres. ch. lxxviii; Pradest. Harres. ch. lxxviii.

Ptolemaus, or Ptolemy (Πτολεμαῖος, i.e. "the warlike," from πτολέμας = πολέμας), the dynastic name of the Greek kings of Egypt (A. V. "Ptolemee" or "Ptolemeus"), and hence employed also by many private persons. The name, which occurs in early legends (I. iv. 220; Pausan. x, 5), appears first in the historic period in the time of Alexander the Great, and became

1. Ptolemaus I, Soter (son of Lagus), B.C. 323-286.
4. Ptolemaus IV, Philopator (B.C. 221-205), to T. Arsinoe.
5. Ptolemaus V, Epiphantes (B.C. 205-181), to Cleopatra (daughter of Antiochus Magnus).
6. Ptolemaus VI, Philometor (B.C. 181-164), to Cleopatra (11).
9. Ptolemaus Euergetes II, to Demetrius II.
10. Cleopatra.
11. Cleopatra.
12. Cleopatra.
13. Cleopatra.
afterwards very frequent among the states which arose out of his conquests. For the following, which are the only persons of the name mentioned in the Scriptures (and in these in the Apocrypha alone, although referred to in Daniel), we adopt the statements found in the standard authorities. For the civil history of the Ptolemies the student will find ample references to the original authorities in the articles in Smith's Dict. of Classical Biography, i, 581, etc., and in Pauly's Real-Encyklopädie. The literature of the subject in its religious aspect has been discussed under Alexander; Democritus. A curious account of the literary activity of Ptolemy Philadelphus is given (by Simon de Magistris) in the Apologia sent. Pat. de LXX Virga, appended to Daniel sec. LXX (Rome, 1772); but this is not always trustworthy. More complete details of the history of the Alexandrine libraries are given by Ritzel, Die Alexandriinischen Bibliotheken (Breslau, 1838); and Parthey, Das Alexandr. Museum (Berlin, 1838). The foregoing table gives the descent of the royal line as far as it is connected with Biblical history. See Egypt.

1. PTOLEMY I, Soter (Striptzi, soteri), known as the son of Lagus, a Macedonian of low rank, was generally supposed to be an illegitimate son of Philip. He distinguished himself greatly during the campaigns of Alexander; at whose death, foreseeing the necessary subdivision of the empire, he secured for himself the government of Egypt, where he proceeded at once to lay the foundations of a kingdom (B.C. 323). His policy during the wars of the succession was mainly directed towards the consolidation of his power, and not to wide conquests. He maintained himself against the attacks of Perdiccas (B.C. 321) and Demetrius (B.C. 312), and gained a precipitate footing in Syria and Phoenicia. In B.C. 307 he suffered a very severe defeat at sea off Cyprus from Antigonus, but successfully defended Egypt against invasion. After the final defeat of Antigonus, he was obliged to divide the dominion of Seleucus and Ptolemy II to Seleucus; and during the remainder of his reign his only important achievement abroad was the recovery of Cyprus, which he permanently attached to the Egyptian monarchy (B.C. 256). He abdicated in favor of his youngest son, Ptolemy II Philadelphus, two years before his death, which took place in B.C. 283.

Ptolemy Soter is described very briefly in Daniel (xi, 5) as one of those who should receive part of the empire of Alexander when it was divided towards the four winds of heaven. "The king of the south [Egypt] shall be strong; one of his princes [Seleucus Nicator, shall be strong]; and he [Seleucus] shall be strong above him [Ptolemy], and have dominion." Seleucus, who is here mentioned, fled from Babylon, where Antigonus sought his life, to Egypt in B.C. 316, and attached himself to Ptolemy. At last the decisive victory of Ipsus (B.C. 301), which was mainly gained by his services, gave him the command of an empire which was greater than any other held by Alexander's successors; and "his dominion was a great dominion." (Dan. iv. 20, 41) very strongly refers the latter clause of the verse to Ptolemy Philadelphus, "whose empire surpassed that of his father." The whole tenor of the passage requires the contrast of the two kingdoms on which the fortunes of Julian hung.

In one of his expeditions into Syria, probably B.C. 290, Ptolemy treacherously occupied Jerusalem on the Sabbath, a fact which arrested the attention of the heathen historians Agatharcides (ap. Joseph. C. Ap. i, 22; Ant. xii, i); I. carried away many of their gods and images captive to Alexandria; but, aware probably of the great importance of the good-will of the inhabitants of Palestine in the event of a Syrian war, he gave them the full privileges of citizenship in the new city. In the campaign of 192 B.C. he attempted to tear the fruits of his liberal policy; and many Jews voluntarily emigrated to Egypt, though the colony was from the first disturbed by internal dissensions (Josephus, as above; Hecat. ap. Joseph. C. Ap. i. c.).

2. PTOLEMY II, Philadelphus (Philadelphus, i.e. brother-loving), the youngest son of Ptolemy I, was made king two years before his death, to confirm the irregular succession. The conflict between Egypt and Syria was renewed during his reign in consequence of the intrigue of his half-brother Magas, "But in the end of the days the kings of Syria [the kings of Egypt] joined themselves together [in friendship]. For the king's daughter of the south [Berenice, the daughter of Ptolemy Philadelphus] came as bride to the king of the north [Antiochus II], to make an agreement" (Dan. xi. 6). But the marriage of the king with one of the daughters of Antiochus II, and the political events of the reign of Ptolemy, who, however, retained possession of the disputed provinces of Phoenicia and Cœle-Syria, offer no further points of interest in connection with Jewish history.

In other respects, however, this reign was a critical epoch for the development of Judaism, as it was for the intellectual history of the ancient world. The liberal encouragement which Ptolemy bestowed on literature and science (following out in this the designs of his father) gave birth to a new school of writers and thinkers. The critical faculty was called forth in place of the creative, and learning, in some sense, supplied the place of original speculation. Eclecticism was the necessary result of the concurrence and comparison of dogmas; and it was impossible that the Jew, who was now become as true a citizen of the world as the Greek, should remain passive in the conflict of opinions. The origin and influence of the translation of the Sept. will be considered in another place. See SEPTUAGINT. It is enough now to observe the greatness of the consequences to the union of the Greek and Hebrew worlds, with Jewish thought. From this time the Jew was familiarized with the great types of Western literature, and in some degree aimed at imitating them. Exechiel (the πώς τον οδηγεῖτο της θριαμβίας του τιμητής, Clem. Alex. Strom. i, 28, § 165) wrote a drama on the subject of the Exodus, of which considerable fragments, in fair readable lines still preserved (Eus. Prop. Ec. ix. 20, 24, 29) convey no satisfactory notion. Another epic poem, On the Jews, was written by Theodorus, and as the extant passages (Isid. ix, 22) treat of the history of Sichem, it has been conjectured that he was a Samaritan. The work of Aristobulus on the interpretation of the law was a still more important result of the combination of the old faith with Greek culture, as forming the groundwork of later allegories. While the Jews appropriated the fruits of Western science, the Greeks looked towards the East with a new curiosity. The histories of Berosus and Manetho and Hecataeus opened a world as wide and as novel as the conquests of Alexander. The legendary sibyls were taught to speak in the language of the prophet. The name of Orpheus, which was connected with the first rise of Greek polytheism,
gave sanction to verses which set forth nobler views of the Godhead (ibid., xiii, 12, etc.). Even the most famous poets were not free from interpolation (Ewald, Greek, iv, 277, note). Everywhere the intellectual approxi-mation of Jew and Gentile was growing closer, or at least more possible. The later specific forms of teaching to which this syncretism of East and West gave rise have already been noticed. See ALEXANDRIA. A second time, and in a new fashion, Egypt disciplined the people of God. It first impressed upon a nation the firm unity of a family, and then in due time reconnected a matured people with the world from which it had been called out.

Oecotrich of Ptolemy II.

3. PTOLEMY III, Euergetes (Eugyperiences, i.e. well-doer), was the eldest son of Ptolemy Philadelphus, and brother of Berenice, the wife of Antiochus II. The repul-sation and murder of his sister furnished him with an occasion for invading Syria (B.C. cir. 246). He "stood up, a branch out of her stock [sprung from the same parents] in his [father’s] estate; and set himself as [the head of] his army, and came against the fortresses of the king of the north [Antiochus], and dealt against them and prevailed" (Dan. xi, 7). He extended his conquests as far as Antioch, and then eastward to Babylon, but was recalled to Egypt by tidings of seditions which had broken out there. His success was brilliant and complete. "He carried captive into Egypt the gods [of the conquered nations] with their sacred images, and with their precious vessels of silver and gold" (ver. 8). This capture of sacred trophies, which included the recovery of images taken from Egypt by Cambyses (Jerome, ad loc.), earned for the king the name Euergetes—Benefactor—from the superstitious Egyptians, and was specially recorded in the inscriptions which he set up at Adulis. (Cosmas Ind. ap. Clinton, F. H. p. 392, n.) After his return to Egypt (B.C. cir. 243) he suffered a great part of the conquered provinces to fall again under the power of Seleucus. But the attempts which Seleucus made to attack Egypt terminated disastrously to himself. He first collected a fleet, which was almost totally destroyed by a storm; and then, "as if by some judicial intimation," he came against the realm of the king of the south [having defeated] himself to his own land [to Antioch] (Dan. xi, 2; Justinian, xxvii, 2). After this Ptolemy "diedd some years from [attacking] the king of the north" (Dan. xi, 8), since the civil war between Seleucus and Antiochus Hierax, which he fomented, secured him from any further Syrian invasion. The remainder of the reign of Ptolemy seems to have been spent chiefly in developing the resources of the empire, which he raised to the highest pitch of its prosperity. His policy towards the Jews was similar to that of his predecessors, and on his occupation of Syria he offered sacrifices, after the custom of the law, in acknowledgment of his success, in the Temple at Jerusalem, and added gifts worthy of his victory" (Joseph. C. Ap. ii, 5). The famous story of the manner in which Joseph, the son of Tobias, obtained from him the lease of the revenues of Judaea is a striking illustration both of the condition of the country and of the influence of individual Jews (id. Ant. xii, 4). See ONIAS.

4. PTOLEMY IV, Philopator (φιλόπατρος, i.e. father-loving). After the death of Ptolemy Euergetes, the line of the Ptolemies rapidly degenerated (Strabo, xvi, 12, 15, p.798). Ptolemy Philopator, his eldest son, who succeeded him, was, to the last degree, sensual, effeminate, and debased. But, externally, his kingdom retained its power and splendor; and when circumstances forced him to action, Ptolemy himself showed ability not unworthy of his race. The description of the campaign of Raphia (B.C. 217) in the book of Daniel gives a vivid description of his character. "The sons of Seleucus [Seleucus Ceaunius and Antiochus the Great] were stirred up, and assembled a multitude of great forces; and one of them [Antiochus] came, and lowered, and passed through [even to Pelusium; Polyb. v, 62]; and he returned [from Seleucia, to which he had retired during a faithless truce; Polyb. v, 66]; and they [Antiochus and Ptolemy] were stirred up in war even to his [Antiochus’] fortress. And the king of the south [Ptolemy] was stirred up to war, and came forth and fought with him at Raphia; and he set forth a great multitude; and the multitude was given into his hand [to lead to battle]. And the multitude raised itself [proudly for the conflict]; and his heart was lifted up, and he cost down ten thousand (comp. Polyb. v, 86); but he was not exasperated" (Daniel xii, 6). After this decisive success, Ptolemy Philopator visited the neighboring cities of Syria, and, among others, Jerusalem. After offering sacrifices of thanksgiving in the Temple, he attempted to enter the sanctuary. A sudden paralyzis hindered his design; but when he returned to Alexandria, he determined to inflict on the Alexandrian Jews the vengeance for his disappointment. In this, however, he was again hindered; and eventually he confirmed to the Jews the full privileges which they had enjoyed before. See Maccabees, The Third Book of.

The recklessness of his reign was further marked by the first insurrection of the native Egyptians against their Greek rulers (Polyb. v, 107). This was put down, and Ptolemy, during the remainder of his life, gave himself up to unbridled excesses. He was succeeded by his only child, Ptolemy V, Epiphanes, who was at the time only four or five years old (Jerome, ad Dom. xi, 10-12).

Oecotrich of Ptolemy III.

5. PTOLEMY V, Epiphanes (Eupiphanes, i.e. illustrious). The reign of Ptolemy Epiphanes was a critical epoch in the history of the Jews. The rivalry between the Syrian and Egyptian parties, which had for some time divided the people, came to an open rupture in the struggles which marked his minority. The Syrian faction openly declared for Antiochus the Great when he advanced on his second expedition against Egypt.

Oecotrich of Ptolemy IV.

Egyptian talent. (Obv. Bust of king, r., beard with fillet, Inv. ΠΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ ΦΙΛΟΠΑΤΟΡΟΣ. Eagle, 1., on thunderbolt.) Struck at Tyre.

Tetradrachm of Ptolemy IV.

Egyptian talent. (Obv. Bust of king, r., beard with fillet, Inv. ΠΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ ΦΙΛΟΠΑΤΟΡΟΣ. Eagle, 1., on thunderbolt.) Struck at Tyre.

Tetradrachm of Ptolemy IV.
and the Jews, who remained faithful to the old alliance, fled to Egypt in great numbers, where Onias, the rightful successor to the high-priesthood, not long afterwards established the temple at Leontopolis. (Jerome [ad Dan. xi, 14] places the flight of Onias to Egypt and the foundation of the temple of Leontopolis in the reign of Ptolemy Epiphanes; but Onias was still a youth at the time of his father's death, B.C. cir. 171.) See Onias. In the strong language of Daniel, "The robbers of the people exalted themselves to establish the vision" (Dan. xi, 14) — to confirm by the issue of their attempt the truth of the prophetic word, and at the same time to forward unconsciously the establishment of the heavenly kingdom which they sought to anticipate. The accession of Ptolemy, and the confusion of a disputed regency furnished a favorable opportunity for foreign invasion. "Many stood up against the king of the south," under Antiochus the Great and Philip III of Macedonia, who formed a league for the dismemberment of his kingdom. "So the king of the north [Antiochus] came, and cast up a mount, and took the most fenced city [Sidon, to which Sopas, the general of Ptolemy, had fled: Jerome, ad loc.], and the arms of the south did not withstand" [at Paneas, B.C. 198, where Antiochus gained a decisive victory] (Dan. xi, 14, 15). The interference of the Romans, to whom the regents had turned for help, checked Antiochus in his career; but in order to retain the provinces of Cilicia-Syria, Phoenicia, and Judaea, which he had reconquered, really under his power, while he seemed to comply with the demands of the Romans, who required them to be surrendered to Ptolemy, "he gave him [Ptolemy, his daughter Cleopatra] a young maiden" [as his betrothed wife] (Dan. xi, 17). But in the end his policy only partially succeeded. After the marriage of Ptolemy and Cleopatra was consummated (B.C. 198), Cleopatra did "not stand on his side," but supported her husband in maintaining the alliance with Rome. The disputed provinces, however, remained in the possession of Antiochus; and Ptolemy was poisoned at the time when he was preparing an expedition to recover them from Seleucus, the unworthy successor of Antiochus, B.C. 181.

These campaigns, which are intimately connected with the visits of Antiochus to Jerusalem in B.C. 170, 168, 167, and 164, are before us in the story of the siege of Jerusalem (2 Macc. vii, 18). "The [Antiochus] shall stir up his power and his courage against the king of the south with a great army; and the king of the south [Ptolemy Philometor] shall be stirred up to battle with a very great and mighty army; but he shall not stand: for they [the ministers, as it appears, in whom he trusted] shall forecast devices against him. Yes, they that feed the portion of his meat shall destroy him, and his army shall melt away, and many shall fall down slain. And both these kings' hearts shall be to do mischief, and they shall speak lies at one table [Antiochus shall profess falsely to maintain the cause of Philometor against his brother, and Philometor to trust in his good faith]; but it shall not prosper [the resistance of Alexandria shall preserve the independence of Egypt]; for the end shall be at the time appointed. Then shall be [Antiochus] return into his land, and his heart shall be against the holy covenant; and he shall do exploits, and return to his own land. At the time appointed he shall return and come towards the south; but it shall not be as the former, so also the latter time. [His career shall be checked at once.] For the ships of Chittim [Cyprus, Acts xxiv, 24: the ships of Chittim shall come against him: therefore he shall be dismayed and return and have indignation against the holy covenant.]" After the disappointment of Antiochus, Philometor was for some time occupied in resisting the ambitious designs of his brother, who made two attempts to add Cyprus to the kingdom of Cyrene, which was allotted to him. Having effectually put down these attempts, he turned his attention again to Syria. During the brief reign of Antiochus Epiphat he seems to have supported Philip against the regent Lysias (comp. 2 Macc. xi, 29). After the murder of Eupator by Demetrius I, Philometor espoused the cause of Alexander Balas, the rival claimant to the throne, because Demetrius had made an attempt on Cyprus; and when Alexander had defeated and slain his rival, he accepted the overtures which he made, and gave him his daughter Cleopatra in marriage (B.C. 150: 1 Macc. x, 51-58). Yet, according to 1 Macc. xi, 1, 10, etc., the alliance was not made in good faith, but only as a means towards securing possession of Syria. According to others, Alexander himself may have desired the life of Ptolemy; and so, Ptolemy (comp. 1 Macc. xi, 10), which caused him to transfer his support to Demetrius II, to whom also he gave his daughter, whom he had taken from Alexander. The whole of Syria was quickly subdued, and he was crowned at Antioch king of Egypt and Asia (1 Macc. xi, 12). Alexander made an effort to recover his crown,
but was defeated by the forces of Ptolemy and Demetrius, and shortly afterwards put to death in Arabia. But Ptolemy did not long enjoy his success. He fell from his horse in the battle, and died within a few days (1 Macc. xi, 18), B.C. 145. Ptolemy Philometor was the last king of Egypt who was noticed in sacred history, and his reign was marked also by the erection of the temple at Leontopolis. The coincidence is worthy of notice, for the consecration of a new centre of worship placed a religious as well as a political barrier between the Alexandrian and Palestinian Jews. Henceforth the distinction was again divided. The history of the temple itself is extremely obscure, but even in its origin it was a monument of civil strife. Onias, the son of Onias III (Josephus, in one place [War, vii, 10, 2], calls him "the son of Simon," and he appears under the same name in Jewish legends; but it seems certain that this was a mere error, occasioned by the patronymic of the most famous Onias [comp. Herzfeld, Gesch. d. Judenl., ii, 557]), was murdered at Antioch B.C. 171, when he saw that he was excluded from the succession to the high-priesthood by mercenary intruders. He went, as it seemed, to his death or upon the transfer of the office to Alcimus, B.C. 162 (Josephus, Ant. xii, 9, 7). It is probable that his retirement must be placed at the later date, for he was a child, 

τοῖς ἁγίοις Ὑπάρχουσιν (Josephus, Ant. xii, 5), at the time of his father's death. It was, however, one of those who actively opposed the Syrian party in Jerusalem (Josephus, War, i, 1). In Egypt, he entered the service of the king, and rose, with another Jew, Dositheus, to the supreme command. In this office he rendered important services during the war which Ptolemy Philometor waged against his brother; and he pleaded these to induce the king to grant him a ruined temple of Diana (ἡ ἄπραξ Ὑπάρχουσιν) at Leontopolis as the site of a temple which he proposed to build "after the pattern of that at Jerusalem, and of the same dimensions." He also asked that the body of the body, who were at the time "divided into hostile factions, even as the Egyptians were, from their differences in religious services" (Josephus, Ant. xii, 3, 5). In defence of the locality which he chose, he quoted the words of Isaiah (Isa. xix, 18, 19), who spoke of "an altar to the Lord in the midst of the land of Egypt, and, according to one interpretation, mentioned "the city of the Sun" (Ἡλίας ἔχουσαν) by name. The site was granted and the temple built, but the original plan was not exactly carried out. The συνοδαμή "like a tower to the height of sixty cubits" (Josephus, War, vii, 10, 3, πῦργῳ παρακλήσιστοι . . . ἡ ἑξακοσίων πυργίς ἀνοστομέτρο) of the altar and the offerings were similar to those at Jerusalem, but in place of the seven-branched candlestick was a single lamp of gold suspended by a golden chain. The service was performed by priests and Levites of pure descent; and the temple possessed considerable revenues, which were devoted to their support and to the adequate celebration of the divine ritual (Josephus, War, vii, in, 3, 4, Ant. xii, 3, 5). The object of Ptolemy Philometor in the foundation of Leontopolis was not less the same as that which led to the erection of the "golden calve" in Israel. The Jewish residents in Egypt were numerous and powerful; and when Jerusalem was in the hands of the Syrians, it became of the utmost importance to weaken their connection with their mother city. In this respect the position of the temple on the eastern border of the kingdom was peculiarly important (Jost, Gesch. des Judenthums, 1, 117). On the other hand, it is probable that Onias saw no hope for the elizabethan Judaism of a poor province; and the triumph of the Maccabeans was still unachieved when the temple at Leontopolis was founded. The date of this event cannot, indeed, be exactly determined. Josephus says (War, vii, 10, 4) that the temple had existed 945 years at the time of its destruction, A.D. 71; but the text is manifestly corrupt. Eusebius (ap. Hieron. viii, p. 567, ed. Migne) notices the flight of Onias and the building of the temple under the same year (B.C. 162), possibly from the natural connection of the events without regard to the exact date of the latter. Some time at least must be allowed for the military service of Onias, and the building in later times whether the service were not idolatrous (Jerus. Josua, 43 d, ap. Jost, Gesch. des Judenthums, i, 119); but the Mishna, embodying, without doubt, the old decisions, determines the point more favorably. "Priests who had served at Leontopolis were forbidden to serve at Jerusalem, but were not excluded from attending the public services." A "vow might be discharged rightly at Leontopolis as well as at Jerusalem, but it was not enough to discharge it at the former place only" (Menach. 109 a, ap. Jost, as above). The circumstances under which the new temple was erected were evidently exaggerated into an excuse for the irreligious worship. The connection with Jerusalem, though weakened in popular estimation, was not broken; and the spiritual significance of the one Temple remained unchanged for the devout believer (Philos., De Monarchia, ii, 2, etc.).

The Jewish colony in Egypt, of which Leontopolis was the immediate religious centre, was formed of various elements and at different times. The settlements which were made under the Greek sovereigns, though the most important, were by no means the first. In the later times of the kingdom of Judah many "traded in Egypt," and took refuge there (Jer. xiiii, 6, 7); and when Jeremiah was taken to Tahapanes, he spoke to "all the Jews which dwell in the land of Egypt, which dwell at Migdol and Tahapanes, and at Noph, and in the country of the Pharaohs" (Jer. xlii, 2, 3). The spirit of commerce must have contributed to increase the number of emigrants; but the history of the Egyptian Jews is involved in the same deep obscurity as that of the Jews of Palestine till the invasion of Alexander. Their spirit, however, is hardly doubted as to the power and influence of the colony; and the mere fact of its existence is an important consideration in estimating the possibility of Jewish ideas finding their way to the West. Judaism had secured, in old times, all the treasures of Egypt, and thus the first instalment of the debt was paid. A preparation was already made for a great work when the founding of Alexandria opened a new era in the history of the Jews. Alexander, according to the policy of all great conquerors, incorporated the conquered in his armies. The Jews of Samaria and Judea (Josephus, Ant. xii, 6) were put to death (Josephus, Ant. xi, 8, 5; Hecat. ap. Joseph. C. Ap. i, 22) are mentioned among his troops; and the tradition is probably true which reckons them among the first settlers at Alexandria (Josephus, War, ii, 18, 7; C. Ap. i, 4). Ptolemy Soter increased the colony of the Jews in Egypt both by force and by policy; and their numbers in the next reign may be estimated by the statement (Josephus, Ant. xii, 2, 1) that Ptolemy Philadelpheus gave freedom to one hundred and twenty thousand. The position occupied by Joseph (Josephus, Ant. xii, 4) at the court of Ptolemy Euergetes implies that the Jews were not only numerous, but influential. As we go onward, the legendary accounts of the persecution of Ptolemy Philopator bear witness at least to the great number of Jewish residents in Egypt (3 Macc. iv, 15, 17), and to their dispersion throughout the
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Delta. In the next reign many of the inhabitants of Palestine who remained faithful to the Egyptian alliance fled to Egypt to escape from the Syrian rule (comp. Jerome, ad Dan. xi. 14, who is, however, confused in his account). The consideration which their presence was to him thus gained, was the rank which a Jew, Aristobulus, is said to have held under Ptolemy Philometor as "tutor of the king" (vid. supra, 2 Macc. i. 10). The later history of the Alexandrian Jews has already been noticed. See Alexandria.

They retained their privileges under the Romans, though they were exposed to the illegal oppression of individual governors, and quietly acquiesced in the foreign dominion (Josephus, War, vii. 10, 1). An attempt which was made by some of the fugitives from Palestine to create a rising in Alexandria after the destruction of Jerusalem entirely failed; but the attempt gave the Romans an excuse for plundering, and afterwards (B.C. 71) for closing entirely, the temple at Leontopolis (Josephus, War, vii. 10).

7. The son of Dorymenes (1 Macc. iii. 38; 2 Macc. iv. 45; comp. Polyb. v. 61), a courtier who possessed great influence with Antiochus Epiphanes. He was induced by a bribe to support the cause of Menelaus (2 Macc. iv. 45-50), and afterwards took an active part in forcing the Jews to apostatize (2 Macc. vi. 8, according to this conjecture). When Judas had successfully resisted the first assaults of the Syrians, Ptolemy took part in the great expedition which Laomedon organized against him, which ended in the defeat at Emmaus (B.C. 166); but nothing is said of his personal fortunes in the campaign (1 Macc. iii. 38).

8. The son of Agoras (Ath. vi. p. 246 C), a Megalopolitans, named Macron (2 Macc. x. 12), was governor of Cyprus during the minority of Ptolemy Philometor. This office he discharged with singular fidelity (Polyb. xxvii. 12); but afterwards he deserted the Ptolemaic party to join Antiochus Epiphanes. He stood high in the favor of Antiochus, and received from him the government of Phoenicia and Cœle-Syria (2 Macc. viii. 8; x. 11, 12). On the accession of Antiochus Eupator, his conciliatory policy towards the Jews brought him into suspicion at court. He was deprived of his government, and in consequence of this disgrace, he poisoned himself, B.C. cir. 164 (2 Macc. x. 13).

Ptolemy Macron is commonly identified with Ptolemy the "son of Dorymenes," and it seems likely, from a comparison of 1 Macc. iii. 38 with 2 Macc. viii. 8, 9, that this son of Dorymenes is the person referred to in the latter account of the war. But the testimony of Athenaeus distinctly separates the governor of Cyprus from the "son of Dorymenes" by his parentage. It is also doubtful whether Ptolemy Macron had left Cyprus as early as B.C. 170, when the "son of Dorymenes" was at Tyre (2 Macc. iv. 45); though there is no authority for the common statement that he gave up the island into the hands of Antiochus, who did not gain it till B.C. 168.

9. The son of Alabus, who married the daughter of Simon the Maccabee. He was a man of great wealth, and, being invested with the government of the distant city of Jericho, formed the design of usurping the sovereignty of Judea. With this view he treacherously murdered Simon and two of his sons (1 Macc. xvi. 11-16; Josephus, Ant. xiii. 7, 4; 8, 1, with some variations); but John Hyrcanus received timely intimation of his design, and escaped. Hyrcanus afterwards besieged him in his stronghold of Dib; but in consequence of the occurrence of the Sabbatical year, Ptolemy was enabled to make his escape to Zeno Cotylas, prince of Philadelphia (Josephus, Ant. xiii. 8, 1).

10. The father of Lysimachus, the Greek translator of Esther (Euth. xiii.). Whether this is the same Ptolemy who is mentioned in the same verse as the carrier of the book to Egypt remains uncertain. See Lysimachus.1

"Ptolemais" (Hiero§ma), the name of two places in Scripture.

1. The same as Accho (q. v.). The name is, in fact, an interpolation in the history of the place. The city which was called Accho in the earliest Jewish annals, and which is again the Akko or St. Jean d'Arc of crusading and modern times, was named Ptolemais in the Macreidian and Roman authors for the former of these periods; it was the most important town upon the coast, and it is prominently mentioned in the first book of Maccabees (v. 13, 55; x. 1, 58, 60; xii. 48). In the latter its eminence was far outdone by Herod's new city of Caesarea. It is worthy of notice that Herod, on his return from Italy to Syria, landed at Ptolemais (Josephus, Ant. xiv. 15, 1). Still in the New Test. Ptolemais is a marked point in Paul's travels both by land and sea. He must have passed through it on all his journeys along the great coast road which connected Caesarea and Antioch (Acts xi. 20; xii. 25; xv. 2, 20, 25; xviii. 22); and the distances are given both in the Antoinian and Jerusalem itineraries (Wesseling, Itin. p. 158, 584). But it is specifically mentioned in Acts xxi. 7, as containing a Christian community, visited for one day by Paul. On this occasion he came to Ptolemais by sea. He was then on his return voyage from the third missionary journey. The last harbor at which he had touched was Tyre (ver. 8). From Ptolemais he proceeded, apparently by land, to Caesarea (ver. 8), and thence to Jerusalem (Acts xxi. 6-8).

2. A place described as οἰκοπόρος, rose-producing (3 Macc. vii. 17), and supposed to be the οἰκοπόρος of Ptolemy (iv. b. 57), in Central Egypt, in the Antonite nome, a district still abounding in roses (Mannert, Geogr. der Griechen u. Römer, x. 1, p. 419; Ritter, Erdkunde, i. 789, 797).

Ptolemais, a branch of the Gnostic sect of the 3rd century, d.ributed by Ireneus as a "check from the Valentinians," takes their name from their leader Ptolemy (q. v.), who differed in opinion from Valentinian with respect to the number and nature of the souls, as well as the authorship and design of some portions of the Old Testament. See Ptolemy.

Ptolemeis, Ptolemois'us, Ptole'mee, forms of the name Ptolemy sometimes found in the Apocryphal books of Esther and Maccabees. See Ptolemeis.

Ptolemy. See Ptolemeis.

Ptolemy was a Gnostic philosopher, in whom, according to St. Ireneus (Pref. ad lib. i., Adv. Haer.), the system of Valentinianism was developed. Ireneus gives a full exposition of it in his work Adv. Haer., lib. i. c. 1, 8. Ptolemy is also named by Tertullian, but without any particulars of his history (Contra Faustum, c. xxvii.), and in a very few words by Philaster (Hier. c. xxviii.), Augustine (Hier. c. xiii.), Prol. Contra Prud. (Hier. c. xii.), and the continuator of Tertullian (Pseudo-Tertullian, Hier. c. xii.). St. Epiphanius, in his great work on heresies (Hier. lib. xxx. c. iii.), communicates a letter of this Ptolemy to Flora, in which the former explains to the lady the fundamental features of his doctrine, and the difference between the Ptolemaic and the Valentinian systems. Ptolemy is in particular named by that of Hiero-Neon as regards a duplex system of four. See Heroeon.
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tem, and that neither the authenticity nor the integrity (except one marginal note in cap. 1, § 6) of the former can be questioned.—Wetter u. Welte, Kirchen-Leizikon, a. v.

Pu'ah (Numb. xxvi, 23). See Phuvah.

Pu'ah, the form in the A. V. of the name of two men and one woman, each different in the Hebrew.

1. (Heb. Pu'ah, ὑβαον, I Chron. vii, 1.) See Phuvah.

2. (Heb. Pu'ah, ὑβαον, thought by Gesenius and First to be for ὑβαον, éπισελεία; Sept. Φωσι, Vulg. Ποεα.) The last named of the two midwives to whom Pharaoh gave instructions to kill the Hebrew male children at their birth (Exod. i, 15). B.C. cir. 1740. In the A. V. they are called "Hebrew midwives," a rendering which is not required by the original, and which is regarded by many as doubtful, both from the improbability that the king would have instructed the execution of such a task to the women of the nation he was endeavoring to destroy, as well as from the answer of the women themselves in ver. 19, "for the Hebrew women are not like the Egyptian women;" from which we may infer that they were accustomed to act upon the latter, and were themselves Egyptians. If we translate Exod. i, 18 in this way, "And the king of Egypt said to the women who acted as midwives to the Hebrew women, this difficulty is removed. The two, Shiphrah and Puah, are supposed to have been the chief and representatives of their profession. Aben- Ezra says, "They were chiefs over all the midwives: for no doubt there were more than 500 midwives, but these two were chiefs over them to give tribute to the king of the hire." According to Jewish tradition, Shiphrah was Recheba, and Puah Miriam; "because," says Rashi, "she cried and talked and murmured to the child, after the manner of the women that lull a weeping infant." The origin of all this is an imaginary play upon the name Puah, which is derived from a root signifying "to cry out," as in Isa. xxxii, 14, and used in Rabbinical writers of the bleating of sheep.—Smith. Josephus (Ant. ii, 9, 9) intimates that these were Egyptian women; but when it is considered that no Egyptian woman was likely to pollute herself by rendering such offices to a Hebrew woman; that Puah and Shiphrah are described as serving Jehovah, and Puah and Shiphrah shorn; that Moses intended to convey the other meaning, he will have written הָתְנְדָה שִפְרָה שִפְרָה, reason will be found for preferring the opinion that they were Hebrew women.

3. (Heb. Pu'ah, ὑβαον, perhaps i. q. πελογ. mouth; Sept. Φου, Vulg. Ποεα.) The father of Tola, who was of the tribe of Issachar, and judge of Israel after Abimelech (Judg. x, 1). B.C. ante 1319. In the Vulg., instead of "the son of Dodo," he is called "the uncle of Abimelech," and in the Sept. Tola is said to be "the son of Phua, the son (ψιης) of his father's brother;" both versions being apparently inapplicable, as he is spoken of as a Hebrew, and that though the words הָתְנְדָה שִפְרָה שִפְרָה may be translated "midwives of the Hebrews," they more probably mean, as the A. V. gives them, "Hebrew midwives;" and that had Moses intended to convey the other meaning, he would have written הָתְנְדָה שִפְרָה שִפְרָה, reason will be found for preferring the opinion that they were Hebrew women.

Public Worship is the service of the different religious bodies open to all worshippers, and is so designated in distinction from minor services intended simply as auxiliaries to the devoted in their religious life. It is usually performed in the presence of the clergy, though it need not be thus limited. It is at any rate supposed to embrace a public address in behalf of the truth espoused by the congregation convened. In the Christian Church the outward forms of religion tended in her very infancy to the imposing. From the ancient temples the incense and many customs of heathenism were transferred to the churches. By the use of tapers and perpetual lamps, the solemnity of nocturnal festivals was combined with the light of day. The people were called together by a piece of metal struck by a hammer, until this method led to the adoption of bells in the 7th century. Soon after the word of God came into use, and added to the spectacular action of Christian worship. But notwithstanding this unwarranted tendency towards the dramatic, the exalting of Holy Scripture and prayer formed a principal part in early worship. In the Roman Church the practice of public worship consisted in the sermon, though it was often only a rhetorical amusement rewarded by the clapping of hands. As the Church had been formed under the Roman empire, it retained many Roman usages. The first to protest against the peculiarities of the Roman clergy were the Christians of Britain, who worshipped in the simplicity of apostolic times. But no effectual check was put upon ecclesiastical usages until the great Reformation movement which resulted in restoring the beautiful and impressive order of the service of his disciples. See Worship. Nearly all Protestant churches have regulations regarding the form and order of public worship. In the Anglican service-book the rubrics (q. v.) present it. According to article xx, the Church has power to decree rites or ceremonies that are not contrary to God's Word, and according to common authority, "it is not necessary that traditions and ceremonies be in all places one, or utterly like; for all times they have been divers, and may be changed according to the diversity of countries, times, and men's manners; so that nothing be ordained against God's Word." But in this same article provision is also made against unscriptural (popish) innovations, as well as against the abandonment of those regulations instituted by the proper authority.

"Whosoever, through his private judgment, willingly and purposely does any trembling to break the tranquillity of any ceremonies of the Church, which be not repugnant to the Word of God, and not decreed, and approved by common authority, ought to be rebuked openly (that others may fear to do the like), as he that offends against the common order of the Church, and hurts the authority of the magistrate, and wounds the concord of weak brethren. Every particular or national Church hath authority to ordain, change, and廢 the ceremonies of the Church, ordained only by man's authority, so that all things be done to edifying."

Canon 6 provides: "Whoever shall affirm that the rites and ceremonies of the Church of England by law established are wicked, or not Christian, or not very useful and orderly, and shall not be allowed to any college, hall, house of learning, or hospital, and every public professed and reader in either of the universities, or in every college elsewhere, and every vicar, and every person in holy orders, and every schoolmaster keeping any public or private school, and every person instructing or teaching any youth in any house or private family as tutor or schoolmaster, who shall be incumbent, or have possession of any cure of soul in any church or chapel, or who shall teach any youth as tutor, or schoolmaster, shall be subject to be removed from his admission to be incumbent, or having possession aforesaid, subcribe the declaration following: 'I, A. B., do declare that I will not desist from the use of the rites and ceremonies of the Church of England, as it is now by law established'" (13 and 14 Charles Ill. c. 4, 8, 8, and 1 William, sess. 1, c. 8, 8). And no form or order of common worship, sacraments, rites, or ceremonies, shall be openly used in any church, chapel, or any house, which is not that which is prescribed in the service book (11).
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Canon 4. "Whoever so shall affirm that the form of Government of the Church of England, established by law, and contained in the Book of Common Prayer and Administration of Sacraments, is a corrupt, superstitious, or God-denying form, or that such anything in it, as that is repugnant to the Scriptures, let him be excommunicated from the Church, and put out of the Bishop's place, or the ministry, till he retract and publicly recant the said error.

If any minister, after he hath subscribed to the Book of Common Prayer, shall omit to use the form of prayer, or any of the orders or ceremonies prescribed for in the Book, such omission and neglect shall be considered and punished as if he had been suspended; and after a month he do not reform and submit himself, let him be excommunicated, and then if he shall not submit himself to be suspended for the space of another month, let him be dismissed from the ministry.

"Thus it requires that "no man shall cover his head in the church or chapel in the time of divine service, except he have some infirmity, in which case let him wear a headgear or cap.

All manner of persons then present shall reverently kneel upon their knees, when the general confession, litany, or other prayers are read; and shall stand up at the saying of the Believers, according to the rules that in that behalf prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer. All persons then present shall devoutly hear the Lord's prayers, and all the supplications that are therein mentioned, due and lowly reverence shall be done by all persons present, as it hath been accustomed; truly, 'tis a duty that a priest, in manner of service, in the church, in the presence of the people, in the spirit of New Testament, and in the manner of divine service and worship, is his main end. And as none, either man, woman, or child, of what calling soever, shall be otherwise at such times but with reverence, with the face toward the Church, and in such a posture as to hear the marks, and understand that which is read, preached, or ministered: saying in their due places andisly, with the mouth of the Gospel, the Church's order, and the Creed, and making such other answers to the public prayers as are set down in the Book of Common Prayer: neither shall they disturb the service or sermon by walking or talking, or in any other way; nor depart out of the church during the time of divine service or sermon without some urgent or reasonable cause."

Canon 14. "The common prayer shall be said or sung distinctly and reverently, upon such days as are appointed to be kept holy by the Book of Common Prayer, and their eyes, and in convenient and unobstructed places, and in the presence of the people, and the common prayer shall be said in the churches, as the bishop of the diocese or ecclesiastical order of the place shall think meet for the largeness or straitness of the same, as the people may be most edified. All ministers likewise shall observe the orders, rites, and ceremonies prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer, as well in reading the Holy Scriptures and singing of prayers as in the administration of the sacraments, without either diminishing in regard of preaching or in any other respect, or adding anything in the matter or form thereof."

The Book of Common Prayer: "All priests and deacons are to say daily the morning and evening prayer, either privately or openly, not being let by sickness, travel, or other urgent cause, and the curate the minister serves in every parish church or chapel, being at home, and not being otherwise reasonably hindered, shall say or cause to be said the morning and evening prayers in the parish church or chapel where he ministereth; and so shall serve a bell to be tolled thereunto, a cord or bell-rope before he begin, and the people may come to hear God's Word, and to pray with him."

The American reviewers omitted from the Prayer-book the 46th canon of 1662, which enjoins that "every minister, after he has served and lectures, and on all other occasions of public worship, use the Book of Common Prayer as the same is or may be established by the authority of the General Convention of this Church. And in performing the Liturgy, no other prayer shall be used than those prescribed by the said book."

The Westminster Directory enact: "Let all enter the assembly, not irreverently, but in a godly manner, taking their seats or places without adoration, or bowing themselves towards one place or other. The congregation being assembled, the minister shall, according to the custom of the church, give the worshippers of the great name of God, to begin with prayer. The beginning of the prayer the people are wholly to attend upon it, for bearing to read anything except what the minister is then reading or citation: and abstaining much more from, to cease from what is no way fit for the congregation, or doing reverence to any person present, or coming in; as also from all gazing, sleeping, and other indecent behavior, which may hinder the people, or hinder themselves or others in the service of God. If any, they shall be publicly admonished to this present at the beginning, they ought not, when they come into the congregation, to betake themselves to their private devotions, but remain still with the congregation, and join with the assembly in that ordinance of God which is then in hand."

This injunction to begin with prayer has been universally departed from in Scotland, and the reason assigned is this: "The reader or preacher began the service with reading a chapter, and gave out a psalm as the minister, also that the minister, the psalm being sung, began with prayer. But the preacher's function has ceased since the middle or towards the end of last century, and the minister now begins with prayer, doing himself what was used to be done by his subordinate. See PREACHER; READER.

In most of the American churches the principal object of public worship is the expounding of the Word of God by the minister in a sermon. This is usually preceded by song and prayer and the reading of the Scriptures, and followed by prayer and song. The order of the service differs, being uncertain, and is immaterial. See CHURCH; CLEANSING; LITANY; PRAYER; WORSHIP.

PUBLICAN (πολιτικός). The word thus translated belongs only, in the New Test., to the three Synoptic Gospels. The class designated by the term were employed as collectors of the Roman revenue. The Latin word from which the English of the A. V. has been taken was applied to a higher order of men. It will be necessary to glance at the financial administration of the Roman provinces in order to understand the relations of the publicans to one another and the grounds of the hatred and scorn which appear in the New Test. to have fallen on the former.

The Roman senate had found it convenient, at a period as early as, if not earlier than, the second Punic war, to appoint the king of one of the independent cities of the Carthaginians, and the portorius (customs, including the oneris on goods carried into or out of cities) to capitalists who undertook to pay a given sum into the treasury (in publicum), and so received the name of publicani (Livy, xxi., 7). Contacts of this kind fell naturally into the hands of the equites, as the richest class of Romans. These knights were an order instituted as early as the time of Romulus, and composed of men of great consideration with the government—"the principal men of dignity in their several countries," who occupied a kind of middle rank between the senators and the people (Josephus, Ant. xii., 4). Although these officers were, according to Cicero, the ornament of the city and the strength of the commonwealth, they did not attain to great offices, nor enter the senate, so long as they continued in the order of knights. They were thus more capable of devoting their attention to the collection of the public revenue. Not unfrequently the sum bidden went beyond the means of any individual capitalist, and a joint-stock company (societas) was formed, with one of the partners, or an agent appointed by them, acting as manager (Livy, xxi., 7; Plut. Philip, 9). Under this officer, who commonly resided at Rome, transacting the business of the company, paying profits to the partners and the like, were the submagistri, living in the provinces. Under them, in like manner, were the portorici, the actual custom-house officers (decemviri), who examined each bale of goods exported or imported, assessed its value more or less arbitrarily, wrote out the ticket, and enforced payment. The latter were commonly natives of the province in which they were stationed, as being most familiar with all classes of the population. The word publican, etymologically might have been used of the publicani properly so called (τοιοῦτοι, ὡς ὅμοιοι), was used popularly, and in the New Test., exclusively of the portorici. The same practice prevailed in the East, from which an illustration of it has been preserved to us by Josephus. He tells us that on the marriage of Cleopatra to Ptolemy, the latter received from Antiochus as his daughter dowry Czale-Syria, Samaria, Judea, and Phoenicia; that "upon the division of the taxes between the two kings, the portion assigned to Antiochus was paid in the cities of the countries, paying to the kings the stipulated sum; and that "when the day came on which the king was to let the taxes of the cities to farm, and those that were the
principal men of dignity in their several countries were to bid for them, the sum of the taxes together of Cœle-
Syria, and Phoenicia, and Judaea, and Samaria, as they were designated large sums of money to the State, and
towards the close of the republic they were so gen-
erally members of the equestrian order that the words
equites and publicani were sometimes used as synony-
mos (Smith, Dict. Gr. and Rom. Antiq. a.v. v.).
The publicani were thus an important section of the econ-
omy of the empire, the money thus raised being put at
the disposal of the state for political purposes, to
court that order, might describe them as "flos
equitum Romanorum, ornamentum civitatis, firmamentum
Reipublicae" (Cicero, Pro Flacco. 9). The system was,
however, essentially a vicious one—the most de-
testable, perhaps, of all modes of managing a revenue
(comp. Adam Smith, Wealth of Nations, vol. ii), and it
bore its natural fruits. The publicani were banded to-
gether to support each other's interest, and at once re-
pected and defied all interference (Livy, xxv, 3, 4).
They demanded severe laws, and put every such law into ex-
ection. Impunity was produced in consequence of the
most vexatious or fraudulent exactions, and a remedy
was all but impossible. The popular feeling ran
strong even against the equestrian capitalists. The
Macedonians complained, as soon as they were brought
under Roman government, that they were treated not
with clemency and justice, but with usury and extortion.
"Aut jus publicum vanum, aut libertas societas nulla" (Livy,
xiv, 18). Cicero, in writing to his brother (Ad Quinti
i, 1, 11), speaks of the difficulty of keeping the publicani
within bounds, and yet not offending them, as the hard-
est task of the governor of a province. Tacitus counted
it as one bright feature of the short life of a people un-
like his own that there "nee publicanis atterri" (Germ,
29). For a moment the capricious liberalism of Nero
led him to entertain the thought of sweeping away the
whole system of portoria; but the conservatism of the
senate, as well as the interest of the state, forbade the
scheme (Tacitus, Ann., xxiii, 50), and the "immodestiae
publicanorum" (ibid.) remained unchecked.
If this was the case with the directors of the com-
pany, what was the situation of the lower classes of its
members? They were considered whenever they had an opportunity (Luke iii, 18). They brought false charges of smug-
gling in the hope of extorting hush-money (ibid. xii,
8). They detained and opened letters on mere sus-
picion (Tertullian, Tharna, 2, 39; Plautus, Trismum,
ii. 3). They were in the habit of extorting money from
themselves, in most cases the subject of complaint
(Cicero, Ad Quinti, i, 1, 11). It was the basest of all
livelihoods (Cicero, De Off., i, 42). They were the
wolves and bears of human society (Stobæus, Serm.,
34). Ουδέραν ἀρχον, μετέξας ἀπομάκρυναν had become a
proverb, even under an earlier regime, and it was
truer than ever now (Xenoph. Com. ap. Dacier.
Meineke, Frag. Com. iv, 596). Of these subordinate
officials there appear to have been two classes, both
included by us under the general name publican—
the δροσφαζόμενοι, or "chief of the publicans," of whom we
have an instance in Zacchæus; and the ordinary publi-
cans (ταλαπτικοί), the lowest class of servants engaged
in the collection of the revenue, and of whom Levi,
afterwards the apostle Matthew, is an example. The
former, the δροσφαζόμενοι, appear to have been managers
under the publicani proper, or associations of publicans,
already spoken of. They were intrusted with the su-
ervision of a collecting district, and if they were its duty
to see that, in that district, the inferior officers were
faithful, and that the various taxes were regularly gath-
ered in. Their situation was thus one of much greater
consequence than that of the ordinary "publican" of the
Gospels. They seem to have possessed a much higher
character, and many of them became wealthy men.
Zac-
chéus is the only example of an ἄρχοντας mentioned
in the New Testament, and it is the ordinary ταλαπτικοί,
whom the government had engaged either to keep the
dependants whom they employed, but a still lower class of
servants, who most interest us. These were not the
publicani, but the portoria of the Roman empire, who
derived their name from levying the taxes known as the
portoria. The portoria included the duties upon the
imported and exported goods, and upon merchandise
passing through the country—one important source of
the wealth of Solomon: "Besides that, he had of the
merchants, and of the traffic of the spice merchants"
(1 Kings x, 19). They included also the tribute or the
tribute levied from individuals for personal vices or
tolls which appear to have been exiguous for the use of
roads and bridges. They thus extended over a large
number of particulars, and, however honorably and gen-
tly the function of the portorius had been discharged, it
would have been impossible for him to avoid that which
the tax-collector seldom escapes from the tax-
ployer. But the office, invidious enough in itself, was in
the ancient world rendered still more hateful, as we
have seen, by the inquisitorial proceedings and the un-
scrupulous exactions of those who discharged its duties.
The frightful and protracted persecution of the Jews
by the governors who were sent to rule them are well
known to all; but the same system of abuse marked the
whole army of officials from the highest to the lowest,
only that the lowest came in contact with the great
mass of the people, and that their hardships, their
severities and severities must have been felt, under one form
or another, by almost all. To such an extent, indeed, did
these exactions proceed, even in the very neighborhood
of Rome, that at one time the Roman government, as the
only means of introducing a remedy, abolished all
the import and export duties in the ports of Italy
All this was enough to bring the class into ill-favor
everywhere. In Judæa and Galilee there were special
circumstances of aggravation. The employment brought
out all the besetting vices of the Jewish character. The
strong feeling of many Jews as to the absolute unlaw-
fulness of paying tribute at all made matters worse.
The Scribes who discussed the question (Matt. xxii, 15)
for the most part answered it in the negative. The
Galileans or Herodians, the district in which Galilea
lived, were the most turbulent and rebellious (Acts v,
37). They thought it unlawful to pay tribute, and
founded their refusal to do so on their being the people
of the Lord, because a true Israelite was not permitted
to acknowledge any other sovereign than God (Josephus,
Ant. xvii, 2). The Galileans were thus in a position to
mention by the subjection of the Jews to the Roman
emperor was perpetuated, and the paying of tribute
was regarded as a virtual acknowledgment of his soverei-
gnty. They were also noted for their impositions, rapine,
and extortion, to which they were perhaps more espe-
cially prompted by having a share in the farm of the
tribune, as they were thus tempted to oppress the people
with illegal exactions that they might the more speed-
illy enrich themselves. Theocritus considered the bear
and the lion the most cruel among the beasts of the wil-
derness, and among the beasts of the city the publican
and the parasite. In addition to their other faults, ac-
cordingly, the publicans of the New Testament were regarded
as traitors and apostates, defiled by their frequent inter-
course with the heathen, willing tools of the oppressor.
They were classed with sinners (Matt. ix, 11; xi, 19),
with harlots (xxi, 31, 32), with the heathen (xviii, 17).
In Galilee they consisted probably of the least reputable
members of the fisherman and peasant class. Left to
themselves, men of decent lives holding aloof from them,
their vanity and loose conversations, as well as those
like them, were outcasts from the world's law. Scribes and people alike hated them.
The Gospels present us with some instances of this
feeling. To eat and drink "with publicans" seems to the Pharisaic mind incompatible with the character of a spiritual leader (Matt. xi. 19). They spoke in the name of the Father, not of a man, as was the case with our Lord as the friend of publicans (xi. 19). Rabbinc writings furnish some curious illustrations of the same feeling. The Chaklee Targum and R. Solomon in "the archers who sit by the waters" of Judges v. 11, a description of the ravens sitting on the banks of rivers or seas as an ambush for the wayfarer. The custom of the Talmud enumerates three classes of men with whom promises need not be kept, and are three murderers, thieves, and publicans (Nedar, iii. 4). No money known to come from them was received in any way, according to the command of the Temple (Baba Kama, x. 1). To write a publican's ticket, or even to carry the ink for it on the Sabbath, was a distinct breach of the commandment (Shabb. viii. 2). They were not fit to sit in judgment, or even to give testimony (Sukkot, fol. 52, 2). Sometimes there is an exceptional notice in their favor. It was recorded as a special excellence in the father of a rabbi that, having been a publican for thirteen years, he had lessened instead of increasing the pressure of taxation (Bab. It is the early Christian fathers who take up the same condemnation of the publican or officer, exclaiming, Tusculum, and from the exhausted vocabulary of Chrysostom they have heaped upon them every epithet of abuse. See the passages bearing upon this point in Wettstein's note on Matt. v. 46; also Sozomen's Theaetysis, v. 4; Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. iv. 28; and Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. ad Matt. xvii. The class thus practically excommunicated furnished some of the earliest disciples both of the Baptist and of our Lord. Like the outlawing, so-called "dangerous classes" of other times, they were at least free from hypocrisy. Whatever moral or religious value there was in them, it was not in the formal convention. We may think of the Baptist's preaching as having been to them what Wesley's was to the colliers of Kingswood or the Cornish miners. The publican who cried in the bitterness of his spirit, "God be merciful to me a sinner" (Luke xvii. 18), may be taken as the representative of those who had come under this influence (Matt. xxv. 82). The Galilean fishermen had probably learned, even before their Master taught them, to overcome their repugnance to the publicans with whom they had been sharers in the same baptism. The publicans (Matthew perhaps among them) had probably gone back to their work learning to exact no more than what was appointed them (Luke iii. 13). However startling the choice of Matthew, the publican, to be of the number of the twelve may have seemed to the Pharisees, they were no trace of any perplexity or offence on the part of the disciples.

The position of Zacchaeus as an ἀρχηγός (Luke xix. 2) implies a position of some importance among the persons thus employed. Possibly the balsam trade, of which Jericho was the centre, may have brought larger profits; possibly he was one of the ἑμβολεύοντα in immediate communication with the bureau at Rome. That it was possible for even a Jewish publican to attain considerable wealth we find from the story of John the ἡγιασμένος (Josephus, War, ii. 14, 4), who acts with the leading Jews and offers a bribe of eight talents to the procurator, Gessius Florus. The fact that Jericho was at this time a city of the priests—12,000 are said to have lived there—gives, it need hardly be said, a special significance to our Lord's preference of the house of Zaccheus. When Jesus visited the house of Zaccheus, who appears to have been eminently honest and upright, he was assured by him that he was ready to give one half of his goods to the poor, and if he had taken anything from any man by false accusation, to "restore it fourfold" (Luke xix. 6). This was in reference to the Roman law, which required that when any farmer convicted of extortion he should return four times the value of what he had fraudulently obtained. There is no reason to suppose that either Zacchaeus or Matthew had been guilty of unjust practices, or that there was any exception to their characters beyond that of being a sinner in the opinion of the world, as the other examples of this occur. Suetonius (Vesp. 1) mentions the case of Salamin, a collector of the fortieth pennies in Asia, who had several statues erected to him by the cities of the province, with this inscription, "To the honest tax-farmer." See Bibia Eaductor, iii. 193. For notes on the publicans see Matthew's Sources, Index Programmatum, p. 56, 57. See Tax-Gatherers.

PUBLICIUS, English Waldenses (q. v.), of whom Rapin, in relating the transactions of the council of Henry II, gives the following account, on the authority of archbishop Usher: "Henry ordered a council to meet at Oxford in 1166, to examine the tenets of certain heretics, called Publiciuni. Very probably they were disciples of the Waldenses, who began then to appear. When they were asked in the council who they were, they answered they were Christians and followers of the apostles. After that, being questioned upon the Creed, their replies were very orthodox as to the Trinity and incarnation. But (says Rapin) if the historian is to be depended on, they rejected baptism, the Eucharist, marriage, and the communion of saints. They showed much more simplicity and meekness in their whole behavior. When they were threatened with death, in order to oblige them to renounce their tenets, they only said, 'Blessed are they that suffer for righteousness' sake.' There is no difficulty in understanding what were their sentiments on these heretical points. When a monk says to the Eucharist, it is because they rejected the doctrine of transubstantiation; when he says they rejected marriage, he means that they declared it to be a sacrament, and maintained it to be a civil institution; when he says they rejected the communion of saints, nothing more is to be understood than that they refused to hold communion with the corrupt Church of Rome; and when he says that they rejected baptism, we understand by it that they rejected the baptism of infants. These were the errors for which they were branded with a hot iron in their foreheads. See Irvine, History of the Baptists, i. 56 sq.

Publius (Greekized Πούλιος), the chief man—probably the governor—of Melita, or Malta, who received and lodged Paul and his companions on the occasion of their being shipwrecked off that island (Acts xxvii. 1-21). It soon appears that Publius was entertaining an angel unaware, for Paul gave proof of his divine commission by miraculously healing the father of Publius of a fever, and afterwards working other cures on the sick who were brought to him. Publius possessed property in Melita: the distinctive title given to him is "the first (πρώτος) of the island," and two inscriptions—one in Greek, the other in Latin—have been found at Civita Vecchia, in which that apparently official title occurs. An inscription found in Malta designates the governor of the island by the same title. (See Lewin's St. Paul, ii. 209, where the originals are given, showing this to be the only natural interpretation.) Publius may perhaps have been the delegate of the Roman praetor of Sicily, to whose jurisdiction Melita, or Malta, belonged. The Roman martyrologies assert that he was the first bishop of the island, and that he was afterwards appointed to succeed Dionysius as bishop of Athens. Jerome records a tradition that he was crowned with martyrdom (De Viris Illustr. xix.; Baron, Amul. i. 554). See Walsh, De Pudbo sanitatem (Jen. 1755).

PUCCI, FRANCESCO (Lat. Franciscus), an Italian theologian, noted as the founder of a heretical school, born in the 13th century when any farmer convicted of extortion he should return four times the value of what he had fraudulently obtained. There is no reason to suppose that either Zacchaeus or Matthew belonged to a noble and ancient family which produced three cardinals. He went to Lyons to engage in commerce, but having assisted in the religious disputes 0
frequent at that epoch, he left his country to give himself to the study of theology. From Lyons he went to England, and in 1574 he took the degree of master of arts at Oxford. In adopting the greater part of the opinions of the Reformation, he expected to make ample use of that most precious conquest, liberty of search; he found himself in those limits from which he could not escape each that which best accorded with his own mind, naturally bold and restless. This independence created for him enemies and disputes in all the countries which he visited; he led a wandering life, and instead of passing, for a person of troubled mind in search of truth, he was loaded with imminent perils. At Oxford, being a candidate for a chair, he was advised to write a thesis De Fide in Deum quae et gualla sit, and raised the opposition of all his future colleagues, less by the scruples which he had shown of the method of comprehending God than because he had openly combated the dogmas of Calvinism. Pucci then went to Basle, and there made the acquaintance of Faustus Socinus, but a dispute that he had with him about the first man, and his ideas of universal mercy, exposed him anew to persecution. Exiled from Basle in 1576, he returned to London, where his own religious views caused him to be imprisoned. After his release, he took refuge in the Low Countries; but always studying, writing, and disputing, he did not find his halting-place until he reached Poland. At Cracow he encountered two Englishmen—John Dee and Edward Kelley, companions of John á Laski; they won Pucci to the study of occult science, and persuaded him that by familiar intercourse with spirits he would have the privilege of discovering much that was unknown. The attraction of the marvellous, and the novelty of the phenomena that John Dee seemed to control, were strong enough to attach Pucci for four years. The papal nuncio at Prague became acquainted with Pucci, and by his personal influence drew him into the bosom of the Rohan Church in 1586. In 1592 Pucci wrote a book dedicated to pope Clement VIII, under the title De Christi Salutaris Officium (Gouda, 1592), in which he used new arguments in support of the doctrine of the universal atonement as follows: "Christ having made an atonement for all men by his death, no other means are now necessary for salvation than those which are provided by natural religion, and not only those who bear the name of the Saviour, but all honest men, can be saved, even in paganism." The doctrine thus espoused was not likely to please the pontiff, though he was honored by the dedication, and Pucci was made so uncomfortable that in 1595 he came from the Rohan Church to the Augustinian order. He then received sacerdotal ordination, and became secretary of cardinal Pompey, with whom he passed the last years of his life in peace. He died in 1600. He had composed the following couplet which was engraved upon his tomb:

"Inveni portam:-spea et fortuna, valte!\nNil mihi voluptas, iadie nunc ales."

Some authors have asserted without proof that Pucci was sent to Rome and burned. See "University Quarter," July, 1874, art. i.; Ittig, De Puccianismo; Schmid, Dr. F. Pucio in Naturalia et Indifferentiati Rerum (Lips. 1712, 4to); Bayly, Hist. Dict. a. v. (J. H. W.)

Puccianites is the name of the followers of Francesco Pucci (q. v.), a class of Italian Universalists. See Universalism.

Pucelle, ABSU., a French ecclesiastic who flourished in the first half of the 18th century, is noted as one of the ablest defenders of the Gallican liberties. He was born at Paris in 1656, and was in Parliament in 1714 when a vote of non-acknowledgement of the bull Crepusculum, which aimed at the destruction of the Jansenists (q. v.), was discussed, and he most vigorously opposed this act on the part of the French state. He was then one of the clerical counsellors of the "Grand Chamber." In 1730, also, after the archbishop of Paris, De Vintimille, attempted to enforce the Unigenitus, and the king had suffered the "lit de justice" to strengthen the papacy, Pucelle stood strong, and caused the councillors to keep their places and assert the independence and supremacy of the temporal power of France over Roman ecclesiasticism. They contended that it does not belong to ecclesiastics to define the limits from which they must not diverge, each that which best accorded with his own mind, naturally bold and restless. This independence created for him enemies and disputes in all the countries which he visited; he led a wandering life, and instead of passing, for a person of troubled mind in search of truth, he was loaded with imminent perils. At Oxford, being a candidate for a chair, he was advised to write a thesis De Fide in Deum quae et gualla sit, and raised the opposition of all his future colleagues, less by the scruples which he had shown of the method of comprehending God than because he had openly combated the dogmas of Calvinism. Pucci then went to Basle, and there made the acquaintance of Faustus Socinus, but a dispute that he had with him about the first man, and his ideas of universal mercy, exposed him anew to persecution. Exiled from Basle in 1576, he returned to London, where his own religious views caused him to be imprisoned. After his release, he took refuge in the Low Countries; but always studying, writing, and disputing, he did not find his halting-place until he reached Poland. At Cracow he encountered two Englishmen—John Dee and Edward Kelley, companions of John á Laski; they won Pucci to the study of occult science, and persuaded him that by familiar intercourse with spirits he would have the privilege of discovering much that was unknown. The attraction of the marvellous, and the novelty of the phenomena that John Dee seemed to control, were strong enough to attach Pucci for four years. The papal nuncio at Prague became acquainted with Pucci, and by his personal influence drew him into the bosom of the Rohan Church in 1586. In 1592 Pucci wrote a book dedicated to pope Clement VIII, under the title De Christi Salutaris Officium (Gouda, 1592), in which he used new arguments in support of the doctrine of the universal atonement as follows: "Christ having made an atonement for all men by his death, no other means are now necessary for salvation than those which are provided by natural religion, and not only those who bear the name of the Saviour, but all honest men, can be saved, even in paganism." The doctrine thus espoused was not likely to please the pontiff, though he was honored by the dedication, and Pucci was made so uncomfortable that in 1595 he came from the Rohan Church to the Augustinian order. He then received sacerdotal ordination, and became secretary of cardinal Pompey, with whom he passed the last years of his life in peace. He died in 1600. He had composed the following couplet which was engraved upon his tomb:

"Inveni portam: spea et fortuna, valte!\nNil mihi voluptas, iadie nunc ales."

Some authors have asserted without proof that Pucci was sent to Rome and burned. See "University Quarter," July, 1874, art. i.; Ittig, De Puccianismo; Schmid, Dr. F. Pucio in Naturalia et Indifferentiati Rerum (Lips. 1712, 4to); Bayly, Hist. Dict. a. v. (J. H. W.)

Puccianites is the name of the followers of Francesco Pucci (q. v.), a class of Italian Universalists. See Universalism.

Pucelle, ABSU., a French ecclesiastic who flourished in the first half of the 18th century, is noted as one of the ablest defenders of the Gallican liberties. He was born at Paris in 1656, and was in Parliament in 1714 when a vote of non-acknowledgement of the bull Crepusculum, which aimed at the destruction of the Jansenists (q. v.), was discussed, and he most vigorously opposed this act on the part of the French state. He was then one of the clerical counsellors of the "Grand Chamber." In 1730, also, after the archbishop of Paris, De Vintimille, at...
PUDENS

senators—one the host of St. Peter and friend of St. Paul, martyred under Nero; the other the grandson of the former, living about A.D. 150, the father of Novatus, Timothy (who is said to have preached the Gospel in Britain), Praxedes, and Pudentiana, whose house, in the valley between the Viminal hill and the Esquiline, served, in his lifetime, for the assembly of Roman Christians, and afterwards gave place to a church, now the Church of Sta. Pudentiana, a short distance at the back of the Basilica of Sta. Maria Maggiore. Earlier writers (as Baronius, Ann. 44, § 61; 53, § 18; 162) are disposed to believe in the existence of one Pudens only. About the end of the 16th century it was observed (F. de Monceaux, Excl. Christian. Vetror Britonum Eccles. Tournay, 1614; Estius, or his editor; Alp. Parker, De Antiquitat. Britann. Exc. 1605; M. Alford, Anales Ecc. Brit. 1665; Camden, Britannia, 1686) that Martial, the Spanish poet, who went to Rome A.D. 66 or earlier, in his twenty-third year, and dwelt there for nearly forty years, mentions two contemporaries, Pudens and Claudia, as husband and wife (Ap. iv, 13), that he mentions Pudens or Aulus Pudens in i, 32; iv, 29; v, 48; vi, 58; vii, 11, 97; Claudia or Claudia Rufina in viii, 60; xi, 53; and, it might be added, Linus, in i, 76; ii, 54; iv, 66; xi, 25; xii, 49. That Timothy and Martial should each have three friends bearing the same names at the same time and place is at least a very singular coincidence. The poet's Pudens was his intimate acquaintance, an admiring critic of his epigrams, an immoral man if judged by the Christian rule. He was an Umbrian and a soldier. First he appears as a centurion aspiring to become a primitius; afterwards he is on military duty in the remote north, and the poet hopes that on his return thence he may be raised to equestrian rank. His wife Claudia is described as of British birth, of remarkable beauty and wit, and the mother of a flourishing family. A Latin inscription found in 1733 at Chichester connects a [Pud]ens with Britain and with the Claudian name. It is as fol-

Fac-simile of the Pudens Inscription at Chichester.

lows, if we fill out the usual abbreviations: "[N]eptuno et Minervae templum [pr] salute domus divinæ auctior is Tiberii Claudii [Co]cidubini regis legrati Augusti in Brit. [cole] giam faburum et qui in eo [sacrie] sunt de suo dedicaverat, donante aequal [Pud]ento, Pudentinì filio." A corner of the stone was broken off, and the letters within brackets have been inserted on conjecture. The inscription thus commemorates the erection of a temple by a guild of carpenters, with the sanction of king Tiberius Claudius Cogidubnus, the site being the site of [Pud]ens, the son of Pudentinus. Cogidubnis was a native king, appointed and supported by Rome (Tacit. Agricol., 14). He reigned with delegated power probably from A.D. 52 to A.D. 76. If he had a daughter, she would inherit the name Claudia, and might, perhaps as a hostage, be educated at Rome. Another link seems to connect the

of Pudentiana. The same fact is said to be affirmed by Damasus in the latter part of the 4th century. These may be mere repetitions. The Acts of Pastor locate the house of Pudens in the Vicus Patricius, which corresponds with the modern Via di Sta. Pudentiana. In this street still stands a church, which is reputed to be the oldest in Rome. It is named Sta. Pudentiana, and is supposed to be located where Pudens and his family once dwelt. The text of the Acts of Pastor is unsettled, and is not free from anachronisms. The documents cannot have come in their present form, or forms rather, from their reputed author, or from the 2d century. Since Tillemont's learned criticism, they have fallen into disrepute. Theollandist writer in the Acta Sanctorum is compelled to propose alterations of the text without authority, and to suppose the existence of two persons, each named Pudens, one either the

Romanizing Briton of that time with Claudia Rufina and with Christianity (see Musgrave, quoted by Fabricius, Liv. exegesis, p. 702). The wife of Aulus Plautius, who commanded in Britain from A.D. 43 to A.D. 52, was Pomponia Gracinae, and the Ruft were a branch of her house. She was accused of a capital charge of "foreign superstition;" she was acquitted, and lived, for nearly forty years, in a state of austere and mysterious melancholy (Tacit. Ann. xiii, 32). We know from the Epistle to the Romans (xvi, 13) that the Ruft were well represented among the Roman Christians in A.D. 55. Modern researches among the Christianumbia at Rome, appropriated to members of the imperial household, have brought to light an inscription in which the name of Pudens occurs as that of a servant of Tiberius or Claudius (Journal of Classical and Sacred Philology, iv, 76).

In certain ancient documents, called the Acts of Pastor, it is recorded that Pudens, after the death of his wife, desired that his house should be consecrated as a church, and that this was done; that subsequently, at his daughters' request, a baptistery was constructed there; that these daughters gathered together their slaves, both from the city and from their country possessions, and gave liberty to those who were Christians, and exhorted those who were not believers in the holy law of Christ, and that the act of monanomia was celebrated in the tithe (church) established by Pudens; that there, also, in a time of persecution, Praxedes and Pudentiana sheltered those who through their instrumentality had become believers; that afterwards, when the latter, and her brother Novatus also, were dead, his property, with the consent of Timothessa, passed into the hands of Praxedes, by whose request the thranor, or baths, of Novatus, which are described as spacious and no longer in use, were consecrated as a church, in the name of Pudentiana, by Pius (bishop of the Church in Rome, A.D. 189-196). In 1733, it is further reported, Pius also consecrated a baptistery. Here, moreover, after the great persecution arose, numbers of Christians were concealed by Praxedes, and nourished with food and with the word of God. Pudens and his daughters, it is also narrated, were buried in the cemetery of Priscilla, on the Via Salaria. Anastasius, librarian of the Vatican in the 5th century, also asserts that Pius dedicated the thranor of Novatus as a church in the
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grandfather or the paternal uncle of the other. Nor does anything preserved in the interior of the present church of Pudentiana carry us back decisively to the first generations of Roman Christians; the older portions of the edifice, however, do contain such indications.

One of the earliest. Church of St. Pudentiana attended a Roman synod in the year 499, and was enrolled as "Presbyter Tituli Pudentiana" (Presbyter of the Church of Pudens). The building was repaired or rebuilt under Adrian I (A.D. 772-795); but portions of an older structure remain. The north aisle runs back much more than the choir and its apses. In its side towards the choir there is a slab with the inscription SIRICIUS EPISCOPVS. Siricius was bishop A.D. 384-396. It is thought that at this time, and in that of Innocent I (402-417), an old hall, or basilica, of a family mansion which had been used as a church, and was called "Titulus Pudentiani," was taken down, and a new church constructed. One wall, however, was left standing—the one at the end of the north aisle and in the rear of the choir. It is now the outer end wall of the church. This, according to competent judges, is a construction of the 1st century, and a part of some great palace. Its large hall windows can be readily distinguished. Made in the 1st century, they are now filled up with brickwork of the 2d. At this time the hall seems to have been divided by pillars and Howson, and other lines distinct from its primary design. The present church stands in the original hall of the palace. Probably long before its construction the hall itself was a place of assembly for Christians in Rome. There are, also, some subterranean chambers, said to have been first opened in 1366. Here are three long, narrow, vaulted rooms, now opened into each other, but originally separated by brick walls. The walls are regarded as 1st-century work; but the openings which throw together the three chambers were evidently made subsequently, and apparently in the 1st century, 1389, by Soccius, 1389, the construction of the arches. In the original or 1st-century wall may still be seen hot-air flues, such as belong to thermae. The cutting of the arches would have spoiled the baths. It secured an assured accommodation for the meetings of a Christian Church in troublesome times. The combined chambers made a spacious room, remote from the street and below its level. Its windows were apertures in the clear-story, and opened into an inner area. Worship could be conducted without attracting attention. The testimony of the walls and the bricks of the arches thus tally with the ancient tradition that the disused baths of Novatus, the son of Pudens, were dedicated about the middle of the 2d century as a Christian church. It is thought that in still another room of this subterranean portion of the tradition of Pudens there was a baptistery. Tradition may present another point of contact with these baths. In Justin Martyr's examination by the prefect of Rome (about A.D. 166), the following dialogue is reported.

"Prefect. Where do you assemble?"
"Justin. Where each one chooses and can. . . . The God of the Christians is not circumscribed by place, but, being in heaven and earth, is everywhere worshipped and glorified by the faithful."

"Prefect. Say, where do you assemble, or into what place do you collect your disciples?"
"Justin. I dwell above one Martinus, at the Timotheus Baths. . . . I know of no other meeting than his."

"Prefect. Are you not, then, a Christian?"
"Justin. Yes, I am a Christian."

In the Roman tradition, the house of Pudens was the place where Christians coming to Rome were freely entertained. Meals were held in Justin's time, Christian assemblies.

On the Via Salaria a cemetery called after Priscilla, the traditional mother of Pudens, which bears unmistakable signs of having been used by persons of the same name, as well as by the descendents of Roman Christians. These evidences are sufficiently indicated in Northcote and Brownlow's "Romani Suttemres," and need not here be specified. It may be added, however, that, in the lower story of this catacomb, imprints have been found of the seal of a pudens Felix upon the cement which closes a loculus or grave (De Romi, Images de l.'T. Savoie choisies dans les Catacombes de Rome [Paris, 1863], p. 17). Two roguous men suits exactly the tradition that the Pudens family belonged to the gens Cornelia (Cornelius Sulla being the first who took the surname Felix), and the further uniform tradition that this cemetery was their burial-place. The traditions are thus confirmed which represent a Pudens family of wealth and distinction to have been very early connected with the Christian Church in Rome. They increase so far the coincidences in favor of the identity of Martial's friends with the Pudens and Claudia of Paul's Epistle. The resemblance is one of family distinction, as well as of name, time, and place. See The House of Pudens in Rome: A Lecture Delivered to the Royal Archaeological Institute, June 2, 1871, by John Henry Parker, C.B., F.S.A., etc.; reprinted from the Archaeological Journal.

On the whole, although the identity of St. Paul's Pudens with any legendary or heathen name is not absolutely proven, yet it is difficult to believe that these facts add nothing to our knowledge of the friend of Paul and Timothy. The identity is favored by Alford, Conybeare, Howson, and Lillie. Other objections have been raised against the story do not seem to be inoperable. The difficulty is that so much is pure conjecture. In The Acts of Pastor, the wife of Pudens, and mother of his children, is named Savinilla. The Welsh legends are said to assert Pudens's marriage with Gladys, the daughter or niece of Caractacus. The facts and arguments are treated at great length in a pamphlet entitled Claudia and Pudens, by archbishop Williams (Llandover, 1848), p. 88; and more briefly by dean Alford, Greek Testament (ed. 1856), iii, 104; and by Conybeare and Howson, Life of St. Paul (ed. 1866), i, 528; also by Lechler, Gesch. der Kirch. i, 528; and by Bp. Howson, Life of St. Paul, p. 197, 197. It is ingeniously woven into a pleasing romance by a writer in the Quarterly Review, xcivi, 100-105. See Prof. Smyth in the Biblioth. Sacra, 1873, p. 174 sq.; also Usher, Eccl. Brit. Antiquitates, § 8, and Stillwell, Antiquitates.

Pudentiana, Sr. Among the Roman families who, in the 2d century, embraced the Christian faith, of the most distinguished seems to have been that of the senator Pudens, his mother Priscilla, and his two daughters Pudentiana and Praxedea. Pudens is frequently alleged to have been a disciple of the apostles Peter and Paul, and there is really a Pudens named in the second letter to Timothy; but this Pudens seems not to be identical with the father of Pudentiana and Praxedea. According to the Bollandists, our Pudens was converted by pope Pius I, who lived in the middle of the 2d century. After the death of his wife, the new convert had his house transformed into a church. He taught his two daughters the doctrines and all good works of Christianity, in which they so distinguished themselves, converting to their new faith, with the assistance of the pope, who used to say mass in the new consecrated building, not only the members of their family and inmates of their house, but a large number of other pagans. We do not know how his holy daughters died. Pudentiana, as well as Praxedea, had churches in Rome in the earliest times. See The Bollandists on May 19, where a learned commentary is given about Pudens and his two daughters, with the documents relating to them. See Pudens.

Pudicitia (Pudice), a personification of modesty, was worshiped by the Greeks and Romans. Pudicitia was an altar dedicated to her (Pausan. I, 17, § 1). At Rome two sanctuaries were dedicated to her, one under the name of Pudicitia patria, and the other under that of Pudicitia plebeia. The former was in the Forum Boarium, near the temple of Clitunno, and the patrician Virginia was drawn from this sanctuary by the other patrician women, because she had married
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pufer, John M., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Richmond, Va., Jan. 29, 1835. From a child he was noticeably correct in his habits, and showed himself well fitted for a life of self-reliance. His mother died young, and his education was at an early age. His educational opportunities were limited to the district school and a few terms at the academy. He was converted in 1852, and united with the Methodists. He was licensed to preach in 1856. The following year he entered the Troy Conference, and filled the following appointments: Johnson and Hyde Park, under the presiding elder: Essex, Milton, and Pittsford, one year each; Essex, N. Y., two years. By a change of conference boundaries he went into Vermont Conference in 1863, and was stationed at Grand Isle two years; at St. Albans’ Bay, one year; at Highgate, Waterbury Centre, Randolph, and Chelsea, two years each; and at Barre, his last appointment, which he served only the fraction of a year, when called from toil to reward. He died Jan. 7, 1874. Puffer labored with great acceptability, and almost literally “seized as once to react to the sin of himself, on the text, “If a man die, shall he live again?” —Conference Minutes, 1874, p. 96.

pufer, Reuben, D.D., an American divine of note, was born at Sudbury, Mass., in 1756, and was educated at Harvard College, class of 1778. He then studied divinity, and became pastor a Congregational church in Bolton; (afterwards called Becket,) where he held this place until his death, in 1826. He published: Election Sermon (1803) — Dedication Lecture in Harvard College (1808) — Conversion Sermon (1811) — Two Sermons (1826); and some secular addresses. See Spurgeon, Annals of the American, 206, 299 sq.

puget, Pierre, called the Michael Angelo of France, on account of his ability in painting and architecture, as well as in sculpture, and perhaps also on account of a kindred enthusiasm and decision of character, was born in 1622 at Marseilles, where his father practiced as an architect and sculptor. It was from him that he received his first instructions in art, after which he was placed under a shipwright, or builder of galleys, to learn to carve the ornaments used in these vessels. Disgusted with the drudgery of such workmanship, he set out for Italy, and passed a considerable time at Florence, where he pursued his studies as a sculptor with great success. He arrived there, however, he was attracted by the fame of Pietro di Cortona. He became the pupil of that artist, but made such progress that he accompanied him to Florence as assistant to paint the ceilings of the Pitti palace. He suddenly resolved upon returning to France, and did so, and was commissioned to design a vessel of extraordinary magnificence. Puget proceeded a second time to Rome, and there spent between five and six years: what afterwards because of his valuable collection of drawings is not known. On his second return from Italy he painted; but excessive application so weakened him that he confined himself thenceforth to architecture and sculpture. His talents met with employment at Tos- kin and Marseilles, and for the latter city he projected many embellishments, which established his reputation as an architect; and he further gave proof of great skill in engineering by different ingeniously and inventions. He was sent by Fouquet to Genoa for the purpose of selecting marble for some of the works proposed to be executed at Marseilles; but that minister being short of funds did not do so. Returning home, Puget preferred returning to Genoa, where he produced some of his most noted pieces of sculpture, the two statues of St. Sebastian and St. Ambrozie, and the grand bas-relief of the Assumption, in the chapel of the Albergo de’ Poveri, besides various architectural ornaments of monasteries. By the last was obtained for him a pension of 1300 crowns, in consequence, it is said, of the earnest recommendation of
nini. That the patronage of the one and the recom-
mendation of the other were not discredited is proved
by his two celebrated performances at Versailles, the
Milo of Crotona and the group of Persians and Aem-
andra, the former of which is generally reckoned the chef-
d'oeuvre of his life, and the other the concludes his compari-
tion with the antique. He died at Marseilles, where he
spent his last days, Dec. 2, 1694.—Engl. Cyclop. a. v.;
Lenoir, Musée des Monuments Français, a. v.; Hoefer,

Pugilariis is a name for the reed of gold or silver,
or ivory, used for drinking from the chalice (q. v.).

Pugin, Augustus Northmore Welby, one of the
most distinguished of modern ecclesiastical architec-
tors, was the son of a French gentleman who fled to
England at the period of the Revolution. He was born in
1811, and commenced his professional career as a scene-painter
and decorator at the Theatre Royal, Covent Garden, and
then devoted himself to decoration in furniture, etc.
Joining the Roman Catholic Church, he determined
therefore to devote his best energies to ecclesiology,
and during the few years that he lived to practice his
profession he was called upon to erect a larger number
of Roman Catholic churches, chapels, convents, and
schools than has probably fallen to the lot of any Eng-
lislian since the Reformation. The following list in-
cludes his chief works: the cathedral church of St. Ma-
rie at Derby, one of his earlier and more pleasing works;
St. Chad's, Birmingham; three churches at Liverpool;
St. Wilfred's, Manchester; church and convent at Edge-
hill; churches at Oxford, Cambridge, Reading, Kenn-
worth, Stockton-on-Tees, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Pres
ton, Kington, Chester, Rugby, Northampton, Stoke-upon-Trent,
Brewd, Wollwich, Hammersmith, Fulham, Pontefract,
St. Edward's near Ware, Buckingham, and St. Wilfred near
Alton, a church, and a convent and chapel at Not-
tingham; convents of the Society of Mercy at London,
Birmingham, Liverpool; a private chapel in New Bath;
colleges at Radcliffe and Rugby; improvements at
Maynooth; and cathedrals, with schools and priests'
houses attached, at St. George's (Southwark), Killarney,
and Enniscorthy. To these must be added the exten-
sive and costly works executed for his great patron, the
earl of Shrewsbury, consisting, besides the alterations
made in the mansion, of a church, school-house, and
monastery at Alton Towers; and a church at Cheadle, which
has the most splendid interior of any of his others. He was a very great man at the Oxford and Cam-
bridge Colleges, Oxford, is one of the very few works executed by
him for any Protestant body; indeed, he is said to have
refused to accept any commissions for Protestant places
of worship. The list of works given above would in
truth seem to have been more than sufficient to exhaust
the time and energies of a man who ceased laboring at the
age of forty; yet he was chiefly employed during his
last years in designing and superintending the orna-
tmenting of the New Palace of Westminster, which prob-
obly owes its somewhat extravagantly mediaval and
ecclesiastical character to Pugin's Diocesan consecrations.
But, besides the practice of his profession, he found time to
add to its literature a second and revised edition of his
Contrasts; a treatise on the True Principles of Pointed
or Christian Architecture (1841); — An Apology for the
Revival of Christian Architecture (1847); — A Glossary
of Ecclesiastical Ornament (1844) — a treatise on Flori-
 rated Ornament (1849); — and a treatise on Chancel
Screen (1851). As he advanced in life his religious
feelings took more and more entire possession of him.
In 1850 he wrote and published An Address to the In-
habitants of Liverpool: A Protest — An Essay on the
Revival of the Ancient Plain Song; — The Present State
of Public Worship among the Roman Catholics; and
other pamphlets of a religious character. At length,
overtasked with all this excessive labor and excitement,
his intellect began to give way, and in his fortieth year
he was removed to a lunatic asylum. For a brief space
his mental powers were so far restored that it be-
came practicable for him to return to his home at
Ramsgate; but he expired there Sept. 14, 1852, three
days after his return. He was buried in a vault of
his own church of St. Augustine, which he had built
on his own acres. Pugin was a man of extraordinary
industry and energy, and he possessed a very unusual
amount of knowledge and great ability. He attempt-
med, however, too many things, and he worked too
much and too fast to produce many great works, even
had he been a man of original power. In truth, his
was not a creative mind, and he lacked comprehensive
thought.

Pu'hte (Heb. only as a collective, and with the
art. kap-Puthi, 2 Sam. 13:17, patronymic from some unknown
primitive; Sept. ὅπαθη, r. ὅπαθη, Vulg. Apu-
thel), a designation of the second named of the "fami-
lies of Kirjath-jearim" descended from Shobal (1 Chron.
ii, 55). "There is a Jewish tradition, stated in
2 Sam. 5:11, that Targum of R. Joseph, that these families of Kirjath-
jeirim were the sons of Moses whom Zipporah bare him,
and that from them were descended the disciples of the
prophets of Zorah and Eshtaol"

Pul, the name of a fraternity, partly religious, in
honor of St. Mary, and partly literary, established in
Picardy and Normandy, and translated to England
about the beginning of the 14th century, deriving its
name from the Virgin of the Cathedral of La Puy, to
which pilgrims greatly resorted. They yearly elected
a prince, who was crowned with garlands or circlets,
like those still used on certain occasions by the city
companies; the loving name was gaily passed at the
election, and the author of the best ballad royal was
also crowned. They had a chaplain-priest to sing
masses, maintained a great feast annually, and kept a
common hutch for the contributions of the brotherhood.
There was a chapel of St. Mary de Pul at Westminster.
No woman was ever admitted to their meetings. Perhaps
Puets, another form, may allude to the Song of Solomon
(14, 15).

Pulk. See Paint.

Pul (Heb. id. בוע [for derivation, see below]), the
name of a people and of a man.

1. (Sept. פּוּד v. פּוד; Vulg. Africa.) A country
or people located at a great distance from Judea, and
named once (1 Sam. iv, 19) between Tarsim and Lud:
"The nations (כּלּ הַנָּהוּ) to Tarshish, Pul, that
draw the bow, to Tubal and Javan, to the
tiles afar off." Hitzig, Knoch, and some others sup-
pose that the true reading is בּוּד, Pul, which is
elsewhere joined with Lud (Ezek. xxvii, 10; Jer. xiv, 9;
A. V. "Libyans") and which is sometimes rendered in
the Sept. פּוד (Gen. x, 6; 1 Chron. i, 8), the same form
which occurs here in that version; for this, however,
there is no MS. authority, and we are therefore bound
to receive the Masoretic reading as correct. Gesenius
observes (Thesaur. a. v. בּוּד) that PULYA could be easily
changed to FOYA by a error of a copist. See Pul.
If a Mirzaitude (q. v.) is intended in this connection,
Pul may be African. It has accordingly been compared
by Hocart (Phaleg, iv, 26) and Michaelis (Spicileg. i, 256; ii, 114) with the island Philae, called in Coptic
Pelak, Pilak, Pslack: the hieroglyphic name being
Elek, P-ôlek, or Olék, (Quatremère, Mémoire sur l'Égyp
t, i, 367 sq.). This island was inhabited jointly
by Egyptians and Ethiopians (Strabo, vii, 516; Diod.
Ric. i, 22; Flinders v, 10; Polomyi, iv, 5, 74; comp. Mannert, X, i, 235 sq.), and Bochart supposes the name to be.
like Elephantine, derived from a word meaning elephant (עָלִים). But it must be kept in mind that the other
names here mentioned are those of great countries, while
Philae is a very small island. Isaiah would scarcely
speak of the Jewish people being driven to it. It seems
much more probable that Pul was the name of some dis-
taneous province of Africa: and perhaps the suggestion of Genesius (Theoscur, p. 1094) may be right, that we have a vestige of the old name in the word Pleo which appears on inscriptions (Champlain, Grammairt, p. 159). Hitzig (Die Geschichte der Juden, p. 71) finds a Phœl not far from Punicus. This only adds to the uncertainty. See Egypt.

2. (Sept. Φωλ κ. τ. Φωλάη, Φωλάν, Φωλάν, Φάλες; Vulg. Phœl.) A king of Assyria, and the first of these monarchs who is mentioned in the Bible (2 Kings xv, 19, 20; 1 Chron, v, 26). Menahem, having succeeded in mounting the throne of Israel, proceeded to make himself master of the whole territory belonging to that kingdom. Settling forth from Tirzah, he attacked and took by storm Tiphah, or Thapsacus, on the Euphrates, which city has never been one of a border town of Israel by the conquests of Jeroboam II, whose victorious career had restored the ancient boundaries of the land in that direction as they had been in the days of Solomon (2 Kings xv, 16; xiv, 25, 28; 1 Kings iv, 24). He appears to have thus drawn on himself the notice of Pul, B.C. 769. Menahem is thought by some to have inherited a kingdom which was already included among the dependencies of Assyria; for as early as B.C. 880 Jehu gave tribute to Shalmaneser, according to the inscription on the black obelisk [see Shalmaneser]; and if it is true as it seems to have been, a regular tributary from the beginning of the reign of Assur-pal (B.C. 837), Samaria, which lay between Judea and Assyria, can scarcely have been independent. Under the Assyrian system the monarchs of tributary kingdoms, on accepting the throne, were obliged to pronounce in their kingdoms to the lord paramount, and only then became established on receiving it. We may gather from 2 Kings xv, 19, 20 that Menahem neglected to make any such application to his liege lord. Pul—a name which would have been regarded as a plain act of rebellion. In the campaign against Tiphah, we must regard Menahem as having attacked the Assyrians, and deprived them for a while of their dominion west of the Euphrates. However this may have been, it is evident that Pul looked upon Menahem as an enemy. He consequently marched an army into Palestine for the purpose of punishing his revolt, when Menahem hastened to make his submission, and having collected by means of a poll-tax the large sum of a thousand talents of gold, he paid it over to the Assyrian monarch, who consented thereupon to “confirm” him as king. See Menahem.

There is great difficulty in determining what Assyrian king is referred to under the name Pul. He must have ruled over Assyria as the immediate predecessor of Tiglath-pileser II, for this latter monarch, according to Sir H. Rawlinson (Athenaeum, No. 1782), is recorded to have received tribute in his eighth year from Menahem, whose reign occupied only ten years. For some time Sir H. Rawlinson identified him with a king whose cuneiform name he has variously represented as Isaahu, Pilahu, and Tama-zulo-khus (Uguru, Hez-lil-khus), and who reckoned among the countries tributary to himself—he of Khurmri or Samaria (Rawlinson, Herodotus, i, 467). [Smith revives this theory (Assyrian Eponym Canon, p. 187) of the identity of Pul with Vulniri (as he reads the name), which, according to his dates, invaded Damascus in B.C. 773.] This identification, however, Rawlinson gave up on ascertaining that the lately deciphered Assyrian canon interposed the reigns of three kings, comprising thirty-seven years, in addition to a probable interregnum of two or three years between this king and Tiglath-pileser (Athenaeum, No. 1808). Subsequently he supposed that one of the same individual is denoted by the names Pul and Tiglath-pileser in the sacred narrative. His chief argument for this is that in 1 Chron, v, 26 the same event—namely, the deposition of the tribes beyond the Jordan—is attributed to the two kings associated together as if they were one and the same individual (Athenaeum, No. 1809). But, as already remarked by Winer (Boeke, ii, 259), the passage in 1 Chron. does not necessarily ascribe to the two kings the accomplishment of the same measure. Pul is mentioned in it as the first Assyrian king who came into collision with the Israelites, and thus probably the way for the subjection of the transjordanic tribes. But that this measure is attributed solely to Tiglath-pileser, as in 2 Kings xx, 29, is manifest from the use of the singular נבוגו [Nebogu]. Dr. Julius Oppert, who accepts the account of Ctesias, and takes it to refer to the subversion of the first Assyrian empire, supposes Pul to be the Babylonian Beluga. The eminent Assyriologist Dr. Hincks supposes that “Pul became king of Babylon, holding Assyria in subjection, in 787 B.C. Tiglath-pileser revolted from him and established an independent kingdom of Assyria in 788 B.C.” (Atheneum, No. 1180). The main difference between this view and that of Dr. Oppert is that Dr. Hincks supposes a considerable interval to have elapsed between Beluga, the conqueror of Nineveh, and Pul. It certainly appears the most plausible opinion; and it seems safest to acquiesce in it until further discoveries of cuneiform students lead to a more exact determination. It is difficult to reconcile with the Sacred chronology, and it falls in with what we can glean of Assyrian history from classical and monumental sources. The account of Ctesias, as found in Diodorus Siculus (Hist. ii), though rejected by Sir H. Rawlinson and his followers (comp. especially Rawlinson, A. M. of ii, 521), has received the support of many eminent modern critics. It has been shown to be reconcilable with the narrative of Herodotus (Hist. i, 102, 106), which contains intimations that there had been a subservial of the Assyrian empire prior to its final overthrow attributed to that historian (see Winer, Reised, i, 104). It is admitted that the Assyrian canonic, in the period between Iva-lush IV and Tiglath-pileser II, gives indication of “troubled times and of a disputed, or, at any rate, a disturbed succession” (Rawlinson, A. M. ii, 388). The writer last cited also asserts that the inscriptions of Tiglath-pileser II “support the notion of a revolution and change of dynasty in Assyria at this point of its history” (Rawlinson, Herodotus, i, 468). That Pul was a Babylonian holding rule in Assyria at this time is confirmed by the notice of Alexander Polyhistor (Euseb. Chron. i, 4): “Post hos at exandris Caesaribus est secundum Phülus erat;” and also by the form of the name. The name Pul, while having, according to Prof. Rawlinson, its counterpart among known Babylonian names, is wholly alien to the rules on which Assyrian names are formed. It is evidently “always composed of two, three, or more characters” (A. M. iii, 388, note). The name is probably the same as the Sanscrit Pula, lofty, highest; hence lord, king; perhaps the same as Bid, i.e. lord. The same syllable is found in the names Sardanapalus and Nabopolassar. Pul is also mentioned in the extracts of Alexander Polyhistor, in Eusebius (Chron. A. D. i, 41), but not elsewhere. Eusebius adds, “Polyhistor says that Senecheribus was king after him;” but this is not to be understood of immediate succession. See Assuria.

Pulaha, a divinity of Indian mythology. Brahmas created Pulahans from different parts of his body. At the same time Sunyambhu, Brahmas son, created the ten celebrated rishis, or forefathers, of all existing beings. These are identical with the nine Brahmas mentioned, and one of them is Pulaha. He was so pious that he could, by his prayers, create men, animals, and gods.

Pulcheria, elf, one of the most celebrated saints of the Greek Church, was an empress. She was the eldest daughter of the emperor Arcadius, and was born between 388 and 400. In early youth she showed rare intellectual gifts and a fervent piety. Her wisdom was an object of general adoration. She was also reen when she came to assist her younger brother Theodosi.
PULÉAR

suius II in the government. Pulcheria then made a vow of eternal chastity, prevailed upon her sisters to follow her example, and gave to the Byzantine court the purity which should prevail in a monastery. Some writers charge that this chastity was feigned from political reasons, Pulcheria desiring to prevent the marriage of her sisters, and thus avoid controversy on the claims to the throne. By her wisdom and piety the prosperity of the empire was certainly promoted: she seemed to be its good guardian. She defended zealously the purity of the Christian faith against the doctrines of Nestorius and Eutyches, and became the foremost advocate of the Nicene Creed. Her eloquence was most beneficial at the synods of Ephesus and Chalcedon. St. Cyril of Alexandria sent her his celebrated work De Fide ad Pulcheriam. She was in correspondence with the popes, especially with Leo I. This great pope, in many letters, praises her wisdom and kindness. He entreats her, in 449, to take measures against the heresy of Eutyches (Jaffé, Reg. Pontif. n. 203, 204, p. 37); rejoices at the vigor and energy of her faith (ibid. n. 226, p. 339), and praises her activity in suppressing Eutychianism (451; ibid. n. 357, p. 40). There are in all ten letters extant from Leo I to Pulcheria. In 449, Bishop James of Cyrrhus, also praised her attachment to the Church, and interceded with her for his city, heavily burdened with taxes (Theod. Ep. 48; Baron. ad ann. 444). All her contemporaries praise her benevolent influence. She dissuaded her brother Theodosius from Nestorianism, and celebrated the victory of the orthodox creed over this heresy by building a splendid church in honor of the Virgin Mary (Nicom. H. E. xiv, 2; Baron. ad ann. 481). She sent valuable presents to Jerusalem, and built a number of new churches (Baron. ad ann. 449, 455). She was several times exposed to the plots of the courts, which tried to destroy her good understanding with her brother and his wife Eudocia. In 446 she retired entirely from the court: but her absence was soon felt. After the death of Theodosius, Pulcheria and Marcianus, who had been honored with the title of Augustus, and whom she had welded, took the reins of the empire. She had married for the good of the empire, and with the stipulation that she should be allowed to keep her vow of virginity. After benefiting the Church in many ways as empress, and opposing Eutychianism with the same decision as she had previously Nestorianism, she died, Sept. 11, 453. Her sainthood is recognised by the Latin as well as by the Greek Church. Baronius (ad ann. 458) and the Bollandists (vol. i, July) erected liturgical memorials to her memory. Benedict XIV permitted, by decree of the Congregation of the Rites of Jan. 8, 1752, to the regular canons of St. Augustine in Portugal, and to some houses of Jesuits, the celebration of her feast on July 7, sub voto duplici: soon afterwards, Feb. 11, the same year, this permission was extended to the whole company of Jesus. These decrees of the pope and mass of Pulcheria, are in the appendix of Benedict XIV’s work De Sanctorum Canonizatione. The oration of the feast praises the chastity of the saint, and her zeal for the purity of the faith. See Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Bio. and Mythol. s. v.; Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon, vol. xii, s. v.; Herberstein, Mem. of the Turks, vol. ii; Alzog, Kirchenlex., iii, 809; Milman, Hist. of Latin Christianity, ii, 243 sqq.

Coin of Pulcheria.

Pulicar, or Ganesha, a deity of Indian mythology, was the son of Siva, Parvati. She lived with him, without the co-operation of her husband, by shaping into the frame of a youth what was washed away from her body during her bath. Siva thought of himself betrayed by Parvati, and in his wrath he struck off the head of the young god. When he found out his mistake, he wished to heal his victim; but the head had been carried away by the waters of the Ganges, and had been eaten by fishes. Siva solved this difficulty by telling the son of his wife to cut off the head of the first creature he should meet and put it on his shoulders: as misfortune would have it, this creature was an elephant. Therefore Ganesha is always represented with an elephant’s trunk. Ganesha sits astride of a mouse, which is nothing else than the metamorphosed giant Siddhajanyashurim, vanquished by him while warring against the gods. Ganesha is incredibly strong, and therefore of great use to the gods in their perpetual warfare against the demons. He is a great eater, and would eat the whole world if he had his own way: it is only in the sea of sugar, in which he has a floating abode, that he can, in some measure, satisfy the cravings of his hunger. Being the favorite son of Siva, he is worshipped like that god himself, and invoked first before every sacrifice. The Indians believed that he could at his will accumulate or remove obstacles: all Indian books commence with a prayer to him. His image is frequently found painted on the house doors, and almost every family has his statue in bronze, marble, or clay. Pulicar is his name as god of marriage: it was the natural question of his father at his first appearance in the world—Pulicar, I.e. Whose son?

PULIAHS

Pulgar, Isaac, a Jewish convert to Christianity, flourished at Avila, in Spain, about 1500 to 1549. He was a friend of Aboer of Burgos, better known (after his baptism) as Alphonso of Valladolid, against whom he afterwards wrote a polemical work entitled "The Book of Answers." He also wrote, besides some other works which are still in MS., a work under the title אביו של פיירו, "A Contest between an Orthodox and a Philosopher," wherein he endeavors to reconcile the difference between philosophy and faith, and which was reprinted with a Paris M. in the "און מִשְׁרָא יְבַשְׁמֵהוּ," of E. Ashkenasi (Frankl. a. M. 1849), p. 1-19. Pulgar was the first to say that "the belief in the Messianic redemption is not an essential point of Judaism, with which it stands or falls, although many passages in the prophesies speak of the coming of the Messiah." See Furst, Bibl. Jud. iii, 110 sq.; De Rossi, Dizionario Storico degli Autori Ebrei, p. 266 (Germ. transl. by Hamburger); the same, Bibliotheca Judaica Antichristiana, p. 98; Grätz, Geschichte der Juden, vii, 337 sqq., 485 sqq. (2d ed. Leips. 1873); Wolf, Bibl. Hebr. i, 1259. (B. P.)

Puliahs, the lowest of all Indian castes, or, rather, the scum of the lowest, being still more despised than the Pariahs. They are not allowed to walk on the regu-
lar roads, but must, at the distance of a hundred paces, warn every wanderer of their vicinity by uttering a well-known yell. They are not even allowed to dwell in huts, but live at a great distance from all inhabited places, in dense forests, where they build their nests on trees, like monkeys.


 Pulleyn, Rosker, an English Roman Catholic prelate of the 12th century, was born, according to Fuller, in the county of Oxford. After having studied in Paris, he returned to England in 1130, and found the University of Oxford devastated and almost ruined by the Danes, and he zealously contributed to restore it to its previously flourishing condition. In the reign of Henry I he was charged with the work of explaining the writings of, and commenting upon, Aristotle, and he acquainted himself in this double task to the great satisfaction of the scholars and the King, his constant patron. He received as recompense the archdeaconry of Rochester.

 After a short time he returned to Paris, and taught theology at the Sorbonne. In vain his bishop summoned him to return to England, and in order to compel him to seize the revenues of his benefice, Pulleyn appealed against these proceedings to the pope, who decided in his favor. Such was his renown that Innocent II summoned him to Rome, and there received him with great honor. In 1144 Celestine II created him cardinal, and soon after Lucius II made him chancellor of the Roman Church. He died in 1160, Pulleyn wrote several works. The one which remains to us is the *Sententiarum Liber* (Paris, 1655). From it is evident that he preferred the authority of the Bible and of reason to the testimony of the fathers or to the subtleties of the scholastics. Pulleyn belonged to the Abbeard school of theology, and inclined to free dialectic discussion. He advocated the doctrine of free will, but did not admit *gratia irresistible*. "Through pride," he writes, "man fell; his salvation must proceed from the opposite quarter. The rational man, who was designed to rule over nature, must humble himself before the sensible elements to receive grace through them." But this was a lowering of the idea of humility to an outward act. He favored, strangely enough for one so liberal in many things, the withholding of the cup from the sick, and he taught, "that the blood might not be spilled again," and supported the doctrine of indulgences (q. v.) in a most extreme manner. But the most eccentric of all his theological notions was the absurd question he raised as to the exact moment at which, and the manner in which, the union of the divine nature of the Son with the human assumed in the womb of Mary had taken place; and that on the cross only Christ's body had died, but not the whole man Christ. Pulleyn appears to have written also on the Apocalypse. There are still twenty of his sermons preserved among the Lambeth MSS. See Wright, *Pleas Brit.*, ii, 183; Hardwick, *Church Hist. of the Middle Ages*, p. 263, 364; Neander, *Dogmas*, ii, 486, 521, 524, seq. et al.; Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*, i, 14, 41, 65, et al.

 Pulling, Alonso B., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born at Rockfield, Conn., Nov. 29, 1818. He experienced religion in the summer of 1840. He was licensed to preach March 1, 1846, was received into the New York Conference in the following May, and appointed to Ponssett and Killingworth Circuit, which he served two years. He was admitted to full membership, June 21, 1848, and, in 1853, was stationed at Southington and Winport, Ansonia, Seymour, New Milford, Nichol's Farms, Roxbury, East Village, and Riverside. In 1867 failing health compelled him to take a superannuated relation. He died Jan. 12, 1878. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1878, 129.

 Pulilah is the name of the temple of the Grand Lama at Deshesho. It signifies "the temple with the golden roof." In this temple dwell, when the Dalai Lama is present, 800 priests, exclusively employed in his service. In the interior, it is said, there is a multitude of statues, every one representing a woman with a child in her arms. These are probably the mothers of as many former dalai lamas.

 Pulpit (סָפָר, migdol, Neh. viii, 4, properly tower), an elevated stage, whence Ezra read the law unto the congregation (comp. ix, 4). See Bible *Educator* ii, 263.

 PULPIT (Lat. pulpētum; Fr. chaire, poupure meaning a lectern, lection being a book-desk), an elevated place from which sermons are delivered. Ezra read from a raised stage, the law, on a pulpit of wood high above the people (Neh. viii, 4); and Solomon prayed on a brazen scaffold (2 Chron. vi, 18). In mediæval times the word designates the roof-loft. Becom uses it in its modern sense. It is said to remind the hearers of Christ going up on the mountain to preach his Sermon of Beatitudes. Originally, it would appear to have been used chiefly for the singing, chanting, or recitation which forms part of the public service, and was a kind of stage sufficiently large to accommodate two, or even more, chanters. For the convenience of the hearers, this stage began to be used by the bishop, priest, or deacon, in the delivery of the homily; and thus, by degrees, a tribune expressly suited to the latter use alone came to be introduced. The earliest pulpit was the ambo, tribune, or tribunal, as it is called by Prudentius. Epiphanius says that St. Chrysostom usually preached from the ambo; so did St. Ambrose and St. Augustine; and Nicephorus records that Macedonius, patriarch of Constantinople in 489, mounted the ambo when he desired to clear himself of a charge of heresy. In some of the older churches, the ambo, or altar, is still used for this purpose, and is called the Gospel and Epistles. The ambo was placed in the centre of the church by the Greeks; it is in the middle of the nave at St. Pancras's, at Rome, on the left side, but on the right at Milan and Ravenna. At St. Clement's, Rome, the ambo table is on the steps of the sanctuary, and the office of the propylæa on the right. At Chartres, Bayeux, and Rouen the main lections were sung on the left side of the choir-entrance, and the desk was called the legam. At Bourges, an eagle stood in front of the main altar. A pulpit at Orleans and Chartres-sur-Marne was used for reading the Epistle, Gradual, Tract, and Alleluia; the Gospel was sung on the west side of the jube at Chartres, Châlons, and Lyons, that for the lections facing the east. At Bayeux and Noyon there were several desks. At Lyons and Vienne, theGregoryian chant was in the lower part of the choir, and the Epistle from the ambo; but the latter was used at both times at Rheims, Cambrai, Tours, Rouen, Sens, Châlons, Laon, Soissons, Noyon, Amiens, Beauvais, Senlis, Orléans, Meaux, Tournay, Bayeux, and St. Denis. The desk for reading the Gospel was called the pulpit; the lectern held the choir-books. The former was movable, so as to be transferred from the one side to the other of the choir, and used by the subdeacon for reading the Epistle; whereas the lectern stood in the centre of the choir as a fixture, and was common to all the cantors in time of divine service. The common ornament, the symbol of St. John Evangelist, were called the Eagle; and it appears on the ambones of Pisa.
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toja of the 18th century, and in three ancient churches at Rome. The deacon, taking the Book of the Gospel, richly bound in ivory, metal, and jewelry, carried it processionaly, preceded by thurifers and taper-bearers, to the north side, where the pulpit stood. Fulke, abbot of Lobbes in the 9th century, made a wonderful eagle, on which burned four tapers in the form of a cross; a censer was contrived in its neck, which poured fragrant smoke from the beak and flaming eyes of the bird; and the head and wings were movable, for the convenience of turning the book. Often the other three evangelists were represented as writing the words sung by the deacon; at Messina there is one with the pelican, as the symbol of the Saviour, above all. At Narbonne, in the cathedral, there is a movable pulpit of the 14th century, consisting of two iron supports set salientwise, and supporting a bookstand of supple leather. Those of St. Augustine's, Canterbury, and Bury St. Edmund's, mentioned in the 12th century, were movable until the 14th century. In Belgium, the ambo or a saldostal, set before the altar, served as a pulpit. According to John de Garlande, who wrote at the close of the 11th century, a pulpit is the ascent of steps to the lectern, upon which the chant- or reading-book was laid. The double pulpits of Milan, Narni, and Perugia connect the tradition with the ambones; those of Toledo are of bronze, and those at Seville are still used for singing the Gospel and Epistle. In three of the ancient churches at Rome, the Epistle ambo is square, and stands on the north; while that for the Gospel is round, and stands on the south side, with flights of stairs leading up to it. The ordinary pulpit also stood on the south side, as at Toledo, because the Gospel was preached from it. The jube for the gospel and epistle in large churches took the place of the ambo, and within two centuries was used by the preacher at Rouen; but in smaller churches a pulpit was used, yet there is no existing example or record of such furniture until the 18th century. Pulpits were formerly placed not only in churches, but also in the refectories of monasteries, as at Beverly, Shrewbury, Chester, etc.; in the cloisters, as at St. Dizé, in France; and occasionally in public thoroughfares, as on the north side of the church of Notre Dame; at St. Lô, in Normandy, and in the outer court of Magdalen College, Oxford. In France there are several overlooking cemeteries. In churches the pulpits were formerly always placed in the nave, attached to a wall, pillar, or screen, and the ecclesiastics and others who occupied the choir during the mass removed into the nave to hear the sermon; this custom was continued at Ely until quite recently.

The church pulpit is usually hexagonal or octagonal, and of wood, possibly in allusion to Christ’s preaching from the boat (Luke v. 1). In Roman Catholic churches the pulpit is generally distinguished by some religious emblems, especially by the crucifix; and the pulpits of the Low Countries and of Germany are often masterpieces of wood carving, the preaching-place in some of them forming part of a great artistic group, as of the Conversion of St. Paul, the Vocation of Peter and Andrew, the Temptation of Adam and Eve, and other similar subjects.

Beaulieu, Hunt.

Early pulpits were, no doubt, movable, and kept in corners until required for use, like that still preserved at Hereford; and at Bury, the analogium, or pulpit, we know, was removed from the chapter-house into the church when it was necessary. This, no doubt, is the cause of their present rarity. There are fine examples of pulpits at King’s Sutton, Kingsbury Episcopi, Wolvercote, North Kilworth, Dartmouth, and Frampton (which has images of saints). Those of Sudbury, Southwold, Hereford, and Winchester are of wood, and of the 16th century. The earliest Jacobean example is at Sopley (1606). There are stationary pulpits of stone at Wells of the 16th century, at Worcester (1504), Ripon, Cambe, Nantwich, and Wolverhampton. The oldest wooden pulpit is at Fulbourne (cir. 1500). In Italy there are examples of the 13th and 14th centuries at Siena and St. Minias, Florence; in Germany there are stone pulpits at Freiburg and Ulm of the latter part of the 15th century; at Avignon, in France; and Nieuport, in Belgium. There is a Byzantine pulpit, said to have been brought from St. Sophia’s, Constantinople, at St. Mark’s, Venice. Romanesque pulpits may be seen in St. Ambrose’s, Milan; St. Mary’s, Toscanelle; and St. Sabino’s, Canova. There is an octagonal pulpit, dated 1482, at Hatfield; that of Kidrich is cir. 1491. An hexagonal pulpit is at St. Andrew’s, Pistoja. The hexag-
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A pulpit of Perugia is used for giving the benediction. There is a superb 18th-century pulpit on seven pillars in the baptistery at Pisa, with lecterns for the Gospel and Epistle on the stairs. Abbot Wygmore's pulpit, Gloucester, was on the north, and placed against the third pillar westward of the choir. The south, to the east of the middle of the nave, was the common position as at Wells, Chartres, Harleam, Aix, and formerly at Winchester, Peterborough, Gloucester, and Worcester. In England the pulpit was copied from those of the reformed, and as such stood in the open air. In cathedral churches the pulpit was often large enough to contain several persons, as the bishop, when preaching, was accompanied by his two archdeacons. Gilding and color were not employed on pulpits until the 15th century. Many of these pulpits were highly enriched with carving; that of Worcester has the New Jerusalem, from which John Capistran preached a Turkish crusade in 1451. At Durham there was an iron pulpit, or ambo, in the gallerie, from which the Sunday sermon was preached to women. There is another on the north-west at San Gil, Guatamala, of two life ambones with desks, in the 15th century, flanked the screen of Zamora. The two pulpits of Milan are of metal, and circular. At Aix the choir pulpit is silver-gilt and jewelled. At Lugo, one of the two metal ambones has an eagle on the south. The pulpit (in Arabic, mubara) forms one of the scanty appliances of Mohammedan worship.—Walcott, Sacred Architecture, s. v.; Parker, Glossary of Architecture, s. v.

Pulpit Eloquence. As pulpits in churches are constructed for the convenience of preachers and preaching, so the term pulpit, by a common form of metonymy, is often used to signify the collective body of the clergy or those who use the pulpit, and by a slight variation of the same principle, the term is also made to signify the collective agency of preaching, as seen in the phrases "influence of the pulpit" and "power of the pulpit." In a signification which, to some extent, blends both the above meanings, the term pulpit is often used in the figurative, metaphorical sense, as in the expression "Let the pulpit speak," "The voice of the pulpit must be heard." The word is thus used in the well-known passage of Cowper:

"I say the pulpit (In the sober use Of that peculiar power) Must stand acknowledged while the world shall stand, The most important and effectual guard, Support, and augmentation of virtue." From such uses as a substantive, the same word derives its significance as an adjective; it being often used in the expressions "pulpit orator," "pulpit eloquence," and the like. The term pulpit eloquence has, in fact, come into general use as designating (1) the quality and character of the eloquence produced from the pulpit, and (2) the body of the most brilliant productions now in preservation as representing the utterances of preachers of the present and past generations.

No just treatment of eloquence in any of its phases can ignore the fact that its highest character and results can only be secured from the expression of the living speaker. There must be voice for the ear, action for the eye, and a certain projection of the sentiments, the sympathies, and the emotions of an animated soul upon the minds and hearts of others. Nor can it be denied that the sympathy of numbers in an audience reacts upon the speaker and augments within him the power of moving those whom he addresses. Hence, whether eloquence be considered subjectively as that subtle power which enables an orator to influence men by uttered language, or objectively in the effects produced upon those to whom he speaks, it needs to be heard and felt in order to be appreciated in its completeness. Nevertheless, this fullest realization of eloquence has its limitations, for when once heard and felt it is in that sense ended. It can neither be repeated nor transferred to persons, times, or places. In view of this condition of eloquence we must more fully appreciate the eloquence of written or printed language, which is to some extent independent both of speakers and hearers, and which may, in a partial but yet not wholly unsatisfactory degree, represent to persons distant, both in time and space, the utterances of eloquent men. To this end, writing and printing are conservative agencies of essential importance and of estimable value. By means of them the orations and sermons of one age are handed down to ages following, and, so far as reading is substituted for hearing, the audiences of orators and preachers are multiplied without limit. It is therefore to what is preserved in books that any article upon the eloquence of the past must chiefly refer.

In order to rightly comprehend the character and relative importance of pulpit eloquence, reference must be made to preaching (q. v.) as a divinely appointed agency for the promotion of Christianity in the world. When it was so appointed by the Lord Jesus Christ (see Matt. xxviii., 19; Mark iii., 14; xvi., 15), a new and peculiar function was conferred upon human speech in making it the chief agency for the spread of that truth which was designed to make men free from sin and to prepare them for the heavenly world. The very nature of this high appointment indicates that the pulpit, as representing the public utterances of Christian ministers, affords unrivalled opportunities for the production and employment of eloquence in its best forms. 1. It demands capacity, convictions, and moral power on the part of preachers, which should go very far towards making them eloquent men from the first and furnishing them with recurring and highly favorable occasions for addressing assemblies. For that object it assigns itself of the consecrated time of the holy Sabbath and of the sanctuary as a hallowed place for the delivery of its message. 3. The themes which it appropriately discusses are all of an elevating and inspiring character, having an intrinsic importance superior to that of any earthly interest, being also invested with the authority of divinely revealed truth. It was in the light of such considerations that John Quincy Adams declared that "the pulpit is especially the battlefield of modern eloquence. Certainly, neither the bema of the Greeks nor the forum of the Romans ever afforded such an agency of power over human minds and hearts. Nor is this agency limited in its exercise to any narrow routine of forms or circumstances. It is as much in place and as full of power in the catacomb as in a cathedral; on the shores of Galilee as in the synagogues of the Jews; in the sequestered glens where persecuted worshippers gather as in churches where kings and magistrates assemble. Indeed, its greatest triumphs have often been in circumstances outwardly and outwardly most pitiful, and preservation in any earthly record was impossible. Hence, while the function of preaching has been in exercise for nearly nineteen centuries by countless thousands of preachers, but a very small proportion of the sermons that have been delivered have been, or could have been preserved in the reading world; yet the combined literature of the ancient and modern pulpit is of immense extent.

It is by no means assumed that all printed sermons are eloquent in any superlative sense. Many, no doubt, are far less so than thousands that have vanished with the breath of one who died them or of the memory and lives of those who heard them. Nevertheless, study and criticism are limited to those products of the pulpit which have been preserved from the oblivion of the past and made accessible to persons living in subsequent periods. But of these there is an
ever-increasing abundance, so that the task of the student is necessarily one of selection. A general or comprehensive view of pulpit eloquence can only be obtained by the study of the subject in chronological order, beginning with the apostolic age and descending to the present period, the proper reference to the characteristics of successive periods. The limits of the present article only admit of a summary outline.

I. The Period of the Apostles and Early Fathers.—Notwithstanding the brevity of its record, the New Testament is by no means silent as to the subject of preaching. The Gospels only contain our Lord’s Sermon on the Mount, but many fragments of the addresses or sermons which he delivered to his disciples and the multitudes. The Acts of the Apostles report in brief several of the discourses of Peter and Paul, while the Epistles may be understood to be summaries of the discussions and instructions which the different apostles were accustomed to give in their discourses as preachers. The specimens of preaching contained in the New Testament are, in fact, more full and satisfactory than any found in ecclesiastical history for several centuries after the close of the apostolic age. Indeed, our chief mode of forming any judgment of the preaching of those early centuries is from the fruits following. Even Eusebius, who wrote in the early part of the 4th century, acknowledges himself indebted to tradition for all that he knew of the lives of the apostles who had “spread the seeds of salvation and of the heavenly kingdom throughout the world far and wide.”

During most, if not all, of this period, pulpits were not in existence, and even churches, as separate religious edifices, were unknown, or, at most, only beginning to exist. Worsippers, instead of assembling in large numbers, met by twos and threes wherever they could escape the surveillance of persecutors. Such circumstances would necessarily control, to a very small extent, the form of address employed by Christian ministers and teachers. The propaedeutic of the Gospel, making especially necessary personal address to individuals wherever a listener could be found. Moreover, as the New-Testament Scriptures only existed in fragmentary manuscripts, it would be necessary to employ a part of the time allotted to pastoral instruction in reciting and explaining such portions of them as were in the possession of the several pastors and teachers.

The prevailing form of ministerial address during the period referred to must, therefore, have been that of explanation and exhortation; but of its efficiency in the best sense, we know only the unanimous testimony of men to abandon error and embrace the truth—the progress of Christianity during that period of abounding paganism is the best possible proof. The power of the early preachers of Christianity, like that of the apostles themselves, must have consisted chiefly in a straightforward utterance of the truth—the direct witness of the Gospel and its appeal to the human heart. There is no reason to think that oratory was studied, or perhaps thought of; but the influence of Christian truth and life was in plain words brought to bear upon the thoughts and lives of those present as well as upon the errors and superstitions of heathenism.

II. The Period of the Later Fathers, or the Oratorical Period of the Ancient Church.—During and following the age of Constantine, Christian churches became common, and the canon of Scripture having been completed, copies were multiplied by transcription. But as manuscripts were costly, they could rarely be possessed by individuals, not always even by churches; hence a great part of the work of preachers was to expound consecutively the several parts of the sacred text. Thus homilies or familiar expositions of Scripture became the form of pulpit address which primarily characterized that period. Voluminous and valuable examples have come down to us in the homilies of Athanasius, Ephraem Syrus, Basil, the Gregory of the Cyrus, Hilary, Ambrose, Chrysostom, and Augustine.

The same period was also marked by the cultivation, among the more prominent preachers, of the Grecian style of oratory. Several of the most distinguished fathers having not only been students, but teachers of rhetoric, they did not neglect opportunities offered them for sacred oratory and panegyrics. The latter style of address, in fact, became very common in the honorings of the martyrs and in celebrations of the great feasts of the Church.

The best specimens of the Christian oratory of this period have been much eulogized, and having been often pointed out as models for study and imitation, have exerted no little influence on the preaching of modern times, more particularly in France and on the continent of Europe. Even the historian Gibbon, in a paragraph which severely, but not without justice, censures certain serious errors into which many of the teachers of the Church had already fallen, says, “But the compositions of Gregory and Chrysostom have been compared with the most splendid models of Attic, or at least of Asiatic, eloquence.”

That the mistakes of the preachers of the ancient Church came largely from ignorance, and that the tendency of education and enlightenment was to increase the influence of truth and the power of the pulpit, is sufficiently evident from the edict of the apostate emperor Julian, which prohibited the Christians from teaching or being taught the right use of books. The motives which prompted the edict are thus set forth by Gibbon: “Julian had reason to expect that (under the influence of his edict) in the space of a few years the Church would relapse into its primate simplicity; and that the theologians who possessed an adequate share of the learning and eloquence of the age would be succeeded by a generation of blind and ignorant fanatics incapable of defending the truth of their own principles or of exposing the various follies of polytheism.”

Notwithstanding the early death of Julian and the restoration of the civil rights of the Christians, through a series of untoward events, to which prevailing corruption in the Church greatly contributed, the evils of general ignorance and the degradation of preaching and of the clergy came only too soon and remained too long. From the first development of ceremonialism in the Church there was manifested a tendency to limit preaching to bishops only. This tendency grew with the multiplication of ceremonial observances, until it resulted in a general transposition of preaching from its primary design as an ever-active agency of evangelization into a ceremony, in which result springs its degenerate oratorical power. When the number of preachers was reduced to a minimum, the chances for the development of the talent of eloquence were correspondingly diminished, and the more so since an election to the office of bishop would do little towards conferring the gift of eloquence upon men previously unaccustomed to preach. Thus it may be seen that what has been called the oratorical period of the ancient Church derived that character from a comparatively few men of extraordinary ability, rather than from the general prevalence of preaching power among the orders of the clergy, the latter part of that period witnessed a serious decline in the spirit and practice of preaching, which was destined to project itself forward into centuries following.

III. The Period of the Middle Ages.—The terms “Middle Ages” and “Dark Ages” have long been nearly synonymous; but historians have not often pointed out with sufficient clearness the extent to which the darkness of those ages was chargeable to the incompetence and unfaithfulness of those who, as Christian teachers, ought to have been the lights of the world. The causes of the prevailing ignorance and degradation were numerous and complicated, but nothing would have more certainly or powerfully tended to remove them than true and zealous utterances from the clergy in the character of Christian preachers. Churches, and even cathedrals, existed in great numbers, but the idea of preob-
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The term pulpit, primarily meaning a note upon a text or texts (postillas), came to designate a religious text following the reading of the Gospel and Epistle of the day at public mass. The term itself was diminutive, showing that preaching was regarded as of small account in comparison with the ceremonials of worship. The postillae in its best form—that of a running comment on the verses of a Scripture lesson—resembled the homily. It continued in use, both among Roman Catholics and Protestants, for several generations after the dawn of the Reformation. Persons specially skilful in delivering postillae were called postillists, or postillas. Specimens of the postillae abound in the ecclesiastical literature of the period and are of much consideration, but few of them are of much present value. The best sermons of the period that have come down to us are several discourses delivered by bishops in connection with the festivals of the Church, such as the Advent, Whitsun-tide, Christmas, the Crucifixion, and the Ascension. As these topics involved Scripture narration, they rose in character far above those treated in connection with the festivals of the saints, of which tradition furnished the staple material. The most tangible, though not the most useful results of preaching in the medieval period were the so-called preachers of the Crusades. Those results were not the peaceable fruits of righteousness, but passion, strife, and bloodshed. Peter the Hermit, a fanatical monk of the 11th century, was the preacher and prime instigator of the first Crusade. On this was based the hatred and antipathy that was to follow. How important the Crusades were to the country, enlisting high and low in his desperate scheme. He even induced pope Urban II to join him in haranguing a vast multitude assembled at Clermont, in the south of France, preparatory to the first great movement towards the Holy Land. It was the hortatory speech of Urban that the multitude cried out Deus aedificans, and thus initiated the war-cry of all the Crusades. Bernard of Clairvaux, subsequently canonized as St. Bernard, preached the second Crusade. He was not only appointed by Louis VII, king of France, for that purpose, but commissioned by pope Eugenius III to offer plenary indulgence to those who would join the new Crusade. He also provided himself with badges in the form of a cross to be attached to the shoulders of all who would enlist. Whereas Peter stirred the lowest dregs of the populace, Bernard succeeded in enlisting kings, emperors, barons, and knights to attempt "to rescue the home and sanctuary of David from the hands of the Philistines." Parliaments and mass-meetings were held and addressed by Bernard from a lofty pulpit, and at these the response to his appeals was the reiterated shudder throughout the land. In such circumstances, and backed by such influences, it was said that the eloquence of Bernard "raised armies and depopulated cities." According to his own statement, towns were deserted so that the only people left in them were widows and orphans whose husbands and fathers were yet living. The third and fourth Crusades were set in motion by the ordinary influences of papal power and kingsy authority, without any special co-operation of the pulpit. The fifth, however, was brought into action by a preacher named Fulk, a Frenchman. As a result of previous disasters, the spirit of crusading had so far declined that for two years the preaching of Fulk seemed unavailing. But at length it began to be said that miracles attested his exhortations, and soon after pope Innocent III sent to his aid numerous nuncios, who traversed Europe offering absolutions and indulgences to stimulate enlistments. Robert de Courillon, an Englishman by birth, was the preacher of the sixth Crusade. He had been an assistant to Fulk, under whom he had learned the art of exciting the people. Although inferior in talents to the other preachers of the Crusades, he was equal to any of them in zeal and fanaticism, and if history does not misrepresent him, he at length became so unconquerable as to embezzeG the alms of his followers. The seventh and eighth Crusades followed like receding waves of the sea, growing smaller and weaker as the impulses of fanaticism abated. They were without any preachers of distinction, and may be regarded as results of the earlier agitation.

The general decadence of preaching throughout the Roman Church became a pretext, during the latter part of the medieval period, for the organization of several preachers orders of monks. Had these orders devoted themselves to intelligent activity in proclaiming the truths of God's Word and the practical duties of Christianity, the best of results might have been expected. But their zeal was devoted to very different objects. It was, in fact, absorbed in efforts to excite persecution against the Albigenses and other sects, and to unite with general exhortations to promote the schemes of the papacy and the inquisition. Hence it is not surprising that the preaching orders as such failed to make any valuable contributions to the eloquence of the pulpit or to stimulate activity in preaching among the clergy at large. Of the ecclesiastical celebrities of the medieval period, few can be mentioned on account of distinguished ability as preachers. The two men who, perhaps, more than others deserve such mention were Antony of Padua, subsequently canonized as a saint, and the Jesuit preacher Robert Bellarmine. The former, of the order of the Jesuits, has been described by his friends as "his rare talents as a preacher caused him to be employed on unceasing missions through the north and centre of Italy, especially in the neighborhood of Bologna and Padua." We have the account of Antony's homily on the Ascension from the country, enlisting high and low in his desperate scheme. He also provided himself with badges in the form of a cross to be attached to the shoulders of all who would enlist. Whereas Peter stirred the lowest dregs of the populace, Bernard succeeded in enlisting kings, emperors, barons, and knights to attempt "to rescue the home and sanctuary of David from the hands of the Philistines." Parliaments and mass-meetings were held and addressed by Bernard from a lofty pulpit, and at these the response to his appeals was the reiterated shudder throughout the land. In such circumstances, and backed by such influences, it was said that the eloquence of Bernard "raised armies and depopulated cities." According to his own statement, towns were deserted so that the only people left in them were widows and orphans whose husbands and fathers were yet living. The third and fourth Crusades were set in motion by the ordinary influences of papal power and kingsy authority, without any special co-operation of the pulpit. The fifth, however, was brought into action by a preacher named Fulk, a Frenchman. As a result of previous disasters, the spirit of crusading had so far declined that for two years the preaching of Fulk seemed unavailing. But at length it began to be said that miracles attested his exhortations, and soon after pope Innocent III sent to his aid numerous nuncios, who traversed Europe offering absolutions and indulgences to stimulate enlistments. Robert de Courillon, an Englishman by birth, was the preacher of the sixth Crusade. He had been an assistant to Fulk, under whom he had learned the art of exciting the people. Although inferior in talents to the other preachers of the Crusades, he was equal to any of them in zeal and fanaticism, and if history does not misrepresent him, he at length became so unconquerable as to embezzeG the alms of his followers. The seventh and eighth Crusades followed like receding waves of the sea, growing smaller and weaker as the impulses of fanaticism abated. They were without any preachers of distinction, and may be regarded as results of the earlier agitation.

The general decadence of preaching throughout the Roman Church became a pretext, during the latter part of the medieval period, for the organization of several preachers orders of monks. Had these orders devoted themselves to intelligent activity in proclaiming the truths of God's Word and the practical duties of Christianity, the best of results might have been expected. But their zeal was devoted to very different objects. It was, in fact, absorbed in efforts to excite persecution against the Albigenses and other sects, and to unite with general exhortations to promote the schemes of the papacy and the inquisition. Hence it is not surprising that the preaching orders as such failed to make any valuable contributions to the eloquence of the pulpit or to stimulate activity in preaching among the clergy at large. Of the ecclesiastical celebrities of the medieval period, few can be mentioned on account of distinguished ability as preachers. The two men who, perhaps, more than others deserve such mention were Antony of Padua, subsequently canonized as a saint, and the Jesuit preacher Robert Bellarmine. The former, of the order of the Jesuits, has been described by his friends as "his rare talents as a preacher caused him to be employed on unceasing missions through the north and centre of Italy, especially in the neighborhood of Bologna and Padua." We have the account of Antony's homily on the Ascension from the

Vieyra was born in 1608, later than the usual limit of the period under consideration; nevertheless, from his style and general character, he has been usually considered as "called to the Order of the Jesuits," a part of his life was spent in Brazil, though for a time he served as court preacher at Lisbon. During that period he visited various cities of Europe, and even preached at Rome in the Italian language. His labors as superior of the missions in Brazil, often requiring him to travel thousands of leagues on foot through the wildest regions, and to traverse immense rivers in canoes; yet he was ever ready to preach to a few natives through an interpreter, or to persons of rank and influence in society. His great talent was satire, which he did not scruple to employ both in and out of the pulpit. At Maranha, one of the northern cities of Brazil, he preached a noted sermon "To the Fishers," after the method of Antony of Padua. It was based upon the text " Ye are the salt of the earth." In style and ingenuity it is not unlike his book entitled The barcode of Stebling, which is regarded as a species of classic in the Portuguese language. Vieyra lived to an advanced age and died at the city of Bahia, having, in circumstances where printing was difficult, published not less than three famous works, which were followed by two others after his death.

IV. The Modern Period.—The beginning of the great Reformation was characterized by a revival of preach-
ing. It was by preaching that the Reformers sought to expose the errors and corruptions into which the Church had fallen, as well as to set forth the doctrines of the Word of God. Thus Peter Waldo in the south of France, Wycliffe in England, Huss and Jerome of Prague in Bohemia, and the famous John Melanchthon in Germany, Zwingli in Switzerland, and Farel and Calvin in Switzerland and France, pursued similar courses and with similar success. Wherever such men were not overborne and crushed by opposition, they were sustained and followed by an ever-increasing number of the people. Hence it may be said declaringly that the Reformation preaching has been in all Protestant countries a universal accompaniment of public worship. It has not only been maintained at a single service on the Lord's day, but usually twice or thrice in each church, and often at other times during the week. This custom has called into action a vast number of preachers, and developed the preaching talent of the Church more thoroughly than it had ever been previously cultivated subsequent to the apostolic age.

As attack prompts defense, so the zeal of Protestant preachers called out new activities and enlisted new talent among the preachers of the Roman Catholic Church. The preaching orders became greatly stimulated. Preaching ceased to be confined to bishops. Priests and curates began to preach, at least to the extent of endeavoring to soothe the people by the supply of a few general sections of Christendom a new prominence was given to the preaching office. It is true that among Roman Catholics the mass still held the precedence and preaching did not universally become a part of Sabbath services. Nevertheless, in Protestant countries Roman Catholics came by degrees to maintain preaching in about as great frequency as the Protestants around them. Even the seating of churches and cathedrals for the convenience of auditors—a custom still unknown in Roman Catholic countries—has come to be common among the people of England and France.

It may thus be seen that the influence of the Reformation tended to increase in various ways the activity and power of the pulpit. It certainly secured for preaching a degree of prominence and frequency unknown to any previous period following the days of the apostles. While the impulse thus given to pulpit eloquence has never died out, its effects have been variable in different countries and at different periods. In Germany, for example, after the Reformation became so far established as to be incorporated into the political institutions of the people, preachers have held a preeminent power from which it has not even yet fully recovered. The causes of that decline were numerous, involving the influence of Jesuitic opposition, false philosophy, scepticism in various forms, and, worst of all, a prevalent indifference to the power of religious truth and the necessity of a personal religious life.

In France the most celebrated epoch of pulpit eloquence occurred during the reign of Louis XIV, a monarch who, notwithstanding personal vices and official cruelties that have made his name detestable, was a zealous prelate. Through his command and example, attendance upon court preaching was made fashionable in a dissolute age, and it cannot be doubted that the influence of his patronage greatly stimulated the study and practice of pulpit oratory among the Catholic clergy of his day. It is not less true that his influence fostered among the preachers that appeared before him a spirit of servility and adulation wholly unworthy of the ministerial office. The extent to which such truly great men as Bossuet, Maslell, le Bas, and Bouhours, with volumes of eloquent sentiment, not to say flattery, in their sermons before the king and the aristocracy, is equally offensive and amazing to readers of the present day. When to the names just mentioned that of Fénelon is added, we have a representation of the highest phase of pulpit oratory known to the Catholic Church of France in any age. The Protestant Church of France, including Switzerland, has furnished many distinguished preachers. Calvin and Farel, of the period of the Reformation, were worthy succeeded by such men as Du Moulin, Faucheur, Daillé, Claude, Superville, Saurin, Vinet, Monod, and many others. The names of the day in the English Church, though obscure, and their circumstances often greatly embarrassed by persecution; yet the specimens of printed sermons by which they are represented to succeeding generations compare favorably with any to be found in their own or other languages. During the current century, Roman Catholic preachers have given a very rare in France. Beyond Lacadure, Ravignan, and Hyacinthe, few can be named as having attained a national reputation.

Great Britain may be said to be the home of modern pulpit eloquence. Taking England, including Wales, Scotland, and Ireland, into one view, it may be doubted if any country of the world has produced more or better sermons during the last three hundred years. Since the days of Wycliffe, preaching in Great Britain has been common among all classes and conditions of men. Successive generations have been educated to look upon it as so familiar a part of their religious life that it has not only not been free to speak, but the masses of the people have been disposed to hear. The British pulpit, moreover, has been favored above that of any other European country in two auxiliary conditions: The great importance which was attached to the use of the Word of God and the religious observance of the Lord's day. Without the former, there is no valid basis for pulpit instruction or appeal, and hence the sermon usually degenerates into a mere oration. Without the latter, hearers are wanting, or at least irregular in attendance, a circumstance that deprives preachers of one of the most inspiring motives for diligent preparation and high effort. More truly than in any other country, unless possibly in the English-speaking portions of North America, the pulpit of Great Britain has been and is the terror of the religious life and sentiments of the people. Its utterances have consequently been greatly diversified at different periods and in different circumstances. In times of religious indifference, and in those portions or branches of the Church in which religious sentiment has run low, preaching has declined to its lowest grade of influence; whereas in periods of religious awakening, and in the more evangelical sections of the Church, pulpit eloquence has attained its maximum power, not only in the sermons of a few men of extraordinary talent, but in the average ability and power of the whole body of the people. In one case, it has not only had a free pulpit, but also a free press, has furnished a body of sermon literature unsurpassed in quality and extent by that of any other country in the world.

The more distinguished preachers of Great Britain may be classified by epochs and religious associations. The names of Wycliffe, Latimer, Knox, and Jewell represent the great preachers of the Reformation. A similar selection for the 17th century would embrace the names of Jeremy Taylor, Barrow, Baxter, Bunyan, Howe, Chernock, Tillotson, South, and possibly many others.

In the 18th century, religion and piety, with the names of extraordinary zeal and effectiveness, were instrumental in awakening a religious movement which extended not only throughout Great Britain, but, in fact, throughout the English-speaking world. One of its results was to improve the tone and quality of preaching in all the churches. The number of great preachers who have adorned the British pulpit in the course of the 18th and 19th centuries is beyond enumeration. The following are representative names, and associated with them by names of masters of oratory and eloquence: Chalmers, Wardlaw, Richard Watson, Robert Newton, Duff, Guthrie, F. W. Robertson, Stanley, Melville, Punshon, and Spurgeon. To this list might be added the names of a large number of other preachers of no less moral and intellectual worth, and of nearly equal though somewhat more local celebrity.
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The freedom of the English pulpit, and, in fact, a greater freedom than was enjoyed in England at that day, came to America with the Pilgrim Fathers. Having been by them established on the Atlantic coast, it has been an indissoluble part of our civilization until the whole continent has felt its power. The pulpit in America, as in Great Britain, has been greatly aided in the accomplishment of its mission by the general observance of the Christian Sabbath and a free use of the Holy Scriptures. The importance of preaching has also been recognized from the first in the Church architecture of America. All edifices constructed as places of worship, from the log structures of the frontier to the great tabernacles of crowded cities and the Roman Catholic cathedrals, have been seated for auditors. In these and other conditions of society, not excepting that of all churches being alike thrown upon the voluntary system of self-support, the Christian pulpit has had in America one of its fairest and widest fields of effort. It would not have been creditable if in such circumstances pulpit eloquence had not been extensively and successfully cultivated. That it has been will appear from the long list of good and great preachers who have adorned the American Church, many of whom have given to the world volumes of published sermons. Probably in no country has the average grade of pulpit eloquence been equalled by the highest State in America; and, owing in part to its vast extent, in no country is it more difficult to determine who may justly be said to have attained a national reputation as preachers. The truth is that each great denomination of Christians forms, in a certain sense, a world of itself, within which the principal preachers are far better known than in other similar worlds surrounding. Nevertheless, there have not been wanting a goodly number of men whose reputation for pulpit eloquence has transcended all denominational boundaries and become indeed national. Without attempting a catalogue of names, it may be said that the names of Jonathan Edwards, Jonathan Mayhew, John Trumbull, John Witherspoon, Thomas Jefferson, and William Ellery Channing, Francis Wayland, Stephen Olin, Henry B. Bucum, Charles P. Millar, George W. Bethune, Stephen H. Tyng, and Matthew Sewall are among the preachers whose names have been at the time present; but since there is no absolute standard of determination, it is deemed preferable to incur the risk of error by diminution rather than by excess.

In this connection, it is only just to remark that in modern times the press serves as an important factor in the creation of public reputations, both local and national. Hence those preachers who have availed themselves of its agency as a means of giving their sermons to the public, and others whose friends have been zealous to do a similar office for them, have become much more widely known than many of equal and perhaps greater ability who have not been thus represented. But as mere publicity does not secure reputation, it is also true that the reputation of some men has been more lasting than helped by the publication of their sermons. It is, in fact, no uncommon thing that published sermons wholly fail to convey to readers the impression they produced upon their hearers when delivered. Hence, to form historic judgments of the ability of preachers, attention should be given both to the influence of the appropriate circumstances and to the matter they employed in their sermons, as tested by the established principles of criticism. It was not our intention to include among the preachers named above any who have not favorably passed the double test. That many others have already done so will not doubt be the opinion of some; but time, which tries all things, will enable readers at a future day better to determine.

Even a cursory survey of the varied character and results of pulpit eloquence during the nineteenth centuries of its history is suggestive of important lessons. A few may be noted.

1. There are different kinds of pulpit eloquence. In order to be intelligently studied or judged, sermons must be classified. Some are didactic, having for their chief object instruction in Christian truth. Some are hortatory, having for their object the enforcement of truth already familiar. Some are axiological, seeking to expand the meaning of the Scriptures. Some are illustrative, seeking to create an interest in Christian truth by exhibitions of its correspondences in nature, in human consciousness, and in the facts of history; while some are composite, seeking to blend the above characteristics into a harmonious whole. Each of these different kinds of pulpit address demands a style of language and discussion adapted to its special object.

2. Attention to this fact might lead to gross misjudgments on the part of critics, and equal mistakes on the part of preachers. A man who is not able to spoil a didactic discourse, while the coolness of didactic address would render an exhortation powerless. An essential element, therefore, in determining whether a given sermon is eloquent is a just consideration of its object. Accepting the etymological, and in fact the scriptural, idea of eloquence—namely, that of speaking well (Exod. iv, 14)—it must be conceded that a certain degree of eloquence must be recognised in sermons well adapted to the promotion of the most common and familiar objects of Christian discourse. But inasmuch as the high degree of eloquence in Christian discourse is a challenge of admiration not accorded to well-doing in more common matters, so it is customary to restrict the term eloquence to those higher and more unusual qualities of speech which excite emotions and control actions. In fact, one of the best definitions of eloquence states it to be the language of emotion. This definition implies that it is easier to instruct the mind and convince the judgment than to move the sensibilities of men. Nevertheless, instruction and conviction are essentially dependent upon strong emotions. Few preachers accomplish the latter without the use of those conditions as antecedent agencies.

3. The natural temperament of preachers governs in a great measure the kind of eloquence in which they may excel. Sons of thunder and sons of consolation have each their own characteristic and their own standard of strength or adopt the style of the other is to hazard failure. Nevertheless, mere natural endowments are insufficient to ensure success without studious self-cultivation; whereas laborious efforts in right lines tend to the highly successful development of ordinary talents. As an instance in point is that of Thomas Guthrie, the distinguished preacher of the Free Church of Scotland, than whom no man ever wielded the power of illustration more effectively. Yet, as shown in his biography, that power was acquired by diligent and continuous efforts after his entrance into mature ministerial life, and as a result of personal experiences convincing him of its importance.

3. Successful pulpit addresses demand a wise choice of subjects, the vivid presentation of thought, and the use of language adapted to the comprehension of hearers. The character and influence of the Christian pulpit have at times been greatly lowered by the introduction of improper topics-topics either trivial in themselves or out of harmony with the spirit and truths of the Gospel. But even when the themes of discourse have been appropriate the important objects of preaching have often been neutralized by language ut-
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terences, or by styles of expression ill adapted to the comprehension of the hearers addressed. The expression — the general statement — is rather to speak five words with my understanding, that by my voice I might teach others also, than ten thousand words in an unknown tongue” (1 Cor. xiv, 19), elucidates an important principle of all true eloquence. No matter how eloquent a man may be in his own estimation, if others fail to comprehend his efforts will be to them either an enigma, or at best a vain show. In short, all genuine pulpit eloquence must be in harmony with those principles of human nature on which the success of secular eloquence depends. It was critically pointed out long ago that the triumphs in eloquence secured by Demosthenes were won by his “handling in succession a variety of topics all calculated to strike his audience.” So the successful proclamation of the Gospel depends largely upon the capacity of its preachers to present in striking forms, and in proper succession, the great truths of God’s Word and providence.

4. The higher degrees of pulpit eloquence are not attained apart from deep religious feeling on the part of preachers. All who are sincere in their hearts and love in the grade of their religious opinions and experience neither choose the themes that strike the deep chords of the human soul, nor are capable of treating them in the most affecting and moving manner. Whereas men who have a profound sense of the divine presence and authority, who live a vivid conception of the reality of eternity, the value of immortal souls, and the power of Christ as the Saviour of the perishing, they, and they only, have the proper moral basis for effective, and hence, in the most important sense, eloquent religious address to their fellow-men. “Out of the fulness of the heart the mouth speaketh.” When, therefore, the heart is full of God’s truth and love, it gives forth its sentiments in impressive utterances, and makes objective to others the eloquent feelings that glow within it. When the emotions of the speaker are not enlisted—in other words, when subjective eloquence is wanting on his part—the objective results of eloquence cannot be produced in the minds and hearts of hearers.

5. The higher effects of eloquence depend largely upon accessories favorable both to speakers and hearers. It is not sufficient that an orator relite in himself the qualities and conditions essential to eloquence. He also has need of all available agencies as helps in the task of transferring his thoughts and emotions to others. His first requisite is language, as a common medium for the expression and reception of thought. But the force of his language may be greatly weakened by indistinct articulation, by feeble utterance, by uncoordinated gestures, and other faults of delivery. On the other hand, it may be greatly intensified by a corresponding physical expression, in which not only the tongue addresses the ear, but the eye, the countenance, the attitudes, and the action of an earnest speaker fix the gaze of his auditors and concentrate the magnetism of his presence and purposes upon the reception and sympathy of his hearers. That the full effect of such an address can be secured, the auditors must be comfortably placed, and within easy range of his voice, since any form of discomfort, or any effort to understand, detracts their attention and weakens the impression they will receive. When, in circumstances like these, the thoughts and emotions of an eloquent man flow into the souls and kindle the emotions of a mass of hearers, their presence, in turn, reacts upon him, quickening his mental powers, and rousing his sensibilities to a degree unattainable in other circumstances. This mutuality of emotion rises with the increase of numbers and the unity of sentiment that pervades the mass. It may be said, therefore, that when speakers are equal in their task, large audiences are important, if not essential, to the higher effects of eloquence. Favorable expectancy on the part of hearers is also another condition greatly helpful to a speaker. It relieves him of the necessity of creating a bond of sympathy between himself and persons ignorant of him, or perhaps prejudiced against him. It is in this respect that a speaker’s reputation may become to him an auxiliary of great value. While the conditions above specified, and others of like character, are not always within the control of ministers of the Gospel, and are sometimes due to contingencies quite beyond their control, nevertheless a diligent discharge of ministerial and pastoral duty tends to create them. It was a precept of the ancient rhetoricians that the orator must be a good man, and a German writer has published a book to demonstrate that eloquence is in a large measure deprived of its force by the presence of profane or immoral people thus sanctioned that extensive personal acquaintance, a high moral and religious character, and a reputation based on faithful labor and habits of doing good, all challenge sympathy, attract hearers, and awaken hopeful expectation.

6. The influence of the Holy Spirit is the crowning auxiliary of pulpit eloquence. Apart from this the preacher is like any other man. But, over and above all merely human aids, a Christian preacher of the right character and spirit is entitled to expect the influence of the Holy Ghost added to the truths he presents in increased impressiveness, and to his hearers increased sensitivity.

It is only under this last-named condition that pulpit eloquence can be hoped to attain its highest power. But this is a condition that no indolent man can reasonably hope to enjoy. It neither follows in the train of religious presumption, nor of an undue reliance upon genius or personal ability, but rather comes in answer to “the fervent, effectual prayer of a righteous man.” He, therefore, who as a minister of the Gospel would, according to the apostolic injunction, study to show himself “approved, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed,” should be equally diligent in the acquisition of sacred knowledge, and in the highest possible cultivation of his powers of expression, that he may with confidence ask for the unction of the Holy One as a means of rendering his utterances as a preacher of Christian truth in the highest degree efficacious. In view of this supreme object, the diligent study of pulpit eloquence, whether in its history, its principles, or its diversified illustrations, both in the published sermons and in the biographies of distinguished preachers, is of equal interest and importance.

Literature.—Bingham, Christian Antiquities; Smith, Dictionary of Christian Antiquities; Daniel, Geschichte der christlichen Beredensamkeit und der Homiletik; Villemain, Traité de l’Eloquence Chrétienne au Ve Siècle; Moule, Christian Elocution during the Early and Middle Ages (Long, 1850); Neale, Medieval Preaching (ibid. 1856); Baring-Gould, Post-Medieval Preaching (ibid. 1865); Vinet, Histoire de la Prédestination parmi les Réformateurs de France au Dix-septième Siècle (Paris, 1860); Rogers, The British Pulpit, in the Edinburgh Review, 1840; Vaughan, The Modern Pulpit (Long, 1842); Turnbull, Pulpit Orators of France and Switzerland (N. Y. 1848); Hunghener, The Preacher and the King, or Broadside in the Court of Louis XIV (Boston, 1865); Spring, The Power of the Pulpit (N. Y. 1854); Fish, History and Repository of Pulpit Eloquence (N. Y. 1836, 2 vols., 8vo); Sprague, Annals of the American Pulpit (ibid, 1850-59, 9 vols., 8vo); Potter, Sacred Eloquence (Dublin, 1868); Hall, God’s Word through Preaching (N. Y. 1875); Taylor, The Ministry of the Word (ibid. 1878); Brooks, Lectures on Preaching (ibid. 1877); Brough, The Church Preacher and the Pulpit on Preaching (ibid. 1878); Brooks, Lectures on the History of Preaching (ibid. 1876); Pettigrew, Homiletical Index (ibid. 1878, 8vo). See Homiletics; Sermon. (D. P. K.)

Pulse (πόλυς), serom, and πολυσμ, serom; Sept. δόρσια; Thess. πεσίματα; Vulg. legumina occurs only in the A. V. in Dan. i, 12, 16, as the translation of the
above plural noms, the literal meaning of which is "seeds" of any kind. The food on which "the four children" thrived for ten days is perhaps not to be restricted to what we now understand by "pulse," i.e., the genus of leguminous vegetables; the term probably involves edible seeds in a variety of forms. This variety makes the words "vegetables, herbs, such as are eaten in a half-fast, as opposed to flesh and more delicate food." Properly the term denotes uncooked grains of any kind, whether barley, wheat, millet, vetches, etc.

Our translators have also inverted in Italian the words "pulse" as one of the "parched" sorts of provision which Barzillai brought to king David (2 Sam. xii. 28). In this they are probably right. Leguminous seeds roasted are still used in the East; and in his commentary on Matt. v. 22 Jerome mentions roasted chick-pease, along with raisins and apples, as the small-wares in which the huckster fruitiers used to deal: "Frumentum, ouveque passus, et poma diversi generis." Allusions in Plutarch and Horace show that parched peas were a familiar article of diet among the poorer Romans.

Pulton, ANDREW, a Roman Catholic divine of the Society of Jesus, flourished in the second half of the 17th century, and is noted as a zealous defender of his order and Church. He was quite a pulpfit orator, but he was more successful still as a polemic. He published in 1667 Against Tolerance, Nunnivocatur, etc. (Lond. 1667, 4to)—Reply to a Challenge (1668)—Total Defeat of the Protestant Rule of Faith (4to). See Oliver, Biog. of English Jesuits; Macaulay, Hist. of England, vol. ii, ch. vi.

Pumbeditha (Pumbeditha), a name celebrated in Jewish literature as the home of one of the great schools of Judaism, was located in Babylonia, and derived its name from its situation at the (pums) mouth of the Bab. 

R. Jehudah ben-Jecheeskel, one of the most distinguished disciples of Abba Areka, also called Rab (q. v.), it flourished until towards the beginning of the 11th century, thus moulding, shaping, and influencing the life and literature of the Jews. Many of the rectors of this academy acquired a great renown for their Rabbinic learning, and were well-known in this Cyclopedia, or will be treated in the succeeding volumes. The following list, giving the names of the famous teachers at that academy, prepared after a careful and diligent perusal of the best authorities, we hope will aid the student of Jewish literature, since it is not easy to bring the membra disjecta into a chronological order out of the rudis indicetque mole of the different sources:

1. R. Jehudah ben-Jecheeskel 297-399
2. Chana of Kafr 399-399
3. Rabba ben-Nachman 399-399
4. Joseph ben-Chiba, the Blind (q. v.) 380-380
5. Abaj ben-Cajil 380-380
6. Rabba bar-Joseph bar-Chama 380-380
7. Nachman ben-Isaac 380-380
8. Chana of Nachmae 380-380
9. Zedib ben-Ushaja. 376-376
10. Bina of Silluna 376-376
11. Roffen ben-Papa 376-376
12. R. Chana 376-376
13. R. Harka 376-376
14. Acha ben-Raba 376-376
15. Gehaza of Be-Kati 376-376
16. Roffen II. 376-376
17. Nachumal, or Nachmuchai 376-376
18. R. Harka 406-414
19. R. Joae 414-415

At this time the final redaction of the Babylonian Talmud (q. v.) was made, and, according to Jewish tradition, to R. Jose, who forms the end of the Amoraim (Soph Haranah), the honor is assigned of "completing to written" the Secpanies of Gentle of the Great of the Synagogue and rabbinical dignity, in the year from the creation 4260, and 311 years from the sealing of the Manna." After the death of R. Jose, the chronological chain is interrupted, and, with the exception of a few names which have come down to us, it is difficult to say who filled the space up to the year 5760, for there is a long interval of persecutions of those times, the names of those famous teachers have been forgotten. With Mar Rabbi, who belonged to the so-called Gaonic period, the chronological order can again be followed down to the last of the R. Chama of Pumbeditha, whose death sealed the closing of that famous academy forever. The following are the names:

1. Mar Rabbai 670-670
4. R. Chiba of Meseve 740-710
5. Mar-Rabbai 740-710
7. Mar-Rabbai 740-710
8. Mar Joseph ben-Chutana 740-710
9. Mar Samuel ben-Chutana 740-710
10. Mar Natrol Kahan ben-Esna 740-710
11. Abraham Kahan 740-710
12. R. Joseph ben-Nachman 740-710
13. Chanaan ben-Menushabaja 740-710
14. Nachman ben-Acha 740-710
15. R. Shemue 740-710
16. Chanaan ben-Abba, a few months before 740-710
17. Chanaan ben-Abba, a few months 740-710
18. Mar Hamelech ben-Isaac 740-710
19. Manasseh ben-Joseph 740-710
20. Joseph ben-Sheba 740-710
21. Joseph ben-Shila 740-710
22. Mar Kahan ben-Chutana 740-710
23. Aberniam ben-Esna 740-710
24. Joseph ben-Abba 740-710
25. Mar Abraham ben-Sherrita 740-710
26. R. Joseph ben-Chiba ante-Gom 740-710
27. R. Joseph ben-Chiba sole Gom 740-710
28. Mar Rabbai solo-Arba 740-710
29. Mar Rabbai solo-Arba 740-710
30. Mar Rabbai solo-Arba 740-710
31. Mar Rabbai solo-Arba 740-710
32. Mar Rabbai solo-Arba 740-710
33. Mar Rabbai solo-Arba 740-710
34. Mar Rabbai solo-Arba 740-710
35. Mar Rabbai solo-Arba 740-710
36. Mar Rabbai solo-Arba 740-710
37. Mar Rabbai solo-Arba 740-710
38. Mar Rabbai solo-Arba 740-710
40. Mar Rabbai solo-Arba 740-710
41. Sherrita ben-Chanania 740-710
42. Sherrita ben-Chanania 740-710
43. Sherrita ben-Chanania 740-710
44. Sherrita ben-Chanania 740-710
45. Sherrita ben-Chanania 740-710
46. Sherrita ben-Chanania 740-710
47. Sherrita ben-Chanania 740-710
48. Sherrita ben-Chanania 740-710
49. Sherrita ben-Chanania 740-710
50. Sherrita ben-Chanania 740-710


Punchao was the greatest of the Peruvian gods, the lord of the day, the creator of light.

Pundek (Puinde), a village of the tribe of Dan mentioned in the Talmud (Schwart, Palest, p. 144); now the village Fandek, about midway between Nablus and the shores of Lake Tiberias, on the north side of the road (Robinson, Later Researches, p. 156). Van de Velde, Memoir, p. 840.

Pungel, Nicolaus, Dr., a Roman Catholic divine, was born at Munster in 1802. Having completed his studies, he was ordained priest in 1825, and for several years labored as chaplain in Riesenbeck and Munster. From 1825 to 1830, he supervised the parish of Schu-benbeck, in the meantime pursuing his studies. The
result was his work on Gerson's tract, De Parvulis ad Christianum Tractandis, together with a Vita Gersonii, which he published in 1853, and thus became a privat-docent at the University of Münster. He soon became professor of pastoral theology, and died April 24, 1876, as senior of the chapter. — Literarischer Handzettel, 1876, p. 238.

Punishment (most properly expressed in Hebrew by a form of אָדַר, pākād, strictly "to visit," and in Greek by σκλαστ or σκυπρωσ, but frequently denoted by other terms). The following account is based upon the Scripture statements, with illustrations from ancient and modern sources. See CORPORAL ILLNATITIONS.

1. Historical Review of Bodily Ilinations among the Hebrews. — The earliest theory of punishment current among mankind is doubtless the one of simple retaliation, "blood for blood" [see BLOOD AVENGE], a view which in a limited form appears even in the Mosaic law. Viewed historically, the first case of punishment for crime mentioned in Scripture, next to the fall itself, is that of Cain, the first murderer. His punishment, however, was a substitute for the retaliation which might have been looked for from the hand of man, and the mark set on him, whatever it was, served at once to designate, protect, and perhaps correct the criminal. That such was the spirit of punishment for murder appears plain from the remark of Lamaceh (Gen. iv. 24). In the post-diluvial code, if we may so call it, retribution by the hand of man, even in the case of an offending animal, for blood shed, is clearly laid down (ix. 5, 6); but its terms give no sanction to that "wild justice" executed even to the present day by individuals and families on their own behalf by so many of the uncivilized races of mankind. The prevalence of a feeling of retribution due for blood shed may be remarked as arising among the brethren of Joseph in reference to their fratricidal crime (xxi. 21). The punishment of death appears among the legal powers of Judah, as the head of his family, and he ordered his daughter-in-law, Tamar, to be burned (xxxviii. 24). It is denounced by the king of the Philistines, Abimelech, against those of his people who should injure or insult Isaac or his wife (xxxvi. 11, 29). Similar power seems to have been possessed by the reigning Pharaoh in the time of Joseph (xii. 13).

Passing onwards to Mosaic times, we find the sentence of capital punishment, in the case of murder, plainly laid down in the Deut. laws, that he must be put to death, even if he should have taken refuge at God's altar or in an asylum city, and the same principle was to be carried out even in the case of an animal (Exod. xxi. 12, 14, 28, 36; Lev. xxiv. 17, 21; Num. xxxix. 31; Deut. xix. 11, 12; and Josh. ii. 28, 29; xxiii. 26). The law did not allow parents to be put to death for their children, nor children for their parents (Deut. xix. 16), as did the Chaldaans (Dan. vi. 24) and the kings of Israel (comp. 1 Kings xxii. 2; 2 Kings ix. 20).

The extensive prescription of capital punishment by the Mosaic law, which we cannot consider as a death letter, may be accounted for by the peculiar circumstances of the people. They were a nation of newly emancipated slaves, and were by nature perhaps more than commonly intractable; and if we may judge by the laws enjoined on them, which Mr. Hume well remarks are a safe index to the manners and disposition of any people, we must infer that they had imbibed all the degrading influences of slavery among heathens. Their wanderings and isolation did not admit of penal settlements or remedial punishments. They were placed under the immediate hand of the government and superintendence. Hence, wilful offences evinced an incorrigibility which rendered death the only means of ridding the community of such transgressers, and this was ultimately restored to in regard to all individuals above a certain age, in certain cases, might enter Canaan (Num. xiv. 29, 32, 55). If capital punishment in Chris-
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Bouching holy things illegally (Num. iv, 15, 18, 20; and see 2 Sam. vii, 7; 2 Chron. xxxii, 21).

In the foregoing list, which, it will be seen, is classified according to the mode to be taken by the law of the principle of condemnation, the cases marked with * are (a) those which are expressly threatened or actually visited with death, as well as with cutting off. In those (b) marked †, the hand of God is expressly named as the instrument of execution. We thus find that (a) there are in class i seven cases, all named in Lev. xx, 9-16; in class ii, two cases; in class iii, two cases; while of (b) we find in class ii four cases, of which three belong also to (a), and in class iii one case. The question to be determined is, whether the phraseology means death in all cases; and to avoid that conclusion Le Clerc, Michaelis, and others have suggested that in some of them—the ceremonial ones—it was intended to be commuted for banishment or privation of civil rights (Michaelis, Lxv of Moses, vol. iii, § 257, p. 486, trans.). Rabbinical writers explain "cutting off" to mean excommunication, and laid down three degrees of severity as belonging to it (Selden, De Sym. i, 6). See ANATHEMA. But most commentators agree that, in accordance with the præma-facie meaning of Heb. x, 28, the sentence of "cutting off" to be death, or punishment of some sort. Saalschütz explains it to be premature death by God's hand, as if God took into his own hand such cases of ceremonial defilement as would create difficulty for human judges to decide. Knobel thinks death-punishment absolutely is meant; so Corn. à Lapide and Ewald. John explains that when God is said to cut off, an act of divine providence is meant, which in the end destroys the family, but that "cutting off" in general means stoning to death, as the usual capital punishment of the law. Calmet thinks it means privation rather than punishment of some sort. It may be remarked (a) that two instances are recorded in which violation of a ritual command took place without the actual infliction of a death-punishment: (1) that of the people eating with the blood (1 Sam. xiv, 32); (2) that of Uzzaiah (2 Chron. xxxvi, 19, 21), and that in the latter case the offender was, in fact, excommunicated for life; (b) that there are also instances of the directly contrary course, viz. in which the offenders were punished with death for similar offences: Nadab and Abihu (Lev. x, 1, 2); Korah and his company (Num. xvi, 33), who "perished of the congregation"; Uzzah (2 Sam. vi, 7); and further, that the leprosy inflicted on Uzzaiah might be regarded as a virtual death (Num. xii, 12). To whichever side of the question this case may be thought to incline, we may perhaps conclude that the primary meaning of "cutting off" is a sentence of death to be executed, in some cases, without remission, but in others voidable (1) by immediate atonement upon the offender's part; (2) by direct interposition of the Almighty, i.e. a sentence of death always "recorded," but not always executed. It is also probable that the severity of the sentence was produced in practice an immediate recourse to the prescribed means of propitiation in almost every actual case of ceremonial defilement (Num. xx, 27, 29). See Saalschütz, Arch. Hebr. x, 74, 75, vol. ii, 299; Knobel, Calmet, Corn. à Lapide on Gen. xvii, 15, 14; Keil, Bibl. Arch. vol. ii, p. 594; § 153; Ewald, Gesich. App. vol. iii, p. 158; Jahn, Arch. Bibl. § 257.

III. Penalties.—Punishments, in themselves, are twofold, capital and secondary; and in the cases we are considering they were either native or foreign. Of the foreign, the possibility of Hebrew, the following only are prescribed by the law.

1. Stoning, which was the ordinary mode of execution (Exod. xxvii, 4; Luke xx, 6; John x, 31; Acts xiv, 5). We find it ordered in the cases which are marked in the lists above as punishable with death; and we may remark further that it is ordered also in the case of an offending animal (Exod. xix, 13; xx v, 29). The false witness, likewise, in a capital case would, by the law of retaliation, become liable to death (Deut. xix, 19; Mosaic, i, 1, 6). In the case of idolatry, and it may be presumed in other cases also, the witnesses, of whom there were to be at least two, were warned to the first stone (Deut. xiii, 9; xvii, 7; John viii, 7; Acts vii, 58). The Rabbinical writers add that the first stone was cast by one of them on the chest of the convict, and if this failed to cause death, the bystanders proceeded to complete the sentence (Sanhedr. vi, 1, 4; Goodwyn, Moses and Aaron, p. 121). The body was then to be suspended till sunset (Deut. xxi, 23; Josh. x, 26; Josephus, Ant. iv, 8, 24), and not buried in the family grave (Sanhedr. vi, 5).

2. Hunger is mentioned as a distinct punishment (Num. xiv, 4; 2 Sam. xi, 6, 9), but generally, in the case of Jews, spoken of as following death by some other means. Hungering alive may have been a Canaanitic punishment, since it was practiced by the Goérons on the sons of Saul (2 Sam. xxi, 9).

3. Burning, in pre-Mosaic times, was the punishment for unchastity (Gen. xxxviii, 24). Under the law it is ordered in the case of a priest's daughter (Lev. xxv, 9), of which an instance is mentioned (Sanhedr. vii, 2); likewise in case of incest (Lev. xx, 14); but it is also mentioned as a capital punishment (Josh. xix, 25), and some have thought it was never used excepting after death. Among the heathens this merciful preliminary was not always observed, as, for instance, in the case of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego (Dan. iii). The Rabbinical account of burning by means of molten lead poured down the throat has no authority in Scripture.

4. Death by the sword or spear is named in the law (Exod. xix, 13; xxxvii, 27; Num. xiv, 7), although two of the cases may be regarded as exceptional; but it occurs frequently in the Gospels (Judg. ix, 5; 1 Sam. xxvi, 33; xxii, 18; 2 Sam. i, 15; iv, 12, xx, 22; 2 Kings ii, 25, 34; xix, 1; 2 Kings x, 7; 2 Chron. xxii, 4; Jer. xxvi, 23; Matt. xiv, 8, 10)—a list in which more than one case of assassination, either with or without legal forms, is included.

5. Strangling is said by the rabbinists to have been regarded as the most common but least severe of the capital punishments, and to have been performed by immersing the convict in clay or mud, and then strangling him by a cloth twisted round the neck (Goodwyn, M. T., xxxvii, 229; Josephus, Ant. vii, 219; Suidas; D. E. Michaelis, De Judicia, ap. Pott, Syll. Comm. iv, § 10, 12). This Rabbinical opinion, founded, it is said, on oral tradition from Moses, has no Scripture authority.

Besides these ordinary capital punishments, we read of others, either of foreign introduction or of an irregular kind. Among the former, 1. Crucifixion (q. v.) is treated separately, to which article the following remark may be added, that the Jewish tradition of capital punishment, independent of the Roman government, being inherited for forty years previous to the Destruction, appears in fact, if not in time, to be justified (John xviii, 31, with De Wette, Comment.; Goodwyn, p. 121; Keil, ii, 264; Josephus, Ant. xx, 9, 1, 5).

2. Drowning, though not ordered under the law, was practiced at Rome, and is said by St. Jerome to have been in use among the Jews (Cicero, Pro Stat. Resol. Rom. ii, 25; Jerome, in Comm. on Matt. lib. iii, p. 138; Matt. xviii, 6; Mark ix, 42). Josephus records that the Galileans, revolting from their commanders, drowned the partisans of Herod (Ant. xiv, 15, 29). 3. Sawing asunder or crushing beneath iron instruments. The former is said to have been practiced on Isaibah; the latter may, perhaps, not always have caused death, and thus have been a torture rather than a capital punishment (Ant. xii, 31, and perhaps Prov. xxvi, 26; Heb. xi, 37; Just. M. T. Title, 120). The process
of sawing sander, as practiced in Barbary, is described by Shaw (Tract, p. 254).

4. Pounding in a mortar is alluded to in Prov. xxvii, 22, but not as a legal punishment. It is mentioned as a Cingalese punishment by Sir E. Tennant (Ceylon, ii, 88), and something similar to this, beating to death (τρυφεόνωσιν), was a Greek punishment for slaves. It was inflicted on a wooden frame, which probably derived its name from resembling a drum or timbrel in form, on which the criminal was bound, and beaten to death (2 Macc. vi, 19, 29; comp. ver. 30). In Josephus (De Macc.) the same instance, his κραταία γόργια, to be understood, hence, to beat upon the tympanum, to drum to death, is similar to “breaking on the wheel” (Heb. xi, 35). David inflicted this among other cruelties upon the inhabitants of Rabbah-ammon (1 Chron. xx, 3).

5. Precipitation, attempted in the case of our Lord at Nazareth, and carried out in that of captives from the Edomites, and of St. James, who is said to have been cast from “the pinnacle” of the Temple; also said to have been executed on some Jewish women by the Syrians (2 Chron. xxxv, 12; 2 Macc. vi, 10; Luke iv, 29; Euseb. H. E. ii, 23). This punishment resembles that of the Tarpeian rock among the Romans.

6. The Persians had a singular punishment for great criminals. A high tower was filled a great way up with sages, the criminal was thrown into it, and as the sages fell into the fire, the criminal perished under them and raised above him till he was suffocated (2 Macc. xiii, 4-6).

Criminals executed by law were buried outside the city gates, and heaps of stones were flung upon their graves (Josh. vii, 23, 36; 2 Sam. xviii, 17; Jer. xxix, 19). Mohammedans, to this day, cast stones, in passing, at the supposed tomb of Abasalim (Fabri, Itinerarium, 1, 409; Sandys, Trav. p. 189; Raumer, Paladin, p. 272). (C.) Of secondary punishments among the Jews, the original principle was, “Eye for eye, tooth for tooth.” Retaliation, the lex talionis of the Latins, and the διεξοσθος of the Greeks, is doubtless the most natural of all kinds of punishment, and would be the most just of all if it could be instantaneously and universally inflicted; but when delayed, it is apt to degenerate into revenge. Hence the desirability that it should be regulated and modified by law. The one-eyed man mentioned by Diodorus Siculus (xiv) complained that if he lost his remaining eye, he was not excused from his victim who would still have one left. Phavorinus argues against this law, which was one of the twelve tables, as not admitting literal execution, because the same member was more valuable to one man than another; for instance, the right hand of a scribe or painter could not be so well spared as that of a singer. Hence that law, in later times, was administered with the modification, “Nicum eo pacato,” except the aggressor came to an agreement with the mutilated person, de tulione redimenda, to redeem the punishment by making compensation. Moses, according to the principle, but not, it is to be observed, did Moses (Exod. xiii, 15), and he was not qualified to apply it to all classes of cases. The criminal, moreover, was not to be attended on in these cases, but was to be thrown into a dungeon, and there to be kept till he had expelled all the enmity that his victim would feel” (Josh. vii, 23, 36; 2 Sam. xviii, 17; Jer. xxix, 19). Mohammedans, to this day, cast stones, in passing, at the supposed tomb of Abasalim (Fabri, Itinerarium, 1, 409; Sandys, Trav. p. 189; Raumer, Paladin, p. 272).

7. Stripes, whose number was not to exceed forty (Deut. xxv, 3); whence the Jews took care not to exceed thirty-nine (2 Cor. xi, 24; Josephus, Ant. iv, 8, 21). This penalty was to be inflicted on the offender lying on the ground in the presence of a judge (Lev. xix, 20; Deut. xxi, 18). In later times, the convict was stripped to the waist and tied, in a bent position, to a low pillar, and the stripes, with a whip of three thongs, were inflicted on the back between the shoulders. A single stripe in excess subjected the executioner to punishment (Macevith, i, 1, 2, 8, 13, 14). It is remarkable that the Assyrian punishment for this offense was nothing more than twenty (276). We have abundant evidence that it was an ancient Egyptian punishment. Nor was it unusual for Egyptian superintendents to stimulate laborers to their work by the persuasive powers of the stick. Women received the stripes on the back, while sitting, from the hand of a man; and boys also, sometimes with their hands tied behind them. The modern inhabitants of the valley of the Nile retain the predilection of their forefathers for this punishment. The Moslems say, “The stick came down from heaven a blessing from God.” Moses describes the usual punishment inflicted on criminals and by masters to servants or slaves of both sexes (Exod. xxi, 20). Scourging was common in after-times among the Jews, who associated with it no disgrace or inconveniency beyond the physical pain it occasioned, and from which no station was exempt (Exod. xxi, 20; comp. x, 13; Jer. xxxvii, 15-20). Hence it became the symbol for correction in general (Psa. lxxxix, 32). Solomon is a zealous advocate for its use in education (Prov. xiii, 24; xxiii, 13, 14; comp. Ecclus. xxx, 1). In his opinion, “God is a wondrously just and holy judge; who wastes away evil, and stripes the inward parts of the belly” (Prov. xx, 30). It was inflicted for ecclesiastical offences in the synagogue (Matt. x, 17; Acts xxvi, 11). Among torturing or tedious penalties, 4. Scourcroy with thorns is mentioned (Judg. viii, 16). Reference to the scourge with scorpions, i. e. a whip or scourge armed with knots or thorns, occurs in 1 Kings xii, 11. So in Latin, scorpio means a knotted or thorny swish. The stocks are mentioned (Jer. xx, 2); passing through fire (2 Sam. xxi, 1); mutilation (Judg. i, 6); 2 Sam. xi, 9; and Philistia, plucking out hair (1 Sam. i, 6; Neh. xiii, 25); in later times, imprisonment, and confiscation of estate (Ezra vii, 26; Jer. xxxvii, 15; xxxviii, 6; Acts iv, 3; v, 18, xii, 4). Imprisonment, not as a punishment, but custody till the royal pleasure was known, appears among the Egyptians (Gen. xxxix, 20, 21). Moses appointed it for like purposes (Exod. xlii, 12). It appears as a punishment inflicted by the kings of Judah and Israel (1 Kings xxii, 27; 2 Chron. xvi, 10; Jer. xxxvii, 21); and during the Christian era, as in the instance of John (Matt. iv, 12). Another kind of imprisonment of debtors and debtors were also committed to prison, and the latter “tormented till they paid” (Matt. xviii, 30; Luke xxii, 19). A common prison is mentioned (Acts v, 18); and also an inner prison, or dungeon, which was sometimes a pit (Jer. xxxviii, 6), in which were “stocks” (Jer. xx, 2; xix, 26; Acts xiv, 24). Prisoners are allotted to
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Job iii, 18), and stocks (xiii, 27). Banishment was inflicted by the Romans on John (Rev. i, 9). As in earlier times imprisonment formed no part of the Jewish system, the sentences were executed at once (see Exarchus, De Syn. xiii, 15; xxiii, 880). Before death, a grain of frankincense in a cup of wine was given to the criminal to intoxicate him (ibid. 889). The command for witnesses to cast the first stone shows that the duty of execution did not belong to any special officer (Deut. xvii, 7).

The sentence of death, especially non-capital, inflicted by other nations we have the following notices: In Egypt, the power of life and death and imprisonment rested with the king, and to some extent also with officers of high rank (Gen. xl, 3; xxii; xlii, 20). Death might be inflicted for the crime of slavery (xlii, 19; xliii, 3, 8). The law of retaliation was also in use in Egypt (Wilkinson, Ancient Egyptians, ii, 214, 215, 217). In Egypt, and also in Babylon, the chief of the executioners, Rubb-Tubbaschim, was a great officer of state (Gen. xxxvii, 36; xxi; xlii, 19; xliii, 10; xlii, 6; iii, 15, 16). Dan. iii, 14; Mark vi, 27; Michaelis, Mos. Rechts, iii, 412; Josephus, Ant. vi, 3, 5. He was sometimes a eunuch (Josephus, Ant. vii, 5, 4). See CHRETHTHEM.

Putting out the eyes of captives, and other cruelties, as flaying alive, burning, tearing out the tongue, etc., were practiced by the Assyrians and Babylonian conquerors; and parallel instances of despicable cruelty are found in abundance in both ancient and modern times in Persia and other nations. The execution of Haman and the story of Daniel are pictures of summary Oriental procedure (2 Kings xiv, 7; Esth. vi, 9, 10; Jer. xxix, 22; Dan. iii, 6; vi, 7, 24; comp. Herod. vii, 89; ix, 112, 118; see Chardin, Voy. vi, 21, 118; Layard, Ninevah, ii, 869, 874, 377; Niebuhr, p. 456, 457). The duty of counting the numbers of the victims, which is there represented, agrees with the story of Jehu (2 Kings x, 7), who commanded the execution of 400 of the sons of Ahab at Mira, by Bar Porter (Travel., ii, 524, 525; see also Burckhardt, Syria, p. 57) and Malcolm, Sketches of Persia, p. 47).

With the Romans, stripes and the stocks, πυθωροτατος τον ξεκολον, mecer and cubilatam, were in use, and imprisonment with a chain attached to a soldier. There were also the λεβάρα κυτσια in private houses (Acts xvi, 23; xxii, 24; xxvi, 16; comp. Xenoph. Hel. iii, 3, 11; Herod. i, 87; Plautus, Rud. iii, 6, 80, 84, 88, 50; Aristot. E. Σφεδ. Bekker) 1044; Josephus, Ant. xvi, 7, 6; xix, 6, 7; Sallust, Cat. 47). The sword was a usual weapon.

The obvious fact that the sufferings of the wicked in this life are not in proportion to their sins has led even the heathen of all ages to the belief in a state of retribution after death. The Scriptures abundantly confirm this position, so that few in the present day deny its truth in some form. The only question that need be raised is the case of the just, and its duration. The former of these points has been discussed under HELL PUNISHMENTS; the latter we will briefly consider here.

1. No one approaching the New Testament without preconceived opinions could get any other impression from its language on this subject than that the punishments of the wicked in hell are to be everlasting. (For special passages, see Matt. xii, 28; xxv; xxvi, 24; Mark iii, 29; ix, 48; Rev. xiv, 9, 10.) Moreover, apart from special passages, the general tone of the New Testament points to the final and irrevocable ruin of those who persist to the last in sin and in the rejection of Christ the Saviour.

2. In the ancient Church, the Alexandrian theologians were the first to teach that there could be an end to the punishments of hell. Yet this change of plan and reformation was the only end of punishment, so that it could not be eternal; the final end is æternum æternae æternitatis, the entire freedom from evil. Hence Clement says, "If in this life there are so many ways for purification and repentance, how much more should there be after death!... whatever is separated from the body, will be easier. We can set no limits to the agency of the Redeemer; to redeem, to rescue, to discipline, is his work; and so will be continue to operate after this life" ( Stromata, vi, 638). Clement did not deem it proper to express himself more fully respecting this doctrine, because he considered it a part of the Gnosis. Hence he says, "As to the rest, I am silent, and praise the Lord" (ibid. vii, 706). Origen infers from the variety of ways and methods by which men are led to the faith in this life that there will be a diversity in the divine modes of discipline after death; notwithstanding this, however, he considers it extremely important that every one should in this life become a believer. Whoever neglects the Gospel, or after baptism commits grievous sins, will suffer so much heavier punishments after death (In Joannis, vi, 267). The doctrine of a general restoration was found explicitly in 1 Cor. xv, 28. Yet he reckons this among the Gnostic (or esoteric) doctrines; for he says, "It would not be useful for all to have this knowledge; but it is well if at least of a material hell keep them back from sin" (ibid. 264). "But, in opposition to these, the doctrine of the eternity of future punishments was affirmed by other equally distinguished teachers, e. g. Basil, John of Constantinople, among the Greeks, and, among the Latins, by Jerome, Augustine, and others." Gregory of Nyssa, however, defended the restorationism (διαστορισμος) of Origen. Augustine, on the other hand, opposed it strenuously; the whole spirit of his system, and his full and strong conception of the justice of God, were fundamentally opposed to restorationism. "The doctrine of the original sin of Adam, and the condemnation of all men with him (Catharina, A.D. 399), and afterwards by many other councils, and the doctrine of the eternity of future punishments was established as the faith of the Church" (Knapp, Theology, § 168). The doctrine of purgatory soon grew up to take the place of the theory of restorationism. "The doctrine of the limited duration of future punishment fell into very ill repute in the Western Church, on account of its being professed by some of the enthusiastic and revolutionary parties in the 16th century (e. g. the Anabaptists), and from its being intimately connected with the most violent sentiments and speculations; the profession of the doctrine came to be regarded as implying assent to the other extravagances of these parties, and as the signal for rebellion. Hence it is rejected in the symboical books of the Lutheran Church as an Anabaptistical doctrine (Anabaptismus, 1618); and in the form in which this doctrine was held by these sects it deserves the most unmingled disapprobation. Again, among the ill-famed Christian free-thinkers—e. g. the Socinians—there were some who professed it. In modern times it has been the same. This doctrine has been advocated in the Protestant Church both by men who have stood in suspicion of enthusiasm (e. g. Peterson, Lavater, and others) and by some of the free-thinkers in philosophy and theology, although for very different causes and on very different grounds by these two classes" (Knapp, at sup.). See Bornet, De Status Mortuorum; Cotta, Historia Succincta Doymatis de Parnassum Infernali Duratione (Tubingen, 1774, 8vo); Dietelmaire, Antiq. Comment. Fanales de æternitatis æternitudes (Altorf, 1769, 8vo); Tillibnian, Sermones, vol. ii.; Lewis, De status Mortuorum; Brough, De Status Mortuorum; Wahlen, De Status Mortuorum; Stuart, Exceptional Essays on Future Punishment (Anover, 1800, 12mo); Baumgarten, Vindiciae Parnarum Inferarum (Halle, 1742); Meth. Quarr. Rev. Apr., 1861; New-England, 1801, p. 68; Contemporary Rev. Apr., 1872; Exeter, 1870; Then 1872; Councils Purgatory, Retribution, and Universalism,
under which latter title the subject will be more fully treated.

Pu'ntes (Heb. 'Puni', נפוץ, a Gentile term, from פֶּנֶּע, פִּיעִּי, a collective term for the descendants of Phuvah or Pua (Num. xxxii, 20). See PHUVAH.

Punjabi and Sikh Version. A version of the New Test. for the people inhabiting an extensive country of North-west Hindostan called Punjab was commenced in 1807 at Serrapmore, but the fonts of type were destroyed by fire. The loss, however, was soon replaced, and in 1818 the Gospels and Acts were announced as finished. In 1815 the entire New Test., in an edition of 1000 copies, was completed, and in 1832 a second edition was undertaken. The translation of the Old Test. was also undertaken, and in 1820 the Penta-
touch and historical books were issued, and now the whole Bible, published by the Serrapmore Mission, is read in Punjabi, as the seventy-third report of the British and Foreign Bible Society (1877) shows. (B. P.)

P'unon (Heb. P'non), פְּנָון, darkness [Genesis]; one of the spies sent by Shôpâh (Num. xxxiii, 42), on the east side of the mountains of Edom, and perhaps belonging to that district, since a duke of Pnun is mentioned (Gen. xii, 10; Num. xxxii, 41; 1 Chron, i, 52) among the chiefest of the Edomites. It lay next beyond Zalmonah, between it and Oboth, and three days' journey from the mountains of Abiram, which formed the boundary of Moab. By Eusebius and Jerome (Onom., p. 413) its name is identified with the modern Tuluh (Burchardt, ii, 477; see Ramer, Zug der Israel, p. 46): but on the Kabsat Phen'am of Setzeen (Zachi's Mouvat. Correspond. xvii, 187) we must await more particular intelligence. See EXOD.

Puni Version. The Punti, or Canton Collo-
quial, as it is sometimes called, is a dialect spoken by a large population which is to be found in and around Canton, in China. Into this dialect only portions of the Bible were translated, viz. Mark's Gospel, by the Rev. G. Piercy, and published in 1872, with the title 王之言 in chuen. Luke's Gospel was translated in the same year by the Rev. T. Ricks, Missionary, and published in 1867, with the title De Evangelium dei in Volksliediste der Punti Chuen, John's Gospel was translated by the Rev. C. F. Preston, and published at Canton on wooden blocks, under the title Tâ han cheon Fâ yoga shoo. In 1872 St. Paul's Epistles—Galatians to Philemon—were published, under the title Pau la di hauy siewn shoo, as translated by Mr. Piercy: while the Acts of the Apostles were also published in the same year, with the title She oleh hing chuen, in the translation of Mr. Preston. These are all the parts of the New Test. published in that dialect, of which St. Mark and St. Luke have been reprinted by the American Bible Society, changing the term for "God." Of the Old Test., the book of Genesis was translated by the Rev. G. Piercy, and published in 1873, under the title K'te rî cheung shê k'ô, to which the book of Psalms must be added, which has been translated by the Rev. A. B. Hutchinson, of the Church Missionary Society, and was published in 1876. Comp. the annual reports of the British and Foreign Bible Society for 1872, 1873, 1874, and 1877. (B. F.)

Puipila (pupil of the eye) is a clerical manual written by John Burgh. It was very popular during the 18th and 16th centuries.

Puppet-plays (Lat. pappe, a girl; Fr. poupée, a
doll) are exhibitions in which the parts of the different characters are taken by miniature figures worked by wires, while the dialogue is given by persons behind the scenes. These plays are of very ancient date, and, originally intended to gratify children, they ended in being a diversions of the ladies. In China, the puppets are still made to act dramas, either as movable figures or as shadows behind a curtain. In Italy and France puppet-plays were at one time carried to a considerable degree of artistic perfection; and even Lessing and Goethe, in Germany, thought the subject worth their serious attention. In England, they are mentioned under the name of motions by many of our early authors; and frequent allusions to them occur in the plays of Shakespeare, Ben Jonson, and the older dramatists. The earliest exhibitions of this kind consisted of representations of stories taken from the Old and New Testa-
ments, or from the lives and legends of saints. They thus seem to have been the last remnant of the moralities of the 16th century. See MYSTERIES. We learn from Ben Jonson and his contemporaries that the most popular of these exhibitions at that time were the Prodigal Son and Nineweh with Jonas and the Whale. Even the Puritans, with all their hatred of the regular stage, did not object to be present at such representations. The most noted exhibitions of the kind were those of Robert Powel, in the beginning of the 18th century (see Dymock, Barrow, Dibdin, and Dibdin, ii, 187). These performances were soon of the time of Goldsmith, scrip
tural "motions" were common; and in The Stoops to Conquer reference is made to the display of Solomon's Temple in one of these shows. The regular performances of the stage were also sometimes imitated; and Dr. Samuel Johnson has observed that puppets were so capable of representing even the plays of Shakespeare that Macbeth might be represented by them as well as by living actors. These exhibitions, however, much degenerated, and latterly consisted of a wretched display of wooden figures, barbarously formed, and decorated without the least degree of taste or propriety, while the dialogues were jumbles of absurdities and nonsense.

Purâna (literally, "old," from the Sanscrit purâ, before, past) is the name of that class of religious works which, besides the Tanastras (q. v.), is the main foundation of the actual popular creed of the Brahminical Hindu (q. v.). According to the popular belief, these works were compiled by Vyâs (q. v.), the supposed arranger of the Vedas (q. v.), and the author of the Mahabharata (q. v.), and they extend beyond an age anterior to the reach of historical computation. A critical investiga-
tion, however, of the contents of the existing works leads to the conclusion that, in their present form, they do not only not belong to a remote age, but can barely claim an antiquity of a thousand years. The word Purâna occurs in some passages of the Mahabharata, the law-books of Yajnavalkya and Manu (q. v.); and it is even met with in some Upanishads and the great Brahmanic portion of the White-Yajur-Veda; but it is easy to show that in all these ancient works it cannot refer to the existing Purânas: and therefore that no inference relative to the age of the ancient can be drawn from the modern. There are, however, several circumstances tending to show that there were a number of works called Purânas which preceded the existing, and were the sources whence these probably derived a portion of their contents. The oldest known authority for a Sanscrit vocabulary, Amara-Sinha, gives as a synonym of Purâna the word Pomecha-lakshana, which means "that which has fire (pomecha) characteristic marks" (lakshana); and the scholars of that vocabulary agree in stating that the lakshanas are: 1. Primary location; or cosmogony; 2. Secondary creation, or the destruction and renovation of worlds; 3. Genealogy of gods and patriarchs; 4. Mamecaturas, or reigns of Manus; and, 5. The history of the princes of the solar and lunar races. Such, then, were the characteristic topics of a Purâna at the time, if not of Amarasinha himself—which is
probable — at least, of his oldest commentators. Yet the distinguished scholar most conversant with the existing Purāṇas, who, in his preface to the translation of the Viṣṇu-Purāṇa, gives an account of their chief contents (Prof. H. H. Wilson), observes, in regard to the quoted definition of the commentators on Amara-Sinhas, that in no one instance do the actual Purāṇas conform to it exactly; that "to some of them it is utterly inapplicable, to others, it only partially applies." To the Viṣṇu-Purāṇa, he adds, it belongs more than to any other Purāṇa; but even in the case of this Purāṇa he shows that it cannot be supposed to be included in the term explained by the commentators. The age of Amara-Sinhas is, according to Wilson, the last half of the century preceding the Christian era; others conjecture that it dates some centuries later. On the supposition, then, that Amara-Sinhas himself implied by Pancha-lakshana the sense given to this term by his commentators, there would have been Purāṇas about 1500 years ago; but none of these has descended to our time in the shape it then possessed. Various passages in the actual Purāṇas furnish proof of the existence of such older Purāṇas. The strongest evidence in this respect is that afforded by a general description given by the Matagya-Purāṇa of each of the Purāṇas (which are uniformly stated to be eighteen in number), including itself; for, leaving aside the exceptional case in which it may be doubtful whether we possess the complete work now going by the name of a special Purāṇa, Prof. Wilson, in quoting the description from the Matagya-Purāṇa, and in comparing it with the real extent of the great majority of Purāṇas, the completeness of which, in their actual state, does not admit of a reasonable doubt, has conclusively shown that the Matagya-Purāṇa speaks of works which are not those we now possess. We are, then, bound to infer that there have been Purāṇas older than those preserved, and that their number has been eighteen; whereas, on the contrary, it will be hereafter seen that it is very doubtful whether we are entitled to assign this number to the actual Purāṇa literature.

The modern age of this latter literature, in the form in which it is known to us, is borne out by the change which the religious and philosophical ideas taught in the epic poems and the philosophical Sūtras have undergone in it; by the legendary detail into which older Purāṇas have been expanded by the expansion of the numerous religious rites—not connoted by the Vedic or epic works—which are taught; and, in some Purāṇas at least, by the historical or quasi-scientific instruction which is imparted in it. To divest which, in these Purāṇas, is one of the great tasks of Sanscrit philology which has yet to be fulfilled; but even a superficial comparison of the contents of the present Purāṇas with the ancient lore of Hindu religion, philosophy, and science must convince every one that the picture of religion and life unfolded by them is a caricature of that afforded by the Vedic works, and that it was drawn by priestcraft, interested in submitting to its sway the popular mind, and unscrupulous in the use of the means which had to serve its ends. The plea on which the composition of the Purāṇas was justified, even by great Hindu authorities—probably because they did not feel equal to the task of destroying a system already deeply rooted in the national mind, or because they apprehended that the nation at large would remain without any religion at all, if, without possessing the Vedic creed, it were deprived of that which the Purāṇas—this plea is best illustrated by a quotation from Sāyana, the celebrated commentator on the three principal Veda-s. He says (Rig. ed. Müller, vol. i. p. 83): "Women and Śūdras, though they, too, are in want of knowledge, have no Veda; the Vedas are deprived of [the advantage of] reading it, in consequence of their not being invested with the sacred cord; but the knowledge of law or duty and that of the supreme spirit arises to them by means of the Purāṇas and other books of this kind."

Yet, to enlighten the Hindu nation as to the reasons for these details, as clearly as times are even called a fifth Veda—teach that religion which is contained in the Vedas and Upanishads, there would be no better method than to initiate such a system of popular education as would reopen to the native mind those ancient works, now virtually closed to it.

Though the results of a comparison of the Purāṇas with the oldest works of Sanscrit literature, it is a poor justification of the origin of the former; and though it is likewise indisputable that, even at this time (the middle of the 19th century A.D.), they were, as they still are, not merely an authoritative source of religion for "women and Śūdras," but for the great majority of the males of other castes also, it nevertheless explains the great variety of matter of which the present Purāṇas are composed—so great and so multifarious, indeed, that, in the case of some of them, it imparts to them a kind of cyclopaedic character. They became, as it seems, the source of all popular knowledge; a substitute to the masses of the nation not only for theological literature, but for scientific works, the study of which was superfluous to them. Thus, while the principal subjects taught by nearly all the Purāṇas are cosmogony, religion (including law), and the legendary matter which, to a Hindu, assumes the value of history, in some of them we meet with a description of plants which goes to the character of geography; and one, the Agni-Purāṇa, also pretends to teach archery, medicine, rhetoric, prosody, and grammar; though it is needless to add that its teaching has no real worth.

One purpose, however, and that a paramount one, is not included in the list of which Śāyana endeavored to account for the composition of the Purāṇas; it is the purpose of establishing a sectarian creed. At the third phase of the Hindu religion, two gods of the Hindu pantheon especially engrossed the religious faith of the masses—Viṣṇu (q. v.) and Śiva (q. v.), each being looked upon by his worshippers as the supreme deity, to whom the other, as well as the remaining gods, was subordinate. Moreover, when the power or energy of these gods had been raised to the rank of a separate deity, it was the female Šakti, or energy, of Viṣṇu, or of Śiva, which was held in peculiar awe by a numerous host of believers. Now, apart from the general reasons mentioned before, a principal object, and probably the principal one, of the Purāṇas was to establish, as the case might be, the supremacy of Śiva or Viṣṇu, or both. This was assumed, of the female energy of Śiva, though the worship of the latter belongs more exclusively to the class of works known as Tantras. There are, accordingly, Viṣṇu-Purāṇas, or those composed for the glory of Viṣṇu; Śiva-Purāṇas, or those which extol the worship of Śiva; and by one or two Purāṇas, perhaps, but merely as far as a portion of them is concerned, will be more consistently assigned to the Śakti worship, or that of Durgā, than to that of Viṣṇu or Śiva.

The invariable form of the Purāṇas," says Prof. Wilson, in his preface to the Viṣṇu-Purāṇa, "is that of a dialogue, in which some person relates its contents in reply to the inquiries of another. This dialogue is interspersed with others, which are repeated as having been held on other occasions, between different individuals, in consequence of similar questions having been asked. The immediate narrator is commonly, though not constantly, Lomaharshaṇa, or Bo-maharṣaṇa, the disciple of Viṣṇa, who is supposed to communicate what was imparted to him by his predecessor as he had heard it from some other sage... all of whom are the same person, Sūtras, that is, a bard or panegyrist, who was cre-
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according to the Vayu-Puranam, to celebrate the exploits of princes, and who, according to the Vyāyu and Puráṇa Purāṇas, has a right, by birth and profession, to narrate the Purāṇas, in preference even to the Brahmas.


In other lists, the Aiyu-Purāṇa is omitted, and the Vyāyu-Purāṇa is inserted instead of it; or the Gauda and Brahmaná are omitted and replaced by the Vyāyu and Nrisiha Purāṇas. Of these Purāṇas, 2, 3, and 5, are clearer and more explicit. They are not a purgatorial fire, where the souls of the righteous are purified by a temporary punishment (definitum tempus cruciatum expiatur), that entrance into the holy house of the gods, or salvation (sākṣipta), by the means of the sūtra, that enthrone an epic works, the Mahābhārata (q.v.) and Ramáyana (q.v.), more especially to the former of them.

But the Purāṇas are for a considerable portion of their contents largely indebted to the two great epic poetical works, the Mahābhārata (q.v.) and Ramáyana (q.v.), more especially to the former of them.

The Purāṇas, the original text of three has already appeared in print: that of the Bhagavata in several native editions, published at Bombay and Calcutta; and partly in a Paris edition by Eugène Burnouf, which remained incomplete through the premature death of the distinguished scholar; that of the Markandeya-Purāṇa, edited at Calcutta in the Bibliothèque Indica, by the Rev. K. M. Banerjee; and that of the Linga-Purāṇa for Bombay; for, regarding a fourth, the Gauda-Purāṇa, edited at Benares and Bombay, it seems doubtful whether that work is the same as the Purāṇa spoken of in the native list. Besides these, small portions from the Purāṇa, Shudra, Bārhabhutā-Purāṇa, Markandeya, and other Purāṇas have been published in India and Europe. Of translations, we have only to name the excellent French translation by Burnouf of the first nine books of the Bhagavata, and the elegant translation of the whole Vāiku-Purāṇa, together with valuable notes, by the late Prof. H. H. Wilson, which is now in course of republication in his Works, in a new edition, amplified with numerous notes, by Prof. E. F. Hall.

For general information on the character and contents of the Purāṇas, see especially Wilson's preface to his translation of the Vaiṣṇava-Purāṇa (Works, vol. vi, Lond. 1864); Burnouf's preface to his edition of the Bhagavata (Paris, 1840); Wilson, Analysis of the Purāṇas (Works, vol. iii, Lond. 1864, edited by Prof. R. Rost); and Banerjea, Introduction to the Markandeya (Calcutta, 1862); and Muir, Original Sanskrit History of the Origins and History of the People of India (Lond. 1856–1868), vol. i–iv; Hardwick, Christian and Other Mumi (see Index in vol. ii); Miller, Chips, ii, 8, 75, 316; Clarke, Ten Great Religions (see Index).

Pura was, according to the Indian mythology, the first man—the father of the human race; his wife, the first woman, Prakriti, gave birth to the ancestors of the Indian castes.

Purcell, Henry, an English composer of great note, celebrated especially as the author of church music, was born at Westminster in 1658. He was the son of a musician attached to the chapel of Charles II. At the age of six, having lost his father, he was admitted into the choir of boys at the royal chapel. His masters were Cooke, Fellham, Humphrey, and Dr. Blow. He was remarkable for precocity of talent, but, what was better, he seconded the liberality of nature by his zeal and diligence. His progress was so rapid that, while still a member of the choir, he produced several anthemian of his own composition, which were widely sought for almost as soon as written; and at eighteen he received the fullest recognition of his ability, by being chosen organist of Westminster Abbey (1676) to succeed Dr. Christopher Gibbons. In 1682, Purcell was granted the place of organist of the royal chapel, and this position he held until his death, in 1695. Purcell was the
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first English composer who introduced the lute into the church to support the voice, which, until then, the organ had alone accompanied. The original character of his music, the variety of its forms, the majesty of its style, and upon all this pressed the seal of his greatness. One is autor: at the great fulness of his genius, when it is wondered how young he died. It is said of Purcell that "his anthems far exceed in number those of any other composer, and would alone have furnished sufficient employment moderately active mind and a life of average duration.
It is to be regretted, however, that his ambition was lessative.
He attempted to bring back to a period in the midst of religious influences, and if confined to the English church, he would have stood out as its cur- tor and propagator in the modern Church. His efforts in several directions weakened any one line he undertook to cover, and he failed to attain that perfection which he aspired to. His own countrymen so greatly revered his memory that they buried him in the mausoleum of their greatest. He rests in the north transept of Westminster Abbey. His epitaph was composed by Dryden. A part of the music written for the theatre has been published in the collection of Airs composed for the Theatres and on other Occasions, by Henry Purcell (Lond. 1697). All his sacred works, which have retained their place to the present day, and include fifty anthems, besides the Te Deum and Jubilate, with orchestral accompaniments, a complete service in seven numbers of hymns and psalms, have been collected by M. Vincent Novello, who has published them in seventy-two numbers, under the title of Purcell's Sacred Music (Lond. 1826—56). This publication is preceded by a notice of the life and works of the composer and his portrait. See Ambros, Gesch. der Musik (Leips. 1878, 8vo), vol. iv.

Purchas, John, an Anglican divine, noted especially in the department of belles-lettres, was born at Cambridge in 1623, received his preparatory training at Rugeby, and then studied at Christ's College, Cambridge, in 1640, and afterwards at Oxford (1644). Entered in 1644 in the Church of England, Mr. Purchas became curate of Ellsworth, Cambridge, in 1651, remaining there two years. In 1656 he was appointed curate of Orwell, in the same county, and remained until 1659. In 1661 he went to St. Paul's, in West Street, Brighton, and soon became notorious for his ritualistic propensities. He was appointed perpetual curate in St. James's Chapel, Brighton, becoming incumbent in 1686. His mode of conducting public worship culminated in his trial in the Court of Arches, the case being subsequently carried by appeal before the judicial committee of the 17th General. The final result of these trials was that Mr. Purchas was admonished to discontinue the use of certain vestments, lighted candles, incense, wafer bread, and the ceremonies he had practised in the regular services. He failed to obey; however, and was in consequence suspended as officio on Feb. 7, 1672, a sequestration being levied upon his lay property to defray the costs of the proceedings. He contemplated thereafter entering the Roman Catholic Church, but was probably prevented by his sudden illness of October, 1672, which, published by him were the Directions Anglicanæ, which forms the text-book of Anglican ritualism. His other works are: The Miser's Daughter, a comedy and poems (1839); —Poems and Idylla (1846); —Book of Fasts, a series of sermons (1838); —The Death of Earl of Northumberland; preached at St. Paul's, West Street, Brighton (1856).

Purgatory, in the English church, is a concept that describes the aftermath of death, where the souls of those who have not reached perfection are purified before entering heaven. The Purgatory of the souls is a common theme in Christian art and literature, and its depiction varies greatly across different cultures and traditions. In the Roman Catholic Church, Purgatory is considered a necessary stage for souls to prepare for the Beatific Vision. It is often depicted as a place of purification, with various levels of suffering and purification. The idea of Purgatory is rooted in the belief that all souls are in a state of grace, and that their souls are purified through the intercession of the saints and the prayers of the faithful.
Purgatory

The Church has also distinguished purgatory, so that there remains no guilt of temporal punishment to be done away in this world, or that which is to come in purgatory, before the passage can be opened into heaven, let him be secured. Elsewhere it is said, "There is a certain purgatory, which is not in the divine order, and is not the eternal and consolatory punishment of earthly sins, but is a place of affliction, help by the sufferings of the faithful, but principally by the sacrifices of the acceptable altar"—a statement obviously vague and indefinite. It leaves the most important inquiry undetermined—viz. whether the souls in purgatory are in a state of happiness or misery: they are "detained," but not "punished" as the text states.

By referring, however, to the Catechism of the Council of Trent, drawn up by order of the fathers there assembled, we get a clearer and more explicit definition: "There is a purgatorial fire, where the souls of the righteous are purified by a temporary punishment [ad definitum tempus cruciatus expiandur], that entrance may be given them into their eternal home, where nothing that is defiled can have a place. And of the business of this doctrine, which holy councils declare to be eternal and liquid, it may instigate many to repentation; in this condition, the pastor will have to declare more diligently and frequently, because we are fallen on times in which men will not endure sound doctrine." (Catech. Trident., sess. vi, can. 30; sess. xxxv, § 1; Catech. Eccl., c. vi, qu. 3.) The indefinite meaning is given to the purgatorial fire and the souls of the faithful are punished for a defined period till their sins are expiated. The almost universal belief prevailing among Roman Catholics—though they do not consider torment by fire as being de jure, but only the most probable opinion—is that purgatory is a place of suffering or punishment for imperfect Christians. Thus Dr. Vilmer, though he says that "in the Council of Trent all is contained that is necessary to be believed on this subject," yet afterwards defines purgatory as "a place of temporary punishment", which is not asserted by, and goes beyond, the decree of the council. (End of Controversy, p. 178, 174.) Bellarmine says, "Purgatory is a certain place in which, as in a prison, the souls are purged after this life which were not fully purged in this life—such as, that they may be able to enter into heaven, where no unclean thing can enter;" and elsewhere, "that the fathers unanimously [sic] teach that the pains of purgatory are not 'severe or terrible'" (De Purgatorio, 164).

The bar. Advanced for purgatory are these: 1. Every one who dies in grace, more than an idol, as it is an offence to God, deserves punishment from him, and will be punished by him hereafter, if not cancelled by repentance here. 2. Such small sins do not die eternal punishment. 3. Few depart this life so as to be totally exempt from spots of this nature, and from every kind of guilt due to God's justice. 4. Therefore, few will escape without suffering some from his justice for such debts as they have carried with them out of this world, according to the rule of divine justice by which he treats every soul hereafter according to his works in this life, according to the state in which he finds it in death. From these positions, which the advocates of the doctrine of purgatory consider so many self-evident truths, they infer that there may be some third place of punishment; for since the indigence of sin has not even nothing in heaven that is not clear and pure from all sin, both great and small, and his infinite justice can permit none to receive the reward of bliss who are yet not out of debt, but have something in justice to suffer, must, of necessity, be placed some place where souls departing this life, pardoned for their mortal and venial sins, are purified and purified before they are admitted into heaven. Those in purgatory are relieved by the prayers of their fellow-members here on.

For such souls and masses offered up to God for their souls. Such as have no reason to pray for them, or give alms to procure masses for their relief, are remembered by the Church, which makes a general commemoration of all the faithful departed in every mass and in every one of the canonical hours of the divine office. But there are two arguments, the following Bible passages are alleged by them in support of these views: 2. Matt. xxi, 46 (on which they rely, on the supposition of its being inspired); Matt. v, 25 (the 'prison' therein referred to being interpreted by some to mean purgatory); xxi, 32; 1 Cor. xi, 11-15; xv, 22; Rev. xxi, 14; as well as certain less decisive indications contained in the language of some of the Psalms, as xxxvi (in the A. V. xxviii), i; lxv, 12; lat. iv, 14; xxxii, 14; Mal. iii, 8. Respecting all these passages as containing the doctrine of a purgatory, arguments are drawn not alone from the words themselves, but from the interpretation of them by the fathers.

T. Direct testimonies cited by Roman Catholic writers from the fathers to the belief of their respective ages as to the existence of a purgatory are very numerous. The following is a very important instance, which may instigate some to repentation: 'Hom., vi, c. 5, in Jeremiam; vi, Hom. in Exod.; xiv, Hom. in Levit.; xxviii, Hom. in Num.; Euseb., De Fide Constant., iv, 71; Athanasius, Quast., xxxvii, ad Antioch.; Cyril, Epist. 13, ad Jerusalem; vi, ad Epist. 3, in Rom., v, 7; Gregory of Nazianzen, xi, Orat. de Laude Athanasii; Gregory of Nyssa, Orat. de Bapt.; as also Epiphanius, Ephraem, Theodoret, and others. Among the Latins, Tertullian, Cyprian, Arnobius, Lactantius, Hilary, Ambrose, and, above all, Augustine (from whom many passages are cited), Paulinus of Nola, and Gregory the Great, in whom the doctrine is found in all the fulness of its modern detail. The epistles of the catacombs, too, occasionally supply Romish controversialists with some testimonies to the belief of a purgatory, and of the value of the intercessory prayers. The history of the purgatory not merely repose, but relief from suffering for the deceased; and the liturgies of the various rites are still more declative and circumstantial. Beyond these two points, Romish faith, as defined by the Council of Trent, does not go. The council expressly prohibits the popular discussion of the "more difficult and subtle questions, and everything that tends to curiosity or superstition, or savors of filthy lucre." Of the further questions as to the nature of purgatory, there is one of great historical importance, inasmuch as it constitutes the dividing line between the Greek and Latin churches. As to the existence of purgatory, both these churches are agreed, and they are further agreed that it is a place of suffering; but, while the Latins commonly hold that this suffering is "by fire," the Greeks do not determine the manner of the suffering, but are content to regard it as "through tribulation." The decree of union in the Council of Florence (1439) left this point free for discussion. Equally free are the questions as to the situation of purgatory; as to the duration of the purgatorial suffering; as to the probable number of souls there; and as to the mode of their admission into the state in which they are to find it in death. From these positions, which the advocates of the doctrine of purgatory consider so many self-evident truths, they infer that there may be some third place of punishment; for since the indigence of sin has not even nothing in heaven, which is not clear and pure from all sin, both great and small, and his infinite justice can permit none to receive the reward of bliss who are yet not out of debt, but have something in justice to suffer, must, of necessity, be placed some place where souls departing this life, pardoned for their mortal and venial sins, are purified and purified before they are admitted into heaven. Those in purgatory are relieved by the prayers of their fellow-members here on.

Purification
in a state of suffering; for even then he would rest from the sorrows and trials of life, and have the assured hope of eternal life. Still, where there is no direct allusion (as in the Mozarabic and Gallican missals) to the suffering of the departed, we cannot fairly and reasonably suppose that a state of suffering is implied in the pain mentioned above, or that the faithful are said to be lost. Such an expression must be taken in its ordinary meaning as denoting a more or less perfect happiness. (The theory of the early Church, which may be called the "Judgment-day Purgatory," we treat of below.) See Bellarmine, *De Purgatorio;* and on the Greek portion of the subject, *De Aliturgetia, De Erwiteuse Eclesiae in Dogmate de Purgatorio Perpetuo Consensiae.*

The mediæval doctrine and practice regarding purgatory were among the leading grounds of the protest of the Waldenses and other sects of that age. The Reformers as a body rejected the doctrine.

In the modern Romish Church the doctrine of purgatory has led to others more directly injurious and corrupting. By the terror which it inspires it gives the preposterous power to impose penances; it leads to indulgences (q. v.) and prayers for the dead, for it is held that the sufferings in purgatory may be greatly mitigated and shortened by the prayers, the services, the masses, the masses, the charities, and other works of supererogation of their friends upon the earth. The extent to which this doctrine has been carried and the increasing importance of the income of the Church receives a significant illustration in one singular fact. There exists a purgatorial insurance company which, for a certain premium paid annually, insures the payor a given number of masses for his soul in the event of his death, and the certificates of this insurance company may be seen hung up on the walls in hundreds of rooms in the tenement-houses of our great cities, especially of New York.

Protestantism, in rejecting the doctrine of purgatory, has found that it is indispensable to depend upon any authority outside of the Bible and not in harmony therewith. It not only, however, refuses to admit the authority of tradition or the testimonies of the fathers, but, at the same time, alleges that most, if not all, of the passages quoted from the fathers as in favor of purgatory are in themselves insufficient to prove that they held any such doctrine as that now taught by the Roman Catholic Church, some of them properly relating only to the subject of prayer for the dead (q. v.), and others to the doctrine of Limbo of the Fathers. The doctrine of purgatory is the final development of that which maintains that prayer ought to be made for the dead, Protestants generally acknowledge, but refuse to admit that the fathers carried out their views to any such consequence. For Origen says, "Prayers and intercessions of this present life, hope to be in the highest heavens," not in purgatory. So Chrysostom, "Those that truly follow virtue, after they are changed from this life, are truly freed from their frightings, and loosed from their bonds. For death, so much as live honestly, is a change from worse things to better. From this transitory to an eternal and immortal life that hath no end." Macarius, speaking of the faithful, says, "When they go out of their bodies, the choirs of angels receive their souls into their proper places, to the pure world, and so lead them to the blessedness of life. Hence Athanasius says, "To the righteous it is not death, but only a change, for they are changed from this world to an eternal rest. And as a man comes out of prison, so do the saints go from this troublesomely to the good things prepared for them."

Certainly, these fathers were no purgatorians, since they unanimously look upon the dead as being outside of purgatory. The closure of the gate and the eternal meeting point of the church and the moment of God's presence are said to be the state of the soul after death. The entrance into the beatific vision and the time of the living without the body, is the only state which the Church doctrine would preserve; and that there are some sins which are to be purged away by the prayers and good works of others. To name no more, the Gospel represents Lazarus as at once conveyed to a state of comfort and joy (Luke xvi, 22, 23); Christ promised Nebat, all such shall go "to be made whole in the kingdom of heaven" (Luke xiv, 14). This day shall thou be with me in paradise" (Luke xvi, 22, 23);
with Christ's coming or the Day of Judgment (see Psa. i, 3; Isa. iv, 4; Dan. vii, 9; Zech. xii, 9; Mal. iii, 2; 3, 4; iv, 1). Many of the Church fathers are cited in support of the belief that Christians must pass through the fire on the Day of Judgment, though all will not be injured by it.

In his judgment day purgatory doctrine about purgatory bids him not to be so hasty, for he might depart and yet not be with Christ; he might pass from death, and yet not to life; he might and must be absent from the body a while before he can be present with the Lord; he might go from earth, yet not to heaven, but to purgatory, a place St. Paul never dreamed of.

The Bible passages quoted by Romanists as in direct support of the doctrine of purgatory, Pro testants simply set aside as a ridiculous attempt at malpractice in exegesis. First it is answered that the books of Macabees have no evidence of inspiration, and that the second of these books, whence the supposition is purported to come, is far from being one of the best books of the Apocrypha (q. v.); besides, that the passage referred to rather prove that there is no such place as purgatory, since Judas did not expect the soul to be parted from sinners to reap any benefit from the sinners till the resurrection. The texts quoted from the Scriptures have no reference to the doctrine, as may be seen by consulting the context, and any lucid commentator upon it; the texts are cited with the sole view of proving the doctrine.

The text Matt. xix, 22 is explained as relating to the final judgment; and I Cor. iii, 11, 15, as relating to a trial of works, and not of persons; while I Cor. xv, 51-57, is having nothing more to do with the course (Lev. xv, 19; I Sam. vii, 3) of all things in the body as affected by pestilence, disease, and the like. Moreover, the passage clothes the whole of the doctrine; for how clothes that touched the carcass of sin all of these or eating or carrying the carcass of a clean b(6, 1867) had a natural death (Lev. xvi, 20, 40); none of both of the person and of the defiled garments in order of ger zemarah (Jer. vi, 16, 17)—the ger seder (15) in the nearest of the above instances to the Lev. xvi, 17, on which the uncleanness was not incurred. A high degree of uncleanness resulted from prolonged ger seder in males and menstruation in women: in these cases a probationary interval of seven days war them allowed to follow the course of the symptoms the more evening of the seventh day the candidate with evening performed an ablation both of the borrowed by the garments, and on the eighth (on, that matter is devoted to two or young pigeons, one for was to rise, it must other a burning (ver. 4, 5-12) or five purification— with persons in the above states, or with the burning of any or furniture that had been used by or of God revealed in states, involved uncleanness in a, a corresponding mor—absorbed by the abation of the day of the abation of the day—without (ver. 5, 11, 23) but in the Lord—must have a great interval of seven days (ver. 6, 9) of the doctrine; for how the sacrifice was increased ho heathen, possessing yet with a pigeon or turtle-dove new faith, and with most of ing made in favor of the, clinging about them, be pro—same offering as in the (in the presence of God? Their 22—24). The purgation sufficient to save them, but the birth of a son, (18) and more—burned, even such as deviated, the difference on. Probably it was a strong Christian feeling of this sort: that determined the reception of the doctrine of purgatory into the creed of the Roman Church, rather than any Gnostic philosophizations, though the Neo-Platonic theories of Alexandria are the Roman Church, rather than prayer for the fire (1 Cor. iii, 11-15). In proof of this doctrine is also quoted the frequent use of the word fire in connection
Purgatory; vid. Homil. vi. in Exod.). St. Basil, in his Commentary on Isaiah (iv, 4), says that baptism may be understood in three senses—in the one, of regeneration by the Holy Spirit; in another, of the punishment of sin in the present life; and in a third, of the trial of judgment by fire. They who have committed deadly sins after they have received the knowledge of the truth, need the judgment which is by fire (τὰς ἐν τῷ καταχθέντας εἰρήνας) (Basil. Opera, t. i, ad loc. Gaume). In his work on the Holy Spirit, illustrating the passage "Shall he not baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire," he calls the trial of judgment a "baptism of fire;" as the apostle says, "the fire shall try every man's work of what sort it is" (ibid. iii, p. 40). Gregory of Nazianzum, speaking of the Novatians, says: "Perchance in the future world they shall be baptized with fire, the baptism more severe and long continued, which devours as grass the stubble, and consumes every vestige of wickedness (λαυκάς πᾶσας καταγιώσας)" (Greg. Naz. Opera, t. ii, c. 588, Migne). Also in one of his poems he speaks of standing in fear of the fiery river of judgment (μισθὸς φόβων ἐπερημμένας) (ibid. t. iii, c. 1429). Gregory of Nyssa says, speaking of infants who die unbaptized: "How shall we judge of those who thus died? Shall that soul behold its Judge, and shall it be placed with others before his tribunal? Shall it be judged, and shall it receive a deserved recompense, purged by fire according to the teaching (区管委会) of the Gospel, or refreshed by the dew of benediction?" (Greg. Nyss. t. iii, c. 161). So he teaches, in another oration, that "we must either be purged in this present life by prayer and the love of wisdom (παθειακά), or after our departure hence in the furnace of the purging fire" (ibid. t. iii, c. 496). See Willet, Symposium Papami; Bull, On the Trinity; Haag, Hist. des Dogmata; Elliott, Deception of Romanism, ch. xii; Cramp, Text-book of Popery: Knapp, Theology, p. 376; Nyss. Opera, p. 226 sq.; Doddrige, Lectures, lect. 570; Barnett, On the XXXIX Articles, art. 22; Edgar, Variations of Popery, ch. xiv; Faber, Difficulties of Romanism, p. 157-192, 448-471, 2d ed.; and especially Hale, Doctrine of Purgatory and the Practice of Prayer for the Deceased (Lond. 1845). Alger, Hist. of the Doctrine of a Future Life: Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctrines, ii, 126 sq., 180 sq., 326 sq.; Tracts for the Times, No. 79 and No. 90; Wettstein, De Vanitate Purgatorii; Allen, Defence of Purgatory; Marshall, Doctrine of Purgatory, Patriarchal, Papistical, Valencian, Lyons, Bollandian Asseveration; Bellarmine, De Controversia Fidei; Usher, Answer to a Jesuit's Challenge; Hall, Doctrine of Purgatory; Kitto, Journ, of Sacred Literature, i, 289 sq.; vol. xx Wedgwood Mag. 1848, p. 882 sq. See also the literature quoted in the art. HADES; IMMEDIATE STATE.

Purgatory, Rabbinic. The doctrine of purgatory (q. v.) is not only a peculiarity of the Romish Church, but also of orthodox Judaism. The latter maintains that the souls of the righteous enjoy the beatific vision of God in paradise, while the souls of the wicked are tormented in hell with fire and other punishments. It teaches that the sufferings of the most atrocious criminals are of eternal duration, while others remain only for a limited time in purgatory, which does not differ from hell with respect to the place, but to the duration. They pray for the souls of the dead, and imagine that many are delivered from purgatory on the great day of expiation. They suppose that no Jew, unless guilty of heresy, or certain crimes specified by the rabbins, shall continue in purgatory after a year, and that there are but few who suffer eternal punishment. Maimonides (q. v.), Abrabanel (q. v.), and other celebrated Jewish writers maintain the annihilation of the wicked. Others suppose that the sufferings of hell have the power of purifying souls and expiating sin, and will be made the more clear when we examine some of the writings bearing on this subject. Among the prayers of the Feast of Tabernacles we find the following declaration and prayer: "It is customary among the dispensers of Israel to make mention of the souls of their departed parents, etc., on the day of atonement, and the ultimate days of the festivity; for the Jewish prays for the souls of their fathers. May God remember the soul of my honored father, A. B., who is gone to his recompense; for that I now solemnly vow charity for his sake; in reward of this, may his soul be bound up in the bundle of life, with the souls of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; Sarah, Rachel, and Leah; with the rest of the righteous males and females that are in paradise, and let us say Amen. May God remember the soul of my honored mother; etc." In the Jewish ritualistic work called Joreh Deah, by Joseph Karo (q. v.), p. 376, we read: "For before the custom is for twelve months to repeat the prayer called Kaddish, and also to read the lesson in the prophets, and to pray the evening prayer at the going-out of the Sabbath, for that is the hour when the souls return to hell; but when the son prays and sanctifies the public, he redeems his father and his mother from hell." The doctrine of the Talmud is that those who die in communion with the synagogue, or who have never been Jews, are punished for twelve months, but that Jewish heretics and apostates are doomed to eternal punishment. Thus the Gentiles, descend into hell, and are judged there for twelve months. After the twelve months their body is consumed and their soul is burned, and the wind scatters them under the soles of the feet of the righteous, as it is said: 'Ye shall tread down the wicked, for they shall be ashes under the soles of your feet' (Mal. iv. 5). But heretics and informers, and Euphrasius, who have denied the law or the resurrection of the dead, or who have separated from the customs of the congregation, or who have caused their fear in the land of the living, or who have sinned, or caused much evil, or who have done that which all such go down to hell, and are judged forever" (Rosh Hashanah, p. 17, a). According to rabbinical law, the dying Israelite ought to expect twelve months of torment, and his surviving son ought to repeat the prescribed prayer for twelve months; but the rabbinists have commanded that the prayer should be repeated only six, or seven months, to intimate that the deceased was not culpable, as to be obliged to remain all the time of torment, is not the custom to say to Kadish more than eight in a month, so as not to cast a reproach upon the dead person. Israelites are not to think of the mother as if they were dead, for twelve months are the term appointed for wicked" (Joreh Deah, i, l.). As to the prayer use of it is found in all Hebrew prayer-books, and runs thus: 'Blessed be the name of the great name be exalted and sanctified throughout the world, as it was created according to his will. May he establish his kingdom in our lifetime, and in the lifetime of the whole house of Israel, soon, and in a short time, and say ye Amen, Amen. May his great name be blessed and glorified for ever and ever. May his hallowed name be praised, glorified, extolled, and most excellently adored; blessed is he that exceeding all blessings, hymns, praises, and beatitudes that are repeated throughout the world, and say ye Amen. May ye prayer be accepted with mercy and kindness. May the prayers and supplications of the whole house of Israel be accepted in the presence of that Father, who is in heaven, and say ye Amen. Blessed be the name of the Lord from henceforth and for evermore. May the fullness of peace from heaven, with life, be granted unto us, and all Israel; and say ye Amen. My help is from the Lord, who made heaven and earth, who is my rock, and my high place, who is my refuge in the days of trouble, my strength, and my shield. He delivereth me from danger, and my flesh from destruction, and say ye Amen." See Adams, Hist. of the Jews, ii, 249 sq.; McCaul, Old Paths, i, 256 sq.; Hamburger, Hist. des Jyfs (Taylor's trans.), p. 380; Boedewadt, Glossen zur Verfassung der heidn. Juden, iii, 78 sq. (B. F.)
Purification (םיקתפ, tohordh, ἱεροποιησία), a ceremony enjoined in the Mosaic law for the purpose of cleansing from pollution or defilement (Num. xix, 9).

Purifications were, for the most part, performed with water, sometimes with blood and with oil (Heb. ix. 21, 22; Exod. xxx. 26-29; Lev. viii, 10, 11). Sometimes fire was used in the purpose of purifying (Isa. i, 25; x, 26; Zech. xiii. 9; Mal. iii, 3).

In its legal and technical sense, the term is specially applied to the ritual observances whereby an Israelite was formally absolved from the taint of uncleanness, whether evidenced by the presence of the uncleanness, or connected with man's natural depravity. The cases that demanded it in the former instance are defined in the Levitical law [see UNECLEANNESS]: with regard to the latter, it is only possible to lay down the general rule that it was a fitting preliminary to any nearer approach to the Deity; as, for instance, in the admission of a proselyte to the congregation [see PROSLEYTE], in the baptism (אֱפֶלֶת, John iii, 25) of the Jews as a sign of repentance [see BAPTISM], in the consecration of priests and Levites [see LEVITE; PRIEST], or in the performance of the various religious acts (Exod. xii, 4; 2 Chron. xxxix, 19). In the present article we are concerned solely with the former class, insomuch as in this alone were the ritual observances of a special character.

The essence of purification, indeed, in all cases, consisted in the use of water, whether by way of ablution or of personal contact with the "muratoria delicti of the uncleanness, sacrifices of various kinds were added, and the ceremonies throughout bore an expiatory character. Simple ablution of the person was required after sexual intercourse (Lev. xv, 18; 2 Sam. xi, 4): ablution of the clothes after touching the carcass of an unclean beast, or eating or carrying the carcass of a clean beast that had died a natural death (Lev. xi, 25, 40): ablution both of the person and of the defiled garments in cases of gonorreae dormientiam (xv, 16, 17)—the ceremony in each of the above instances to take place on the day on which the uncleanness was contracted. A higher degree of uncleanness resulted from prolonged gonorreae in males and menstruation in women: in these cases a probationary interval of seven days was to be allowed after the cessation of the symptoms; on the evening of the seventh day the candidate for purification performed an ablution both of the person and of the garments, and on the eighth offered two turtledoves or two young pigeons, one for a sin-offering, the other for a burnt-offering (ver. 1-15, 19-30). Contact with persons in the above states, or with clothing or furniture that had been used by them while in those states, involved uncleanness in a minor degree, to be abated by ablution on the day of infection generally (ver. 5-11, 21-25), but in one particular case after an interval of seven days (ver. 24). In cases of childbirth the incubus increased to a lamb of the first year, with a pigeon or turtledove (xii, 6), an exception being made in favor of the poor, who might present the same offering as in the preceding case (ver. 8; Luke ii, 22-24). The purification took place forty days after the birth of a son, and eighty after a daughter, the difference in the interval being based on physical considerations. The uncleannesses already specified were comparatively of a mild character: the more severe were connected with death, which, viewed as the penalty of sin, was in the highest degree contaminating. To this head we refer the two cases of (1) touching a corpse, or a grave (Num. xix, 16), or even killing a man in war (xxxi, 19); and (2) leprosy, which was regarded by the Hebrews as nothing less than a living death. The ceremonies of purification in the first of these two cases are detailed in Num. xix, 16.

A peculiar kind of water, termed the water of uncleanness (םיקתפ, A. V. "water of separation"), was prepared in the following manner: an unblemished red heifer, on which the yoke had not passed, was slain by

the eldest son of the high-priest outside the camp. A portion of its blood was sprinkled seven times towards (םיבובלו, the sanctuary; the rest of it, and the whole of the carcass, including even its dung, were burned in the sight of the officiating priest, together with cedar-wood, and scarlet, and scarlet. The ashes were collected by a clean man and deposited in a clean place outside the camp. Whenever occasion required, a portion of the ashes was mixed with spring-water in a jar, and the unclean person was sprinkled with it on the third and again on the seventh day after the contact.

It is important to note that the water of purification was not a sacrament, but the repetition of the ceremony had symbolical significance appropriate to the object sought. The sex of the victim (female, and hence life-giving), its red color (the color of blood, the seat of life), its unimpaired vigor (never having borne the yoke), its youth, and the absence in it of spot or blemish, the cedar and the hyssop (possessing the qualities, the former of incorporation, the latter of purity), and the scarlet (again the color of blood)—all these symbolized life in its fulness and freshness as the antipode of death.

At the same time the extreme virulence of the uncleanness is taught by the regulations that the victim should be wholly consumed outside the camp, whereas generally certain parts were consumed on the altar, and the offal only outside the camp (comp. Lev. iv, 11, 12); that the blood was sprinkled towards, and not before, the sanctuary; that the officiating minister should be neither the high-priest, nor yet simply a priest, but the presbyste high-priest, the office being too impure for the first and too important for the second; that even the priest and the person that burned the heifer were rendered unclean by reason of their contact with the victim; and, lastly, that the purification should be effected, not simply by the use of water, but of water mixed with ashes which served as a lye, and would, therefore, have peculiarly cleansing qualities. See PURIFICATION-WATERS.

The purification of the leper was a yet more formal proceeding, and indicated the highest pitch of uncleanness. The rites are thus described in Lev. iv, 4-32: The priest having examined the leper and pronounced him clear of his disease, took for him two birds "alive and clean," with cedar-wood, and hyssop. One of the birds was killed under the priest's directions over a vessel filled with spring-water, into which its blood fell; the other, with the adjuncts, cedar, etc., was dipped by the priest into the mixed blood and water, and, perching on the unclean person, the number of seven times sprinkled with the same liquid, was permitted to fly away "into the open field." The leper then washed himself and his clothes, and shaved his head. The above proceedings took place outside the camp, and formed the first stage of purification.

The next interval of seven days was then allowed, which period the leper was to pass "abroad out of his tent": on the last of these days the washing was repeated, and the shaving was more rigidly performed, even to the eyebrows and all his hair. The second stage of the purification took place on the eighth day, and was performed "before the Lord at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation." The leper brought thither an offering consisting of two he-lambs, a yearling ewe-lamb, fine flour mingled with oil, and a log of oil. In cases of porous leprosy the offering was reduced to one lamb, and two turtledoves, or two young pigeons, with a less quantity of fine flour, and a log of oil. The priest slew one of the he-lambs as a trespass-offering, and applied a portion of its blood to the right ear, right thumb, and great toe of the right foot of the leper; he next sprinkled a portion of the oil seven times upon the Lord, applied another portion of it to the parts of the body already specified, and poured the remainder over the
the other hand, the ewe-lamb, or the two birds, as the case might be, were then offered as a sin-offering and a burnt-offering, together with the meat-offering. The significance of the cedar, the scarlet, and the hyssop, of the running water, and of the "life (full of life) and clean" condition of the life referred to in the text is variously described.

The two stages of the proceedings indicated, the first, which took place outside the camp, the readmission of the leper to the community of men; the second, before the sanctuary, his readmission to communion with God. In the first stage, the slaughter of the one bird and the dismemberment of the other symbolized the punishment of death deserved and fully remitted. In the second, the use of oil and its application to the same parts of the body as in the consecration of priests (Lev. viii, 23, 24) symbolized the readedication of the leper to the service of Jehovah. See PURIFICATION-OFFERING.

The ceremonies to be observed in the purification of a house or a garment infected with leprous were identical with the first stage of the proceedings used for the leper (Lev. xiv, 83-85). See LEPROSY.

The necessity of purification was extended in the period between the death of the owner to a variety of unauthorized cases. Cups and pots, brazes vessels and couches, were washed as a matter of ritual observance (Mark vii, 4). The washing of the hands before meals was conducted in a formal manner (vii, 3), and minute regulations are given for the washing of the hands in the various parts of the Mishna entitled Yadaim. These ablutions required a large supply of water, and hence we find at a marriage feast no less than six jars containing two or three firkins apiece, prepared for the purpose (John ii, 6). We meet with references to purification after childbirth (Luke ii, 29), and after the cure of leprosy (Matt. viii, 4; Luke xvii, 14), the sprinkling of the water mixed with ashes being still retained in the latter case (Heb. ix, 13). What may have been the specific causes of uncleanness in those who came up to purify themselves before the Passover (John xi, 55), or in those who had taken upon themselves the Nazarite's vow (Acts xxii, 24, 26), we are not informed; in either case it may have been contact with a corpse, though in the latter it would rather appear to have been a general purification preparatory to the accomplishment of the vow.

In conclusion, it may be observed that the distinctive feature in the Mosaic rites of purification is their expiatory character. The idea of uncleanness was not peculiar to the Jew: it was attached by the Greeks to their conception of a real distinction, the term and divinity of the Eurip. Iph. in Taur. 383), and by various nations to the case of sexual intercourse (Herod. i, 198; ii, 64; Pers. ii, 16). But with all these nations simple ablation sufficed: no sacrifices were demanded. The Jew alone was taught by the use of expiatory offerings to discern to its full extent the connection between the outward sign and the inward fount of impurity. See ABABT.

PURIFICATION IN THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH. The Protestant Church recognises no ceremonial purifications, as a rule, seeking for raising emblems of piety to the necessity of holiness in the people of the Lord. Christ taught purification of the heart only, and so the evangelical Christians teach purity of heart as the fit condition in which to approach the Deity in worship; the blood of the Son of God having cleansed from all sin those who accept of his atonement in righteousness. See IMPURITY; SIN.

In the Roman Catholic Church and the Greek Church, as well as some of the ultra-rhetic churches which still cling to Protestantism, acts of purification prevail to some extent. There is, firstly, the act of purification after the communion in the mass. It relates (a) to the purification of the chalice; some wine is poured into it by the servant of the altar, and slightly shaken with a circular motion, to take in all particles of the holy blood; then the chalice is emptied in two draughts, the mouth touching the same place from which the holy blood has been drunk. During this performance the prayer Quid ore sumpsit is recited: this prayer stands in an old Gothic missal of Charlemagne's time as Postcommunion.

In the oldest times of Christianity the purification of the chalice was done with water, which was afterwards poured out into the sacrificial vessel placed on the altar, and called piscina (q. v.). It was Innocent III who directed that the purification of the chalice should be done with wine. (b) To the periodical purification of the chalism (q. v.), which is performed after the partial taking of the host at Mass, there is added the purification of the chalice, by gathering with wine the rest of the holy blood left in the chalism, and emptying it as before, and then wiping out its inside with the purificatorium (q. v.). There is, secondly, the act of purification for women, which has been derived through rather than from the Jewish rite (Lev. xi). It is based upon the practice of the Blessed Virgin Mary, whose compliance with the demand of the Jewish ceremonial law is related in Luke ii, 22-24. The Romish Church has in commemoration of this purification act instituted a festival called Feast of Purification of the Blessed Virgin, and, by the Levitical law the ceremony was appointed for the fortieth day after childbirth, the feast is put in February (reckoning from Dec. 25, the Nativity of Christ). As on the same occasion the Holy Virgin compiled also with the festival, a litany being preserved. On the redemption of the first-born, the festival is also called by the name of the Presentation of the Child Jesus, or the Feast of Simeon, and sometimes, also, of the Meeting (occurrus), in allusion to Simeon's meeting the Virgin Mother, and taking the child into his arms (Luke ii, 27). The date of the introduction of this festival is uncertain. The first clear trace of it is about the middle of the 6th century, during the reign of Marcia, and in the Church of Jerusalem. Its introduction in the Roman Church, in 494, was made by Pope Gelasius the occasion of transferring to a Christian use the festivities which at that season were annexed to the pagan festival of the Lupercalia.

In the Church of England, the restoration of woman to the privileges of the Church is accompanied by a solemn thanksgiving for deliverance in her great danger. The title of the service, The Thanksgiving of Women after Childbirth, was adopted in 1552 to bring this point into prominence. The old Sarum title, Ordo ad Purificationem Mulierem post Partum, and that in the Prayer-book of 1549, The Order of the Purification of Women, are preserved in the Sarum service removed. The Puritans objected to the use of the service for this very reason—"For what else do this churching imply but a restoring her unto the Church, which cannot be without some bar or shutting forth supposed?" They complained, too, against such individualizing of prayer and praise (see the controversy between Cartwright and Whitgift and Hooker, in Reb. 84 ed. of Hooker's Works, ii, 434-438). In the Sarum use the service was read at the church door, ore cathum eccele; in the book of 1549, 'nigh unto the quire or ante-chamber, and there a convenient place." The solemn readmission of the woman to divine service of the Sarum use has been wholly discontinued. The Book of Common Prayer requires of the woman to be "decently apparelled," which means that she shall appear at church veiled. Hooker gives an instance where a woman appeared unveiled and was therefore excommunicated, and when the case was appealed to the bishops they confirmed the decision. Palmer says that all the Western rituals and that of Constantinople had offices for this rite. A service of the Sarum use is given in the Sarum Ordo, Proton. ii, 1941, cxxvii: "Benedictio Purpurae secundum usum Æthiopum." The anointing the forehead of the woman and child, aucta unctio, the imposition of hands, the reception of holy communion, the giving of
incense, are parts of this rite. See Siegel, Christliche Alterthümer (Index in vol. iv.); Riddle, Christian Antiquities (see Index); Brit. Qu. Rev., July, 1871, p. 110. See also Ablution.

Purification-offerings were such as the law enjoined upon those who had been raised from leprosy, unclean issues, hemorrhages, and childbirth. See Pollution. Those for lepers were the most burdensome, since a trespass-offering was among them.

1. The purifying offerings of menstrual women and of women after childbirth were the same (Lev. xv.). And the eighth day after the cure was certain, each brought two turtle-doves, or young pigeons, to be slain by the priests—the one as a sin-offering, the other as a burnt-offering (xxv, 14 sq., 29 sq.). Drink-offerings are not expressly mentioned in connection with these. See Woman.

2. The offerings of purification of women after childbirth (Lev. xxi, 8-6), offered thirty-three or sixty-six days after confinement, consisted in a yearling lamb as a burnt-offering, and a young pigeon or a turtle-dove as a sin-offering. In case of poverty, two turtle-doves or young pigeons sufficed—the one as a burnt-offering, the other as a sin-offering (comp. Luke ii, 24). See Child.

3. More extended was the purifying ceremony of birds and oxen (Lev. xii, 6-8, 16-21; xxv, 1-5, 9-13, 16-21). The ritual is composed of two parts: (a) vs. 2-8. The healed leper brought to the priest for cleansing must present two small birds, alive and clean (according to the ἁγιάζω, xiv, 5, it must be in form, size, and value precisely alike and bought at the same time); but this was not necessary; comp. Lutsch, De Dubia. Avv. Purgat. Leprosi Destin. Lavori, Mystere. [Hal. 1737]). The one was to be slain over an earthen vessel filled with fresh spring-water (and then buried; ἁγιάζω, xiv, 1), and the living bird, together with a bunch of myrrh and a priestly garment (a coat, and a girdle) was dipped into the vessel, now containing water and blood mixed together, and the leper was sprinkled with it seven times. The priest then let the living bird loose into the open air (perhaps bearing away the guilt). See EXpiATION. Then the man healed was required to wash, shave off all his hair, and bathe. He was now so far cleansed as no longer to render unclean the place he occupied (ἁγιάζω, xiv, 2), and might again abide in the city, but was required to "larry abroad out of his own tent" or house. This is referred by the rabbins, as a metonomy, even in those cases but without reason. (yet Bähr follows them; Symbol, ii. 520 sq.). The ceremony with the two birds is not a sacrifice, but a mere symbol of the purifying of the blood from the humors of the disease, and the return of freedom on the part of the leper again to associate with men (otherwise explained in Bähr, op. cit. p. 515 sq.). (b) Vers. 9-31. On the seventh day, the leper was required again to shave his whole body with the utmost care—not even sparing the eyebrows—to wash, and to bathe. A special chamber was provided in a corner of the women's court-yard of the second Temple for this purpose (Joh. viii, 49 sq.; comp. ἁγιάζω, xiv, 8). Bähr is mistaken, and contradicts Lev. xiv, 9, in referring this washing to the eighth day). On the eighth day he presented two lambs and a yearling sheep. The lamb was first slain as a trespass-offering, and the healed man was touched with its blood in three places—on the right ear, the right thumb, and the great toe of the right foot. Then the priest took the oil offered by the leper, and, after sprinkling it seven times "before the Lord," touched the leper with it in the same places, but washed with the oil and poured the remainder over his head. Finally, the sin-offering and the burnt-offering were slain. Poor persons were allowed to bring for these two turtle-doves or young pigeons. See Leprosy.

The putting of the blood on the body, as well as touching it with oil, in this second service, is considered as a ceremony expressing reconciliation; but the rabbinic consider the final anointing with the oil as the essential part (Nag. xiv, 10), because in this connection alone is mention made of "an anointing before the Lord" (Lev. xiv, 18). In other respects, the whole ceremony strongly resembles the consecration of priests (Bähr, op. cit. 621 sq.). The cutting of the hair was also the same (Lev. xiv, 19). The hair brought to the medical police of the law, for the leprosy conceals itself most easily under the hair, and hence the last traces of the disease could thus be detected. On the ceremonies of purification in consecrating priests and Levites, see those articles. See Natzahli.

Purification-waters (περιοικός, mey nisdād) properly waters of uncleanness, i.e. of purification; Sept. ἐκατοπτρίζεται, water of sprinkling, after the Chaldean usage; comp. nedāk, ἐκθέσις, to sprinkle [see Rosenmüller, on Num. xix, 9]). This was a holy water of cleansing, which was mixed with the ashes of a red or reddish-brown heifer—one which had never been under the yoke (comp. Deut. xxvi, 9; Bochart, Hieroz. i, 328; on the age of this heifer the interpreters of the law do not agree; see Para, i, 1; Jonathan, on Num. l. c., speaks of a two-year-old). With this water those who had contracted impurity by contact with a corpse or otherwise were sprinkled by means of a spring or branch of hyssop, and thus cleansed (Num. xiv, 4 8,75, 19 sq.; Heb. ix, 18; Josephus, Ant. iv, 4, 6; comp. the Talmudical tract Pará, in the 6th part of the Mishna). The ceremony of burning the heifer, which was accounted a sin-offering (Num. xix, 9, 17), was as follows according to the law (comp. Mishna, Pará, vi, 4): A priest, who had set himself apart and purified himself, for this work for seven days previous (ibid. iii, 1; Josephus ascribes the duty to the high-priest, which may have been the custom in his time, although the Mishna usually speaks only of a priest, iii, 5, 10; comp. Philo, On the Laws, p. 202; Josephus, Ant. ii, 8). One priest (through the east dór, Mishna, Middoth, i, 8) before the city (on the Mount of Olives, Pará, iii, 6), slew it, and burned it entire, with its flesh, skin, blood, and dungs (Num. xix, 5), on a fire fed with cedared-wood, scarlet wool, and hyssop (comp. Lev. xiv, 6). The ashes were then gathered, and kept in a clean place outside the city (according to the Pará, iii, 2, they were divided into three parts, one of which was kept in a court outside the Temple, the second on the Mount of Olives, and the third was given to the priests). A heifer was burned, thus anew rendered unclean for the iniquity committed. The Pará (iii, 6) tells us that only nine in all were ever burned, and only one of them before the captivity (Jerome, Ep. 108 ad Eustach., says that one was burned yearly). A part of these ashes was mixed with fresh water (comp. Pará, viii, 8) and a clean person sprinkled with it the unclean on the third and on the seventh day after the contraction of uncleanness. With it, too, the house of the dead and the vessels rendered unclean by a corpse were sprinkled. He who burned the heifer, the priest who slew her, and the man who collected the ashes were sprinkled with it (Num. xix, 7, 8, 10). The same took place in the use of the water; he who sprinkled it on the unclean, and all that touched it, were unclean until evening (xix, 21 sq.). This is analogous to Lev. xvi, 24, 26, 28; although in that case the uncleanness contracted by contact with the goats was considered as removed immediately after the required washings. Clericus properly remarks on this passage in Numbers, "The victim was considered as uncleann through the sins which the prayer of the priest made away with. Thus, of this victim cleansed the unclean by taking his pollution; but they also defiled the clean, because no pollution could seem to pass from them to the water." The last clause, however, is not clear.

The whole ceremony is peculiar, and suggests many questions which have never been fully solved. In particular, the symbolic meaning of the details is still un-
settled, as the disagreement of recent expositors shows (Bähr, Symbol. ii, 438 sq.; Hengstenberg, Moers und Egypten, p. 181 sq.; Anonymous, Evang. K.-Z. 1848, No. 19; Baumgarten, Comment. zum Pentateuch, ii, 833 sq.; Philipson, p. 721 sq.; in the Stud. u. Krit. [1846], iii, 629 sq.). We cannot here dwell upon this unfruitful investigation, but will refer singly to the principal points.

1. The purification of those made unclean by a corpse was effected, not by the usual means of cleansing—pure water—but by this sharp fluid, because this kind of uncleanness was considered very deep and sad. The reason of this is obvious. Hence the means of cleansing is a kind of lye, which is strong in its action. We find ashes and hyssop among the means of purification not merely by the Romans (Virgil, Eclog. viii, 101; Ovid, Fast. iv, 689, 725, 738; Amob. Genn. vi, 82), but by the old Persians, who made their most powerful cleansing stuff out of water and ashes by means of fire (Zenda-rasta, iii, 216; another kind of sacred water used by Egyptian priests is mentioned in Zilan. Antis. vii, 45). Besides, this lye among the Israelites was made, not out of ashes in general, but from the ashes of a sin-offering, and from that which alone remained of this sin-offering.

2. A heifer, not a bull (Lev. iv, 14), is used, perhaps (Bähr, p. 489) because the female sex is that which brings forth life (comp. Gen. iii, 20; otherwise Hengstenberg and Baumgarten—the former interpreting too outwardly, op. cit. p. 182; the latter too artificiously). But the object may have been simply to distinguish this particular sin-offering, when the animal was made a means to a hallowing purpose, from that in which it was presented to Jehovah in his sanctuary as a sacrifice of reconciliation. Yet physical uncleanness is always less burdensome than sin against the moral law (comp. Philo, p. 765). Why a red heifer? The explanation of Spencer (Leg. Ritu. ii, 15, 2, 6), that a red heifer was chosen in token of opposition to the Egyptian custom of sacrificing red cattle to Typhon, who was fancied to be of a red color (Plut. Isid. ii, 22), is worthless. The recent expositors of the symbols water between red as the color of life (Bähr, Kurta) and of sin and death (Hengstenberg). According to the rabbins, Solomon did not know the reason, and no ancient tradition respecting it has reached us. The secret will never be discovered. If it be said that red heifers were chosen for sacrifices, which rendered them prized in the East (Reland, Antig. Sacri. ii, 5, 28; Amvlkies [ed. Lette], p. 74), the answer is only rendered more difficult. Rarity is not made an object in the directions given. Perhaps the dark color is simply selected as a conspicuous mark of antithesis in the work in hand, and as a means of aiding to keep the removal of sin steadily before the eye. White heifers were unsuitable for this purpose: black ones are very rare in the East. As the accompaniments—cedar-wood, hyssop, and scarlet wool, which Maimonides in his time already felt the difficulty of explaining—have never yet been fully accounted for, Bähr's explanation is the most intelligent (p. 602 sq.), while Baumgarten's is absurd. See Hyssor.

3. The twofold sprinkling on the third and seventh days has an analogy in two other places (Lev. xii, 2 sq.; xiv, 8 sq.). That terrible impurity was not to be removed in a moment; its serious nature demanded two periods of effort. Three and seven, too, are significant numbers in themselves. The seven, or week, is also a liturgically complete period, and with it the ceremony of purification ends. Perhaps why the heifer was burned without the holy city, and the persons occupied in this work were accounted unclean, is not the impurity of the sacrifice in itself (as Bähr has well remarked), but in the fact of its relation with the most unclean things—death and the consequent purity.


The Purificatorium is a piece of linen folded several times, which is used in drying the chalice and wiping the paten during the mass. It was originally a towel fastened to the piscina, or vessel placed at the side of the altar. Only in later times it took the present simpler form—probably at the time when the priest himself drank at the chalice, which had been used for the purification of the chalice and the ablation of the fingers. The cleaning of the purificatorium, as it comes in immediate contact with the consecrated forms, must, by prescription of the canon, be done by the priest himself. Its length and width must be about half an ell, and as it is exclusively employed for the ritual use, it must be consecrated and marked in the middle with a cross. The Greeks use a sponge for the cleaning of the chalice and paten—a custom mentioned by Chrysostom (Hom. in Epist. ad Ephes.).—Weisser u. Weise, Kirchen-Lez. a. v.

Furrier. See Purificatorium.

Purim (פּוּרִים), Purim; Sept. Φούρπαι v. r. Φούρπαι, etc.; also פּוּרְסָה יבשא, days of the Purim, Esth. ix, 26, 28), the annual festival instituted by Mordecai, at the instigation of Esther, to commemorate the wonderful deliverance of the Jews in Persia from extermination with which they were threatened through the designs of Haman (Esth. ix; Josephus, Antiq. x, 6, 28). (The following article is substantially compiled from Biblical and Rabbinical authorities. See FESTIVAL.

1. Name of the Festival and its Signification. The name פּוּרְסָה יבשא (singular פּוּרְס), which is derived from the Persian pars, cognate with pars, part, and which is explained in Esther (iii, 7; ix, 24) by the Hebrew פּוּר, lot, has been given to this festival because it records the casting of lots by Haman to ascertain when he should carry into effect the decree which the king issued for the extermination of the Jews (Esth. ix, 24). The name Φούρπαι, which, as Schleusner (Lexik. in LXX. s. v.) and others rightly maintain, is a corruption of Φούραι, is the Greek pronunciation of the Hebrew term. In like manner, the modern editors of Josephus have emended the term they have otherwise preserved in the Heb. פּוּר (Esth. iii, 7). They gave the name Purim, or Lots, to the commemorative festival because he had thrown lots to ascertain what day would be auspicious for him to carry into effect the bloody decree which the king had issued at his instance (ix, 24).

Ewald, in support of his theory that there was in patriarchal times a religious festival at every new and full moon, conjectures that Purim was originally the full-moon feast of Adar, as the Passover was that of Nisan, and the New-Year festival that of Tammuz.

II. The Manner in which the Feast was and is still observed. All that the Bible tells us about it is that Mordecai ordered the 14th and 15th of Adar to be kept annually by the Jews, both nigh and afar; that these two days are to be made days of feasting and of joy, as well as an innumerable of presents and of sending gifts to the poor, and that the Jews agreed to continue to observe this festival every year in the same manner as they had begun it (Esth. ix, 17-24). No further directions are given about its observance, and the Bible says nothing about the Jews assembling in places of assembly to develop themselves with the circumstances of the nation. It is not easy to conjecture what may have been the
ancient mode of observance, so as to have given the occasion something of the dignity of a national religious festival. The traditions of the Jews, and their modern usage respecting it, are curious. It is stated that eighty-five of the Jewish elders objected at first to the institution of the feast, when it was proposed by Mordecai (Jerus. Gem. Megillah; Lightfoot, on John x, 21). A preliminary fast was appointed, called "the fast of Esther," to be observed on the thirteenth of Adar, in memory of the fast which Esther and her maids observed, and which she enjoined, through Mordecai, on the Jews of Shushan (Esth. iv, 16). See MORDECAI.

The following is the mode in which the festival of Purim is kept at the present day. The day proceeding—i.e. the thirteenth of Adar—is kept as a fast-day, and is called "the fast of Esther" (פורים ביום אסתר), in accordance with the command of this Jewish queen (Esth. iv, 5, 6); and sundry prayers expressive of repentance, humiliation, etc. (אף שלום), are introduced into the regular ritual for the day. As on all the fast-days, Exod. xxxii, 11-14; xxxiv, 1-11, are read as the lesson from the law, and Isa. lv, 5-6; lv, 3, as the Haphtaroth. If the thirteenth of Adar falls on a Sabbath, the fast takes place on the Thursday previous, as no fasting is allowed on this sacred day, nor on the preparation-day for the Sabbath. Some people fast three days, as Esther enjoined at first. On the evening of this fast-day—i.e. the one closing the thirteenth of Adar and introducing the fourteenth, as soon as the stars appear—the festival commences, when the candles are lighted, and all the Israelites resort to the synagogue, where, after the evening service, the book of Esther, called, kar' ḫok̄im, the Megillah (תֵאֵזוֹפִים, the Roll), is read by the praelector. Before commencing to read it he pronounces the following benediction: "Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who hast sanctified us with thy commandments, and hast enjoined us to read the Megillah! Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who hast wrought miracles for our forefathers in these days and at this time. Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who hast preserved us alive, sustained us, and brought us to this season!" The Megillah is then read. The praelector reads in a histrionic manner, suiting his tones and gestures to the changes in the subject-matter. As often as he pronounces the name of Haman the congregation stamp on the floor, saying, "Let his name be blotted out. The name of the wicked shall rot!" while the children spring rattle. The passage in which the names of Haman and his sons occur (Esth. ix, 7, 9) is read very rapidly, and if possible in one breath, to signify that they were all hanged at the same time, the congregation stamping and rattling all the time. It is for this reason that this passage is written in the MSS. in larger letters than the rest, and that the names are arranged under one another. After the Megillah is read through, the whole congregation exclaim, "Cursed be Haman; cursed be Mordecai. Cursed be Zeresh (the wife of Haman); cursed be Esther. Cursed be all idolaters; blessed be all Israelites, and blessed be Harbonah who hanged Haman." The volume is then solemnly rolled up. Lastly, the following benediction is pronounced by the reader: "Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who hast contended our contest, judged our cause, hast avenged our wrongs, required all the enemies of our souls, and hast delivered us from our oppressors. Blessed art thou who hast delivered thy people from all their oppressors, thou Lord of salvation!" All go home and partake of a repast said to consist mainly of milk and eggs.

On the morning of the fourteenth of Adar the Jews again resort to the synagogue, insert several appointed prayers into the ordinary daily ritual; Exod. xvi, 8-16 is read as the lesson from the law, which relates the destruction of the Amalekites, the people of Agag (1 Sam. xv, 8), the supposed ancestor of Haman (Esth. iii, 1), and the Megillah or the Book of Esther as the Haphtaroth, under the same circumstances as those of the previous evening. The rest of the festival is spent in great rejoicings: presents are sent backwards and forwards among friends and relations, and gifts are liberally forwarded to the poor. Games of all sorts, with dancing and music, commence. In the evening a quaint dramatic entertainment, the subject of which is connected with the occasion, sometimes takes place, and men frequently put on female attire, declaring that the festivities of Purim, according to Esth. ix, 22, suspend the law of Deut. xxi, 5, which forbids one sex to wear the dress of the other. A dainty meal then follows, sometimes with a free indulgence of wine, both unmixed and mulled. According to the Gemara (Megillah, vii, 2), "tenetar homo in saeculo Purim eo uque inbibit..."
PURITANS

Purim

ari, ut nullum discriminem notre inter medieclionem Ha-

mum et Donis, et Thessaloniciens, et Ephesinorum.

From the canons which obtained in the time of Christ, we learn that the Megillah had to be written in Hebrew characters, on good parchment, and with ink (Mishna, Megilla, ii, 2); that if the 14th of Adar fell on a Tuesday or Wednesday, the inhabitants of villages read the Megillah on the Monday in advance, or on Thursday, because the country people came to town to attend the markets and the synagogues in which the law was read and tribunals held (Megilla, i, 1–3); that any one was qualified to read it except deaf people, fools, and minors (ibid., ii, 4), and that it was lawful to read it in a foreign language to those who understood foreign languages (ibid., ii, 1). But though the Mishna allows it to be read in other languages, yet the Megillah is generally read in Hebrew.

The rejoicings continued on the 15th, and the festival terminates on the evening of this day. During the whole of the festival the Jews may engage in trade, or any labor, if they are so inclined, as there is no prohibition against it. When the month Adar used to be doubled, in the Jewish leap-year, the festival was repeated on the 15th of Adar, and was called Adar II.

It would seem that the Jews were tempted to associate the Christians with the Persians and Amalekites in the curse of the synagogue (see Cod. Theod. vi, 8, 18). Hence probably arose the popularity of the feast of Purim in those ages in which the feeling of enmity was excited between Jews and Gentiles, and which seemed to be identified between Jews and Christians. Several Jewish proper names are preserved which strikingly show the way in which Purim was regarded, such as, “The Temple may fail, but Purim never.” “The Prophets may fail, but not the Megillah.” It was said that no books would survive in the Messiah’s kingdom except the law and the Megillah. This affection for the book and the festival connected with it is the more remarkable because the events on which they are founded affected only an exiled portion of the Hebrew race, and because there was so much in them to shock the principles and prejudices of the Jewish mind. So popular was this festival in the days of Christ that Josephus tells us that, “even now, all the Jews that are in the habitable earth keep these days festivals, and send portions to one another” (Ant. xi, 9, 13), and certainly its popularity has not diminished in the present day.

III. Did Christ celebrate this Feast?—It was first suggested by Kepler that the iojpy 16ow of John v, 1 was the feast of Purim. The notion has been pursued and exposed by Paul Otter, Lamy, Hug, Tholuck, Lücke, Olshausen, Stier, Wieseler, Winer, and Anger (who, according to Winer, has proved the point beyond contradiction), and is favored by Alford and Elliotte. The question is a difficult one. It seems to be generally allowed that the opinion of Chrysostom, Cyril, and most of the fathers, which was taken up by Erasmus, Calvin, Beza, and Bengel, that the feast was Pentecost, and that of Gocceius, that it was Tabernacles (which is countenanced by the reading of one inferior MS.), are precluded by the general course of the narrative, and especially by John iv, 55 (assuming that the words of our Lord which are there given were spoken in a single time) compared with v, 1. The interval indicated by a comparison of these texts could scarcely have extended beyond Nisan. The choice is thus left between Purim and the Passover.

The principal objections to Purim are, (a) that it was not necessary to go up to Jerusalem to keep the festival; (b) that it is not very likely that our Lord would have made a point of paying especial honor to a festival which appears to have had but a very small religious import, and which seems rather to have been the means of keeping alive a feeling of national revenge and hatred. It is alleged, on the other hand, that our Lord’s attending the feast would be in harmony with his deep sympathy with the feelings of the Jewish people, which went further than his merely “fulfilling all righteousness” in carrying out the precepts of the Mosaic law. It is further urged that the narrative of John is best made out by supposing that the incident at the pool of Bethesda occurred at the festival which was characterized by showing kindness to the poor, and that our Lord was induced, by the enmity of the Jews to the Gentiles, to go up to Jerusalem till the Passover, mentioned John vi, 4 (Stier).

The identity of the Passover with the feast in question has been maintained by Ireneus, Eusebius, and Theodoret, and, in modern times, by Luther, Scaliger, Grotius, Cornelius, Neander, and Robinson, and the majority of commentators. The principal difficulties in the way are, (a) the omission of the article, involving the improbability that the great festival of the year should be spoken of as “a feast of the Jews;” (b) that as our Lord did not go up to the Passover mentioned John vi, 4, he must have abstained himself from Jerusalem for a year and a half that is, till the feast of Tabernacles (John vii, 2). Against these points it is contended that the application of iojpy without the article to the Passover is in keeping with what is said in John xiv, 4 (see John xviii, 39); indeed, it makes but little difference in Hellenistic Greek whether the article is present or absent with a noun thus in regimen with a following genitive; that it is assigned as a reason for his staying away from Jerusalem for a longer period than usual, that “he did not go up” (John vii, 3); that this long period satisfactorily accounts for the surprise expressed by his brethren (John vii, 5); and that, as it was evidently his custom to visit Jerusalem once a year, he went up to the feast of Tabernacles (vii, 2) instead of going to the Passover. A still more conclusive argument in favor of the Passover is the use of the peculiar epithet δια αυτων πασχαλις in Luke vi, 1, for the Sabbath following, which can mean no other than that occurring after the Paschal week. Moreover, the fact of the ripe but unharvested barley at that time leads to the same conclusion. See Passover.

The arguments on one side are best set forth by Stier and Olshausen on John v, i, by Kepler (Eccles. Chronicon, Frankfort, 1615), and by Anger (De Temp. in Act. Apost., 64); also, in Hugh’s Introd. (p. 5, i, 64), and in Lücke’s Comment. on St. John’s Gospel (see the English translation of Lücke’s Dissertation in the appendix to Tittman’s Meditamenta Sacra, or a Commentary on St. John’s Gospel, in Bib. Comment. vol. xvi); those on the other side, by Hengstenberg (Christology vol. ii, 341, 546, and in Lücke’s Comment. on St. John’s Gospel); see the English translation of Washington, 1889; Robinson, Harmony, note on the “Second Passover;” and Neander, Life of Christ, § 143. See also Lightfoot, Kuenkel, and Tholuck, on John v, 1, and Gresswell, Diss. vol. vii, ii, Ellicott Lect. 157.

IV. Literature.—See Carpzov, App. Crit. iii, 11; Re- land, Ant. iv, 9; Schickart, Purim sive Bucchamica Judaorum (Curt. Sac. iii, col. 1184); Buxtorf, Syn. Jud. xxix. The Mishnaic treatise Megilla contains directions respecting the mode in which the scroll should be written out and in which it should be read (see also Stellen, in the Talmah, Washington, 1889); Robinson, Harmony, note on the “Second Passover;” and Neander, Life of Christ, § 143. See also Lightfoot, Kuenkel, and Tholuck, on John v, 1, and Gresswell, Diss. vol. vii, ii, Ellicott Lect. 157.

Puritanism, a name given to a large party in the reign of queen Elizabeth, who complained that the Reformation in England was left in an imperfect state, many abuses both in worship and discipline being still retained and others introduced, and which seems rather to have been the frequent assertion of those who composed the party that the Church of England was corrupted with the remains of popery, and that what they desired was a “pure” system of doctrine and discipline; but the Eng-
lish word "Puritans" happens accidentally to represent the Greek name "Catharoi" which had been assumed by the Novatians, and which had been adopted in Germany during the Middle Ages in the vernacular form "Ketzer" for the Almarginants of the Church. It first came into use as the designation of an English Church party about the year 1564 (Fuller, Ch. Hist. ix, 66), but after a few years it got to be used also as inclusive of many who had separated from the Church of England. It was gradually extended as regards the latter by the names of their various sects, as Independents, Presbyterian, Baptists, etc., and as regards the former by the term "Nonconformists." At a still later time, towards the end of the 17th century, the Church Puritans were represented by "Low- Churchmen," and the Non-Church Puritans by "Dis- senters."

The presence of a Puritan party in the Church of England is, however, traceable for two centuries before the name of "Puritan" was assumed. In the 14th century the common people had become alienated from their parish priests by the influence of the friars, who had authority from the pope to preach and to receive confessions wherever they pleased, and quite independently of the ordinary clergy. This extra-parochial system of the friars was a serious weakness of the Church upon the point at large; and, when the friars themselves began to lose their influence, alienation from the clergy developed into alienation from the Church. Thus arose the Lollards of the 16th century, a party which made no attempt to set up separate places of worship or a separate ministry, but which introduced its antiscerficial principles into many parish churches, and made many of the clergy as strong opponents of the existing ecclesiastical system as were Wycliffe himself. During the trying times of the Reformation the party was considerably augmented by those whose opposition to Romish abuses had, by a similar excess, developed into opposition to the whole of the established ecclesiastical system—men who thought that "pure" doctrine and "pure" worship could only be attained by an utter departure from all that had been believed and practiced during the times when the Church of England had contracted impurities of doctrine and worship through popish influences. While Luther's movement was at its height, the party which thus became the progenitors of the Puritan party was formed into a society under the name of "The Christian Brethren," which seems, from the faint view we get of it, to have been very similar to that organised by John Wesley two centuries later. The head-quaarters of the Brethren party, which by 1540 had gained a footing at both the universities, apparently among the undergraduates and younger graduates. As early as the year 1528, a body of Cambridge residents met at once at a house called 'The White Horse' to confer together with others, in mockery called Germans, because they conversed much in the books of the divines of Germany brought thence. This house was chosen because those of King's College, Queen's College, and St. John's might come in at the back and so be the more private and undiscovered" (Stryte, Eccles. Mem. i, 569, ed. 1822). Among those mentioned as so meeting are the names of Barnes, Arthur, Bilney, Latimer, and Coverdale, familiarly known as precursors of the Puritan movement in Edward VI's and queen Elizabeth's reign. A few years later, in 1537, similar gatherings were detected at Oxford, where the names of Frith, Taverner, Udall, Farrar, and Cox, Edward VI's tutor, are found among those who met together for the same purpose (ibid. i, 569). Among the Oxford party the men of Wolsely's college held a conspicuous position, and their levity towards all who were brought before them, was a matter of wonder and jesting. The principles which were developed among the more extreme section of these early Puritans may be seen by an extract from a work written by William Tyndale (himself a friar and a priest), who was their representative man. Writing of the ministerial office, he says: "Subdeacon, deacon, priest, bishop, cardinal, patriarch, and pope: these names are as they should be, and not sacraments. There is no promise coupled therewith. If they minister their offices truly, it is a sign that Christ's Spirit is in them; if not, that the devil is in them. . . . O dreamers and natural beasts, without the seal of the Spirit of God, but sealed with the mark of the beast, and with cankered consciences, . . . By a priest understand nothing but an elder to teach the younger, and to bring them unto the full knowledge and understanding of Christ, and to minister the sacraments which Christ ordained, which is also nothing but to preach Christ's promises, . . . According, therefore, as every man believeth God's promises, longeth for them, and is diligent to pray unto God to fulfil them, so is his prayer heard; and as good is the prayer of a cobbler as of a cardinal, and of a butcher as of a bishop; and the blessing of a baker known. The truth is as good as the blessing of our most holy father the pope. . . . Neither is there any other manner of ceremony at all required in making our spiritual officers than to choose an able person, and then to rehearse him his duty, and give him his charge, and so put him in his room" (Obls. of Christ. Mem [Park Soc. ed.], p. 254-259).

These floating elements of Puritanism had, however, very little compactness and unity except in the one particular of opposition to the principles and practices which then prevailed in the Church of England. But in the latter years of Henry VIII's reign, Calvin was consolidating a system of doctrine, worship, and ecclesiastical discipline which was explicitly calculated to unite in a wieldy form the individual particles which had previously been too garrisoned for want of cohesion. Calvin gained some personal influence in England by means of pertinent letters addressed to the king, the protector Somerset, and archbishop Cranmer; but the principles of his system were chiefly propagated through the introduction of some of his foreign disciples into positions of influence in the Church of England. Thus an Italian named Pietro Vermigli, who had been an Augustinian friar, was made regius professor of divinity at Oxford, and is known to history as Peter Martyr (q. v.). A similar appointment was made at Cambridge, where the deacon and professor of divinity was a German named Martin Bucer (q. v.), who had been a Dominican friar. Paul Büchler, or Pagius, a companion of Bucer, was destined for the professorship of Hebrew at Cambridge, but died in 1549. Bernardino Ochino, who was an Italian, and had taken the Capuchin friars and confessor to pope Paul III, came from Geneva with Peter Martyr, and was made canon of Canterbury, being afterwards banished from place to place on the Continent for his Socinianism and his advocacy of polygamy. John a Laseo, the Pole, was an inmate of Lambeth Palace, when he and his foreigner formed a kind of Calvinistic private council to Cranmer; and John Knox (A.D. 1556-72), the Scotch preacher, was at one time carrying out his duties as chaplain to the young king, and at another going on a puring commission to preach down the Church in Northumberland, Durham, and the other northern counties (Jackson, Works, iii, 273).

It was not to be expected from his character that Henry VIII, though he rescued the kingdom from the papal yoke, would proceed far in reforming the religion of the country. His successor, however, Edward VI, a young prince of earnest piety, was likely, had his valuable life been spared, to have carried out a real reform, which would have rendered the Church of England more simple in her ritual and discipline; more in her discipline that she has ever had in her power to be. But Mary succeeded to the throne, and the ancient superstitions were restored. Several congrega-
tions of German Protestants, fleeing from Continental persecution, had found an asylum in England. One of the principal of these was settled in London under the patronage of John & Lasco, a man of great repute, the friend and patron of Erasmus; while another was placed by the duke of Somerset, the protector during the king's minority, at Glastonbury, upon the lands of the famous monastery then recently dissolved. The influence of the foreigners in matters of religion, however important this threat was not known as to excite suspicion, for they were commanded to leave the kingdom without delay. Nor did they retire alone. A furious burst of persecution drove with them a thou-
sand Englishmen, who felt that to remain at home was to be excluded from the society of the heathen world. The Low Countries, the free

cities of the Rhine, and Switzerland were now filled with these wanderers. Frankfort, Basle, Zurich, and

Geneva particularly attracted them; for there the doc-
tories of the Reformation had taken the strongest hold, and there its most eminent professors dwelt. Mingled

with these were the leaders of the Continental Refor-
mation. The English refugees had constant intercourse with Calvin, with Gualter, with Peter Martyr, and

John & Lasco, and, above all, with Henry Bullinger.

On the death of Mary, the English exiles returned home in great numbers, bearing nothing back with them; says Ful-
er, "but much learning and some experience." It is

likely that they were influenced by the manners of the

German churches. On their return to England, the

contrast between the splendor of the English ceremoni-

als and the simplicity of this abroad was the more strik-
ing. Their opponents never ceased to attribute much

of the discontent that followed to the Genevan exile. They were for the most part Zwinglai-gospelers at

their going hence," says Heylin, "and became the great

promoters of the Puritan faction in their coming home." The Puritans themselves were never unwilling to own

their obligations to the German Reformers, still, how-

ever, founding their scruples rather upon what they

themselves conceived to be the absence of scriptural

simplicity than upon the practice of other Christians.
The question of the habits, or, as it has since been
termed, the vestiarium controvergy (q. v.), most unset-

tled them, and it then began to wear an anxious, if not a

threatening aspect.

It was urged by the dissatisfied party that the im-

position of the vestments was an infringement of their

Christian liberty. They were called under the Gospel
to worship God in spirit and in truth; and no outward

forms or splendors could contribute in any measure to

assist the devout mind in a service so spiritual and ex-

alted. On the contrary, the tendenciess to heighten the

gaudiness was to distract the worshipper, and to debase

his devotions by an admixture of these sentiments

which are allowed no place in spiritual things. The

Church of Christ was only safe in its simplicity, and

such was its inward glory that any attempts to deco-

rate would but in fact degrade it. They objected, too,

that the vestments against which they were contending

had a Jewish origin, and belonged not to the Chris-
tian ministry, but to the priesthood of the house of

Aaron. To introduce them into the Church of Christ

was to pervert their meaning. They were a part of the

divinely appointed constitution of the Jewish Church,

and had passed away, together with the rest of its fig-

urative and mystic ceremonial.

It was a further objection, and one that appealed not

only to divines but to confectioners, but the complaint

of the common people, that the vestments were identi-
cal with all the superstitions of popery. They were

looked upon as the badge of antichrist; and those who

wore them were regarded with suspicion, as men ei-

ther indifferent to the cause of the Reformation, or

not yet convinced of the necessity to reform. The sin-

fulness of approaching the most distant confines of a

system which ought to be avoided with alarm and

horror. "If we are bound to wear popish

apparel when commanded, we may be obliged to have

drawn crowns, and to use oil, and cream, and spittle,

and all the rest of the papistical additions to the ordi-
nance." The accession of Elizabeth, after the brief but bloody reign of Mary, revived the hopes of those who had

been longing for a day of more complete reformation.

But it soon became quite apparent that the queen, though opposed in principle to popery, was resolved,

nevertheless, to retain many of its practices, and to make religious matters as might be possible. A meeting

of convocation was held in the beginning of the year

1562, at which the proposal for a further reformation

was seriously discussed. Six alterations in particular

were proposed; and these were Sabbath and those relating to Christ; that in prayer the minister should turn his face to the people; that the signing of the cross in baptism should be omitted; that the sick and aged should not be compelled to kneel at the communion; that the passing of the surplice should be sufficient; and that the use of organs should be laid aside. By a majority of one, and that

the proxy of an absent person, these proposed alter-

ations were rejected.

From this time the court party and the Reformers, as

they were now called, became more decidedly opposed to each other. The difference in their views is well
described by Dr. Hetherington in his History of the Westminister Assembly. "The main question," says he,

"on which they were divided may be thus stated: whether it were lawful to retain the external aspect of religion a close resemblance to what had prevailed in the times of popery, or not? The
court divines argued that this process would lead the people more easily to the reception of the real doctrinal
changes, when they might observe appearances so little altered, so that this method seemed to be recommended by expediency. The Reformers replied that this tend-
ed to perpetuate in the people their inclination to their

former superstitions, led them to think there was after all, little difference between the Reformed and the Pa-
pal churches; and, consequently, that if it made them quit popery the more readily at present, it would leave them at least equally ready to return to it should an opportunity offer; and for this reason they thought it best to leave as few traces of popery remaining as possible. It was urged by the court party that every

sovereign had authority to correct all abuses of doctrine and worship within his own dominions; this, they as-
serted, was the true meaning of the Act of Supremacy, and consequently the source of the Reformation in

England. The court party of these officials for a long time the security of the queen's explanation given in the

Injunctions, but could not admit that the conscience and the religion of the whole nation were subject to the

arbitrary disposal of the sovereign. The court party

recognized the Church of Rome as a true Church, though

rejecting in some points of doctrine and government; and this view it was thought necessary to maintain, for

without this the English bishops could not trace their

succession from the apostles. But the decided Reformers

affirmed the pope to be antichrist, and the Church of

Rome to be no true Church; nor would they risk the

validity of their ordinations on the idea of a succession

through such a channel. Neither party denied that

the Bible was a perfect rule of faith; but the court par-
y did not admit it to be a standard of Church govern-

ment, and this did not to the feeling that it was an

deference to the judgment of the civil magistrate in Christian coun-

dies to accommodate the government of the Church to

the policy of the State. The Reformers maintained the

Scriptures to be the standard of Church government and
discipline as well as of doctrine; to the extent, at

the least, that the civil power might not be seasonably

limited which was not expressly contained in, or derived from

them by necessary consequence, adding that if any dis-

cretionary power in minor matters were necessary, it
must be vested, not in the civil magistrate, but in the spiritual office-bearers of the Church itself. The court Reformers did not hold that the Church of England for the four or five earliest centuries was a proper standard of Church government and discipline, even better suited to the dignity of a national establishment than the times of the apostles; and that, therefore, nothing more was needed than merely to remove the more modern innovations of popery. The true Reformers wished to keep close to the Scripture model, and to admit neither office-bearers, ceremonies, nor ordinances, but such as were therein appointed or sanctioned. The court party affirmed that things in their own nature indifferent, such as ceremonies, and vestments, might be appointed and made necessary by the command of the civil magistrate; and that then it was the bourned duty of all subjects to obey. But the Reformers maintained that what Christ had left indifferent no human laws ought to make necessary; and, besides, that such rites and ceremonies as had been abused to idolatry, and tended to lead men back to popery and superstition, were no longer indifferent, but were to be rejected as unlawful. Finally, the court party held that there must be a distinction between the ancient usages of the Church and the new. The king, the queen, and the Parliament, said they, were the supreme and the laws of the land. The Reformers regarded the Bible as the only standard, but thought compliance was due to the decrees of provincial and national synods, which might be approved and enforced by civil authority.

But these were not the opinions of the two parties; it is plain that, though the use of the ascendant vestments formed the rallying-point of the whole controversy, its foundation lay deeper than any mere outward forms. The queen gave strict orders to the archbishop of Canterbury that exact order and uniformity should be maintained in all external rites and ceremonies. Nay, so determined was she that her royal will should be obeyed that she issued a proclamation requiring immediate uniformity in the vestments on pain of prohibition from preaching and deprivation from office. Matters were now brought to a crisis by this decided step on the part of the queen. Multitudes of godly ministers were ejected from their churches and forbidden to preach anywhere else. Hitherto they had sought reformations within the Church, but now, their hopes from that quarter being wholly blasted, they came to the resolution in 1566 to form themselves into a body distinct from the Church of England, which they regarded as only half reformed.

Elizabeth was enraged to see her royal mandate so disregarded, and no longer the veneration of the multitude took strong ground, and, having separated from the Church as by law established, they published a treatise in their own vindication, boldly declaring that the imposition of mere human appointments, such as the wearing of particular vestments by the clergy, was a decided infringement on Christian liberty, and, being it was not only lawful but a duty to resist. In the face of persecution, and under threats of the royal displeasure, the Puritans, who, since the Act of Uniformity had been passed, in 1561, were sometimes called Nonconformists, continued without their priestly meetings. Their main attempt to engage in public worship was rudely interrupted by the officers of justice, and under color of law several were sent to prison and were afterwards tried. The party, however, continued to increase, and so infected were the younger students at Cambridge with the Puritan doctrines that the famous Thomas Cartwright, with three hundred more, threw off their surplices in one day within the walls of one college.

The religious condition of England at this time was truly deplorable. The Churchmen, says Swayne, in his History of the Church of England, explains that many benefited upon themselves, and resided upon none, neglecting their cures; many of them alienated their lands, made unreasonable leases and wastage of their woods, granted reverys and advowsons to their wives and children, or to others for their use. Churches ran greatly into dilapidations and decay, and were kept nasty and filthy, and in a large Church in the City of London there was little devotion. The Lord's day was greatly profaned and little observed. The common prayers were not frequented. Some lived without any service of God at all. Many were mere heathens and atheists. The queen's own court was a horror for epicures and atheists, and a kind of lawless place, because it stood in no parish. Which things made good men fear some sad judgments impending over the nation. To provide a remedy for the ignorance and inefficacy of the clergy, associations were established in different dioceses for the purpose of conducting "prophecyings," as they were called, or private expositions of difficult passages of Scripture. These meetings, however, excited the jealousy of the queen, who issued an order for their suppression. The Parliament seems to be somewhat disposed to mitigate the sufferings of the Puritans, and in 1572 two bills were passed having that object in view. Encouraged by this movement in their favor, they prepared a full statement of their grievances under the title of the "Articles of the Parliament," and in this document, which is understood to have been the production of Cartwright, the Parliament was urged to reform the church. Instead of obtaining redress, several of the leading Puritans were imprisoned and treated with great severity. The decided opposition of the queen led to the church reform in the Church finally led the Puritans to surrender all hope of any legislative act in favor of their views; and being most of them Presbyterians in principle, those of them resident in London and its neighborhood formed themselves into a presbytery, although the step thus taken called forth from the queen another proclamation enforcing uniformity.

In 1572, a Presbyterian Church was formed and a meeting-house erected at Wandsworth, in Surrey. Field, the lecturer of Wandsworth, was its first minister, and several names of consideration with the Puritans, including those of Travers and Wilcox, were among its founders. Presbyteries were formed in other parts of the kingdom, and numerous secret meetings were held in private houses, which gave more alarm to the government, or at least a stronger pretext for severity. Even moderate men began to express anxiety. To meet the danger, the High Court of Commission was now first put in motion. It empowered the queen and her successors, by their letters patent under the great seal, to authorize, or at least a master to prevent for safety. One of its first acts was the violent suppression of the Presbyterian meeting at Wandsworth; its subsequent labors were of the same character. Notwithstanding these severities, Puritanism continued to increase; for the persecution which does not exterminate a religion never fails to spread it. And while the cause was gaining strength in London, it was taking firm root in the great seats of learning.

The Puritans were now effectually separated from the Church of England, and were organized under a different form of Church polity. But the same attitude which they had thus assumed rendered them only the more obnoxious to the queen and the High-Church party. Stronger measures were accordingly adopted to discourage them and destroy their influence; many of them were silenced, imprisoned, banished, and "otherwise oppressed in every manner. In the latter part of 1585 an act passed prohibiting the publication of such books or pamphlets as assailed the opinions of the prelates and defended those of the Puritans. This was followed in the same session by another act authorizing the infliction
tion of heavy fines and imprisonment upon those who
absented themselves from "church, chapel, or other
place where common prayer is said according to the
Act of Uniformity."

The effect of these harsh and rigorous enactments
was to embolden and more deeply
minded. No longer limiting their complaints against
the Established Church to merely outward rites and
ceremonies, some of them even went so far as to re-
nounce her communion, and to declare her as scarcely
titled to the name of a Christian Church. Political
discussion broke in upon religious inquiry. The hi-
ernarchy was assailed, the Prayer-book vilified, and min-
isters who had been silenced for their irregularities
were listened to, perhaps with the greater satisfaction
because of their nonconformity, in the prophecyings.
The general religious condition of the country mean-
while suffered greatly. In many counties scarcely one
preacher could be found. In some dioceses there were
two or three; there was a general thirst for religious
instruction, but the people, as the archbishop told the
queen, were allowed to perish for lack of knowledge.

Grindal resolved to take the "prophesyings" under his
own care, and at the same time to remove the causes
of objection. He therefore forbade the introduction of
politics, the speaking of laymen, or ministers sup-
pressed, and the allusions, hitherto not unfrequent, to
the property of the Church, and in addition to the office of a chairman
lected by the societies, he placed the meetings for the
future under the care of the archdeacon, or of some
grave divine to be appointed by the bishop. Ten
bishops heartily approved of the prime minister's decision, and
encouraged the prophecyings in their dioceses. But
the queen regarded them with great dislike, and the
court resolved on their suppression. It was in vain the
faithful prime minister remonstrated with the queen. "Alas!
madam, is the Scripture more plain in any one thing
than that the Gospel of Christ should be plentifully preached and
acted on, with all humility, and yet,
plainly, to profess that I cannot with safe conscience,
and without offence to the majesty of God, give my
assent to the suppressing of the said exercises." In
vain did the earl of Leicester and the lord-treasurer
Burleigh, who presented the remonstrance, add
the weight of their intercessions. The queen was enraged,

and the prime minister, who was old and sick, was ordered to
consider himself a prisoner in his own house, and would
probably have been deprived of death if death had not stopped in
him. He died July 6, 1568. Preaching
fell into contempt, and the Church of England has never
since entirely recovered from the blow. There has
always since this event been a party in the Church
which has regarded this divine ordinance with real or
well-pleased contempt.

One of the leaders of the extreme section of the
Puritan party was Robert Brown, who is thought to
have been the founder of the Independent or Congre-
gational Church in England. See BROWN. The
greater number of the Puritans, however, were either
Presbyterians, or still retained their connection with
the Church of England. But in all circumstances they
were the objects of the most bitter and unrelenting hos-
tility on the part of Elizabeth. The tide of persever-
cation ran high and strong. In vain did the House of
Commons attempt to throw the shield of their protec-
tion over the poor oppressed Puritans; the queen was
inexorable, and parliament was compelled to yield.

In this state of matters all hope of a legislative
remedy was abandoned, and the Puritan ministers set
themselves to devise plans for their own usefulness and
efficiency. Many of them, however, when taken before
many of the Puritans thus formed separate sects, a very large
proportion of them still continued in the Church; and
very subtle measures were taken by some of their leaders
a few years later, under Cartwright's advice and di-
rection, for the inoculation of the country with Presby-
terian principles in such a manner as to avoid the for-
feiture of their benefices. On May 8, 1569, sixty cler-
gymen from the eastern counties met at Cockfield, in
Suffolk, of which parish one of them—Knewstowe—was
vicar (oddly enough, Cockfield is within a short dis-
tance of Hadleigh, where the earliest plans of the Trac-
tarians were laid), to consult about the ordinary Pur-
itan plans of a «collection, manifold forms of
jurisdiction." etc. They adjourned to Cambridge, and
from thence to London, "where they hoped to be con-
cealed by the general resort of the people to Parlia-
ment." At length, under the guidance of Cartwright,
the latter's enemies, the president of Travers, afterwards
Hooker's opponent, and who was at the time domestic
chaplain and tutor in the family of lord Burleigh, this
convocation of Puritan clergy framed the following
systematic plan for grafting their new system on that
of the Church. The document is of sufficient impor-
tance to be given in full length:

"Concerning Ministers. — Let no man, though he be a
university man, offer himself to the ministry; nor let
any man take upon him an uncertain and vague mini-
istry, though it be offered unto him.

"But such as be called to the ministry by some certain
Church societies, and whereby themselves are, or else unto some greater Church
assembly and if such shall be found fit by them, then let them be
appointed by their letters unalt by the bishop, that they
may be ordained ministers by him.

"The articles of the Book of Common Prayer
which, being taken from popery, are in part
ought to be omitted and given over, if it may be done
without doing wrong; but if being put from the
place of their use, there be any imminent danger to be deprived, then this
matter must be communicated to the Synod in which that Church is, by the judgment thereof it may be
determined what ought to be done.

If any objection is made to the Articles of Religion and to
the Book of Common Prayer shall be again urged, it is
thought that the Book of Articles may be subscribed unto, according to the statutes 15 Eliz., c. 29,
which are only as contain the sum of Christian faith and
doctrine of the sacraments. But, for many weighty causes, neither this nor the Articles in that form may be
subscribed unto. The Articles of Common Prayer may be allowed; so, though a man should subscribe
thereunto, the Synod in which he is, by the judgment thereof it may be
determined what ought to be done.

Concerning Churchwardens. — It seemeth that church-
wardens and collectors for the poor might be thus ruled in
their business:

"When they are to be chosen, let the Church have
warning fifteen days before the time of elections, and
the ordinances of the realm be placed; but especially of Christ's
ordainance touching appointing of watchmen and
overseers in his Church, who are to oversee this house of
scandal do arise in the Church; and if any such hap-
pen, that by them it be only abolished.

Of Clerks of the Poor, or Deacons. — And touching
deacons of both sorts viz., men and women the Church
shall be ministering what is required by the apostle; and
that the common deacons shall be chosen for the poor,
or of riches, but for their faith, zeal, and integrity; and
that a poor woman be not to pray in the meeting or be
directed that they make choice of them that be meet.

Let the names of such as are chosen be published the
next Lord's day, and thereafter their duties and
functions, and the Church's towards them, shall be declared; then
let them be received unto the ministry to which they are
chosen with the general prayers of the whole Church.

Of Classes. — The brethren are to be requested to
make a distribution of all churches, according to these
rules that be set down in the Synodical Discipline, touching classical, provincial, continental, or such
remembrances as are to the whole kingdom.

The Classes are to be required to keep acts of mem-
orable matters as they are delivered to the com-
tial assembly, that from thence they may be brought by
the provincial assembly.

They are to deal earnestly with patience to present fit
men whenever any Church is fallen void in that Class.

The comitial assemblies are to be admired to make
collections for the relief of poor parochial schol-
ars, but especially for the relief of such ministers here as
are put to it; and also to subscribing to the articles rendered
by the bishop; also for relief of Scottish ministers and
others, and for other profitable and necessary uses.

All the members of the synods must consider, when
meet to deliberate, in time to appoint the keeping of their next
provincial synods, and for the sending of chosen persons with certain qualifications unto the next national synod, to be
held whenever the Parliament for the kingdom shall be called.

A Book of Discipline was prepared for their direc-
tion in their pastoral work; and this document was
Puritans, was continued; subscription to canons and articles was enforced with the utmost rigor, and those ministers who refused to subscribe were silenced or deposed. Thus insulted and oppressed, both by the government and their co-religionists, the Puritans felt it to be important that their true principles should be thoroughly understood by the people. With this view a treatise was published, entitled English Puritanism, which afforded a full and impartial statement of their peculiar opinions.

The extent to which James was disposed to push the royal prerogative was well fitted to awaken alarm both in the Parliament and the people. Both civil and religious liberty were evidently in danger, and Parliament prepared to interfere and to demand redress of grievances which were now becoming intolerable. "But the king," says Dr. Hetherington, "met all their remonstrances and petitions for redress with the most lofty assertions of his royal prerogative, in the exercise of which he held himself to be accountable to God alone, affirming it to be sedition in a subject to dispute what a king might do."

The Puritan party, however, were not silenced by the king’s action. The Parliament repeated the assertion of their own rights, accused the High Commission of illegal and tyrannical conduct, and advocated a more mild and merciful course of procedure towards the Puritans. Offended with the awakening spirit of freedom in England, the king, by the advice of Bancroft, dissolved the Parliament, resolved to govern, if possible, without parliaments in future. This arbitrary conduct on the part of James aroused, in the mind of England, a deep and vigilant jealousy with regard to his sovereign’s intentions, which rested not till, in the reign of his son, it broke forth in its strength and overflowed the monarchy.

Deprived of all hope of redress, numbers of the Puritans fled to the Continent, and some of them, having got there, never returned. The party which had as its stronghold the universities, returned to introduce that system of Church polity into England. Thus arose a body of Christians which e re long assumed a prominent place both in the religious and political history of the kingdom. The king, though a professed religiousist, was still more a politician; and so completely was the former character merged in the latter that he had come to rank as Puritans who dared to limit the royal prerogative or to uphold the rights and liberties of the people as established by law and the constitution of the country.

To the maintenance of which these Puritans contributed; the nation, however, was also the fostering of a novel theology in the Church, avowing his hostility to the Calvinistic views in which he had been reared in Scotland, and bestowing his favor upon those of the English clergy who were beginning to teach Arminian sentiments. The condition of the country, both in a political and religious aspect, was every day becoming more agitated, and matters were fast ripening for a great national convulsion, when the death of James, in 1625, and the accession of his son Charles I., arrested the revolutionary tendencies for a time. Additional cruelties, however, following soon after the Puritans under the new reign; fresh ceremonies of a thoroughly Romish character were introduced by Laud with the royal sanction; and, in consequence, numbers who refused to conform were obliged to seek refuge in other countries.

A few years before the new reign had commenced, a body of Puritans, unable longer to endure the persecution to which they were exposed, had emigrated to exile, seeking a new home on the western shores of the Atlantic, and had formed a settlement in New England, destined to be the foundation of a new empire. This colony of the Pilgrim fathers (q.v.) received vast accessions in consequence of the arbitrary measures of Laud. An association for promoting emigration to New England was formed on a large scale. Men of rank and influence and others had been long interested in promoting the emigration, and a grant of land from
the government was applied for. The king was not opposed to the design, and a patent was obtained for the government and company of Massachusetts Bay. Emigrants to the number of 200 set sail, and, landing at Salem in 1629, established a new colony there. Next year 1500 left the shores of England, including many both of wealth and education. The desire for emigration on the part of the oppressed Puritans continued to gather as much strength, and year after year larger numbers of them proceeded to New England. Neal alleged that had not the civil power interfered to check the rage for emigration, in a few years one-fourth part of the property of the kingdom would have been taken to New England. The government then alarmed, and a proclamation was issued "to restrain the disorderly transporting of his majesty's subjects, because of the many idle and refractory humors, whose only or principal end is to live beyond the reach of authority." Next day an order appeared to "stay eight ships now in the river of Thames prepared to go for New England," and the passengers, among whom was Oliver Cromwell, were obliged to disembark. Notwithstanding the check thus given to emigration, it is calculated that during twelve years the emigrants amounted to no less than 24,210 persons.

The tyrannical conduct of Charles and his minions, both in the government and the Church, soon precipitated the country into all the horrors of a civil war, which ended in the death of the king by the axe of the executioner, and in the establishment of the Commonwealth under the protectorate of Cromwell. By the act of Sept. 10, 1642, it was declared that prelacy should be abolished in England from and after Nov. 5, 1643, and it was resolved to summon together an assembly of divines in order to complete the necessary reformation. In the meantime, various enactments were passed for the suppression of some of the most crying evils, and for affording some support to those Puritan ministers who had been ejected in former times for nonconformity, or had recently suffered from the ravages of the king's army. It was a religious age; and though the people had trampled the crown beneath their feet, they showed no disposition to deprive the office of the clergy. During the heat of the war the Puritans, who almost to a man sided with the Parliament, preached to large congregations; and, in all the great towns at least, they had the implicit ear of the people. Episcopacy being at an end, they acted, for a while, according to the dictates of conscience or mere taste; the surplice was generally laid aside; and extemporary prayer was used in the parishes before the ordination of Parliament. The Independents, appearing, in 1645, forbidding the Book of Common Prayer. The old Puritanism, however, was now passing away. A generation had arisen in whose eyes the principles of Cartwright were crude and imperfect. They no longer contended against the forms and vestments, but against the constitution of the Church of England. Prelacy, by which we understand the episcopacy titled and associated with civil authority, was detested; all forms of prayer were decried; and episcopacy, even in its mildest forms, was thought unscriptural. Thus Puritanism, properly so called, became extinct because the grounds of the old contention no longer existed. The later Puritans appeared and immediately fell into two great parties, Presbyterians (q. v.); and Independents (q. v.). For nine months after the passing of the act for the abolition of prelacy there was no settled and legalised form of Church government in England at all. Even Charles had consented to the removal of the bishops from the House of Lords; and though he had not sanctioned the abolition of the hierarchy, yet a large party regarded the measure as called for in the circumstances. In the state of matters the Westminster Assembly of Divines was convened, consisting largely of Puritan preachers who had gradually become attached to Presbyterianism. The Independent or Congregational party in the Assembly, however, though few in point of number, yet had sufficient numbers to prevent any statute from being established in England. Throughout the early years of the Commonwealth Puritanism existed in the form chiefly of Independency. On Dec. 25, 1655, Cromwell issued a proclamation that thenceforth no minister of the Church of England should dare to preach, administer the sacraments, or perform any other office of the Church on pain of imprisonment or exile. After the Restoration of Charles II, in 1662, the name of Puritan was changed into that of Nonconformist, which comprehended all who refused to observe the rites and subscribe to the doctrines of the Church of England. The Church was nominally re-established; but the power of the Church was nominally re-established; but the power of the Church was suspended. By this act nearly 2000 ministers of the Church of England were ejected from their charges and thrown into the ranks of the Nonconformists (q. v.).

It may be proper to mention, in conclusion, the doctrinal Puritans. These formed, in fact, the moderate church party during the reign of Charles I. Their leaders were bishops Davenport, Hall, Williams, and Carleton. The title of doctrinal Puritans was fastened upon them by the Laudian party. They held and taught the doctrines of the Reformation, in opposition to the dangerous tendencies of the Church of England, and were called by that name. They entertained no scruples as to the forms and ceremonies of the Church of England, to which they willingly conformed. But they rejected with indignation the innovations of the Laudian party, who, in their return, branded them with the name of Puritans. It was an entirely new application of the word, and one against which they did not fail to protest. It seems to have been first used about 1625 by bishop Montague in a controversy with Carleton, and the latter exclaims, "This is the first time that I ever heard of a Puritan doctrine so practical, and I have lived longer in the Church than he hath done. I thought that Puritans were only such as were factious against the bishops, in the point of pretended discipline; and so I am sure it hath been understood in our Church." The controversies which have ever since existed within the bosom of the Church of England now for the first time appeared. The construction of the baptismal offices became a subject of contention, and the whole question of baptismal and sacramental grace. The doctrinal Puritans adhered to the ancient forms of worship, and for doing so were severely harass ed. The Laudian party maintained "that whatever rites were practiced in the Church of Rome, and not expressly abolished at the Reformation, nor disclaimed by any doctrine, law, or canon, were consistent with the Church of England," and the Church of England was re-established. It introduced a multitude of ceremonies—such, for instance, as bowing to the east and placing candles on the altar, now gorgeously decorated once more—which had long been dismissed as badges of popery. Thus in a short time a difference was apparent between the two parties both in their doctrine teaching and in visible forms. To complete the quarrel, the Laudians were of the Arminian school, while the doctrinal Puritans were moderate Calvinists. For twenty years the doctrinal Puritans were subjected to all manner of annoyance; but they remained steadfast in their attachment to the Church, and when the storm burst upon it they were exposed to all its fury. They took no share in Laud's convocation of 1640, and greatly disapproved of its arbitrary measures. But the popular rage made no distinctions, and the Church of England suffered just as much as their old opponents of the high prelatic party. The Church itself was overthrown; and in the darkness and confusion that ensued they disappear from sight during the civil war. The literature of the Puritans, as a religious party, is vast. There were those who devoted themselves to the study of theology, in the consistencies of practical theology. The medium and in all of its is conferred by friendship and foe. As Whitgift and his disciple Hooker exhausted the argument in favor of episcopacy and a liturgical Church,
so did Cartwright and Travers that in behalf of Presbyterian discipline. The student, after a wide search among the combatants of later times, finds, to his surprise, how insignificant are all their additions to a controversy opened, and, as far as learning and argument can go, finally to the by-ways the names of the greatest men of the reigns of James, Charles I, and the Commonwealth present themselves as in a greater or less degree connected with the Puritans. Selden, Whitchurch, Milton, with their pens; Rydcard, Hampden, Vane, in Parliament; Owen, Marshall, Calamy, Baxter, and a host of others, in the pulpit; Cromwell, Essex, and Fairfax, in the field—all ranged themselves under the Puritan cause. Never was a party more distinguished in its advocates; never was a cause lost amid more hopeful prospects, or when to human eyes its triumphs appeared most complete, than in 1660 it was in the summit of its pride and power, with the Church of England at its feet. Ten years afterwards its influence had passed away; and, in the persons of the Presbyterians who crossed over to propitiate the young king at Breda, it was thought advisable to place, not a leader, but men like,
Episcopal Church, was born in Cecil County, Md., March 21, 1833. He was converted at Elkton, Md., in 1834, and was for some time engaged in business at Oxford, Pa. In 1858 he felt called to preach, and was made assistant pastor to the neighboring Lutheran Church. In the following year he joined the Philadelphia Conference, and was made junior preacher on Laurel Circuit, Del., in 1859, and on Church Creek Circuit, Md., in 1860. In 1861 and 1862 he was in charge on Aries Circuit, Md. In 1863 and 1864 he was in charge on Sharpstown Circui

PURPLE

Purples, purple, argaman, from the Sanscrit raga, red; see Grec. Thea, a. v.; Chald. argesin, from the same root, in 2 Chron. ii. 7; Dan. vii. 16, 29; Sept. and Greek Test. πασσία, Vulg. purpura) occurs in Exod. xxv, 4; xxxvi, 1, 31, 86; xxvii, 16; xxviii, 5, 6, 8, 16, 33; xxxv, 6, 20, 25; xxxvi, 8, 10, 13; xxxix, 18, 24, 29; Numb. xiv, 13; Judg. viii, 26; 2 Chron. ii. 13; iii, 11, 14; Esth. i, 6; vii, 9; Prov. xxxi, 22; Cant. iii, 10; vii, 5; Jer. x, 9; Ezek. xxvii, 7, 16, Ecles. xiv, 10; Bar. vii, 9, 12; 1 Macc. ii. 35; viii, 14, x, 29, 62; 2 Macc. ii. 38; Mark xiv, 17, 20; Luke xvi, 19, John xiv, 2; Acts vi, 4; Rev. xvii, 1; xviii, 12, 16.

In many of these passages the word translated “purple” means “purple cloth,” or some other material dyed purple, as wool, thread, etc.; but no reference occurs to the means by which the dye was obtained, except in I Kings vii. 2. We have the same Hebrew word, תֵּא, translated “purple of the sea” (comp. Diod. Sic. iii, 68; Josephus, Warr. v, 5, 4). There is, however, no reason to doubt that it was obtained, like the far-famed Tyrian purple, from the juice of certain species of shell-fish. Different accounts are given by the ancients respecting the date and origin of this invention. Some place it in the reign of Phenix, second king of Tyre, B.C. 500; others at the time that Minos I reigned in Crete, B.C. 1489, and consequently before the Exodus (Suidas, a. v., ῥυαῖς, ii, 75). But the person to whom the invention is ascribed by the Tyrians, Herodotus, says that it was invented by the Phenicians, when a dog, it is said, instigated by hunger, broke a certain kind of shell-fish on the coast of Tyre, and his mouth becoming stained of a beautiful color, his master was induced to try its properties on wool, and gave his flocks and herds of sheep and goats a taste of this coloring-juice so much that he restricted the use of it by law to the royal garments (Pollux, Onom. i, 4; Achilles Tatius, De Clitoph.; Pausanias, in Chron. Pashcal. p. 43). It is remarkable that though the Israelites, as early as the first construction of the tabernacle in the wilderness, appear to have had purple stuff in profusion (Exod. xxv, 1-4), they which had most likely brought with them out of Egypt, yet no instance occurs in the pictorial language of the Egyptians, nor in Wilkinson's Ancient Monuments and Customs, of the actual process of dyeing either linen or woollen, although dyes similar to the Tyrian were found among them. These facts agree, at least, with the accounts which ascribe the invention to the earliest of these two periods, and the pre-eminent trade in it to the Tyrians. The Greeks attributed its first introduction among them to the Phenicians (Paus. iv, 32. 3), and in the wars of Phoenicia with Tyre (Paus. iv, 1497). Their word φοινίξ, Phenix, means both Pheniciun and purple. The word πασσία is, according to Martinus, of Tyrian origin. Though purple dyes were by no means confined to the Phenicians (comp. Ezek. xi, 23, 24: "the house from the house of Eliah," supposed to mean "Elisha," and "from Syria," ver. 10); yet violet purples and scarlet were nowhere dyed so well as at Tyre, whose shores abounded with the best kind of purples (Pliny, Hist. Nat. ix, 60, p. 524, ed. Harduin), and which was supplied with the best wool by the neighboring Shepherds. The ancients, and its various shades, were obtained from many kinds of shell-fish, all of which are, however, ranged by Pliny under two classes: one called "buccinum," because shaped like a horn, found, he says, in Lampsacus and the yielding a sullen blue dye, which he compares to the colour of a horn in a tempest; the other called "purpurea," or "pelagia," the proper purple shell, taken by fishing in the sea, and yielding the deep-red color which he compares to the rich, fresh, and bright color of deep-red purple roses and to congealed blood, and which was chiefly valued (ibid. c. 61, 62). The latter is the Muræus trunculus of Linnaeus and Lamarck (see Syst. Nat. p. 1215, and A. in leugre saxa Vertebr. [Paris, 1822], vii, 170). Both sorts were supposed to be as many years old as they had spiral rounds. Michaelis thinks that Solomon alludes to their shape when he says (Cant. vii, 5). "The hair of thine head is like purple," meaning that the streams (Sept. πλάκαν κυμάσει, Vulg. como cupida) were tied up in a spiral or pyramidal form on the top. Others say that the word "purple" is here used like the Latin purpurina, or the Greek purpureus, to denote a "purple color," "a beautiful swan's" of Horace (Carmin. iv, 1, 10), and the "purpureus capillus" of Virgil (Georg. i, 405); but these phrases are not parallel. The juice of the whole shell-fish was not used, but only a little this liquor called the "downy substance" in the tinctor vessel in the neck. The larger purples were broken at the top to get at this vein without injuring it, but the smaller were pressed in mills (Aristot. Hist. An. v, 15, 75; Pliny, Hist. Nat. ix, 60). The Muræus trunculus has been demonstrated to be the species used by the ancients. The shells of the Muræus trunculus, and of the shells in some of the ancient dye-pots sunk in the rocks of Tyre (Narrative [Dublin, 1840], i, 482). It is of common occurrence now on the same coasts (Kirke, Physical History of Palestine, p. 418), and throughout the whole of the Mediterranean, and even of the Atlantic. In the Mediterranean, the countries most celebrated for purples were the shores of Peloponnesus and Sicily, and in the Atlantic the coasts of Britain, Ireland, and France. Horace alludes to the African (Carmin. ii, 16, 36). There is, indeed, an essential difference between the purple of the Tyrians and that of different coasts. Thus the shells from the Atlantic are said to give the darkest juice; those of the Italian and Sicilian coasts, a violet or purple; and those of the Phenician, a crimson. It appears from the experiments of Pliny, and that this coloring-juice is perfectly white while in the vein; but when being laid on linen, it soon appears first of a light-green color, and, if exposed to the air and sun, soon after changes into a deep green, in a few minutes into a sea-green, and in a few more into a blue; thence it speedily becomes of a purplish color, and in an hour more of a deep purple red, which, upon being washed in scalding water and soap, ripens into a most bright and beautiful crimson, which is permanent. The ancients applied the word translated "purple" not to one color only, but to the whole class of dyes manufactured from the juices of shell-fish, as distinguished from the vegetable dyes (coloreras herbes), and comprehending not only what is commonly called purple, but also light and dark purple, and almost every shade between. Various methods were adopted to produce these different colors. Thus, a salt-solution was obtained from the juice of the buccinum alone; a plain red, yet also deep and brown, from the pelagia; a dark red by dipping the wool, etc., first in the juice of the purpura, and then in that of the buccinum; a violet (which was the same as the thistled color, and obtained by the dyer) by working the process; and another, called a rose variegated and ad-
mire of all—the tyriamethystus—by again dipping the amethyst in the juice of the pelagia. This Pliny calls *amphaka Trysis*; so named, he says, because “its tincta” (*Hist. Nat. ix*, 39). No reference to this process occurs in the Scriptures, but it is oftenalluded to in Roman authors. Thus, Horace *(Epod. xii, 21)*: “Mu
rarum Tyri Rhodum pelagias haud.” Other varieties of shellfish (Malus is the ancient name for the Tyrian purple double dyed). Other varieties of color may have been produced by the use of various species of mollusks, and of those from different coasts. The Phoenicians also understood the art of throwing a peculiar lustre into this color by making other tints play over it, and producing what we call a shot color with the Tyrian purple double dyed). Other varieties of color may have been produced by the use of various species of mollusks, and of those from different coasts. The Phoenicians also understood the art of throwing a peculiar lustre into this color by making other tints play over it, and producing what we call a shot color with the Tyrian purple double dyed). Pliny records a similar use of it among the Jews: “Diis sacrificii placidantibus” (*Hist. Nat.* ix, 60; Cicero, *Epist. ad Atticum*, ii, 9). The Babylonians arrayed their idols in it (*Jer. x*, 9; *Bar. xii*, 72). Homer speaks of it if it were almost peculiar to them (II. iv, 144; 1 Macc. vii, 14). Pliny says it was used by Romanus and the succeeding kings of Rome, and by the consuls and first magistrates under the republic. Strabo relates that Julius Caesar prohibited its use by Roman subjects, except on certain days; and that Nero forbade it altogether, upon pain of death. The use of it was bestowed by kings upon favorites, etc.; Josephus says it was used by Pharaoh on Joseph (*Ant. ii*, 5, 7). It was given by Ahasuerus to Mordecai (*Esth. viii*, 15); to Daniel by Belshazzar (*Dan. vii*, 16, 29). It was the dress of an ethnarch or prince, and as such given by Alexander to Jonathan (1 Macc. x, 20, 62, 64, 65; comp. 2 Macc. iv, 38). In the last chapter of the *Proverbs* it is represented as the dress of a matron (Prov. xi, 4), and used by the ancient ladies and rich men (Livy, xxxiv, 7, and Valerius Max. ii, 1). See also the parable of the rich man and Lazarus (*Luke xvi*, 19). In *Esth. i*, 6, it appears as part of the royal furniture of Ahasuerus; and in *Cant. iii*, 10, as the covering of the royal chariot; and Pliny refers to its general use, not only for clothes, but carpets, cushions, etc. (ix, 39). The robe in which the Pretorian guard arrayed the Saviour, called *χαλκός κοσκίνη* by Matthew (xxvii, 28), and *πορφύρα* by Mark (xv, 17, 20), and *ἀφρατόν πορφυρον* by John (xix, 2), and which appears to have been the cast-off garment of one of their officers, was no doubt scarlet—that is, proper *crimson*, as will hereafter appear—of a deeper hue and finer texture than the sanguin or chalmys of the common soldier, but inferior in both respects to that of the emperor, which was also of this color in the time of war, though purple during peace. The adjectives used by the evangelists are, however, often interchanged. Thus a vest, which Horace (*Sat. ii*, 6, 102) calls “rubro coccio cincta,” in l, 106 he styles “purpurea.” *Brau
nius* shows that the Romans gave this name to any color which he found dyeing the *Sueri* or *Sueri*
musum (*Hist. Nat. 1680*), i, 14). Ovid applies the term “purpureas” to the cheeks and lips (*Amor*, i, 3). In *Aesch. x*, 14, reference is found to Lydia, of the city of Thyatira, a seller of purple cloth. The manufacture seems to have decayed with its native city. A col
ony of Jews which was established at Thebes in Greece in the 12th century carried on an extensive manufac
tory for dyeing purple. It ultimately became superceded by the use of indigo, cochineal, etc., whence a cheaper and finer purple was obtained, and free from the disagreeable odor which attended that derived from shellfish. (Max. 59, 39). With the ancients in preparing and applying it, and other particu
lars respecting its history, uses, and estimation, are most amply detailed by Pliny (*Hist. Nat. ix*, 36-42). The best modern books are Amati, *De Restitutio Purpurarum* (Rome, 1784); the compilation by Ca
pelli, *De Authigia et Nepure Purpurea*, with notes by and Don Michaele Ross, *Dissertatione delle Porpere*, etc. (1768). See also *Dictionnaire des Sciences Naturelles*, xlii, 219, etc.; Bochart, edit. Rosenmüller, i, 675, etc.; Heeren, *Historical Researches*, translated (Oxford, 1888), ii, 85, etc.; Steiger, *De Purpurea, Sacra Dignitatis Imagin* (*Lipsa. 1741*).
for a whole summer to the solar rays in a south window, they almost vanished. The application of alkali to the acidulated color always restores it to its primitive state, and it is as readily changed again by mineral acid (Montagu, Tectcuts Brit. Supp., p. 192). The circumstance that the fluid diffused by Jambhina and Scularia is purple from the first is conclusive against its being the purple dye of the ancients, who

Tyrian Rock-shell—Murex trunculus.

tell us distinctly that this was white or cream-like while within the vein. This agrees accurately with the genera Murex and Purpuraria, as may be readily tested in the case of P. lapillus, the common dog-whelk of the British coast. Montagu thus records the result of his experiments on this species: "The part containing the coloring-matter is a slender longitudinal vein, just under the skin on the back, behind the head, appearing whiter than the rest of the animal. The fluid itself is of the color and consistency of cream. As soon as it is exposed to the air it becomes of a bright yellow, speedily turns to a pale green, and continues to change imperceptibly, until it assumes a bluish cast, and then a purplish red. Without the influence of the solar rays, it will go through all these changes in the course of two or three hours; but the process is much accelerated by exposure to the sun. A portion of the fluid, mixed with diluted vitiolic acid, did not at first appear to have been sensibly affected; but, by more intimately mixing it in the sun, it became of a pale purple, or purplish red, without any of the intermediate changes. Several marks were now made on fine calico, in order to try if it were possible to discharge the color by such chemical means as were at hand; and it was found that after the color was fixed at its last natural change, nitrous no more than vitriolic acid had any other effect than that of rather brightening it; aqua regia, with or without solution of tin, and marine acid, produced no change; nor had fixed or volatile alkali any sensible effect. It does not in the least give out its color to alcohol, like cochineal, and the succus of the animal of Turbo (Scularia) clathrus; but it communicates its very disagreeable odor to it most copiously, so that opening the bottle has been more powerful in its effects on the olfactory nerves than the effluvia of asafoetida, to which it may be compared. All the markings which had been alkali and acidulated, together with those to which nothing had been applied, became, after washing in soap and water, of a uniform color rather brighter than before, and were fixed at a fine unchangeable crimson" (Test. Brit. Supp., p. 106). The changes of color are absolutely dependent on the stimulus of light. Dr. Bancroft found that linen stained with the fluid of the Purpuraria might be kept for years shut between the leaves of a book without any visible change, which at the expiration of its incarceration presently passed through all the changes, under the influence of light, to a glowing purple (in Perinn. Col. i. 145). Reaumur asserts that the immature egg-capsules of the same mollusk will yield the dye more abundantly, and with more facility, than the animal itself (Hist. Acad. Sci. 1711). It would appear as if the knowledge of this art had never been lost, but had been perpetuated even in Great Britain from the classical ages. Bede, in the 8th century, alludes to it familiarly; and with admiration of the brilliancy and permanence of the hue (Hist. Eccles. Ang. i. 1); and Richard of Glastonbury speaks of it in the 14th (Deacr. of Brit., p. 26). About the same time the following description was given in a translation of Higelin's Polykronicon: "Ther is alse of sheel that we dyesh with ynce reede. The redness thef of is wondre fayre and stable and steyneth neyvr with colhe ne with hete ne with drie but ever the eldere the hue is fayvere" (Of Bretagne, i. 88). Three hundred years later the art was practiced for profit by persons on the coast of Ireland, who guarded it as an heirloom secret. Cole, however, found that the Purpuraria lapillus was the shell employed. See Bible Educator, iii, 327 sq.; iv, 217; and comp. Color.

Purple Manuscript (Codex Purpurarius, sometimes called "the Cotton MS."); variously designated as

Specimen of the Codex Purpurarius (containing John xvi, 20: τον λόγον ὄν | τοῦτο εἰρήνη διασάλλευσεν ἔν τινι ματιν | τῶν ἀποικῶν).
PURVEY

N. J, and Γ of the Gospel), a beautiful uncial MS. of the Greek Gospel, of which only twelve leaves remain: four of these (containing Matt. xxi. 57-65; xxvii. 26-34; John xiv. 2-10; xv. 15-22) are in the Cotton Library (Codex Cottonianus, the "J" of Wetstein) of the British Museum; two (containing Luke xiv. 18-21, and 29-39) are in the British Library at Vienna ("N" of Wetstein and others); and six (containing Matt. xix. 6-13; xx. 6-22; xx. 29-31) are in the Vatican Library at Rome (called "Γ" by Scholla). These are written in silver letters (now turned black), occasionally in gold letters, on purple vellum, in a large rounded hand, and in two columns, with the Ammonian sections and Eusebian canons in the margin. The date is of the end of the 6th or the beginning of the 7th century. Some of the fragments were collated in part by Wetstein and Scholla, and the whole was published by the late Archbishop of York, in his Monumenta Sacra Inedita (Lips. 1846). See Tregelles, in Horne's Introduct. iv, 177; Scrivener, Introduct. p. 110 sq. See Manuscripts, Biblical.

Purpose of God. The word purpose is commonly used and preferred to the word decree when God's determination regarding man's salvation is referred to. The word purpose owes its use to the fact that it is more comprehensive and expresses the idea of intelligent design, and therefore more clearly and with less of prejudice sets forth the true scope of the divine government. See PREDESTINATION.

Purpureus, Codex. See Purple Manuscript.

Purse (δημιοσ, kis, Prov. i. 14; "bag" for money). Isa. xlii. 6, or for weights, Deut. xxv. 18; Prov. xvii. 11; Mic. vii. 11; 6, but箱子, Matt. x. 9; Mark vi. 8, is the "girdle, as elsewhere rendered." The Hebrews, when on a journey, were provided with a bag, in which they carried their money (Gen. xiii. 35; Prov. i. 14; vii. 20; Isa. xlii. 6), and if they were merchants, also their weights (Deut. xxv. 13; Mic. vii. 11). This bag is var-

Purvan. 9, Codex. See Purple Manuscript.

Purva, one of the four main divisions of the Vedas. The Purva-brâhmana (as above) ; νοον, τετραγωνος; and διπλωμα, charit. The last occurs only in 2 Kings v. 23 ("bags"); Isa. iii. 22 (A. V. 'crespingpins'). The latter is supposed to refer to the long, round form of the purse. The money-bag is described in the New Test. by the terms παλασίον (as above), peculiar to Luke x. 4; xlii. 33; xlii. 35, 36), and γλαυκόσκορπον (peculiar to John xii. 6; xlii. 29). The former is the Latin term (Plato, Comen. xlii. 190, c. στεφάνιστα (παλασίον); the latter is connected with the classical γλαυκοσκορπίον, which originally meant the bag in which musicians carried the mouthpieces of their instruments. In the Sept. the term is applied to the chest for the offerings (2 Chron. xxiv. 8, 10, 11), and was hence adopted by John to describe the common purse carried by the disciples. The girdle also served as a purse, and hence the term γυνε- occurs in Matt. x. 9; Mark vi. 8. See Girdle. Ladies wore ornamental purses (Isa. ii. 23). The Rahabnits bore one of these in passing through the Temple with stick, shoes, and purse, these three being the indications of travelling (Mishna, Berachoth, 9, § 5). See Bag: Money.

Purelain. See Mallow; White of An Egg.

Purtenance (ζηνεν, κερεδ, мohet, or inner part) stands improperly in one passage of the A. V. (Exod. xii. 9) for the sicerer, or "inwards" (as elsewhere rendered) any one passing as relation to eternity to the ordained victim.

Pun, in Hindu mythology, was the son of Jajata and of Devajani, the daughter of a Brahmin. He was the boldest warrior in the army of the Devas during their struggles against the daemons and giants: he distinguished himself by the terrible use he knew how to make of his war-hatchet. There was another Puru-, the first king of India from the family of the Children of the Moon: his father, Buddha, was the son of the Moon. He is the forefather of the whole dynasty of the Children of the Moon, who were all celebrated rulers, and seemed to have founded on the upper Ganges an eternal empire. The kings of Paurava, Purva, Purva, etc., belonged to this family, in which Krishna was born several times.

Purva, in Hindó mythology, was the name of the first man created, the Adam of the Indians. The name of his wife was Pargute. See Puru.

Purver, Anthony, a Quaker preacher of great note for his remarkable literary attainments, especially his exegetical knowledge, was born at Upwood, in Huntingdonshire, in 17th, about 1702. He was originally apprenticed to a shoemaker, but later he was employed in keeping sheep. Though his early education was very limited, his capacity and inclination for the acquisition of learning were very great. He found leisure for study, and his curiosity being excited by the perusal of a tract in which some inaccuracies of the A. V. were pointed out, he determined to study the original languages of the Scriptures. He secured the assistance of a Jew in the acquisition of Hebrew, Chaldee, etc., and other aid for learning Greek and Latin. He became a member of Friends, and preached among them. While laboring as a schoolmaster at Andover, he occupied himself in preparing a new version of the Scriptures; and this, after spending more than thirty years over it, he published by the aid of Dr. Fothergill, who gave him £1000, and carried it through the press at his own expense. It appeared in 1764, entitled A New Translation of the Old and New Testaments, with Notes, Critical and Explanatory, in two volumes folio, beautifully got up. Notwithstanding the enormous labor bestowed upon it by its author, and though it is now and then a better rendering to be found in it than in the A. V., Purver's translation, as a whole, is not of much critical value. The style is crude and bombastic, the very reverse of what might have been expected from a member of the society whose language is so simple; while the notes, though containing much valuable matter, while the notes, though containing much valuable matter, and in contemptuous expressions about the labors of others in the same department. Purver's Bible is therefore deservedly scarce. He died in 1777. See Orme, Biblioth. Bibl. s. v.; Ritto, Bible Dict. s. v.; Alli- bone, Dict. of Rel. and Amer. Authors, s. v. (J. H. W.)

Purver, John, the friend and fellow-laborer of Wycliffe, with whom he lived in his latter years. His denunciations of the errors of the Roman Church, as well as his endeavors to make the Bible accessible to the people at large by translating it into English, drew upon him the severest penalties which it was in the power of the hierarchy to inflict. He was forbidden, by a mandate of the bishop of Bristol, dated August, 1387, to preach in the diocese where he officiated after the death of Wycliffe; his books were declared to be erroneous and heretical, and were among those which the bishops of Worcester, Salisbury, and Hereford were author-

Purvis. See Purve, 2.
the assistance of several fellow-laborers he (1) corrected the Latin text by comparison of Bibles, doctors, and glosses; (2) studied the text thus corrected with the gloss and other authorities, particularly De Lyra on the Old Testament; (3) made special reference to the works of the Fathers and the glosses for the meaning of difficult words and passages; and (4) did not translate literally, but according to the sense and meaning as clearly as he could, taking care to have many persons of ability present at the correction of the translation. He inserted numerous textual glosses in the Old Testament and in a large number of passages in the New Testament. He published his translation, but made no such insertions in the New Testament, and carefully excluded all the glosses which were introduced into the former version. That he improved upon Wycliffe's translation is beyond doubt, as may be seen from a comparison of the following passages in the respective versions: Gen. ix. 13; Exod. xxiii. 2; Deut. xxxii. 2; xxxiii. 7; Josh. x. 15; vi. 25; Job x. 1; xi. 12; xiv. 12; Matt. xii. 5; xiii. 52; 1 Cor. iii. 13-15; which are pointed out by the erudite editors, the Rev. Joseph Forshall and Sir Frederic Madden, who for the first time published this early English version, together with Wycliffe's translation, in an entire form, in parallel columns, 4 vols. 4to, Oxford University Press, 1850. Purvey's translation of the New Testament was first published by Lewis (Lond. 1871, fol.) as Wycliffe's translation; it was then superseded by the work of Baber (Lond. 1820, 4to), and by Bagster in the English Hexapla. Comp. Foxe's The Acts and Monuments, Towns-end's (Lond. 1844), iii. 285, 292, 822, 823; and the elaborate preface by Forshall and Madden to their edition of Wycliffe's and Purvey's translation of the Bible.

Purseveyor. This word is not found in the A.V. although it would perhaps represent the meaning of the Heb. צָלַל, צָלָל, in 1 Kings iv, 5, 7, rather than the word כָּלַע, כָּלָע, of the similar "officer" of our version. The Hebrew word, however, is the Niphal (passive) participle of the word צָלַל, צָלָל, to put or station, and is literally translated by the Greek, which has the same meaning, the appointed. Solomon divided his kingdom into twelve parts, and these men were placed one over each province, to procure provisions for the king's household. Thus he was enabled to entertain foreigners, and to support a vast number of wives, servants, and attendants (Patrick, Comment, ad loc.). The number twelve refers, not to the tribes, but the months of the year, each being required to furnish the provisions for the king's household. These collections probably corresponded to tax-gathering among the moderns. Patrick thinks the officers were merely purchasers; but Kitto regards this as an error (Kitto, Pict. Bible, ad loc.). Rosemulliner calls these officers head collectors of taxes (Alt. u. a. Morcagend, iii. 160), and Ewald thinks they were stewards of the royal domains; but Theophyl (Ezra, Handb, ad loc.) holds that they were officers of higher rank, of whose duties the supply of the royal table formed only a part. Josephus calls them מַעֲמוֹן (Ant. viii, 2, 4). See PALESTINE; SOLOMON.

Puseyism is one of the names by which the ritualistic movement of the Church of England and her offspring is sometimes designated, but it is properly descriptive only of the followers of the much-celebrated Oxford professor in theology, the Rev. Dr. E. B. Pusey. Though he was by no means alone in originating the movement to which his name has been given, the Puseyites now form a very different class from that which organized and kept alive what is known as the Tractarian movement, and of which we have treated in the art. OXFORD TRACTS (q. v.).

The Tractarians advocated the acceptance by the Church of England of the doctrines of the Churchits return to apostolical succession, Priestly Absolution, Baptismal Regeneration, the Real Presence, the Authority of the Church, and of Tradition. "Scripture and tradition," says one of the Tractarians, "taken together, are the joint rule of faith" (No. 78, p. 2, English ed.). "Conscient "patristical tradition," says Keble in his Sermons, "is the record of that oral teaching of the apostles which the Holy Spirit has impressed upon the Church." These Tractarians held that the New Testament is an infallible interpretation of Scripture and test of doctrinal truth, they understood the voice of Catholic antiquity, or the voice of the theologians of the Nicene age, of the 4th century; and yet as far as the majority of the Church is concerned, this is a doctrine of Arian heresy. For example, Frod Sho. says, "You find the principles about Scripture being the sole rule in fundamentals, I nauseate the word" (i, 413). Thus, having broken away from the corner-stone of Protestantism, it was easy for them to accept the Roman view of the sacraments (q. v.), restoring also the old Roman number of seven (Tract 90), and affirming with the Church of Rome that "the sacraments, and not preaching, are the sources of divine grace," says Mr. Dennison, "I understand the Tractarian doctrine of the sacraments to be this:

1. That man is 'made a member of Christ, the child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven,' in and by baptism.

2. That he is 'made a member of Christ, the child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven,' in and by baptism, is renewed from time to time in holy communion.

3. That a 'death unto sin and a new birth unto righteousness' are communicated to every adult Christian, in and by the outward visible sign or form of baptism, in water in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.'

4. That the gift may be received, in the case of adults, worthily or unworthily, but that it is always received.

5. That the body and blood of Christ, as given to every one who receives the sacramental bread and wine.

6. That the gift may be received, worthily or unworthily, but that it is always received.

Antiquity," wrote the author of Tract 90, "continually affirms a change in the sacred elements" (p. 78). Palmer, in his Letter to a Protestant Catholic, declared that "the bread and wine are changed by the consecration of the priest and the operation of the Holy Ghost, and become the very body and blood of our Lord." (p. 50). "The table is properly an altar," said their organ, the British Critic, "and altar presume a propitiatory sacrifice" (July, 1841, p. 24). With such views of the sacraments, evangelical views on regeneration were impossible for the Tractarians, and there need be no surprise that they stigmatized the grand Protestant doctrine of justification by faith alone as a "Lutheran heresy." Whether any one heresy," says the Critic, "has ever infested the Church so hateful and unchristian as this doctrine [of justification], it is perhaps not necessary to determine: none certainly has ever prevailed so subtle and extensively poisonous. We must plainly express our conviction that a religious heathen, were he really to accept the doctrine which Lutheran language expresses, so far from making any advance, would sustain a heavy loss in exchanging fundamental truth for fundamental error" (No. Ixvii, p. 391). Again, speaking of the Tractarian party, this open confession is made: "We cannot stand where we are; we must go back as far as possible, and it will surely be the latter. As we go on, we must be more and more from the Church, if any such there be, of the English Reformation" (No. Ixix, p. 45). "The Reformation," says Frod Sho. (i, 433), "was a limb badly set; it must be broken again, in order to be righted." "Utterly reject and anathematize the principle of the Reformation, and with all its forms, sects, and denominations," says Palmer (Letter to Godly, p. 9).

* This reference is undoubtedly correct, and as Christ is not sacrificed in Protestant churches, the table on which the sacramental elements are placed ought not to be termed an altar, but be regarded as an altar to the spirit of Protestantism; and as the thing was wisely discarded by the Reformers, the name also should be dropped.
The Tractarian movement terminated with Newman's secession to Rome, but its effect remains in several buildings both of the Church of England and of the High-Church party, which still maintains, to a great extent, the principles advocated in the Tracts; the introduction of various alterations in the mode of performing divine service, such as the use of the surplice instead of the gown, uniting the prayers and singing the responses, the elevation of the communion-table into an altar, the substitution of low, open benches for high pews; a remarkable impulse given to the building and restoration of churches, and the revival of Gothic architecture in all parts of England; the secession of many Episcopal churches from the Church of England; the introduction of Sacramentalism; the supreme ability and distinction, to the Church of Rome; and the establishment of colleges and sisterhoods, and other religious and charitable institutions, under Episcopalian auspices.

Dr. Pusey himself, in his earlier years, inclined to that Protestant view of Christianity according to which all things and ceremonies acting on the senses must be removed from the Church (see his Rise and Decline of Rationalism in Germany). But he gradually turned away from that system in which the heart and soul are supposed to be primarily controlled by logical ideas, and came to accept another which is dependent upon the outward actions of the body — one which abounds in observances, reaching the heart through the medium of the senses, and encouraging a habit of devotion. This change in Pusey's ideas was attributed to the influence of his friend, John Henry Newman, and in the year 1833 Pusey accepted the confession of faith and practice drawn up by Newman. The publication of writings called Tracts for the Times was in 1841 interdicted by the bishop of Oxford, but the ninety-three that appeared published gave a clear insight into the new religious tendencies. Newman, Pusey, and their friends wished no fusion with the Roman Church, some of the tenets of which filled them with actual horror; but they tried to introduce into the English Church, the origin of which they did not approve and the decay of which they acknowledged, such doctrines as the Romish Church has distinctively preserved. Newman tried, in consequence, to conciliate the Thirty-nine Anglican Articles with the resolutions of the Council of Trent, in which, of course, he did not succeed, as he could satisfy neither of the parties, Catholics or Anglicans. Newman was made aware that his position between the two churches was a false and untenable one, and he passed over to Romanism. His example was followed by several ecclesiastics and professors, and he was accused by the English Church of breaking the communion, the first families of the kingdom. Pusey, however, has persevered in his former career. He and his followers have remained to this day in the Anglican Church, the situation of which they do not despair of mending. But they discard the name by which they are generally designated as a class. In 1870, Dr. Pusey himself wrote respecting this party-name as follows: "I never was a party leader, I never acted on any system. My name was used first to designate those of us who gave themselves to revive the teaching of forgotten truth and piety, because I first had occasion to write on baptismal regeneration; but it was by opponents, and not by confederates. We should have thought it a note against us to have deserved any party name, or to have been anything but the followers of Jesus, the disciples of the Church, the sons and pupils of the great fathers whom he raised up in her. I never had any temptation to try to form a party, for it was against our principles. . . ."

Then, personally, I was the more exempt from this temptation, because God has given me neither the peculiar organizing abilities which tempt men to it, nor any part of the spirit of that of an archdeacon — which would entitle me directly to counsel. . . . My life, contrary to the character of party leaders, has been spent in a succession of insulted efforts; bearing, indeed, upon one great end—the growth of Catholic truth and piety among us, or, contrariwise, resistance to what might hinder, retard, or obscure it; but still insulated" (Elenchus, iii, 338).

The Puseyites have adopted from the Romish Church, without assenting in a general way to her dogmas, a number of ritual institutions, and even some points of faith. They affix to their churches portable crosses; have burning tapers on their altars; adorn chasubles and Prayer-books with crosses; have a Latin choir; and, what is more than these exterior conformities, they have declared for the Romish doctrine about the situation and power of the Church, and about the sacraments, the number of which they increased; they have introduced auricular confession. In the doctrine of justification, where it was first intended to deviate from the Roman Catholic tenets, the resolutions of the Tridentineum were finally admitted as a base. The Puseyites went even the length of acknowledging in the pope a pre-eminen ce of spiritual honor and authority; they say that, as patriarch of Rome, not only his spiritual, but also his temporal authority extends over Italy; that the Church of England is bound to recognize it; and that all decrees of the Council of Trent may be authorized by him, and is not to be considered heretical, or even acceptable to the Anglican Church. The Puseyites call themselves Catholicks, a branch of the universal Catholic Church: they object most decidedly to being called Protestants. They regard the Church as one organic body, and primitive Christianity as one germ or seminal principle, to be developed and properly matured in the progress of ages. They adopt as such legitimate additions to Biblical Christianity obvious gross corruptions, which gained currency in the Church in different centuries, and were taught by leading fathers or councils — a proceeding which shows an uncertainty about the lineaments of Christianity, and opens the door for every species of error that designing men may be inclined to adopt, while it enables the so-called Catholic Church to justify every one of her errors, both doctrinal and ritual" (Schmucker). Another gross appendage sometimes associated with this theory of development is that Christ has placed himself in some kind of physical connection or concorporation with the mass of his disciples, the Church, by which his body nourishes them in some mystical manner through the Eucharist, and nourishes the germ of their resurrection body. Though Newman, still before his perversion, recommended, in the Ninetieth Tract for the Times, the acceptance of the doctrines of purgatory, of the invocation of saints, and of papal authority, Pusey has persisted in rejecting them. He also accepts the doctrine of the Real Presence of Latin in the mass, and the communion in one form (comp. Pusey, A Letter to his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury [Oxf. 1842], and The Holy Eucharist [ibid. 1843]). As Puseyism is in progress among the cultivated classes of England, especially among the clergy, and as it is thought to be only a forerunner of Catholicism, it is combated by the English bishops with admonitions, speeches, and disciplinary measures. They do not tolerate the rites introduced by the Puseyite ecclesiastics, and pronounce them a "mixture of Romanism or popery." They ordain no student of divinity suspected of Puseyistic tendencies. At the University of Oxford, the seminary of the High-Church clergy, the antagonism of Puseyites and anti-Puseyites has broken out so openly that there is a storm of both parties on every vacant professorship. Puseyist tendencies pervade the most influential literary papers: the Quarterly Review has published a series of articles in favor of the Puseyite innovations. The chief adversaries of the Puseyites, or Anglo-Catholics, are the Evangelicals, a party which originated in Methodism — the latter being opposed both by the Puseyites and by the Episcopalians. If we compare the judgment of the English papers of different colors on the religious situation of Great Britain, and especially on Puseyism, we find
Pusillanimity is a feebleness of mind, by which one is terrified at mere trifles or imaginary dangers, an attribute of the most distant probability.

Puspadanta, in Hindu mythology, was one of the celebrated twelve Buddha who were particularly worshipped by the Jainas. He was the son of Sugiya and of Roma, from the family of Ikshvaku. He is represented as a man ending in the body of a fish.

Pustkuchen - Glanzow, Fr. CPHl., a German theologian of some note, flourished as pastor at Winckelskirchen, near Treves. He was born Feb. 4, 1763, at Detmold, and died Jan. 2, 1834. He wrote, Die Urgeschichte der Menschheit in ihrem rollen Umfange (Leip., 1821) - Historisch-kriftliche Untersuchung der bild. Urgeschichte (Halle, 1823) - Wiederherstellung des alten Protestantismus, etc. (Hamb., 1823) - Der Begin der evangel. Pfarrers nach seinem Zweck u. Wesen, etc. (Barmen, 1833) - Grundziige des Christenthums (Hamb., 1835, 3 vol. ed.) - Glanzeu u. Sittendre (Barmen, 1831-33, 3 vol.) - Maria, oder die Fruhmliches der Weiber (Hamb, 1832, 2 vol.) - Kirche, Schule u. Heim (Hamb., 1833). See Winer, Handbuch der theologie, Literatur, p. 71 (see Index); Furst, Bibl. Judaica, iii. 124; Zuchold, Bibl. Theologica, iii, 1022; Diestel, Gesch. des Alien Testament, p. 726, 733. (B.P.)

Püstrich, an ill-shaped Slavonic idiom: it is of bronze, and hollow. It represents a small, chubby boy holding a bottle. The bottles have been made with two holes, one at the top, the other at the place of the mouth. It is believed that the priests used this figure to terrify the people by the spectacle of an infuriated deity. It was filled with water, and, the holes being stopped, put on a fire: in due time the stoppers were driven out of the holes with considerable noise and tremendous eruption of steam and boiling water. Other more modern investigations would lead to the conclusion that the chubby god was nothing but an instrument of distillery.

Put (1 Chron. i. 8, Nah. iii. 9). See Phut.

Puteol (Gracized Phoroiou (Acts xxviii. 13), but in classical Greek often Phoros, a well, on account of the Wells or springs of a volcanic origin, with which the volcanic town of Campania, in Italy, on the northern shore of the bay of Naples, and about eight miles north-west from that city. Here Paul landed on his way to Rome (Acts xxviii. 13). As above noted, it derived its name from the wells or springs, of which the springs which now exist is now called Terra di Lavoro. The earlier name of Puteoli, when the lower part of Italy was Greek, was Diaerarchia; and this name continued to be used to a late period. Josephus uses it in two passages (Jos. xvii. 12, 7; xviii. 7, 2); in a third (Esth. 5, 2), he speaks of himself (after the shipwreck which, like St. Paul, he had recently gone through) as ἢ πεθανοῦσα τοῦ Ιουνίου, τοῦ Ποταμίου τῆς Τάρατος καλομένην. So Phile, in describing the curious interview which he and his fellow Jewish ambassadors had here with Caligula, uses the old name (Legat. ii. 6, 521). Its Roman history may be said to have begun with the Second Punic War. It was a favorite watering-place of the Romans as its numerous hot-springs were judged efficacious for the cure of various diseases. It was also the port where ships usually discharged their passengers and cargoes, partly to avoid discharging the pollution of Circium, and partly because there was no commodious harbor nearer to Rome. Hence the ship in which Paul was conveyed from Melita landed the prisoners at this place, where the apostle stayed for a week (Acts xxviii. 13). In connection with Paul's movements, we must notice its communications, in Nero's reign, along the mainland with Rome. The coast road leading northward to Sinuessa was not made till the reign of Domitian; but there was a cross-road leading to Capua, and...
there joining the Appian Way. See Three Taverns.

The remains of this road may be traced at intervals; and thus the apostle’s route can be followed almost step by step. We should also notice the fact that there were Jewish residents at Puteoli. We might be sure of this from its mercantile importance; but we are positively informed of it by Josephus (Ant. xvii, 12, 1) in his account of the visit of the pretended Hend-Alexander to Augustus; and the circumstance shows how natural it was that the apostle should find Christian "brethren" there immediately on landing. From this port it was that the Roman armies were dispatched to Spain, and here the ambassadors from Carthage landed.

It had the privileges of a colony from a very early period, and these were successively renewed by Nero and Vespasian, the latter bestowing on the place the title of Colonia Flavia. Puteoli was at that period a place of very great importance. We cannot elucidate this better than by saying that the celebrated bay a part of which is now "the bay of Naples," and in early times was "the bay of Cumae," was then called "Sinus Puteolanus." The city was at the north-eastern angle of the bay. Close to it was Baiae, one of the most fashionable of the Roman watering-places. The emperor Caligula once built a ridiculous bridge between the two towns; and the remains of it must have been conspicuous when St. Paul landed at Puteoli in the Alexandrian ship which brought him from Malta. See Castor and Pollux; Miletus; Rhodes; Syracuse. In illustration of the arrival here of the corn-ships we may refer to Seneca (Ep. 77) and Suetonius (Nero, 38). No part of the Campanian shore was more frequented. The associations of Puteoli with historical personages are very numerous. Scipio sailed from hence to Spain. Cicero had a villa (his "Puteolanum") in the neighborhood, Here Nero planned the murder of his mother. Vespasian gave to this city peculiar privileges, and here Hadrian was buried. In the 5th century Puteoli was ravaged both by Alaric and Genesius, and it never afterwards recovered its former eminence. It is now a fourth-rate Italian town, still retaining the name of Pozzuoli.

The remains of Puteoli are considerable. The aqueduct, the reservoirs, portions (probably) of baths, the great amphitheatre, the building called the temple of Serapis, which affords very curious indications of changes of level in the soil, are all well worthy of notice. But our chief interest here is concentrated on the ruins of the ancient mole, which is formed of the concrete called Puteolanum, and sixteen of the piers of which still remain. No Roman harbor has left so solid a memorial of itself as this one at which St. Paul land-
ed in Italy. Here, too, was the statue erected to Tiberius to commemorate his restoration of the Asiatic cities destroyed by an earthquake, and of which statue the pedestal with its inscription remains almost entire to this day. See Mazzella, Storia et Antiquissima Patrua, in Graecus and Burnam, Thanat. ix. pt. iv.; Romaneli, Viaggio a Pozzuoli (Naples, 1817); Jorio, Guida dei Pozzi (ibid. 1838); Lenoignore, Die Landschaff Pozzuoli (Achench., 1841); Lewin, St. Paul, 218 sq. See Ita. — PAUL.

Putil (Heb. Putil', 4 M)., afflicted of God; Sept. οφναλή, the father of the wife of Eliezer the priest and the mother of Phinehas (Exod. vi. 25). B.C. cir. 1619. In modern Jewish traditions Putil is confounded with Jethro the Midianite, "who fatted the cattle for idolatrous worship" (Targum Pseudo-Jon. On Exod. vi. 25; Genesis of Sota by Wayneggeli, c. viii. § 6).

Putnam, Franklin, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Marietta, O., July 22, 1801. After receiving a good academical training, he entered Athens College, O., and graduated with honor in 1825. During the last three years of his college course he was converted, and though up to this time the law had been the object of his studies, the Gospel now became his all-absorbing hope. He entered the Theological Seminary at Auburn, N.Y., and in 1826 was licensed by Onondaga Presbytery, N.Y. In 1832 he removed to Ohio, and was appointed to labor as a missionary and evangelist among the dealing churches in Springfield, Urbana, and Buck Creek, O. Subsequently he accepted a call to Springfield Church, and was ordained and installed pastor by Dayton Presbytery: here he labored for eighteen months, when he accepted a call to the Church in Dayton, O., at the division in the Church, he resigned, and accepted a call to Circleville, O., where he continued to labor for over six years, when, by reason of paralysis of one half of his body, he resigned his charge, and removed to Delaware, Ohio. Here he devoted care on the part of his family, his health was restored, and he resumed preaching and ministered to the Church at Delaware, and subsequently at Tiffin, Greenville, and Republic, O., and Thomontown, Ind. He died at the latter place Oct. 11, 1850. Mr. Putnam was a logical thinker, and full of zeal for the cause of Christ; an excellent pastor, ever ready in sorrow to administer comfort and consolation. See Wilson, Prep. Hist. Alumni, 1861, p. 162. (J.L.S.)

Putnam, George, D.D., a Unitarian minister of the Old School, was born in Massachusetts in 1808, and was educated at Harvard University, class of 1828. He early entered the ministry, and finally became pastor at Roxbury, Mass., where he sustained the pastorate of nearly half a century, enjoying not only the warm affection of his own people, but the highest respect and confidence of the whole community. Away from home also Dr. Putnam wielded a very wide influence in all directions, and he was beloved by men of every religious school in an eminent degree. Dr. Putnam was more than an ordinary man. He was not only possessed of the most noble personal characteristics, but was endowed with excellent scholarship, remarkable intellectual power, and great wisdom in judgment. He was always vigorous, fresh, and often very eloquent in his pulpit discourses. For years his fast-day and Thanksgiving services were largely attended by visitors from what was then the adjoining city (Boston), to listen to his thought and powerful discussions upon public and national questions. A study of his writings in 1827 warned him that the period of his vigor was terminating; and he was obliged to consent to have a younger associate with him in the pastorate. For the last two years before his death, which occurred in 1827, he was able to render service only on the occasion of motions of some one of his beloved parishioners, who, in these joyful and painful domestic events, especially welcomed even the trembling voice of their old pastor. From 1849 to 1856 Dr. Putnam was editorially connected with the Christian Examiner. He published a number of separate sermons, orations, etc.

Putnam, Jonathan W., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Leyden, N.Y., July 31, 1812. He was converted at the age of twelve, and was received into the Methodist Episcopal Church. He was licensed to exhort in 1835; in 1836 he received license to preach. He travelled four years in the New-Jersey Conference, and then went to the Wisconsin Conference. In 1856 he was transferred to the East-Geneese Conference, and stationed at East Palmyra. Afterwards he was successively appointed to Tyrone, Catharine, Southport, Jackson, Canton, Prattsburgh, Dresden, and Middlesex. He had just begun the work of the second year on this last charge, with good promise of success, when death overtook him on Sept. 8, 1871. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1872, p. 120, 131; Northern Christian Advocate, 1871.

Putsha, in Hindû mythology, is the name of the small, bloodless sacrifices, consisting of fruits and flowers, which were offered to the genii, as well as to the three great gods of the old Hinduism. Putshuli, in Hindû mythology, is the name of the Brahmins who, after twelve years' study, determine to devote their lives entirely to the gods, and in consequence attach themselves to some pagoda.

Puxis is the box in which the consecrated hosts for the sick are preserved. See Pux.
The Greek πυγμαχος denotes an animal with a "white rump," and is used by Herodotus (iv, 192) as the name of some Libyan deer or antelope. Αλιαν (vii, 19) also mentions the πυγμαχος, but gives no more than the name; comp. also Juvencii (Sat. xi. 189). It is usual to identify the pygmy of the Greek and Latin writers with the addax of North Africa, Nubia, etc. (Addax nasomaculatus), known to the ancient Greeks under the same title (Oryx addax, Lichl.), which has been recognised as a beast of chase in the old Egyptian sculptures. It is widely spread over Central Africa, extending to the borders of the Nile in Nubia, and is well known to the Arabs, who still distinguish it by its ancient name, with the familiar prefix of Abu, or father - Father Addax. The addax is a coarse and heavy antelope, three feet high at the withers, with a large clumsy head and stout legs. The horns exist in both sexes, are long, twisted outwards, covered with rings nearly to the points, which are sharp; the tail is long and tufted. The head and neck are of a deep reddish brown color, with a band of white across the face; the forehead and throat are clothed with coarse black hair, and all the rest of the body and limbs is of a whithish gray hue. It is one of that group of antelopes in which we may clearly discern an approach to the bovine race. See Ox.

Addax Antelope (Oryx addax).

Against this identification of the diakon with the addax, however, there are some considerable objections. In the first place, this antelope does not actually exist at all, and the required characteristic implied by its name; and, in the second, there is much reason for believing, with Rippell (Atlas zu der Reise im nörd. Afrika, p. 21) and Hamilton Smith (Griffith's Cuvier's Anim. Kingdom, iv, 195), that the addax is identical with the strepsicerus of Pliny (N. H. xi, 87), which animal, it must be observed, the Roman naturalist distinguishes from the pygmy (vii, 53). Indeed, we may regard the identity of the addax and Pliny's strepsicerus as established; for when this species was, after many years, at length rediscovered by Hempich and Rippell, it was found to be called by the Arabic name of akus ot adax, the very name which Pliny gives as the local one of his strep sings. The pygmy, therefore, must be sought for in some animal different from the addax. The required characters seem to be found in a group of antelopes described by Mr. Bennett (Trans. Zool. Soc., vol. i). They have many peculiarities in common with the group which includes the spring-bok (Antidorcas euchore) and the houte-bok (Damalis pygargus), those fine white-rumped species of South Africa, but are distinguished by the characters of the horns, which are larger, thicker, more bovine, and of broader curvature, turning first almost horizontally backwards, and then hooked abruptly forwards. The legs are long, the neck long and slender, and there is a white patch on the throat in all the species. The group is confined to the northern half of the African continent. The best-known species is the mhorr (Antilope mhorr, Bennett), which stands two feet eight inches high at the croup. The horns are ringed from the base about half-way up, whence to the tip they are round, smooth, and obtusely pointed. The expression of the face is gentle; the eye large, dark, and liquid. The tail is long, close-haired at the base, but tipped with a tuft of long black hair—a very ox-like character. The general hue of the coat, which is short and sleek, is a deep brownish red; the line of the belly and the inner surface of the limbs are white. But the whole region around the base of the tail is pure white, abruptly separated from the dark red of the flanks; the patch running forwards in a point on each hip, and downwards on the posterior surface of the thighs. The strong contrast of the two colors has a very singular effect, and would probably be seized on to form a descriptive appellation. Two males of this beautiful species were sent to the Zoological Society from Morocco; they were not, however, indigenous to that country, but had been brought from the eastern side of the desert. The species is hunted by the Arabs for the sake of the stomatal characteristic called becour, to which it is peculiarly subject, and which is so highly valued in Oriental pharmacy. These stones are called in Morocco beid el-uchor, or mhorr's eggs. There is, however, another species, considerably larger than the mhorr, but having the same general form and the same distributions of the colors. It is the addra (A. effugialis), a fine beast found in the wastes of Nubia by Rippell, and by Hempich and Ehrenberg in Dongola. This animal stands about three feet three inches high at the croup, and is five feet four inches in length. It is seen in considerable flocks on the borders of the Great Desert, and may well have been the pygmy of the ancients. See Tritrastum, Natural History of the Bible, p. 126; Wood, Biblia Animata, p. 141 sq.; Bible Educator, ii, 24, 183, 167. Comp. Antelope.

Pygmies of Western Africa. The existence of pygmy races of human beings in Africa has often been asserted, and many circumstances less easily credible than their diminutive size have been reported. Du Chaillu has recently discovered the actual existence of a pygmy race, but of whom the diminutive size is the only remarkable characteristic. He found them in the mountainous country on the east of the southern great branch of the Ogooué. They are called kongoos, and live in the midst of negro tribes of ordinary stature. They showed extreme timidity on being visited by a white man. In size they are only about three feet and a half. They subsist chiefly on animal food, but partly also on the roots, berries, and nuts which they find in the forests. In their mental calibre, these pygmies vary as greatly as ordinary races. Hence there is no settled theory as to their religious tendency, some of them comprehending their religious need, while others seem to be almost void of any religious consciousness. See Pre-Adamic; Religion.

Fyle, Thomas, an eminent Anglican divine, was born at Stodye, near Holt, Norfolk, in 1674. He was educated at Caius College, Cambridge, and, after taking holy orders, distinguished himself as minister of St. Margaret's parish in King's Lynn. He was made prebendary of Salisbury by Dr. Hoadly for his services in the Bangor Convener Controversy. His Paraphrase on the Acts and all the Epistles is an excellent work, often reprinted. He published, besides, Paraphrase of the Books of the Old Testament (London, 1717-25, 4 vols., 8vo). The Scripture Preservative against Popery (ibid., 1785) and three volumes of Sermons. He died at Lynn in 1757, greatly respected and highly admired in all England for his excellency in purpose and superiority in scholarship. See Hook, Eccles. Rugs., vi, 172; Gentleman's Magazine (London, 1786), p. 659, 692; Nichols, Literary Anecdotes.

Pynchon, William, an English divine, was born in the second half of the 16th century, and, after mi-
grating to this country, settled at Roxbury, Mass., in 1630, aged 71 or 73. In 1657 he removed to Springfield, Mass. He finally returned to England, and died at Wraybury, Buckinghamshire, in 1662. He published, The Merciful Device of Christ's Redemption (London, 1650 and 1655, 4to), which was so heretical in tendency that it offended the Puritan fathers, and was burned on the Common by order of the authorities of Massachusetts:—The Jesuit's Synagogue (1652, 4to):—Time and Eternity how the First Sabbath was Ordained, etc. (1654, 4to).

Pyne, Smith, D.D., a clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was a native of Ireland, and was educated at Eton and Oxford, England. After arriving in this country he studied theology, and was admitted to holy orders by bishop Hobart in 1826. He was in turn rector of a parish at Elizabeth, N. J.; Christ Church, Middletown, Conn.; St. John's Church, Yonkers, N. Y.; Calvary parish and St. John's Church, Washington. In the latter position he remained upwards of twenty years. During the war, Dr. Pyne worked in the camps and hospitals and among the soldiers. He was at one time a trustee of the General Theological Seminary, and of Trinity College, Hartford. He died in New York Dec. 7, 1875.

Pyramid (πυραμίς, perhaps from the Egyptian br), a structure of the shape of the geometric figure so called, erected in different parts of the Old and the New World, the most important being the pyramids of Egypt and Mexico. Those of Egypt were considered one of the seven wonders of the world. They are in all seventy in number, of different sizes, lying between 29° and 30° N. lat., and are masses of stone or brick, with square bases and triangular sides. Although various opinions have prevailed as to their use, as that they were erected for astronomical purposes, for resisting the encroachment of the sand of the desert, for granaries, reservoirs, or sepulchres, the last-mentioned hypothesis has been proved to be correct in recent times by the excavations of the late general Howard Vyse. They were all the tombs of monarchs of Egypt who flourished from the fourth to the twelfth dynasty, none having been constructed later than that time, the subsequent kings being buried at Abydos, Thebes, and other places, in tombs of a very different construction. The picture of a pyramid forms a part of the hieroglyphic name of Memphis, and the immutability of most things in Egypt leads us to infer, from this circumstance, that the foundation of the pyramids was coeval with that of the city. It is probable that the title of being the builders of them, and the honor of being buried in them, were given to the monarchs by whom they were finished. The pyramids are solid mounds raised over the sepulchral chambers of the kings, the first act of an Egyptian monarch being to prepare his future "eternal abode." For this purpose, a passage of the size of the intended sarcophagus was first hollowed in the rock at a suitable incline to lower it, and at a convenient depth a rectangular chamber was excavated in the solid rock. Over this chamber a cubical mass of masonry, of square blocks, was then placed, leaving the orifice of the shaft open. Additions continued to be made to this cubical mass both in height and breadth as long as the monarch lived, so that at his death all that remained to be done was to face or smooth the exterior of the stepped mound. But in some cases the masses of stone passed beyond the orifice of the shaft, which involved the construction of a new shaft, having its orifice beyond it. The pyramid was faced by adding courses of long blocks on each layer of the steps, and then cutting the whole to a flat or even surface, commencing from the base. The outer masonry, however, or casing, as it is called, has in most instances been partially stripped off. Provision was made for protecting the vertical joints by placing each stone half way over another. The casing is admirably finished, and the mechanical means by which such immense masses of stone were transported to their places has long been a mystery: the discovery, however, of large circular holes in some of the stones has led to the conclusion that they were wound up by machines. The stones were quarried on or near the spot: sometimes, however, granite tacts from the quarries of Syene was partially employed. The entrances were carefully filled up, and the passage protected by stone portcullises and other contrivances, to prevent ingress to the sepulchral chamber. There appears to have been also a door, or pylon, at the entrance of the shaft, ornamented with Egyptian sculptures and hieroglyphs. The sides of the pyramids face the cardinal points, and the entrances face the north. The work of the larger pyramids was executed by corvées of laborers.

The most remarkable and finest pyramids are those of Gizeh, situated on a level space of the Libyan chain at Memphis, on the west bank of the Nile. The largest three are the most famous. The first of Great Pyramid, as appears from the excavations of Vyse, was the sepulchre of the Cheops of Herodotus, the Chamber, or Chem, of Diodorus, and the Sphynx of Manesto and Eratosthenes (Shufa 1. R.C. 218. 2186). The name of the founder of the Great Pyramid has been detected in a small tomb in its immediate vicinity. It is written in Greek by Manesto, Sphynx, which is said by Eratosthenes to mean in Egyptian squa, "one who has much hair." The hieroglyphic name, Sayh, has also the same meaning as in the
Coptic, "much hair." Its height was 480 feet 9 inches, and its base 764 feet square, having an area of about 13 acres. Its slope or angle is 51° 50'. It has, however, been much spoiled and stripped of its exterior blocks for the building of Cairo. The original sepulchral chamber, called the Subterranean Apartment, 46 feet by 27 feet, and 11 feet 6 inches high, has been hewn in the solid rock, and was reached by the original passage, 320 feet long, which descended to it by an entrance at the foot of the pyramid.

The excavations in this direction were subsequently abandoned on account of the vast size attained by the pyramid, rendering it impracticable to carry on the entrance on a level with the natural rock, which had been cut down and faced for that purpose. Accordingly a second chamber, with a triangular roof, was constructed in the masonry of the pyramid, 17 feet by 18 feet 9 inches, and 20 feet 3 inches high. This was reached by a passage rising at an inclination of 36° 18', terminating in a horizontal passage. It is called the Queen's Chamber, and occupies a position nearly in the centre of the pyramid. The monument—probably owing to the long life attained by the monarch—still progressing, a third chamber, called the King's, was finally constructed, by prolonging the ascending passage of the Queen's Chamber for 150 feet farther into the very centre of the pyramid, and, after a short horizontal passage, making a room 17 feet 1 inch by 34 feet 3 inches, and 19 feet 1 inch high. To diminish, however, the pressure of the superincumbent masonry on the flat roof, five small chambers were made vertically in succession.
above the roof, the last one pointed, varying in height from 1 foot 4 inches to 8 feet 7 inches, the apex of the top one being rather more than 69 feet above the roof of the King's Chamber. The end of the horizontal passage was finished in a superior style, and cased with red syenitic granite; and in the King's Chamber was the granite sarcophagus of the king. Cheops, 7 feet 6 inches long, 3 feet 3 inches broad, and 3 feet 5 inches high, for whom the pyramid was built. As the heat of this chamber was stifling, owing to want of ventilation, two small air-channels, or chimneys, about nine inches square, were made, ascending to the north and south sides of the pyramid. They perfectly ventilate this chamber. After the mummy was deposited in the King's Chamber, the entrance was closed with granite portcullises, and a well made at the junction of the upward-inclined and horizontal passages, by which the workmen descended into the downward-inclined passage, after carefully closing the access to the sepulchral chambers. The changes which took place in this pyramid gave rise to various traditions, even in the days of Herodotus, Cheops being reported to lie buried in a chamber surrounded by the waters of the Nile. It took a long time for its construction—100,000 men being employed on it for thirty years. The operations in this pyramid by general Vyse gave rise to the discovery of marks scratched in red ochre in a kind of cursive hieroglyphs on the blocks brought from the quarries of Turah. These contained the name and titles of Shufu (the hieroglyphic form of Cheops); numerals and directions for the position of materials: with them were mason's marks.

Hieroglyph of Cheops.

Section of the Great Pyramid of Gizeh.

The second pyramid is situated on a higher elevation than the first, and was built by Shufu II, or Chephren (B.C. 2166-2163), the son of Shufu I. His name reads Shepré: he is called Sophis II by Manetho, and Cephrenes by Herodotus. It is inscribed on a beautiful tablet in the British Museum, which was brought from one of the tombs near Memphis, and was engraved in memory of a personage who acted as superintendent of the building of the pyramid. This pyramid has two sepulchral chambers, and appears to have been broken into by the caliph Alaziz Othman ben-Yusuf, A.D. 1196. Subsequently, it was opened by Belzoni. The masonry is inferior to the first, but it was anciently cased below with red granite. The casing still remains at the summit.

Hieroglyph of Mycerinus.

The third pyramid, built by Mencheres, or Mycerinus (brother of Chephren, B.C. 2163-2130), is much smaller than the other two, being only 218 feet high by 324 feet 6 inches square. It also has two sepulchral chambers, both in the solid rock. The lower sepulchral chamber, which held the sarcophagus of rectangular shape, of whinstone, had a pointed roof, cut like an arch inside; but the cedar coffin, in shape of a mummy, had been removed to the upper or larger apartment, and its contents there rifled. Among the debris of the coffin and in the chambers were found the legs and part of the trunk of a body with linen wrapper, supposed by some to be that of the monarch, but by others to be that of an Arab, who had cut off the lower right knee. This body and fragments of the coffin were removed to the British Museum; but the stone sarcophagus was unfortunately lost off Carthagena, by the sinking of the vessel in which it was being transported to England. There is a hieroglyph very beautifully engraved on the fragment of the coffin, containing a royal name, which reads Menkau-re. The masonry of this pyramid is most excellent, and it was anciently case half-way up with black granite.

The second pyramid has a line of chambers cut in the rock, and on its eastern side are the ruins of a temple. The third has a similar temple and avenue; and, indeed, the eastern face of the Great Pyramid has traces, though more indistinct, of a similar structure; but the second temple, that of Chephren, is distinguished by having the Sphinx ranged in front of the centre of its eastern face, bearing all the marks of having been connected with it by communications cut through the rock under-ground. Between the paws of the Sphinx temple was discovered, a few years ago, by Belzoni, on clearing away the sand by which it had been choked up for ages.

There are six other pyramids of inferior size and interest at Gizeh: one at Abu Rûbê, five miles to the north-west of the same spot, is ruined, but of large dimensions; another at Zowre el-Arriana, ruined, and made of limestone, is still more ruined; another at Rihah, a spot in the vicinity of Abûstr, also much ruined, and built for the monarch User-en-Ra, by some supposed to be Ptolemais. There are five of these monuments at Abuâr, one with a name supposed to be that of a monarch of the third dynasty; and another with that of the king Sahura. A group of eleven pyramids remains at Sakkarî, one with a doorway inlaid with porcelain tiles, and having a royal name. Five other pyramids are at Dabûr, the north-west of which, built of brick, is supposed to be that of the king Apsichis of Herodotus, and has a name of a king apparently about the twelfth dynasty. Others are at Mârtûn and Ilahân; and two at Bâmu, at Meînet el-Fayûm, apparently the sepulchres of the last kings of the twelfth
nasty. Some small brick pyramids of the kings of the eleventh dynasty are at the Drah Abu Negru at Thebes. In Nubia, the ancient Ethiopia, are several pyramids, the tombs of the monarchs of Meroë, and of some of the Ethiopian conquerors of Egypt. They are taller in proportion to their base than the Egyptian pyramids, and generally have no spiral staircase, with their original wall paintings and sculptures, which faces the east. The principal groups of these pyramids are at Bege Ranie, or Begromi, 170 N. lat., in one of which gold rings and other objects of later art, resembling that of the Ptolemaic period, were found.

In Assyria, the Birs Nimrod, or Tower of Belus, was a kind of step-shaped pyramid of seven different-colored bricks, dedicated to the planetas by Nebuchadnezzar. See BABER. The Mujilibe, another mound, was of pyramidal shape. The pyramid also entered into the architecture of the tomb of Sannadarius at Tanis, and of the mausoleum of Artemisia at Halicarnassus. A small pyramid, the sepulchre of C. Cestius, imitated from the Egyptian in the days of Augustus, still exists within the wall of Aurelian at Rome. Temples and other monuments of pyramidal shape were found in India, China, Java, the Polynesian Islands, and elsewhere. The Toltec and Aztecs erected temples in Mexico, called Teocalli, or abodes of gods, of pyramidal shape, with steps or terraces by which to ascend and reach an altar, generally of the sun-god. Some of them performed human sacrifices and other rites. These, however, are not true pyramids, the pure and simple form of which is restricted to Egypt. The pyramid entered extensively into the architecture of the Egyptians, and appears on the tops of obelisks and tombs as a kind of roof. Small models of pyramids, with inscribed adorations to the sun, or having royal names, were also placed in the tombs. See Lepsius, Urber den Bau der Pyramiden (1843), p. 143, 217; Wilkinson, Topogra. of Thebes (Lond. 1835); Vigne, Operations carried on at Gizeh in 1837 (ibid. 1842); Perring, Prees, etc. (1839-42); Gliddon, Oita Egyptian (ibid. 1849); Taylor, The Great Pyramid (ibid. 1859, 1864); Smyth, Life and Work at the Great Pyramid (1867); also, Our Inheritance in the Great Pyramid (Lond. 1864, 1866, 1877, a work full of fanciful theories); St. Day, Plates and Notes (Edinb. 1869).

PYRAMID, a sepulchral monument in imitation of a spire of flame. Beleth mentions one built at Tours, and another, called St. Peter's Needle, at Rome.—Walcott. See EFFIGIES.

Pyrrker, Johann Ladislav of Egal-Eris, a Roman Catholic prelate, and a poet of some talent, was born Nov. 2, 1772, at Langk, in Hungary. His father was the manager of an estate. John studied first at the gymnasia of Stuhlweissenburg and the academy of Fürthkirchen, and then decided to enter the service of the State. His application for admission in the chief chancery at Oen having met with a refusal, he accepted a situation as private secretary in the house of a count at Palermo, but never performed these functions; for, while on his journey back to Vienna on the point of passing over to Sicily, he suddenly changed his mind and returned. On his journey home he escaped an ambush of pirates, which circumstance gave origin to the tale that he was taken by pirates, sold at Algiers, and escaped to Genoa. The aspect of the South exercised an animating influence upon Pyrrker's poetical talent. On his return through Venice and Vienna, he made the acquaintance of a former Cistercian monk, and applied for admission to that order. His request was granted at Lillenhof (Lower Austria), Oct. 18, 1792. He studied theology at St. Pölten, received holy orders in 1796, and subsequently exercised several monastical functions. In 1807 he became curate of Tiriž. In 1811 he was recalled to his monastery as prior, and in 1812 he was elected abbot of Lillenhof. In 1818 he was appointed bishop of Zips, where he founded a seminary for country teachers. In 1820 he became patriarch of Venice, and in the ensuing year primate of Dalmatia, chaplain of the Lombardo-Venetian kingdom, etc. In 1827 he was called to the archiepiscopal see of Eia, which post he held until his death, at Vienna, Dec. 2, 1847. Pyrrker was a man of amiable manners, a conscientious and exact writer, with a fatherly heart, a son of the poor, an ornament to science, and enjoyed general esteem and affection. His heart rests in the cathedral at Eia; his body, in conformity with his will, in a spot of the cemetery of Lillenhof chosen by himself. His epitaph, carved on a simple slab of marble, is also of his own composition: Deo l. L. P. Patr. Archiv. Aegipti. recognoscit in pace. Of his works, we consider it appropriate to mention here only Perlen der heiligen Vorzeit (Vienna, 1821; 2d ed. 1826)—Bilder aus dem Leben Jesu und der Apostel (Leips. 1842-43);—Legenden der Heiligen (ibid. 1842). His complete works were published at Stuttgart (1842-43, 3 vols.; new ed. 1848). Severe critics miss in Pyrrker's poems creative freshness and the charm of an original fancy; but they cannot deny the power and beauty of his poetical pictures, the pronounced relief of his characters, and his masterly management of the language and rhythm. See Ignaz Hub, Deutshlands Balladen- und Romanszen- Dichter (Carlsruhe, 1849, 2d ed.), p. 188; Winer, Handb. der theol. Literatur, ii, 351, 718; but especially Braith, Gesch. der kath. Literatur, Deutschlands (Vienna, 1861), p. 540 sqq.

Pyrrhus, John Christopher, a Moravian itinerant and missionary among the Inuits, was born April 25, 1718, at Paama, in Swabia, graduated at the University of Leipzig, and immigrated to America in 1740. After having spent a part of the year 1743 in the Mohawk country, in order to learn its language and customs, he opened a so-called "Indian monasteries" and the Illinois, Pa., in which he prepared young men for missionary service among the aborigines, and, in particular, taught them the Mohawk tongue. The illustrious David Zeisberger (q. v.) was one of his pupils. He continued such instructions at Gnadenhütten, a missionary settlement in Pennsylvania, whether he removed in 1747, taking part at the same time in the work of the mission. Besides translating a number of hymns into the Mohawk, he wrote three valuable treatises on this language, which, however, were never printed. The MSS. are deposited in the library of the American Ethnological Society, Philadelphia. In 1751 he went to England, where he labored in the ministry for nearly twenty years. He died at Herrnbut, Saxony, May 28, 1785. (E. de S.)

Pytho (Πῦθος), a Greek philosopher of much eminence, is especially noted as the founder of the Pyrrhonian or first Sceptic school of Greece. He was the son of Pleistarchus, or Pleistocrates, and a native of Elis, a town of Peloponnesus. He lived about the time of Philip and Alexander of Macedonia, and was originally a poor painter; but, after having learned the elements of science from Dryson, he followed Alexander the Great in his Eastern expedition, and thus became acquainted with the doctrines of the Indian, Egyptian, and Persian magi (Diog. Laer. ix, 11, 2). He was also an ardent admirer of Democrates. During the greater part of his life he dwelt in quiet retirement, abstaining from pronouncing any decided opinion upon anything, and endeavoring to possess the greatest possible wisdom and composure in whatever circumstances he was placed. Notwithstanding this apparently inactive and indolent mode of life, he was highly honored by his countrymen, who not only made him their high-priest, but, for his sake, decreed that all philosophers should be exempt from payment of the chisel tax. Later (Diog. Laer. xi, 11, 2), the Elysian (vit. 24, 4) saw his statue in a portico at Elis, and a monument erected in honor of him at a little distance from the town. The Athenians honored him with the franchise of their city. He died at the advanced age of ninety. Cicero (not so far wrongly either) ranks him
PYRRHONI

PYTHAGORAS

among the Socrates; and, indeed, he was as much opposed to the pretensions of the Sophists as Socrates himself, though from a different point of view. An undisputed peace of mind (ευνοήμων) appeared to Pyrrho the highest object of philosophy; and, thinking that this peace of mind was disturbed by the dogmatical systems of the schools and the disputes of all other philosophical schools, he was led to scepticism; but he was by no means of that class of thorough-going scepticism which is usually associated with his name, and which is synonymous with absolute and unlimited indubitability. He simply considered what was a real scientific knowledge of things to be altogether impossible. His fundamental principle was, that there is nothing true or false, right or wrong, honest or dishonest, just or unjust; that there is no standard in anything, but that all things depend upon law and custom, and that uncertainty and doubt belong to everything. Yet, like the eminent modern German thinker, he appears to have tenaciously maintained the obligations of morality, and he declared virtue to be the only thing worth striving after (Cicero, De Fin. iv. 16). On all occasions, therefore, he answered his opponents, 'What you may say be true, but I cannot decide.' This and other similar expressions drew upon him the ridicule of his adversaries; and most of the absurd anecdotes respecting his conduct in the common occurrences of life, which Diogenes repeats with all the credulity of a gos

PIRRHONI. See PIRRHONI.

PYTHAGORAS. See PIRRHONI.

PYTHAGORAS (Πυθαγόρας) is a Greek name given in the best MSS. as the name of the father of Sopater, Paul's companion (Acts xx. 4). See SOPATER.

PYTHAGORAS, one of the earliest and most celebrated sages of Greece, the alleged originator of the name the procession of philosophers, and the founder of a school which enjoyed great and enduring reputation. Notwithstanding the numerous fables which are interwoven with the traditionary accounts of his career, it is certain that none of the elder philosophers of Greece attained higher eminence in speculation, impressed himself more forcibly on the contemplatory world, or influenced more widely and more permanently the character of subsequent investigation. Engaged equally and simultaneously in abstract inquiry and in scientific research, at once to theorists and practical politicians, and predominant wherever his efforts were directed, he was regarded as the judge of society, the arbiter of the law, the interpreter of the spirit of the age, the exponent of the social, the protector of the cause of liberty, and the watchman of the commonwealth. With his political acumen, his political ascendency was by a potent influence during a considerable part of his life, and was prolonged, in a mitigated and disguised form, through successive generations. He seems to have discovered the peculiar circumstances which had favored its original establishment and the violent catastrophe which crushed the primitive association, and, after his characteristic doctrines had been accepted, with modifications and additions, by other schools, devoted itself with marked earnestness to the public and private ethics which had chiefly attracted the regards of the master. His discoveries, or happy conjectures, in mathematics, in astronomy, in music, etc., fascinated Plato, and were largely incorporated into the all-embracing system of Aristotle. Even in cases in which they were questioned, rejected, or almost forgotten by later antiquity, they have been revived by modern philosophy, and may frequently be recognised as furnishing the germ of future philosophic erudition. The speculations of Pyrrho and his followers are called Pyrrhonism—a name which in subsequent times has been applied to any kind of scepticism, though the Pyrrhonian philosophy in reality is, as we have seen above, only one particular, and an elementary, form of scepticism. Cicero, in several passages, speaks of the philosophy of Pyrrho as long exploded and extinct. Pyrrho himself is said by some ancient authors to have left no works behind him; the tropes or epochs, or fundamental principles, of his philosophy, being justly ascribed to one or other of his followers. But Sextus Empiricus (Ad. Math. i. 290) says that he wrote to Alexander the Great, for which he was richly rewar
d and Athenaeus (x. p. 419) quotes a passage from a work by Pyrrho, the character of which is entirely unknown. The first writer on the scepticism of Pyrrho is said to have been Timon, his friend and disciple, whose life is written by Diogenes Laertius. See English Cyclop. s. v.; Smith, Dict. of Class. Biog. s. v.; Kingsley, Alexandria and Her Schools, p. 59 sq.; Ueberweg, Hist. of Philos. (see Index in vol. ii); Mackintosh, Works, i. 806, 807; Borde-Delelin, Mélanges Philosophiques (Paris, 1841), p. 47 sq.

PYTHAGORAS. See PIRRHONI.

PYTHAGORAS. See PIRRHONI.

PYTHAGORAS. See PIRRHONI.

1. Life and Labor. —The details of the life and opinions of Pythagoras, as transmitted to us by the ancients, are so confused and contradictory, and are so blended with fantastic fables, that it is impracticable to extract from them a plain trustworthy, and consistent account (Bruckner, Crat. Phil. i, 991). The fourth of the Greek age, of a secret society at once religious and political, philosophical and scientific, afforded an apt frame on which to hang the exaggerations of admiring disciples and the credulous fancies of his own and of other generations. We have no authentic remains and no contemporary memorials of the Samian philosopher. The relics attributed to his earlier followers are not acknowledged to be genuine. The special works of Aristotle and of his pupils, Diogenes, Aristocles, and Theophrastus, of their subject of the Pythagoreans, are not conserved. A few scattered notices survive in Herodotus, Heraclitus, Xenophon, Isocrates, Plato, and Aristotle; but our chief sources of information are the later writers Diogenes Laertius, Porphyry, and Lamblichus. Whatever materials may have been accessible to them, they cannot be supposed to have possessed credible authorities for their compilations. The loose and uncritical habits of Diogenes do not invite confidence, whilst the mythical and theaumatical proverbs of the Neo-Platonists do provoke constant suspicion. These miraculous agents are proud and greedy of their own lusts; and would not be scrupulous about adding embellishments or fictions of their own to the tales of wonder which they might find already in circulation. We are singularly unfortunate in regard to this pioneer in philosophy. Antiquity has bequeathed to us so much in regard to him which is absurd as well as incredible;
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it has left little that can be received without hesitation, to form a portrait of the man, or to furnish an adequate scheme of his doctrines.

The birthplace of Pythagoras is placed by Mullah in the first year of the 43rd Olympiad (B.C. 580), on the strength of a legend reported by Eratosthenes and cited by Diogenes Laërtius. The same date is deduced, with some uncertainty, from a statement made by Antiquus and preserved by Clements Alexandrinus. The nativity of Pythagoras is brought down nearly forty years later by accepting the declaration of Aristeus that he left Samos at the age of forty, in the reign of Polycrates. The difference between these estimates is sufficient to destroy any confidence in either, and distrust is increased by the position of Aristeus in Thucy- dy; yet each of these deductions has been espoused by eminent scholars. Bentley and Larcher are on the side of Mullah; Dodwell attaches himself to the declaration of Aristeus; Grote, apparently convinced of the inconclusiveness of all reasoning on the subject, aims at the golden mean, and places the birth of Pythagoras about B.C. 580. The only safe conclusion is that the philosopher began to flourish in the second half of the 6th century before Christ.

The birthplace of Pythagoras, if less doubtful than that of Homer, has been more variously determined. He is usually designated the Samian. This rests, primarily, upon a passage in Herodotus, in which the curious story of Zabolix is related. Grote considers the passage decisive. On referring to the text, it will be found that the character of Lyconius supposed positively, by the philosopher's place of birth. The general belief of antiquity, however, accredited Pythagoras to Samos, and it is only this belief that is attested by Isocrates (I. 256). Aristeus represented him as a Tyrrhenian from Lemnos or Imbros. By some writers he was represented as the son of a Phliasian refugee and settled in Samos. Neanthes regarded him as a Syrian or Tyrian; Theopompos and Aristarchus entertained the opinion of Aristoxenus; Hippobotus and Herme- pus endorsed the common belief.

Contradictions continue to multiply. There is no agreement in regard to the paternity of Pythagoras. The accepted tradition presents him as the son of Men- scrus; Justin, however, names his father Demaratus. Those who assigned a Phliasian origin to his father gave him the name of Tzetze, with which Tzetze and Fa- ber think that Justin blunderingly converted into De- matus. Tzetze, a very late author indeed, calls his mother Pythalis. His father is variously reputed to have been an engraver of gems and a rich merchant; he may have been both or neither. Two brothers, older or younger, Pythagoras and Thamyris, according to other accounts, Eunostes, and Tyyrhenus. These names are very suspicious.

These confusions and perplexities are noticed, not with any desire of exhibiting the numerous opinions which prevailed in relation to the birth of Pythagoras, but to show how uncertain and unauthenticated, even in antiquity, were those points in his history which were least apt to provoke diversity of statement. If there were such differences in such matters, there is little reason to expect trustworthy accounts in regard to more important concerns, where enforced secrecy pro- moted fanciful conjecture, where the love of the mar- vellous might indulge itself without check or fear of detection, and where the character of the school cherished the wildest inventions and encouraged their ac- ceptance. The story is, throughout, involved in fable and in superfluations of fable.

Tradition has been wholly unrestrained in relating the education of Pythagoras. Several teachers have been assigned to him. He is said to have been placed by his uncle Zelus under the charge of Pherecydes in the island of Lemnos. He is reported to have after- wards attached himself to Hermodamas, or Leodamas (both names are given), the grandson of Creophylus, the cyclic poet. He is alleged to have been the disciple of Thales, of the Milesian Anaximander, and of the Cretan Epimenides, who is even a more shadowy per- sonage than the Titan. The true and probable com- bination of names may probably be found in the disposition of later times to regard Pythagoras as in- structed in all the learning of the Greeks. Yet the accumulation of Hellenic knowledge was not considered a sufficientequipment for his career. He is supposed to have set out, while still young, on extensive travels through the Oriental world, just as the medieval sages were believed to have gathered their stores of learning from the Saracen schools in Spain and in the East.

Egypt seems to have been the first foreign country visited by Pythagoras. The testimony of Herodotus (II. 12) to the widespread use of astrology throughout Asia and the Near East makes it probable that he visited Egypt, where he was received at Memphis, and possibly even by the gods. It is possible that this visit was prompted by his desire to learn the secrets of the Egyptian religious system, or by his interest in the Pythagorean school of thought. In any case, his travels were instrumental in spreading the influence of Greek philosophy and astronomy throughout the Mediterranean world.

In the early period of his life, Pythagoras is known to have taught in Samos, where he established a school of philosophy. His influence spread rapidly, and he is said to have been invited to edit the law code of Cyrus, king of Persia. This was a significant move, as it allowed him to establish his ideas in the heart of the Persian empire and to spread his influence throughout the region. His teachings were also disseminated through his students, who traveled extensively and spread his ideas to new audiences. In this way, Pythagoras's influence continued to grow, and his ideas became an integral part of the intellectual landscape of the world.

After a long and uncertain absence, Pythagoras re- turned to Samos, and opened a school, at the request of his countrymen, for the dissemination of the marvels of learning which he had collected in his extensive travels. His pupils were few and listless, and his method of teaching—by signs and symbols—irritated rather than enlightened his acolytes. To add mystery to his instructions and a divine sanction to his wisdom, he vis- ited Delos and other oracular shrines. To these jour- neys may be assigned his appearance at the Olympic Games, and his celebrated invention of the name of "Philosopher," though this is also referred to a conversation with the Tyrant of Platus, and probably did not originate with him.

Having, by these journeys, by frequent intercourse with the divinities, by the pretension of a divine origin and of marvelous gifts, and also excited in the congresses of men, extended and height- ened his reputation, Pythagoras came back to Samos, and reopened his school under brighter auspices than before. He gave public instruction in ethical and po- litical philosophy, and from the famous oracles consulted him in regard to the government of the is- land. But, besides conducting this public academy, he provided a retreat for those who sought and were deem- ed worthy of more recondite education. Outside of the city he procured a cave, to which he retired with his more select disciples. Here he spent much of the night, as well as of the day, in esoteric instruction, and espe- cially in teaching the wonders of mathematical science. He added the arts of the charioteer to the learning of the scholar and the wisdom of the sage.

Samos, however, proved an uncongenial abode. Whether his philosophical vocation was too much interru- perted by the embassies and public duties imposed on him by his countrymen, or the Samians displayed too little aptitude for philosophy; whether he was of- fended by the tyranny of his friend Polycrates, or im- perilled by that of Syloco, the brother and successor of Polycrates, it is vain to inquire. It is sufficient to know, from the universal testimony of antiquity, that Pythagoras abandoned Samos, and migrated to South- ern Italy, where he professed singularly hospitable to philo- sophy. But there is no minute description of the time when this migration took place as in regard to other circumstances in the life of the Samian teach-
PYTHAGORAS

er; it is placed about B.C. 531 by Fynes Clinton, in 529 by Ueberweg, and other dates are given.

Crotona received the emigrant. He was soon surrounded by numerous admires belonging to the wealthier and more influential part of the population. He is said to have united these, to the number of three hundred or more, in a secret organization. Among the earliest consequences of his residence in Crotona is mentioned the complete reformation of the manners and morals of the people, produced by his persuasive address, by the authority of his divine pretensions, by his imposing demeanor, and by his judicious counsels. His disciples were of the rich and noble class, and, by converting them to a more sober and abstemious life, he was necessarily subjected to the attacks of luxury and sensuality; for these are not the vices of poor laborers and "rudd mechanicals." Moreover, as the political control was still in the hands of the aristocracy, though already contested, political interest might complicate with religious enthusiasm and philosophical convictions in facilitating a reform requisite to maintain a doubtful ascendency. That aristocratic rule was confirmed by the action of Pythagoras was the belief of later times; and that Crotona was strengthened by the reformation is shown by its subsequent victory over Sybaris, under Pythagorean leadership. As the Pythagorean rule was internationally political, how far Pythagoras directed his secret society to political aims, cannot be ascertained, and has been diversely determined. It has been well observed that a select body of influential men, interested in the necessities of a specific policy, bound together by the closest ties of opinion, sentiment, and affectionate regard; united, moreover, by secret obligations, would necessarily employ concerted action in public affairs. It should also be observed that the Greek schools, until the close, or nearly the close, of Plato's career, had always a decided political inclination. It may well be supposed that Pythagoras, who had already tested, at Samos, the efficacy of supernatural claims, would avail himself of like arts to establish his predominance in a new land. He had previously presented himself as a son of Phæbus, and he is said to have been worshipped in Italy, after his death, as the offspring of the Hyperborean Apollo; his golden thigh had been shown to Abaris at the Olympic Games as evidence of his divine descent. The claim was consonant with the whole tenor of Greek genealogy, and is illustrated by the striking parallelism of Greece and in other lands. He offered, in confirmation of his doctrine of the transmigration of souls, his recognition, in the temple of Juno at Argos, of the shield of Euphorbus, slain in the Trojan War, whose body he had then in his custody.

"Isee ego (iam meminit) Trojani tempore bellis, Pantholides Euphorbus eram" (Ovid, Met, xv, 160, 161).

To the earlier years of his residence at Crotona may be assigned his death, burial, and resurrection, and his report of the wonders of the nether world; to the same time may be referred (though there is really no chronology in these matters) his familiar intercourse with animals, his handling snakes with impunity, his prediction of earthquakes, his control over tempests, his removal of pestilences, etc. To the closing years of his life must be referred his remarkable apparition to his friends at Metapontum and Tarentum simultaneously, and his public conversation with them. It is scarcely surprising that the Neo-Platonists, by whose biography was composed (or consacrinated), should have presented him at the court and rival of Crotona. It is natural that these miraculous endowments should be regarded as the bold inventions of late pagans; but this solution is not satisfactory, as some of them are evidently of much earlier origin, and all of them appear, in modified forms, in other myths in widely separated regions. The one common to the Pythagoreans which appear to be only late survivals of primitive superstitions and delusions.

The high and various endowments of Pythagoras, real and fictitious, rendered him singularly successful in the institution of his school at Crotona. The most important, the most credulous, or the most zealous of his pupils were constituted as a secret society, were subjected to the most stringent discipline, and to the most absolute obedience to their inspired teacher. According to some traditions, the property of all was surrendered for the common use. This is scarcely probable, as the age of communism had not yet arrived. The statement may simply indicate that the means of the members were freely employed for common objects, and that the wealthier brethren generously ministered to the requirements of the poorer. The society seems to have been divided into two classes: the more advanced, or esoterical, and the neo-phores, or exoterical. Other divisions are also mentioned, as into Pythagorici, Pythagorei, and Pythagoristae, according to their progress in the studies of the sect, and the intimacy of their communion with their common superior.

The candidates for admission were carefully scrutinized, and great attention was paid to physiognomy and the external indications of moral and mental qualities. If accepted, they had to pass through a long period of probation, and if found suitable, they had to maintain silence for five years; that, during this period, they were not allowed to behold the face of the master; and that they were required to undergo other tests of fitness for membership. Silence, or the government of the tongue (μυστος), was prescribed as earnestly as by St. James; but the length and degree of the silence required were not uniform in all cases. The fellows of the guild received instruction in all the knowledge then existing, either directly from the scholar himself, or through the intervention of his more instructed pupils. The systematic studies which had been differently supposed to have been the political theories and the political projects of Pythagoras, and the mystic religious rites, or orges, which rendered the society a theosophic sect; they were probably the latter.

The publication of the characteristic Pythagorean doctrines was absolutely prohibited; and when these were published by Philolaus, in a later age, the procedure was regarded as a grave infraction of Pythagorean proprieties. Daily self-examination, which presupposes habitual meditation, was a constant requirement.

"Τραγούδησε ο Πήδιος της Δαίας Ἐκείνη της προάτες." Such reverence was paid to the declarations of the master that all contradiction, cavil, and doubt were unknown. Every difference of opinion was promptly settled by the democratic dictum, Διαίτητα ὢν, ἀρνήται ἔπειτα." In the midst of the luxury, sensuality, idleness, and extravagance for which Crotona, like other cities of Magna Grecia, was noted, the greatest restraint was imposed on the elect in regard to all those vices which undermine or fetter awaymorality. Modesty and simplicity in dress, decorum in behavior, abstemiousness in food, abstinence from meats, beans, and other articles of food, and moderation in all things, were earnestly inculcated. The institutions of Pythagoras appear to have been, in many respects, an anticipation of the monastic life of the early medieval Benedictines. Healthful recreations for mind and body, music and gymnastics, each of which embraced a large and varied sphere, were zealously prosecuted.

The members of the association were segregated from "the vulgar herd, not merely by their secret organization and higher culture, but also by the pride of learning, of creed, of power, and by the haughty contempt for inferiors which usually attends such pride. The mystic secrecy and the careful separation from the multitude were maintained by signs and emblematic symbols, which enabled Pythagoreans to recognize each other with certainty and without display.

The best and the latest investigators of the perplex-
and the instructor of Simmias and Cebes, he belonged to the Socratic era; and, as Lysis was the teacher of Epaminondas, he may be regarded as the contemporary of Plato. The interval must have been considerable between Pythagoras and Philolaus, as Archytas, the instructor of the latter, was regarded together as the last of the Pythagorean school. Yet the distinctive doctrines of Pythagoras must have been bruited abroad long before the publication of Philolaus; for we find among the fragments of Xenophanes an epigram on the Pythagorean doctrine of metempsychosis, and Xenophanes was born before the death of Pythagoras. But the doctrines of Pythagoras, deducible from earlier and later writers, cannot be regarded as even a fragmentary exposition of a definite system constructed by them. They are only the mutilated expression of his leading principles, as interpreted and expanded by those who claimed to be representatives of his teachings.

The remnants of the early Greek inquirers, whether dialectic or speculative, exhibit their disposition to employ terrestrial aphorisms for the utterance of their views. This is the tendency of all primitive speculation. While recognizing the unmediated and the immediate as the essential, the exponents of the exposition thence resulting, it is well also to remember the communion and employment of the same mode of communication by Francis Bacon in a period of much amplier knowledge and more diffused intelligence.

Gathering from the unities of the Pythagorean philosophy, that remain the distinctive doctrines of Pythagoras, they appear to these: The soul is, in its nature, immortal, and akin to divinity. It consists of two parts: the rational, which is alone immortal; and the sensuous, or irrational, which is ultimately mortal. Plants possess the latter. In this distinction may be found the germ of the Aristotelian dogma of three souls: the intelligent, the animal, and the vegetative. The rational soul is pure: the irrational, impure, because immersed in matter: both are united in man. The former attains modification in his divine nature and endows him with a divine and governing material frame, with which it is united in life, and through which it is diffused. Death is the withdrawal of this complex soul from the corporeal involucrum in which it has been enclosed, and which it has animated. The spirit, thus released, descends in the circumambient air, retaining, in shadowy guise, its former shape, visible as a ghost, or intervening in the affairs of men through dreams and other influences. Souls that have divested themselves in life of the taint of their irrational companion, and of their corporeal environment, enter into the divine Blake, and become the divine, apparently without loss of individual nature.

Soul not liberated from the vices and passions of the lower soul, or from the impurities and temptations of their material vessel, floats for a time in the air, tormented by the Furies and the ministers of vengeance, till they are allowed a new form, and are subjected to a new ordeal, by passing into new creatures, human or bestial.

"animam sic semper caudam
Reae, sed in varias doceo mihi surgere"

(Ovid, Met. xvi, 171, 172).

The air is always full of souls, undergoing the penal consequences of their sins, and awaiting their descent into new bodies.

"peritqque necesse est
Multa dis concreta mollis insensae mirae"

(Virgil, Æn. vi. 737, 738).

This is the noted metempsychosis of Pythagoras, which is usually conceived to have been of Hindu origin, but is often referred to an Egyptian source, this little correspondence with the metempsychosis or the anastaseis of Egyptian mythology. It is much more reasonable to consider it a philosophical adaptation of the primitive beliefs in regard to spiritual existence after death (see Tylor, Primitive Culture).
It is an obvious deduction from the doctrine of metempsychosis that animal life should be scrupulously regarded, and that animals should not be slaughtered for food. The butcher is a homicide, if not a murderer. It is a natural consequence from the doctrine of dissimilar bodied spirits that Pythagoras should have attached great importance to dreams and other spiritual communications. The sanctity of all life, and the consideration of human life as a probation and as a progress to a higher existence, explain his strong condemnation of suicide.

"The Everlasting had fixed
His canon 'gainst self-slaughter.'

(See Thom. Aquin. Summa Theolog. II, ii, qu. xxiv, artv.)

Not only the spirits of men are divine, according to Pythagoras, but those of the sun, moon, and stars, which move at such musical intervals from each other, and in such regulated concord, as to produce the music of the spheres—a doctrine welcome to the poetic imagination of Plato.

"Such harmony is in immortal souls, / Both grossly close the ill in, we cannot hear it."

The ontology of Pythagoras was intimately associated with his transcendental theory of numbers. It can scarcely be determined which suggested the other, or by what series of reciprocal reactions both were produced. The cosmogony attributed to him is much more manifestly an evolution from the numerical fantasy which has always been held to be the most distinctive part of Pythagoreanism.

Mullach justly observes that the exposition of the significance and potency of numbers in the Pythagorean theory would require an ample volume; hence he notices them very briefly. The like course must be adopted here, and a summary, abridged from an abridgment by Baring-Gould, must suffice.

"1. The unit, or Monad, is the beginning and end of all; it is the symbol of existence, identity, equality, conservation, and harmony (comp. Philolal. Fragm. 15).

"2. Two, or the Dyad, is the origin of contraries, the symbol of diversity, division, change, disorder.

"3. Three, or the Triad, is the first of unequala. It represents God and the soul of man.

"4. Four, or the Tetrad, is the most perfect of numbers; the root, or origin, of all things, whence the soul derives its earlier earthly structure of decay.

"5. Five, or the Pentad, is everything supplying the principle of everything, and repelling evil spirits.

"6. Six, or the Hexad, is the number of good fortune.

"7. Seven, or the Heptad, is a sacred number, generating good and evil.

"8. Eight, or the Octad, the first cube, is a perfect number.

"9. Nine, or the Ennead, being the square of three, is sacred.

"10. Ten, or the Decad, the sum of the first four numbers, contains all numerical relations. All science proceeds from it and returns to it (comp. Philolal. Fragm. 10, 13)."

Whether numbers constituted the esse of things, or were only simulacra, or symbols, is still in dispute, and was, perhaps, never clearly determined. The language of Aristotle (Met. I, v) is vague and indistinct. That they were generally employed in a symbolic sense is apparent. The monad was the first principle of all things, or nothing at all, hence all things commenced; it was at once the odd and the even, the limited and the unlimited, God and the universe. The dyad, or first evolution of number, was the even, and represented the interval between limiting extremes. The triad generated the progressive scale of numbers. The tetrads were the unit, or of the dyad with itself, and indicated geometrical body. The pentad was physical body, with its properties and accidents of sense. Numbers, again, represented points; by the procession of points, lines are formed; by the movement of lines, surfaces; by the progress of surfaces, bodies. From these last arise all bodies, and the four elements of earth, air, water, fire, which undergo constant change and reciprocal conversion.

"Nature specus: aulae maner: rerum non naturae / Ex ales: alias separat Natura figurae. / Nec perspicuum est, quid sit, mithraeum, mundi, sed variar, faciendae noae" (Ovid, Met. XV, 590-590).

A fifth element was added by thepentad; this was the upper air, the surrounding ether, the Quintessence. These five cosmic elements were also symbolized by the five mathematical bodies. The cube was the earth; the pyramid, fire; the octahedron, air; the dodecahedron, space, or ether; and the icosahedron, water. All were contained within the enveloping sphere. Such are the bare outlines of the Pythagorean cosmogony.

Much less influential than this intellectual development of Greece was the moral instruction, which long continued to form a large part of Pythagorean speculation. Morals were divided into two departments: disciplinary, or ethical, for the perfection of the individual; and political, for the furtherance of the common welfare. In both parts, great stress was laid upon the obligation and the benefit of friendship, which extended, also, to the metaphysical and to the material constitution of the universe, producing the harmony of the former, and the attractions, combinations, and absorptions of the latter. The efficacy of the Pythagorean friendship is exemplified by the well known story of Damon and Pythias. The Pythagorean Symbols belong mainly to practical morals, and exhibit a decided advance on the contemporaneous sentiments of the Greek world. They are unauthentic. Many belong to a later date, many are simply ceremonial, and others are general and traditional precepts.

Condensed and inadequate as is this summary of the alleged career and teachings of Pythagoras, it reveals the powerful influence exercised by him on the communities with which he was associated, and on the later generations who professed the adoption of his alleged philosophy. Admitting the utmost confusion and uncertainty in the chronology of both his biography and his doctrines, and the fabulous nature of much that was ascribed to him, it yet remains degrading to the reputation he left behind him, and is still "claram et venerabile nomen."

III. Literature.—All the historians of ancient philosophy, and all the extended histories of Greece, necessarily treat of Pythagoras with more or less fondness and with more or less discernment. Brucker, as usual, provides an ample accumulation of materials; Ueberrwerg is brief but perspicacious; while Ritter is very copious and discreet. Grotje's observations are valuable. Of more special sources of information may be enumerated: Mullach, Pythagoras (Camerum Commentarius, Lips. 1834); Aristotle, Metaphysics, lib. i, x, xii, xiii; Diogenes Laertius (ed. Hubner, Lips. 1828-31, 2 vola.); Forrhvittii, Pythogores Vitae; Iamblichii, Pythagora VITA (ed. Kiesling, Lips. 1813); Fabricii Bibliotheca Graecae, i., 750-804; Mason, ed. Smith, Dict. Greek and Roman Biog. and Myth. s. v.; Schiller, Doss. de Discipij Pythagoria; Terpstra, De Solis et Solarium Pythogori, Origine (Utrecht, 1824); Wendt, De Reti; Pauinus Soc. Pythagori (Lips. 1827); Ritter, Geschichte der Pythag. Philosophie (Hamburg, 1826); Krische, De Societate a Pythag. condito Scop. Pythag. (Gottingen, 1800); Bechmann, De Pythagore, Religio (Berlin, 1844); also Questions Pythagories (Brussels, 1832-1836); Langel, Pythagoras, sa Doctrine et son Histor. in the Rerum du Deux Mondes (Paris, 1864); Zeller, Pythagoras und die Pythagorassagen (Leips. 1865); Bialer, Pythagoras der Weise von Samos (Northhausen, 1865); Rambger, Grossreichenden und Pythagorasis (Gotha, 1866); Chaignet, Pythagore (Paris, 1873); Montes, Quelques Miscons sur le PHILOSOPHIE PYTHAGORAIS (Dousi, 1876).

Python occurs in the margin of Acts xxvi. 16, a spirit of Python, where the text of the A. V. reads a
PYTHONISM

spirit of divination. The word Python (Πυθων in Greek mythology) is the name of a serpent or dragon slain by Apollo, then transferred to Apollo himself; in later times used for diviners, soothsayers, held to be inspired of the Pythian Apollo (Plutarch, De Defjet.; Orac. c. q.). The Pythones, like the obéd, “familiar spirits,” among the idolatrous Hebrews (Lev. xix, 31; 1 Sam. xxvii, 3, 7, 8, 9), were called enturiales epecies because the god or spirit was supposed to be in them, and to speak from their bellies without any motion of the lips. See NICROMANCY.

Pythianism (from Pythonica, a prophetess) inspired by the Pythian god in Delphi, Apollo, who killed the serpent Python in the country called Python, near Mount Parmassus) is the ecstatic straining after supernatural enlightenment, in order to be able to foresee the future: it is oracular mania. This degeneracy of the natural instinct of curiosity is well described by an anonymous author in the writing Une Pythonaise Contemporaine (Paris, 1835, 2vo). This book relates the adventures of a young lady of noble extraction, who is inveigled by the arts of a modern Pythoness, and, by her superstitious regard for the insane oracles of her teacher, gets from aberration to aberration, and falls at last into all kinds of turpitudes—into crime, vice, and misery. Pythianism is also called Sibylinism.

Pyx (πυξ, the box-tree; hence a box, properly boxwood) was in the Roman Catholic Church to contain the consecrated eucharistic elements, which are preserved after consecration, whether for the aim of the sick or for the devotion of the faithful.

Q.

Quadragesima (fortieth day) is a name sometimes applied to the Lenten season, or more properly to the first Sunday of Lent (q. v.). It is so called by analogy with the three Sundays which precede Lent, and which are called respectively Septagesima, Sexagesima, and Quinquagesima. The whole period of Quadragesima is in the Roman Catholic Church accounted as tempus clausum.

Quadrangle is an architectural term used to describe a square or court surrounded by buildings. The buildings of monasteries were generally arranged in quadrangles. See also Quadratum.

Quadramas. See FARTHING.

Quadratum (squared), a name which was given to the nave of a church because of its square form. See CHURCH; NAVE; QUADRANOLE.

Quadratus, bishop of Athens, flourished under the government of Antoninus Pius. Quadratus is reputed to have been a disciple of the apostles and a native of Athens. Under emperor Adrian, while Fulvius was bishop of Athens, the Christians were persecuted and the congregation scattered. When Quadratus later succeeded to the episcopate of Athens, he wrote, for the purpose of ending the persecution of his co-religionists, an Apology for the Christian Faith, and presented it to the emperor. This Apology, which had the desired effect, was extant in Eusebius's time, who tells us that it showed the genius of the man and the true doctrine of the apostles; but we have only a small fragment preserved by Eusebius in the fourth book of his history, wherein the author declares that “none could doubt the truth of the miracles of Jesus Christ, because the persons healed and raised from the dead by him had been seen, not only when he wrought his miracles, or while he was upon earth, but even a very great while after his death; so that there were many,” says he, “who were even yet speaking of our time.” The empress and others upon his authority, make of this Quadratus a different person from Quadratus the bishop of Athens; but this assertion is generally rejected. Jerome affirms that the Quadratus of Athens and the one reputed to have lived at Magnesia were the same. Nothing certain can be collected concerning the death of Quadratus; but it is supposed that he was banished from Athens, and then put to a variety of torments, under the reign of Adrian. See Eusebius, Hiat. Eccles. iv, 3; Cave, Hiat. Lit.; Donaldson, Literature of the Early Centuries; Lardner, Works; Hook, Eccles. Biol. viii, 178; Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biol. a. v.

Quadrato, Francesco Savero, a learned Italian Jew, was born in Valletina, Dec. 1, 1655. He was of an infirm and susceptible temper, which involved him in sundry broils and disappointments, in consequence of which he sought and obtained leave to quit the Order of the Jews and assume the garb of a secular priest or abbe. He died at Milan, Nov. 21, 1756. He is noted principally as a secular writer. His historical and descriptive work on his own country, which he dedicated to pope Benedict XIV—Dissertazioni Critico-storiche intorno alla Resin, di qua dalle Alpi oggi detta Valletina (Milan, 1755, 3 vols. 4to)—is the best account extant of that secluded region. But the principal work of Quadrato is his general history of poetry in all ages and countries; Storia e Regione d'ogni Poesia (Bologna and Milan, 1741-52, 7 vols. 4to), a laborious work, containing a vast deal of information not found collected in any other compilation; and, notwithstanding several mistakes and imperfections, is a very useful library book. Its composition occupied the author a considerable part of his life. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biol. Générale, a. v.

Quadratrante is the technical term for the divisions of a vault into four triangular spaces.

Quadrissacramentarianism is a controversial name for some German reformers in Wittenberg and vicinity who maintained that there are four sacraments necessary to salvation, viz., baptism, the Lord's supper, absolution, and holy orders. See Melancthon, Loc. Comm., and other SACRAMENTARIANS.

Quadrivium (quatuor, four, and via, a road), the
name given, in the language of the schools of the West, to the higher course of the mediæval studies, from its consisting of four branches, as the lower course, for an analogous reason, was called Trivium, or "Three Roads." The quadrivium consisted of arithmetic, music, geometry, and astronomy. It would carry us beyond our limit to detail the nature and extent of each of these branches as pursued in the mediæval schools. The reader will find much curious and new matter on all questions of this nature in the volumes of the works of Roger Bacon, lately edited in the series issued under authority of the Master of the Rolls, as also in the introduction prefixed to the volumes.

Quail (יוֹדָע, יַעַר, סֵלָד; Sept. ἑρμομηκία; Vulg. coturnix) occurs in Exod. xv. 13; Numb. xi. 31, 32; Ps. civ. 40, where it is mentioned as food of the Israelites while they were in the desert. According to Schultens (Orig. Heb. i. 201), the Hebrew שֵׁלָד is derived from an Arabic root "to be fat." The round, plump form of the quail is eminently suitable to this etymology; indeed, its fatness is proverbial. Josephus (Ant. iii. 15, 5), too, expressly names the bird referred to here oryx, ὄρυξ. In fact, the Hebrew word שֵׁלָד is unquestionably identical with the Arabic شَلَاد, a "quail." Nevertheless, various opinions have been held as to the nature of the food denoted by the Hebrew שֵׁלָד, which distinction was supposed to the Israelites in the wilderness (see Exod. xvi. 13, on which occasion the people were between Sin and Sinai, and Numb. xi. 31, 32, when at the station named, in consequence of the judgment which befell them, Kibroth-hattaavah). Ludolf, for instance, an author of high repute, has endeavored to show that the שֵׁלָד were locusts (see his Dissertatio de Locustis, cum Distributis, etc. [Franc. ad Moen. 1694]). His opinion has been fully advocated and adopted by Patrick (Comment. on Numb. xi. 31, 32). The Jews of Arabia also, as we learn from Niebuhr (Johannes confer. Arab. p. 172), are convinced that the birds which the Israelites ate in such numbers were only clouds of locusts, and they laugh at those translators who supposed that they found quails where quails were never seen. Rudbeck (Ichthyol. Bibl. Spec. i.) has argued in favor of the שֵׁלָד being suitable to this etymology; some species of the genus Eremocetes. Michaelis at one time held the same opinion, but afterwards properly abandoned it (see Rosenmüller, Not. ad Bocch. Hieroz. ii. 619). A later writer, Ehrenberg (Geograph. Geisch. i. 86), from having taken the number of "flying-fool" (gurmands, the genus Trikala of Oken, Dactyloptera of modern ichthyologists) lying dead on the shore near Elin, believed that this was the food of the Israelites in the wilderness, and named the fish Trikala Israelitarum. Hermann von der Harth supposed that the locust bird (Pistor rosae) was intended by שֵׁלָד; and recently Mr. Forster (Voice of Israel, p. 98) has advanced an opinion that "red geese" of the genus Casarca are to be understood by the Hebrew term. A similar explanation has been suggested by Stanley (S. and P. p. 82) and adopted by Tenmout (Cypr. i. 487, note): this is apparently an old conceit, for Patrick (on Numb. xi. 31) alludes to such an explanation. Some writers, while they hold that the original word denotes "quails," are of opinion that a species of sand-grouse (Pterocles alchata), frequent in the Bible lands, is also included under the term (see Rosenmüller [Not. ad Herod. ii. 949], Faber [in Harms, ii. 442], and Genuesen [Theol. s. v. שֵׁלָד]). It is usual to refer to Hasselquist as the authority for believing that the Kutta (sand-grouse) is denoted: this traveler, however, was rather inclined to believe, with some of the writers named above, that "locusts," and not birds, are to be understood (p. 448); and it is strange that he means by Trikala Israelitarum. Linnaeus supposed he intended by it the common "quail." In one paragraph he states that the Arabians call a bird of a "grayish color and less than our partridge" by the name of Kutta. He adds "An Selaw?" This cannot be the Pterocles alchata. The view taken by Ludolf may be dismissed with a very few words. The expression in Ps. lxxviii. 27, of "feathered fowl" (בּוֹרֶא פַּר), which is used in reference to the שֵׁלָד, clearly denotes some bird, and Ludolf quite fairly supposes that it may include winged insects. Again, there is not a shadow of evidence to support the opinion that שֵׁלָד can ever signify any "locus," this term being used in the Arabic and the cognate languages to denote a "quail." As to any species of "flying-fool," whether belonging to the genus Dactyloptera or to that of Eremocetes, being intended, it will be enough to state that "flying-fool" are quite unable to sustain their flight above a few hundred yards at the most, and never could have been taken in the Red Sea in numbers sufficient to supply the Israelite host. The interpretation of שֵׁלָד by "wild geese" or "wild cranes," or any "wild fowl," is a gratuitous assumption without a particle of evidence in its favor. The Casarca, with which Mr. Forster identifies the שֵׁלָד, is the C. albula, a bird of about the size of a mallard, which can by no means answer the supposed requisite of standing three feet high from the ground. The large red-legged cranes of which Prof. Stanley speaks are evidently white storks (Ciconia albus), and would fulfill the condition as to height; but the flesh is so nauseous that no Israelite could ever have done more than have tasted it. With respect to the Pterocles alchata, neither it, nor indeed any other species of the genus, agrees with the Scriptural account of the שֵׁלָד. The sand-grouse is a bird of strong wing and of unwearied flight, and never could have been captured in any numbers by the Israelite multitude. It is at all times a tenant of the wilderness far from water, and, strictly taken, is perhaps not a clean bird, all the species subsisting, for the most part, on larvae, beetles, and insects. We must question, moreover, whether the people would have eaten to excess—for so much the expression translated "fully satisfied" (Ps. lxxviii. 29) implies—of the flesh of this bird, for, according to the testimony of travellers, from Dr. Russell (History of Aleppo [2d ed.], ii. 194) down to observers of to-day, the flesh of the sand-grouse is hard and tasteless. The ἑρμομηκία, or "quail-moth," of the Sept., should not be passed over without a brief notice. It is not easy to determine what bird is intended by this term as used by Aristotle and Pliny (ortypaemeta). According to the account given of this bird by the Greek and Latin writers on natural history just mentioned, the ortypaemeta precedes the quail in its migrations, and acts as a sort of leader to the flight. Some ornithologists, as Belon and Fleming (Brut. Anim. p. 98) have assigned this term to the "land-mill" (Ceris promeris), the Rois des Cailleux of the French, Ré de Quaglio of the Italians, and the Waclowicz of the Germans, but without making out what he means by Trikala Israelitarum. Probably the Sept. uses the term as a synonym of שֵׁלָד, or to express the good condition in which the birds were, for Hexebychus explains ἑρμομηκία by ὄρνιθ.
QUAIL

See Partridge.

The objections which have been urged by Patrick and others against "quails" being intended are very easily refuted. The expression "as it were two cubits [high] upon the face of the earth" (Numb. xi. 31) is explained by the Sept., by the Vulg., and by Josephus (Ant. iii. 1, 5) to refer to the height at which the quails flew above the ground, in their exhausted condition from their long flight. As to the enormous quantities which the least successful Israelite is said to have taken (viz., "ten homers") in the space of a night and two days, there is every reason for believing that the "homers" here spoken of do not denote strictly the measure of that name, but simply "a heap;" this is the explanation given by Onkelos and the Arabic versions of Sadias and Erpenius in Num. xi. 31. Indeed, the inspired historian has himself shown that a complete covering of the ground with a compact mass is out of the question. For he has informed us that the people "spread them all abroad for themselves round about the camp." This was in order to dry them in the sun for keeping, and it would require to be performed before the decomposition had begun to set in; therefore the ground about the camp was free and clean for the drying process, which could not have been if it had been covered a yard deep with birds, twenty bushels to the square yard. As it was, however, the store they collected in thirty-six hours lasted them for a whole month. The bodies, after having been split and cleansed, may have been simply dried in the sun without any antiseptic; for desiccation having once taken place, which a few hours of sunshine would be sufficient to accomplish, the stock would be preserved in the arid climate of the desert for an indefinite period. Thus the flesh of animals taken in hunting is simply sun-dried in South Africa, and thus the stock-dash of the Norwegians is prepared from the cod, without salt. It is possible that a portion of the preserved meat may have been salted. The Egyptians used a large quantity of salt provisions, particularly fish and fowl; and the processes of splitting and salting geese are well depicted in the paintings of the tombs. The Hebrews would thus be sufficiently familiar with the art; and we know, from the ordinances concerning sacrifices (Lev. ii. 18), that they carried salt with them. But that they had, or could on the spur of the occasion procure, salt enough for the curing of a hundred millions of bushels of quails (allowing twenty millions to have been consumed in the fresh state), is altogether improbable. A comparatively small quantity may have been so preserved, but the bulk was doubtless simply sun-dried. The Egyptians similarly prepared these birds (see Herodotus [ii. 77], and Maillet [Lettres sur l’Egypte, ix. 21; iv. 130]). See Exodus.

Common Quail (Coturnix coturnix). Quails form a subdivision of the Tetraonidae, or grouse family, being distinguished from partridges by their smaller size, finer bill, shorter tail, and the want of a red naked eyebrow and of spurs on the legs. There are several species, whereof the common, now distinguished by the name of Coturnix coturnix, is abundant in all the temperate regions of Europe and Western Asia, migrating to and from Africa in the proper season. Thus it crosses the Mediterranean and Black seas twice a year in vast numbers; but being a light bird of heavy flight, the passage is partially conducted by way of intermediate islands or through Spain, and in the East, in still greater numbers, along the Syrian desert into Arabia, forming, especially at the spring season, an innumerable host. The quail, till that species of the genus known to migrate, has, in fact, a very wide geographical range, being found in China, India, the Cape of Good Hope, and England, and, according to Temminck, in Japan (see Col. Sykes’s paper on The Quails and Hempsols of India [Trans. of Zool. Soc. vol. ii]). Enormous flocks of this bird, after crossing an immense surface of sea, are annually observed at the spring and fall to take a brief repose in the islands of Malta, Sicily, Sardinia, Crete, in the kingdom of Naples, and about Constantinople, where on those occasions there is a general shooting-match which lasts a whole week. This always occurs in the autumn. The birds, starting from the Crimea about seven at night, and with a northerly wind, before dawn accomplish a passage of above sixty leagues in breadth, and alight on the southern shore to feed and repose. In the vernal season the direction of the flight is reversed; but it is more than probable that this is done in a similar condition on the Russian coast. The same phenomena occur at Malta, etc.; and as gregarious birds of passage are known to guide their course by given landmarks, which they distinguish with unerring precision, and which, unless they have been driven out of their usual direction by storms of wind, they invariably arrive at or over before they take a new flight, so also quails congregate in Arabia in numbers proportionate to the surface of Western Asia, whither they are proceeding. The providential nature of their arrival with in and around the camp of the Israelites, in order that they might furnish meat to a murmuring people, appears from the fact of its taking place where it was not to be expected; the localities, we presume, being out of the direction of the ordinary passage; for, had this not been the case, the dwellers in that region, and the Israelites themselves, accustomed to tend their flocks at no great distance from the spot, would have regarded the phenomenon as a well-known periodical occurrence. Aristotle (Anim. viii, 14) mentions the habit; and Pliny (Hist. Nat. x. 25) states that they sometimes alight on vessels in the Mediterranean, and even in the Nile. Beadon found quails alight in autumn on a vessel bound from Rhodes to Alexandria; they were passing from the north to the south, and had wheat in their crates. In the preceding spring, sailing from Zante to the Mores, Buffon relates that M. le Commandant Godlew saw quails constantly passing Malta during certain winds in May, and repassing in September; and that they flew by night. Tournefort (Voyage, i. 329) says that all the islands of the Archipelago in certain seasons of the year are covered with these birds. Col. Sykes states that such quantities were once caught in Capri, near Naples, as to have afforded the bishop no small share of his revenue, and that in consequence he has been called Bishop of Quails. The same writer mentions also (Trans. Zool. Soc. vol. ii. 190) that 100,000 quails have been netted in one season on this little island. M. Temminck says that in spring such prodigious numbers of quails alight on the western shores of the kingdom of Naples, about Nettuno, that one hundred thousand are taken in a day (Vaccari, Rer. aves, v. 404). It is interesting to note the time specified: "it was at even" that they began to arrive; and they, no doubt, continued to come all the night. Many observers have recorded that the quail migrates by night, though this is denied by Col. Montagu.
Quaini, Luigi, an Italian painter, the son of Francesco, was born at Bologna in 1643. After having acquired the rudiments of the art and a knowledge of perspective from his father, he became a disciple first of Giuretto, and afterwards of his relation Carlo Cignani, in whose school he was contemporary with Marc Antonio Franceschini. His improvement was so great that in a few years he was employed, as well as Franceschini, to assist Cignani in the execution of some of his great works. Their method of handling and coloring was so similar that it was difficult to determine what part of any work was executed by either of them. In Cignani's principal works, however, it seems that Quaini painted the landscape, the architecture, and other ornaments, and Franceschini the figures. After Cignani's death the two artists continued to work together. They were employed at Bologna, Modena, Piacenza, Genoa, and Rome, where they painted the cartoons for a cupola in St. Peter's, which has since been executed in mosaic. Quaini also painted many historical subjects from his own compositions, which were executed by himself. In the church of St. Joseph at Bologna there is a picture of the Visitation; in La Carità, the dead Christ Supported by the Virgin; and in the church of St. Nicholas the principal altar-piece is by Quaini—it represents St. Nicholas in the Piazza Vittorio and an Angel, and is favorably spoken of by Lanzi. Quaini died in 1717.

Quaker. See Friends.

Quam despectus, quam despectus, is the beginning of a passion-hymn, written by the doctor seraphicus, St. Bonaventura (q.v.), of which the first stanza runs thus:

"Quam despectus, quam despectus,
Hoc coronarium set effectus,
Ut salvatur seculum;
Beantit et substitit,
Patris et genceus vivat
Ueque ad patibulum."

This beautiful hymn has been translated into English by P. S. Worsley, and from the Lyra Musicana, p. 275, we subjoin the first stanza:

"Oh, what shame and desolation,
Working out the world's salvation,
Deigned the King of Heaven to bear!
See him bowed with sorrow's endless,
Hungry, thirsty, poor, and friendless,
Even to the cross repair."

For the original, see Trench, Sacred Latin Poetry (London, 1864), p. 159 (B. P.).

Quam dilecta tabernaculâ is the beginning of a prose of Adam of St. Victor (d. about 1192) for the dedication of a church. "This hymn," says Mr. Trench, "of which the theme is the dignities and glories of the Church, as prefigured in the Old Testament and fulfilled in the New, is the very extravagance of typical application, and were it only as a study in mediæval typology, would be worthy of insertion; but it has other and higher merits, even though it must be owned rather that the poet's learned stuff masters him, than that he is able effectually to master it. Its title indicates that it was composed for the occasion of a dedication of the services of which time were ever laid out for the carrying of men's thoughts from the temple made with hands to that spiritual temple, on earth or in heaven, whose builder and maker is God." We subjoin the first verse:

"Quam dilecta tabernaculâ
Domini virtutem et aetia
Quam electi architecti,
Plens, optans, et ostens,
Que non movent, immo forest,
Venus, flumin, pluvia!"

There are two English translations of this prose, one by W. B. Flower, in Lyra Mystica, p. 211 sq.; "How loved thy halls and dwelling-place"—and the other by Nasee, in his Medieval Hymns, p. 146 sq., with explanatory notes. A third translation, but only of the last stanza, is given by Mr. Bonar in the Sunday at Home (Jan. 1787), which, for their beauty, we subjoin:

"Quam dilecta tabernaculâ
This our day of grace displays!
On the couch with our beloved
We bring rest, and sing, and praise,
Now the bridal day has come!

Days of which the silver trumpets
Of the ancient feasts first told;"
QUANDT

Day of days, whose promised glory
Israel's holy psalms unfold,
Giving voice to solemn sound.

"Thousand, thousand are the praises
To the Bridgeway which they raise:
With one voice in triumph singing
Through the everlasting days,
Hallelujah, without end."


Quandt, Johann Jacob, a Lutheran theologian, doctor and professor of theology, was born March 27, 1666, at Königberg, in Prussia, where he also died Jan. 17, 1722, as church-counsellor and general superintendent. Of his writings we mention, Judenpredigt (Königberg, 1710) — De Atramento Hebraorum, ex Pundicta Teutonica (ibid. 1715) — De Cultis Circumcistorum et Sepulcrorum Hebraorum (ibid. 1713) — De Controversiis Altioris Ecclesia (ibid. 1713) — Dissertatio de Sogamin (1723) sive Pontificis Maximi Suffraganone (Lipa, 1708), reprinted in Ugolino, Thesaurus Antiquitatum Sacrarum, etc. xii. No. 16; — De Christo Vero Ecclesia Fundamento in Nomine Setti typice adserente Gen. ii, 25 (Königberg, 1721). See Först. Bibl. Judae. iii, 124; Win. Handbuch der theolog. Literatur, i, 637, ii, 718 (Leips. 1838). (B. P.)

Quinian Version. The Quines, a wandering people, for whom this version is made, inhabit that most northerly portion of Lapland which is called Finmark or Norwegian Lapland. This dreary region, having for its northern boundary the Arctic or Frozen Ocean, is the habitat of about 6000 people, called the Quines, who till within the last half century were left without any version of the Scriptures in their vernacular dialect. The Bible Society of Finland sent them copies of the Finnish Testament, but this version was unintelligible to them, and even so the Lappish Testament, although they speak a dialect of Laplandish. In 1822 the British and Foreign Bible Society voted £200 to promote a version in Quinian, and it was not till the year 1829 that arrangements for the immediate translation of the New Testament were made by the Norwegian Society. The execution of the translation was committed to Mr. Stockleth, a missionary of eminent devotedness, who in 1829 was laboring as a pastor among the uncivilized tribes of Laplanders under the seventy-first degree of north latitude, and during ten months of the year, the sun never rises. In 1840 the translation of the New Testament was completed, and an edition was published at Christiania, under the superintendence of the Norwegian Bible Society. See The Bible of Every Land, p. 324. (B. P.)

Quanwon is, in Japanese mythology, an embodiment of the goddess Amida. She is represented with a multitude of hands, each holding a different object, probably things useful to men, whom she has undertaken to make happy. Her temples are splendid, of extraordinary dimensions, and filled with idols: 33,333 are said to be contained in the temple of Mioko; hence its name, San san San Tein, which signifies the temple of the 33,333 images. A large number of children are represented around her in pictures: they are the gods themselves looking up to her with love and veneration.

QuARRANTA. In the mountainous wilderness between Jerusalem and Jericho, in which, according to tradition, our Lord's temptation took place, there is a very high mountain, one of the highest in Judea, called Quarranta (by the Arabs Karanta), in allusion to the forty days' fasting of Jesus, and which is supposed to be the mount alluded to in Matt. iv, 8 (see Thomson, Land and Book, ii, 450; Wilson, Bible Lands, ii, 12); but by some it is identified with the Rock of Kimmern, where the defeated Benjaminites took refuge (Judg. xx, 47). "The mountain rises precipitously, an almost perpendicular wall of rock, twelve or fifteen hundred feet above the plain, crowned with a chapel on its highest point. The eastern front is full of grotts and caverns, where hermits are said once to have dwelt in great numbers. At the present day, some three or four Abydonians are said to come hither annually to pass the time of Lent upon the mountain, living only upon herbs. There is nothing else remarkable about this naked cliff to distinguish it from the other similar ones along the Ghor and the Dead Sea farther south. The tradition which regards the mountain as the place of our Lord's temptation, as well as the name Quarranta, appears not to be older than the age of the Crusades" (Robinson, Bib. Res. ii, 803).

Quare impedit (i. e. why he is hindered) is the title of an English action whereby a person who has purchased an advowson, or right of presentation to an ecclesiastical benefice, sues any one who disturbs or hinders him in the exercise of his legal right.

Quare incumbavit (why he has cumbered or taken possession). During a plea between two persons for the possession of an advowson [see QUARE IMPEDE], if the bishop admits the presence of one of them within six months, the other can have a writ of this form against the bishop.

Quare non admisit (why he has not admitted). When one has recovered an advowson, and the bishop refuses to admit his presence, such a writ may be employed.

Quarrel (Fr. carré, square) is a technical term employed in architecture to describe a diamond-shaped pane of glass, or a square one placed diagonally. It is also the name of a small piercing in the tracery of a window. A wax taper (q. v.) used in churches is also called "quarrel."

Quary (Sisq. pasti, but only in the plur.; Sept. ἄμια, Vulg. ibida). In the account of the exploit of Ehud in Judg. iii, 19, 26, for the "quaries that were by Gilgal" of our version, or, as the Syriac and the Chaldee read, stone-pits or quarries, the primary signification of images of false gods may be intended, as in Deut. vii, 25; Isa. xliii, 8; Jer. viii, 19; ii, 52; Hos. xi, 12, etc., and it is so understood by the Sept. and the Vulg. in the above text. We have no knowledge of any quarries at Gilgal, in the plain of Jericho; and Boothroyd conjectures that idols might have been erected at Gilgal by Eglon, and that the sight of them there inspired Ehud with new ardor to execute his purpose. Rosenmüller, after Rashii, adheres to the above inter-
QUARTERLY FAST

prestation of quarries, and in this Fürst and Keil agree. The last-named interpreter remarks that the Gilgal intended cannot be the one near the Jordan, but that in the hills of Ephraim. See Gilgal. Gesenius regards Pasilim as the name of a place. Casel, in Lange’s Commentary, understands it by boundary-stones, i.e. “termi

ci of the ancient Canaanites. These nations had extensive quarries is evinced by the cyclopean blocks at the foundation of the temple at Baalbek (q.v.).

Quarterly Fast. See Fastings.

Quarterly Meeting. See Meeting, Quarterly.

Quartodecimani, a name in ecclesiastical history for those Christians of Asia Minor who, in the first ages of the Church, annually commemorated the death of Christ at the 14th of Nisan, the time when the Jews celebrated the Passover [see Paschal Controversy], and three days after the resurrection of Jesus, totally ignoring the regard for the day of the week usually taken as the one on which this event is believed to have occurred. This difference it was determined to adjust at the Council of Nice in A.D. 325, when it was decreed that the practice of observing Friday as the day of crucifixion (q.v.), and the following Sunday as the day of ascension (q.v.), should prevail. Those who refused to accept this decision of the council were denounced Quartodecimans, because of the motive of possessing for the fourteenth day of the first Hebrew month as the proper time for observing Easter, quartodecima luna, on the fourteenth day of the moon. They are sometimes called Paschics. The Aeulians, Montanists, Novatians, and other sects were Quartodecimani. See Schaff, CA.Hist., vol. ii; Riddle, Christian Antiquities; Waterland, Works, vol. vi.

Quartus (Greekized Coptic, for the Latin quartus, fourth), a Christian resident at Corinth, and, from his name, apparently a Roman, whose salutations Paul communicated to the Church of Rome in his epistle thereto (Rom. xvi, 23). A.D. cir. 50. There is the usual tradition that he was one of the seventy disciples; and it is also said that he ultimately became bishop of Berytus (Tillemont, i, 384).

Quas laudes tibi nos, Pater, casernus, is beginning of one of the hymns written by the “preceptor Germanicus,” Philip Melancthon (q.v.). It was composed in the year 1527, and is based on Ps. cxiii. It is one of his other poems, of which he composed about 400, in Bretschneider’s Corpus Reformatorum (Hal. Sax. 1842), vol. x. A selection of about fifty-one, together with a German metrical translation, was published by Oberhöf, Melanchthon’s Gedichte, ausg. und übersetzt (Halle, bei Mahlmann, 1602). See Koch, Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenleides, i, 259 (B. 1).

Quaser. The Scandinavian Edda tells us that the divine families of the Asas and Vanas, having warred against each other for many years, felt tired at last of these never-ceasing disputes, and determined to create a being on whom the wisdom they might safely rely, and whom they would take for their empire. The Asas and Vanas spat into a common vessel, and formed Quaser. He was so wise that no one could ask him a question which he was not able to answer. Therefore, having pronounced his sentence in the quarter of the gods, he travelled about the world to impart his wisdom to men. But two gnomes, Flalar and Galar, killed him, mingled his blood with honey, and thus prepared a de

cious meal, which made poets of all those who tasted it. In the gods’ court, some pronounced some anxiety as to what had become of the great sage, the gnomes managed to spread the rumor that Quaser had been choked by his own wisdom (a phrase which has become proverbial in the north), as nobody could relieve him of it by his questions. Shortly afterwards the same dwarfs killed the giant Gilling and his wife by crushing them with a

mili-stone while sleeping. The giant Suttung, Gilling’s son, avenged his father by exposing the murderers on a deserted island, to die there of starvation. In this extremity they offered him, to ransom their lives, their poetical meal. Suttung listened to their proposition, set them free, and had the precious liquid carefully guarded by the giantess, and poured it into the interior of a mountain. Odín, by a stratagem, penetrared into the mountain, gained the favor of the young giantess, and drank the mead to the last drop.

Quasi-modogenitis is a term sometimes used to denote the first Sunday after Easter. It is of comparatively late origin, and is derived from the Latin version of 1 Pet. ii, 2: “Quasi modo geniti infantes, etc.”—“As new-born babes,” etc. See Easter.

Quatember are fasts observed in the Church of Rome, and by other ecclesiastical bodies, among them the Church of England. According to Jewish custom, the four seasons of the year were observed as occasions for fasting. These were the four fast-weeks: one after Ash-Wednesday, Pentecost, the Crucifixion (Sept. 14), and after Lucia (Dec. 15). The fast-days were Wednesday, Friday, and Saturday. Wednesday was the day on which the churches customarily offerings were made, and it was principally called Quatember-day. In the German Protestant Church these fasts were for a long time observed also.

Quater-nion (verpāsō, a body of four). “A quartemion of soldiers” (Acts xii, 4) was a detachment of four men, which was the usual number of a Roman night-watch (Veget. De Re Mūlit., iii, 8; Philo, In Flacc. p. 98; Polyb. vi, 38, 87). See Soldier. Peter, therefore, was guarded by four soldiers, two within the prison, probably attached to his person, and two outside the doors of the dungeon. The watch was usually changed every three hours, it was necessary that the “four quartemions” mentioned in the text should be appointed for the purpose. See Prison. Or one set of sentinels may have been posted at the door of the cell (which was probably thought to be so secure as not to require a guard within), and another at the outer gate (Walch, De Vincula Petri, in his Dissert. ad loc.). See Peter.

Quatre-mère, Étienne Marie, a celebrated French Orientalist, was born at Paris, July 12, 1782. He began his studies at a very early age, and as a youth was noted for his remarkable attainments. In 1807 he was employed in the Imperial Library, and in 1809 was called to the professor’s chair at Rouen. In 1815 he was appointed to the Academy of Inscriptions, and in 1819 instructor of Hebrew, Chaldee, and Syriac at the College of France. He succeeded the venerable Persian of Persia. He was now known as one of the greatest Orientalists in the world, and was especially noted as an Egyptologist, and how well he deserved this distinction appears from his publications in this line of study. In his religious pro

cilities he was Gallican and Jansenist. He used his pen freely against the innovations of the papists and against their assumptions. We have not room here to mention his severe satires against the Ultramontanes, but refer the reader who desires to study them to Renan’s Essays. Quatre-mère died Sept. 16, 1857.

Quaw James E., a minister of the Reformed (Dutch) Church in the United States. He was graduated at Princeton Theological Seminary in 1828, and was engaged during his ministerial life chiefly in missionary work among feeble churches in New York and Michigan. He was the author of two remarkable books—The Cold Water Fountain, an Exposition of the Bible Baptism, or the Immerger Instructed from Various Sources. The latter has passed through a number of editions, and is a real treasury of information, and of learned, acute, and valuable discussion of the mode of baptism. The object is to place before the reader the results of learned investigation, and to prove that im-
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mersion is not the only scriptural mode of baptism; that sprinkling is scriptural, and that infants are proper subjects of that ordinance. The individuality of the author's character, life, and ministry, and his independence of thought and treatment of his subject, may be gathered from his preface statement: 'Many of the manuscripts of ancient writers were lost, and others corrupted, while the author was travelling in primitive apostolic style in different parts of the great American valley. In these, his ministerial journeys, he usually preached six or eight times a week, while he often travelled on foot without purse or scrip; two roads, sometimes with scarcely one, often for days without bread and occasionally without water. But the mighty God of Jacob was always with him. . . . This book was written in a Western log-cabin, in a room which at one and the same time answered for a study, a parlor, a sitting-room, a dining-hall, bedroom, and kitchen. The hours which, for six or eight months the author could spare from the discharge of the duties of a New-Testament bishop, he has, in this rather romantic study, devoted to this work.' Mr. Quay was lost on Lake Erie in the dreadful wreck of the steamship Otsego in 1845. He was a godly, self-denying man, peculiar in appearance and manner, a faithful missionary to the needy, and an able writer. (W. J. R. T.)

*Quedara Wardon* is a Hindu festival in honor of the goddess Paravati (q. v.). It imposes on him who has once celebrated it the obligation of celebrating it every year subsequently; the posthumous corpse is distinguished by a yellow string, which they carry around their arm. They fast the whole day of the feast.

*Queddi* is a Hindu feast in honor of the goddess Mariatali. The performances are the same as those of the goddess Mariyamma. Mariatali is probably identical with the latter.

*Quedlinburg, Sxronon of.* Several ecclesiastical councils were held in this German city in mediæval times. The first took place in 1085. The bishops who sided with pope Gregory VII assembled it immediately after Easter, and it was presided over by the papal legate Otto di Ostia. Among those who attended were archbishops Gebhard of Salzburg and Hartwick of Magdeburg; the bishops Adalber of Würzburg, Altmann of Passau, Bernard of Meersburg, Günther of Zeis, St. Benno of Meissen, Albert of Worms, Burchard of Halberstadt, Herrmann of Metz, Reformhard of Minden, Wigold of Augsburg, Gebhard of Constance, and Hartwig of Hamburg. The council recognized, first, the primacy of the pope, whose decisions it was allowed to no one to alter or to criticize. In conformity with the decrees of former popes, the consecration of the bishops unlawfully established by Henry IV, Wenzel of Mentz, Siegfried of Augsburg, Gebhard of Chur, etc., was declared null, and likewise all other ordinations and consecrations of the same kind. The synod rejected the erroneous assertions of Wenzel of Mentz in regard to excommunication. Excommunications are only valuable when they are pronounced against a king or a church. The following resolutions are of a general kind: The sixth canon recommends to the priests, deacons, and subdeacons perpetual continence; the seventh canon prohibits the lays from touching the altar-pails and holy vessels; according to the eighth canon, the lays shall not take hold of the dimes without having the consent of the legitimate owners; the ninth canon directs that the spring fast of Quatember shall be held in the first week of Lent, the summer fast in the week of Pentecost; the tenth canon decrees no one shall eat eggs or cheese during the forty days of Lent; the eleventh canon declares that the choice made by the legate Otto of Gebhard as bishop of Constance, and everything done by the legate in that city, is approved by the council. At the close of the council the anathema was pronounced, with burning tapers, against the anti-pope Wilbert (pseudo-Clemens III), the heresiarch; against the apostate Hugo of Alba, who had presided at the Council of Worms in 1076; against Johannes (Petrus), archbishop of Porto, and against Petrus, late chancellor of the see; against archbishop Liemar of Bremen, Udo of Hildesheim, Otto of Constance, Burchard of Basle, and others; against the usurping bishops Wenzel, archbishop of Mentz; Siegfried, bishop of Augsburg; Norbert, bishop of Chur, and all their followers. See Labbe, Concil. x; Hardouin, Concil. vii; Hartzmnik, Conc. Germ.; Blutner, Deutsche Conc. vol. iii; Fliche, Histoire eccl. 1855, vol. i, pp. 303, 306. Two other synods were held at Quedlinburg in 1105, for the reformation of manners; a third in 1121, about the situation of the empire and the investitures. See Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lex. s. v.

*Quedua* was, in Hindu mythology, the son of Kasriaka and Siugfrieda. He and his brother Rahu were dreadful giants and wicked demons. They tried to prevent the gods from preparing the beverage of immortality, the amrita. The gods having succeeded in their enterprise, by causing the Mandar Mountain to rotate in the middle of the milk sea, the two giants robbed the vessels containing the liquid. They were defeated and slain. The sun and moon had been witnesses to the robbery: they denounced it to Vishnu, who cut off the heads of the giants at the very moment when they carried the immortalizing liquid to their lips. A drop of the amrita had already made the two heads immortal; they flew towards the sky and became the seven stars in the zodiac; these seven stars are only visible at the time of eclipses. They are fierce enemies of the sun and moon, which they pursue and try to swallow.

*Queen.* The Hebrews had no word properly answering to our term queen in the sense of a female sovereign, either in the title, the dignity, or the power; to which that dignity denotes. Of the three Hebrew terms used as the equivalents of "queen" in the A. V. (יָשָּׁר לְאֶלֹהִים: יָשָּׁר לְאֶלֹהִים), the first (malakáh) alone is applied to a queen regnant; the first and second (shegedh) equally to a queen consort; without, however, implying the dignity which in European nations attaches to that position; and the third (gebiráh) to the queen mother, to whom that dignity is transferred in Oriental courts. The etymological force of the words accords with their application. Malakáh is the feminine of melék, "king;" it is applied in its first sense to the queen of Sheba (1 Kings x, 1), and in its second to the church (Mal. iv, 2, compared with 1 Cor. xii, 28; Heb. x, 22 sq.); Gebiráh is the feminine of gebir, "queen," and is applied to Solomon's bride, to the queen of Sheba, to the church, to the personification of Mary, the mother of Jesus, to the queen of the Chaldean and Persian monarchs (Dan. v, 2, 8; Neh. ii, 6). Gebiráh, on the other hand, is expressive of authority; it means "powerful" or "mistress," being the feminine of נָשָּׁר, gebir, "master," or "lord." The feminine is to be understood by its relation to the masculine name, which is not applied to kings or churches, but to general authority and dominion. It is, in fact, the word which occurs twice with reference to Isaac's blessing of Jacob: "Be lord over thy brethren;" and "I have made him thy lord" (Gen. xxvii, 29, 37). It would therefore be applied to the female who exercised the highest authority in the state. As this is in the line of the legitimate owners, it is not the wife, but the mother, of the master. Strange as such an arrangement at first sight appears, it is one of the inevitable results of polygamy: the number of the wives, their social position previous to marriage, and the precariousness of their hold on the affections of their lord combine to annihilate their influence, which is transferred to the mother, as being the only female who occupies a fixed and dignified position. Hence the application of the term gebiráh to the queen mother, the extent of whose influence is well illustrated by the
narrative of the interview of Solomon and Bathsheba, as given in 1 Kings ii, 19 sq. The term is applied to Maachaiah, Asia's mother, who was deposed from her dignity in consequence of her idolatry (1 Kings xv, 13; 2 Chron. xv, 16); to Jezabel as contrasted with Joram (2 Kings x, 13, "the children of the king and the children of the queen"), and to Bathsheba (Jer. xiii, 18; comp. 2 Kings xxix, 12; Jer. xxix, 2). In 1 Kings xi, 19, the text perhaps requires emendation, the reading followed in the Sept., יתלע"א, "the elder," according better with the context. The limited use which is made even of the restricted term gebirhad is somewhat remarkable. It is only employed twice with reference to the wife of a king: in one of these two cases it is applied to the wife of the king of Egypt, where the condition of the royal consort was not queenly (in 1 Kings x, 19; comp. Wilkinson, loc. cit. Egypt. ii, 59; iii, 64; v, 29); and in the other to Jezabel, the wife of Ahab, who, as the daughter of a powerful king, appears to have enjoyed peculiar privileges in her matrimonial state (2 Kings x, 13). In two other places it is noted that the king's wife or his father is intended (Jer. xiii, 18; xxix, 2); and in the remaining passages it is pointedly referred to the king's mother in such terms as clearly show that the state which she held was one of positive dignity and rank (1 Kings xv, 13; 2 Chron. xv, 16). See W. A. The absence of all inquiry into the subject seems to show that among the Jewish kings the usages bearing on this point were not different from those which are still exhibited in Western Asiatic courts. Where woman never becomes the head of the State, there can be no queen regnant; and where polygamy is allowed or practiced, there can be no queen consort. There will, however, be a chief wife in the harem; and this is no doubt the rank indicated in the Bible by the words which we render "queen." This rank may be variously acquired. The first wife of the king; or the first whom he took after his accession, usually obtained it; and if she is both of high birth and becomes the mother of the first son, her position is tolerably secure; but if she possesses neither of these advantages, she may be superseded in her position as head of the harem by a wife of higher birth and connections subsequently espoused, or by one who becomes the mother of the heir apparent. The king, however, will sometimes act according to his own pleasure in this matter, promote any favorite lady to this dignity, and also remove her from it at his pleasure; but more generally it is convenient to follow the established routine. The daughter of the king of Egypt was doubtless, from her high rank, the chief wife of Solomon; as was Jezabel, for the same reason, the chief wife of Ahab. In like manner the high-born mother of Absalom was probably the chief wife of David, although it is possible that the mother of the eldest son, Amnon, at first enjoyed that distinction, which, we may safely presume, eventually devolved on Bathsheba, after her son Solomon had been recognized as the heir. In one of Mr. Morier's amusing books (Hiiss Robe in Langleys), there is a passage which strikingly illustrates this matter. The court of Persia is there represented as being perplexed how to answer a letter which, in ignorance of Eastern customs, had been addressed by the queen consort of England "to the queen of Persia." The cause of the dilemma thus created was that..." Although the shah's principal wife is called the banou harem, or head of the seraglio, yet her situation in the State bears so little affinity to that of the queen of England as one may say the she-buffalo kept in the enclosure for food and milk has to the echo of the eagle to the Hindu." Our law forbids killing and create banous at pleasure, whereas the queen of England maintains her poet till the hand of fate lays her in the grave" (comp. Chantin, Voyages [ed. Langley], vol. vi, ch. xii; Thornton's Turkey, ii, 204-280). Very different was, and is to this day, in Western Asia, the position of the king's mother, whose state is much the nearest to that of a European queen of any with which the East is acquainted. It is founded on that essential principle of Oriental manners which in all cases considers the mother of the husband as a far superior person to his wife, and as entitled to more respect and reverence than herself. This principle should be clearly understood; for it extends throughout the Bible, and is yet entirely different from our own social arrangements, under which the mother, as soon as she becomes widowed, abandons her place as head of the family to the daughter-in-law. Mr. Urquhart has admirably illustrated and developed this principle in his Spirit of the East (ii, 387 sq.); and his remarks, although primarily illustrative of Turkish manners, are, with some unessential limitations, applicable to the ancient and modern East. In p. 300 there is an anecdote of the late Ibrahîm Pasha, who is represented as staying a whole week in the harem of his mother, waiting to find a favorable opportunity of pressing a request upon her; and when admitted, kissing her feet, refusing to be seated, and standing an hour and a half before her with his arms crossed behind his back, all according to the suit which he—the conqueror of Syria and the victor of Konieh—preferred to an aged woman. The arrangement in the seraglio of the more magnificent Hebrew monarchs was probably similar to that of Turkey, with this difference, that the chief women in the harems of the Jewish sovereigns entered it as wives, and not as slaves. The grand signior, from an indeterminate number of female slaves, selects his favorites, who are distinguished by the title of esnub, which, as it means "lady of the house," seems nearly equivalent to the Hebrew gebirhad. The number of these is said to be limited to seven, and their rank seems to correspond to that of the "wives" of the Hebrew seraglio, whose number was unlimited. The mother of a boy is called ha-sheky, unless the boy die, in which case she descends to her former rank. The esnubus, or wives, of a deceased or deposed sultan are all removed from the imperial harem to a separate palace, with the single exception of the valide sultan, the mother of the reigning sultan, who has her liberty, a palace, and revenues to support a suitable establishment. But the hasekis, or those who have a son living, are treated with marked respect, as in the natural course of events they may become sovereigns. The title of sultan (for the Turkish has no distinction of gender), though from courtesy it may be given to the hasekis, is strictly speaking, appropriate only to the sovereign's mother, and to the sons and daughters of the imperial family (Engl. thor, ii, 276; Urquhart, ii, 433). This statement, especially the last point of it, strikingly illustrates the view we have taken as to the more generous position of the king's mother than of his wife in the Jewish and other Asiatic courts. It must be clearly understood that this position is by no means peculiar to the modern East, or to the Jews among the ancient Orientals. Heeren, indeed, 

Ancient Egyptian Queen.
thinks that the power of the "queen mother" was even more considerable among the ancient Persians than among the modern Turks (Hist. Researches, i, 400); and the narratives of Herodotus and Constantine respecting the tyrannical influence exercised by Pyrrus, Amnias, and others bear ample testimony to this fact. The careful reader of Scripture will easily be able to trace the same ideas respecting the position of the king's mother among the Israelites. In how marked a manner does the mother of Solomon come forward at the end of her husband's and the beginning of her son's reign? She takes an active part in securing her son's succession; it is in the conviction of her commanding influence that Adonijah engages her to promote his suit, alleging "he will not say thee nay," and then, when Bathsheba appears before her son, the monarch rises from his place, advances to meet her, bows himself before her, and seats her on the right hand of his throne (1 Kings i, ii). That the king's mother possessed high dignity is further evidenced by the fact that Assaf found it necessary to remove his mother, Maachah, "from being queen," on account of her abuse of the power which that character conferred (1 Kings xv, 13). Jezebel, as was already stated, very powerful in the lifetime of her husband; but it is only under her son that she is called "the queen (q̄ēneth);" and the whole history of his reign evinces that she was the chief among the women of affairs (2 Kings ix, 22, 30, 37; x, 13). Still more marked was the influence which her daughter Athaliah exercised in Judah during the reign of her son Ahaziah, which was, indeed, such as enabled her at his death to set herself on her own head, and to present the anomaly in Jewish history of a regent queen (2 Kings xii). See Woman.

QUEEN OF HEAVEN. In Jer. vii, 18; xiv, 17, 18, 19, 23, the Heb. מְלֶכֶת הַשָּׁבָּה, melēkeh hash-shabh, is thus rendered in the A.V. In the margin is given "frame or workmanship of heaven," for in twenty of the Hebrew pulpit translations this is the translation, and the same is the case in fourteen MSS. of Jer. xiv, 18, and in thirteen of Jer. xiv, 19. The latter reading is followed by the Sept. and Peschito Syriac in Jer. vii, 18, but in all the other passages the received text is adopted, as by the Vulg. in every instance. Kimchi says "It is wanting, and it is as מְלֶכֶת הַשָּׁבָּה = workmanship of heaven, i.e. the stars; and some interpret 'the queen of heaven,' i.e. the great star which is in the heavens." Rashi is in favor of the latter; and the Targum renders throughout "the star of heaven." Kircher was in favor of some constellation, the Pleiades or Hyades.

It is generally believed that the "queen of heaven" is "queen of the heavens," "siderum regina," "hora, Cram. Sec. 35," and "regina colui," Apul. Met. xi, 657, worshipped as Ashtoreth or Astarte, to whom the Hebrew women offered cakes in the streets of Jerusalem. Hitzig (Der Prophet. Jeremia, p. 64) says the Hebrews gave this title to the Egyptian Neith, whose name in the form Ta-nith, with the Egyptian article, appears with that of Baal Hamman, on four Carthaginian inscriptions. It is little to the purpose to inquire by what other names this goddess was known among the Phoenician colonists; the Hebrews, in the time of Jeremiah, appear not to have given her any special title. The Babylonian Venus, according to Harpocrates (quoted by Selden, De Die Sya. s. c. 127), moreover, is the important part with which the queen of heaven," Mr. Layard identifies Hera, the "second deity mentioned by Diodorus, with Astarte, Mylitta, or Venus," and with the "queen of heaven," frequently mentioned in the sacred volumes. . . . The planet which bore her name was sacred to her, and in the Assyrian sculptures a star is placed upon her head. She was called Belit, because she was represented in the guise of the great divinity, or Baal; the two, there is reason to conjecture, having been originally but one, androgynous. Her worship penetrated from Assyria into Asia Minor, where its Assyrian origin was recognised. In the rock tablets of Pterium she is represented, as in those of Assyria, standing erect on a lion, and crowned with a tower or mural coronet, which, we learn from Lucian, was peculiar to the Shemitic figure of the goddess. This may have been a modification of the high cap of the Assyrian bas-reliefs. A figure of Astarte found in Krituria represents her as winged (Rawlinson, Hierod. ii, 404). To the Semites she was known under the names of Astarte, Ashteroth, Mylitta, and Alitta, according to the various dialects of the nations among which her worship prevailed (Ninerg. ii, 454, 456, 457). It is so difficult to separate the worships of the different nations from one another, that we may have a mistaken idea of the planet Venus in the Assyrian mythology when introduced among the Western nations that the two are frequently confused. Movers believes that Ashtoreth was originally the moon-goddess, while according to Rawlinson (Hierod. i, 921) Ishtar is the Babylonian Venus, on whom the punic practices, which the Hebrews called "inscriptions is "the mistress of heaven and earth" (see Onias, De Scopus i, 1666). See ASHTORETH.

With the cakes (יוֹקֵר, yōqer; Sept. χαυανίας) which were offered in her honor, with incense and libations, Selden compares the πύρπα (A. V. "branch") of Ep. of Jer. 48, which were burned by the women who built and welcomed near the idolatrous temple of the goddess, for the purposes of prostitution. These πύρπα were offered in sacrifice to Hecate while invoking her aid for success in love (Theocr. ii, 83). The Targum gives יוֹקֵר כַּרְדוֹת (kardōt), which elsewhere appears to be the Greek καρδονίς, a sleeved tunic. Rashi says the cakes had the image of the god stamped upon them, and Theodoret that they contained pine-cones and raisins. See CAKE.

QUEEN OF THE SOUTH. See SHEBA.

Queen Anne's Bounty is the name given in England to a fund appropriated to increase the income of the poorer clergy. It was created out of the first-fruits and tithes which before the Reformation were exacted by the pope from the clergy. These were funded by a statute in Queen Anne's time; hence the name. See Chamber's Encyclop. s. v. See ANNATES.

Queensferry Declaration. After the defeat at Bothwell Bridge, the stricter and more violent portion of the Covenanters drew off from the main body, and adhered exclusively to the ministers Cameron and Cargill. An outline of their opinion had been composed, and the document was found in possession of Hall of Haughhead, on his apprehension at Queensferry on June 3, 1690. Hall was mortally wounded as he was defending himself, and Cargill, his companion, escaped. This document, unsigned and unfinished, and named after the place where it was seized, after affirming adherence to the Scriptures and the covenanted work of reformation, goes on, however, to say: "We do declare that we shall set up over ourselves, and over what God shall give us power of, government and governors according to the Word of God; that we shall no more commit the government of ourselves, and the making of laws for us, to any one single person, this kind of government being most liable to inconveniences, and aptest to degenerate into tyranny." This bold avowal of revolution was soon charged against the entire Presbyterian body, and increased persecutions was the result. See COVENANTERS; RUTHVEN'S DECLARATION; SAMOHRAN DECLARATION.
QUEISS, EBERHARD VON, a German prelate of the Reformation period, flourished near the opening of the 16th century. In 1523 he was made bishop of Pomerania, but in the following year he fell constrained to announce his abandonment of the old faith and became Protestant. In 1527 he resigned his worldly power (the episcopates of Germany then holding secular as well as ecclesiastical sway) into the hands of the duke of Pomerania. Having abandoned the life of a prelate, and in every way he identified himself with the Protestant cause. He was overshadowed by the greatness of his predecessor in the see, George von Polenz (q.v.), and little is known of Queiss after 1527. Probably his death only two years later was the reason for this obscure page in his life's history.

Quelen, Hyacinthe Louis de, a French Roman Catholic prelate of note, was born at Paris, Oct. 8, 1778, and was educated at the seminary in St. Sulpice. In 1807 he was ordained to the priesthood, and made shortly after secretary of cardinal Fesch. When this noted dignitary fell out with Napoleon, Quelen accompanied his eminence to the court of the Restorers; he became general vicar of Talleyrand, took an active part in the establishment of the concordat, and was rewarded for his valuable services by the bishopric in Paris by Napoleon in 1819. When Talleyrand was elevated to the patriarchate of Paris, Quelen was made his coadjutor cum sede vacante, and on Oct. 20, 1821, succeeded Talleyrand in the primacy of France. He made many journeys and busied himself greatly with religious controversies (Francis de Sales, Vincent de Paul); but his most advocacy of Ultramontanism and the Jesuits, whose expulsion from France in 1828 he vainly endeavored to prevent, made him very unpopular, and he was subjected to repeated attacks in his palace by the mob of Paris in 1830 and 1831. He lived on, however, until 1859, when sudden death ended the ignominious rôle of his great ecclesiastic. See Beurton, Vie et Travaux Apostoliques de M. de Quelen; D'Azurville, Vie d'Abrégé; Clavel, Histoire des Diocèses de France, etc.

Queensedt, Johann Andreas, a German theologian, was born at Quedlinburg in 1617, studied at Helmstedt under Calixtus and Hornejus, and in Wittenberg under Leyer. Won to the theology of the latter high-school, he became in 1646 its theologian under the Restorers, and in 1649 extraordinary, and in 1660 ordinary professor of theology at Wittenberg, and always distinguished himself as a most ardent Lutheran. He died in 1688. His most celebrated work, Theologia Didactico-polemica, a Systema Theologicum, 1697, is a most elaborate treatise of Lutheran scholasticism, and constitutes one of the best polemics of its distinguishing dogmas. Other works of his of note are, Dec administravit veterum (ibid. 1648, 8avo, and later); — Dialogus de Patris Illustrium Doctrina et Scriptura Virorum (ibid. 1654, 4to) — Disputations Eclectica in Epistolam ad Colossenses (ibid. 1664, 4to); — Ethica Pastorialis (ibid. 1678, 8vo, and later); — Antiquitates Bibliicae et Ecclesiasticae (ibid. 1688, 4to, and later). Personally Queensedt was a mild, unpretentious character, and even his polemics are not often zealous. He appeared on the stage when the period of dissolution had touched Lutheranism, and rejuvenated the old orthodox spirit, and gave it new and attractive form. His power was not only with his pen, but in the university. See Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctr. (2d Index); Buecher, Allgem. Griechen- ler, s. v.; Tholuck, Wittenberger Theologen, p. 214 sq.; Gass, Geschichte der protest. Dogmatik, i. 357 sq. (J. H. W.)

Quental, Bartholomew de, a Portuguese theologian, was born of noble parentage, Aug. 22, 1626, in the Isle of St. Michael, Azores. In 1643 he was sent to Portugal to study theology and other Portuguese high-schools, and after taking holy orders became one of the confessors of the king. He greatly served papal interests, and was distinguished by pope Clement XI with the title of "the venerable." Quental introduced the Congregation of the Oratory, and in other ways strengthened Romanism. He died at Lisbon, Dec. 28, 1708. His principal works are, Methodicis (Liss. 1665, 6 vols. 8vo) — Sermones (ibid. 1692, 4to). See Niezny, Memoires, vol. xlli. Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xlii. 800.

Querat, Mathurin, a French controversialist, was born at Sens, Aug. 1, 1614, studied theology at Paris, where he obtained the doctorate, and was attached to the Sorbonne. In 1643 he was a Jansenist in the sense that in 1666 refused to abandon the Port-Royalists even on the threat of being ousted from his professorship. He was rewarded for his consistency by the archbishop of Sens, who made Querat one of his grand vicars and placed him at the head of his theological seminary. On the death of his protector, Querat was obliged to retire to Troyes, and became prior of St. Quentin. He spent the remainder of his life, like the Port-Royalists, in retirement and penitence. He died Sept. 9, 1686.

Quercus, Synod of. In the year 403 a council was held at a place in the neighborhood of Chalcedon. The report is found in the Liber Episcoporum to the see of Rome, and the council is therefore known as the Concilium ad Quercum. It was presided over by Paul, bishop of Hieracles. Theophilus of Alexandria here succeeded in effecting the deposition of his archenemy St. John Chrysostom, which was decreed by the thirty-six bishops present, among whom were bishops of Bera, Severino of Greece, in Syria, Antiochus of Ptolemais, and Cyprian of Chalcedon. St. Chrysostom was cited, but refused to appear, unless Theophilus, Arcadius, Antiochus, and others of his declared foes withdrew. The emperor Arcadius, yielding to the entreaties of his wife Eudoxia, determined the ruin of Chrysostom, confirmed the judgment of the council, and banished him to Bithynia. However, an earthquake, which occurred on the very day of his departure, terrifed the empress to such a degree that he was instantly brought back, and re-entered Constantinople in triumph. See CHRE- TOSTOM.

Querini, Angelo Maria, an illustrious Italian prelate of the Church of Rome, was born at Venice, of noble parentage, in 1690. He first studied under the Jesuits, and at the age of seventeen entered the Benedictine order. He became some well acquainted with the Greek, Hebrew, and Biblical learning, he was made instrutor of the novices, for whom he wrote a dissertation, De Municipio Historiae Præstantiae. He afterwards travelled four years in France, England, Holland, and Germany, and enjoyed the society of some of the most distinguished men of those countries. In his Commentarii de Rebus ad se Pertinentibus, he gives some account of what he saw and the conversations he had with many learned men. On his return to Italy he published several works on liturgical antiquities: Reservi Ommia Quadrageminalis Graecum; — Distributio ad Pape, Pater- nis Officii; — De Ecclasticiorum Officiorum apud Graecos Antiquitate; — De Hymmis Quinquageminulis Graecorum; — De Aliis Cantus Quadrageminalibus. In 1721 Querini was made archbishop of Corfu, and he wrote on the antiquities and history of that island. In 1728 he was transferred to the see of Brescia, and soon after he was made a cardinal and librarian of the Vatican. It was after his promotion to the see of Brescia that he wrote his literary history of Brescia. He also published the Liber de Papi II (q. v.) and Paul III (q. v.), in the latter of which he gives the history of that pope from the charges of Plutarch and other historians; and he edited a collection of the epistles of cardinal Reginald Pole. His other works consist of di-
assertations upon literary subjects, both sacred and profane, and of numerous epistles, chiefly in Latin. Cardinal Querini was in every respect one of the most distinguished prelates of the Roman Church in the 18th century. Spotless in his morals, modest and simple in his appearance, and dignified by the elevation he had acquired, he cultivated the esteem of men of all countries and opinions. Frederick the Great wrote to him in the most flattering terms. Voltaire dedicated to him his tragedy of Semiramis and other works. Querini labored particularly to improve the town of Brescia, of which he was bishop. He completed the structure of its handsome cathedral, founded a clerical college, a house for female instruction in the Val Canonica, and, lastly, he established the public library of Brescia. He died in 1759.

Quesnel, Paquier, a celebrated French priest of the Oratory, was born of Scottish descent, at Paris, in 1634. He studied at the Sorbonne, and in 1657 entered the Congregation, to which his two brothers belonged also. Those were times that tried men's souls. All France was agitated by the controversy which threatened the exodus of Holland from the domain of Romanism. The heresy of Jansen had found warm advocates in France also, and Quesnel was himself one of the most ardent of these. In 1671 he brought out his Abrégé de la Morale de l'Évangile, which constitutes only the opening of a series of volumes containing his Nouvayes Testament en Français, avec des Réflexions Morales (first complete ed. Paris, 1687, and often since). This work most unequivocally condemned much in the Mass, and advocated a great bodily many holy features of Jansenism. Voltaire says that thirty pages of this book, properly qualified and softened, would have prevented a great deal of the disturbance which Jansenism created in France. In 1675, Quesnel made the breach wider by his publication of the works of Leo I and of St. Hilary of Arles, greatly enriched by marginal notes, in the interest of the doctrine of the Gallican Church. Of course, the book was placed on the Index, and its author proscribed at Rome. The superior of the Oratorians, père Abel de Saint-Marte, was himself an enthusiastic Jansenist, and positively endorsed Quesnel. But when the archbishop of Paris, De Harlay, exiled Saint-Marte, Quesnel found France a very undesirable home, and he determined to go beyond its borders. In 1681 he was not even left to make his choice, for he was in that year driven from Paris. At first he went to Bruges. His persistent refusal to abandon Jansenism made him uncomely there also. In 1684, finally, his order promulgated an anti-Jansenistic formula and demanded the signature of all its members. Quesnel refused to comply, and, feeling insecure, retired to Brussels, where he found the great Arnauld living, also in exile, on account of his Jansenistic proclivities. The two theologians became intimate companions and wrought much together, until the death of Arnauld, in 1694, terminated their relations. One of the most telling labors in defence of Jansenism brought out at Brussels by Quesnel was his Réflexions Morales. Notwithstanding its favorable treatment of Jansenism, the work, by its spirit of devotion and fervor, attracted many readers and warm admirers. Its beauties made even the moderate Ultramontanes forget the Jansenistic proclivities of the pen that wrote it, and all bestowed high encomiums on it. Several bishops were loud in its praises. Even the ultra-Jesuits would read it to catch its holy influences; and Voltaire (Siècle de Louis XIV, vol. ii) asserts that it was freely read at Rome. He tells the story that the abbé Renaudot, one of the most learned men in the French metropolis, who lived during the pontificate of Clement XI, at one time visited this pope, who loved men of letters, and who was himself a man of learning, and found him reading Quesnel's book. "This," said his holiness, "is an excellent performance; we have no one at Rome capable of writing in this manner. I wish I could have the author near me." Yet this very pope in 1708 published a decree against it, and afterwards, in 1713, issued the famous bull Unigenitus, in which were condemned a hundred and one propositions extracted from it. We must not, however, look upon this condemnation of Clement XI as a contradiction to the encomium he had before given; it proceeded entirely from reasons of state. The warmest advocate of the Réflexions was cardinal de Noailles (q. v.). While still bishop of Chalon he had defended Quesnel's works. Later, in the archiepiscopal see of Paris, he was a chief cause of the trial of the Portuguese Royalists, and, of course, of Quesnel. In 1656 he even brought out an edition of the Réflexions at Paris. But the Jesuits were at work, and they finally succeeded in securing the pope's disapproval of the work, and in blackening the character of its author. They accused him of plotting against the authorities and as a dangerous and seditious person. In 1708 Quesnel was arrested by order of king Philip V, at the instigation of the archbishop of Malines, and put in prison. He was rescued, however, by Jansenist friends, and made good his escape to Amsterdam, where he spent the remainder of his days building up Jansenism in Holland and strengthening it in France and Belgium also. He died in 1719. The titles of all his writings fill in Moret's several columns. We have room here to mention only, L'Idée du Sacrifice et du Sacrifice de Jésus-Christ (1er, 1668, 12mo); — Causes religieuses (ibid. 1697, 8vo): — La Paix de Clément IX, ou Démonstration des deux Fausses Capitales avancées dans l'Histoire de cing Propositions contre la Foi des Déciples de Saint-Augustin, etc. (ibid. 1701, 2 vols. 12mo): — Consolation sur le Fausse Cus de Conscience (ibid. 1704, 12mo): — La Discipline de l'Eglise (ibid. 1698, 2 vols. 4to): — Tradition de l'Eglise Romaine sur la Prédication des Saints et sur la Grace Efficace (ibid. 1687, 4 vols. 2o). See Guettée, Hist. de l'Eglise de France, vols. x and xi; Ceillier, Dict. Hist. des Auts. Ecclés.; Jervis, Hist. of the Church of France (see Index); Beaucé, Hist. de l'Eglise de France, ii; Neander, Christian Dogmas; Hagenbach, Hist. of Rationalism, p. 381; Princeton Review, 1856, p. 132; Morey, Dict. Historique, x. v. (J. H. W.)

**Question.** Modern is, in Scotland, "Whether it be the duty of all to whom the Gospel is preached to repent and believe in Christ?" and it is called modern because it is supposed to have been brought into use in the early part of the last century. It originated in Northamptonshire, in the churches in which Mr. Davis of Rothwell preached, though it does not appear that he took an active part in it. The question thus started was pursued by inferior writers of the first half of the 18th century; and it was at the time of Andrew Fuller, who very ably supported the positive side of the question, namely, that faith is the duty of all men, although, through the depravity of human nature, men will not believe till regenerated by the Holy Spirit. On the other side it was contended "that faith was not a duty, but a grace," the exercise of which was not required till it was bestowed. On this subject Mr. Fuller published The Gospel Worthy of All Acceptation; or, The Duty of All Men to Believe in Jesus Christ. Thereupon Fuller was attacked by Mr. Lee. The latter was supported by a large number of the Scotch Presbyterians, and, among the rest, by Mr. Daniel Taylor, an Arminian, on the other, to whom he replied A Defence of his former tract.

**Questmen** are parish officers whose duty it is to assist church-wardens.
of the canon law. He died March 2, 1696. We have from him: *Hieronymi de Medicis Formulam Expiatorio Summæ Thel. D. Thomas Aquinatis (Paris, 1657, fol.):—
Concilii Trident. Cunones (ibid. 1666, 12mo):—Vita Hier. Suevemarole (ibid. 1674, 3 vol. 12mo) — Petri Morini Opuscula et Epistolae (ibid. 1683, 12mo) — Theologiae Ordinis Predicatorum Recensuit (ibid. 1719, 2 vol. fol.),
left incomplete and continued by Echard. See *Scriptores Ordinis Predicatorum,* ii, 746; *Nicene, Memoires, xxiv; Moret, Dict. Hist. s. v.—Hoeter, Novus, Ing. Hist.*

Quetzalcoatl, a Mexican divinity, represented by the green-feathered serpent, is the god of the air. He was, while on earth, a high-priest in the city of Tula, and was so immensely rich that his houses were built with nothing but gold and precious stones. He was, at the same time, a legislator of incredible wisdom; his commands were published from the top of a mountain by a herald whose voice could be heard at a distance of three hundred miles. It was to him that useful inventions were due; he was, besides, a favorite of the gods, who, for his sake, loaded the land with blessings of all kinds. He was the first to come an ear of corn; he was of such a size that it was no light burden for a strong man. But as the country, through him, grew happy to excess, and as the gods were well aware that such unmixed felicity was not to the advantage of the people, they caused him to emigrate. He did so; went to Choluha, where the people were happy and content for their ruler. His reign was as prosperous as could be expected. After his death he was worshipped as god of the air. Almost all peoples, even those hostile to Choluha, recognized his divinity and built temples in his honor.

Quevedo y Villegas, Francisco Gomez de, a Spanish author of note, was born in Madrid, Sept. 26, 1589; was educated at the university at Alcalá, and when only fifteen years of age took his degree in theology. He would probably have risen to great distinction in the Church had not his hot temper involved him in strife and controversy, which ended in a duel and exile. He removed to Italy and there also led a restless and eventful life. He died at Villanueva de los Infantes in 1645. Many of his writings were confiscated by the government, but among those that reached the public we are interested in the treatise on the Providence of God:—God's Politics and Christ's Government, in which he attempts a complete body of political philosophy based upon the example of the Saviour:—On a Holy Life:—The Militante Life of a Christian, etc.

Quintau, in the mythology of the Hindoos, the conceiving force resting (therefore sterile, ineffectual) in Brahma. It is called his wife, and as such is opposed to the prolific goddess, Saraswati. The latter is the feminine element of Brahma in its exterior appearance; Quintai is the same resting in himself.

Quichés, Kichés, or Uiticacens, a semi-civilized nation of Guatemala, occupying, at the time of the conquest, the greater part of what is now called Los Altos, or the highlands, of Guatemala, including the districts of Quiché, Totonicapán, and Quetzaltenango. Their traditions indicate that they sprang from the Toltec stock. Their records, as written out by members of the royal house immediately after the conquest, give a long array of kings, and imply a high antiquity. It seems that the Kachipus and Zutugui were the rulers of the land in the time of the ancient Kachipus, in which the name of the Quichés is preserved in the name of Quiché. These three divisions subsequently becoming hostile, were easily conquered by the Spaniards.

varado encountered his most vigorous resistance in Quiché, where the king, Tecum-Usma, went out to meet him, according to the chroniclers, with 220,000 men. They fought with great bravery; but musketry and cannon, and, above all, the terror inspired by the Spanish horses, brought about the fall of the native arms. The Spaniards rode in the midst of resistance at their command. The battle lasted six days, the Indians fighting desperately as they fell back. The king at last was slain by Alvarado, and the subjugation of the Quichés was completed. The ruins of the city of Quiché, described by Mr. H. C. Martius, attest the grandeur and power of this people, and give a fair support to the early accounts of their numbers. The district which they occupied is the best-populated portion of Guatemala, and is almost purely Indian, the ancient language being still in general use. The people are described by Arthur Morelet as an "active, courageous race, whose heads never grow gray, persevering in their industry, skilful in almost every department of art, good workers in iron and the precious metals, generally well-dressed, neat in person, with a firm step and independent bearing, and altogether constituting a class of citizens who only require to be better educated to rise equal to the best." Their language is regarded as a purer dialect than either the Kachiquel or Zutugui, with which it is compared by Fray Ildofonso Flores, in his *Historia del Estado de Guatemala, y Zutugui* (Mexico, 1596, 4to). Much has recently been done for a better knowledge of this people by Brassier de Bourbourg, especially in his *Grammaire de la Langue Quichèe mise en Parallèle avec les Deux Dialectes Cakchiquel et Tzutujil,* avec un *Vocabulaire, serré d'Introduction au Motif d'Enseignement, Drame Indigene (Paris, 1862);* and *Jugem Yok, le Livre Sacré et les Mythes de l'Antiquité Américaine,* avec les *Lirees Héroïques et Historiques de Quiché (1861).*—The Amer. Cyclop. s. v.

Quichuas, the dominant people in the empire of Peru under the Incas, who made their language the general one of their territory. The Quichuas extended from Lake Titicaca to Quito, and towards the coast to the territory of the Chinchas and Yuncas. The Ayarquas, extending from Lake Titicaca to what is now the southern limit of Bolivia, were first reduced by the Quichuas under the Inca. The Quichuas are gay, cheerful, energetic, and, under the wise sway of the Inca, seem to have risen rapidly in many arts. They were assiduous cultivators of the soil; maize and other grains raised in Titicaca were sent to all parts of the empire as a tribute and the Inca's sustenance, a ready example of the honor of agriculture. They soon and the wool of the llamas, vicuna, and alpaca; they worked mines of gold, silver, and copper; built suspension bridges; erected adobe houses with gables, niches, and arches, and temples of the same material; made delightful saddles, cutting and fitting the blocks with an accuracy and finish that cannot be excelled; made sterile tracts productive by a wise and extended system of *tigueyos* and aqueducts, and also by cultivating till moisture was reached. In astronomy they had not reached as high a degree as the Mexicans; and in literature, though preserving records mainly by quipus, or knotted cords, they cultivated poetry, and had dramas, as well as touching songs, that won the admiration of the Spaniards. The incas claimed to descend from the sun, and introduced the worship of that luminary. They reduced the Chances and Huancas, apparently intrusive eastern tribes, and then attacked the Yuncas, the people of the coast, whose capital was at Chimu, near Trujillo, and who worshiped Pachacamac, creator of the world (of whom there were a famous idol at temple at the place that bears his name), and the Rimas (who had a famous oracle near Lima), and other deities. After a long and bloody war, the incas Capac Yupaqui overthrew Chonqui Manca, king of Chimu, and reduced the Yuncas. They were compelled to accept the sun-worship; but the worship of Pachacamac continued in the Inca. As the name was spread through most of South
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America. There are remnants of the Yuncas still extant in their language as Mocho and Elen., and it is entirely different from the Quichua. The priests of the sun dressed in white, and practiced celibacy and fasts. Near each temple was also a convent of virgins of the sun. The men wore woolen tunics and leggings, the women long skirts and short cloaks, joined by gold, silver, or copper clasps. The incas were distinguished by the llauta, a fillet with a ball desending between the eyes. After the Spanish conquest, the Incas lost much of the arts they had gained, and retrograded generally. A desperate effort was made by the Quichuas in the last century. The original pilot, however, the leader Tupac Amaru, a descendant of the inca, was taken and torn in pieces by horses in the plaza of Cuzco in 1780. There is a series of grammars of the Quichua, beginning with that of Fray Domingo de San Tomas (Valldolid, 1680), and coming down to Markham, Contributions towards a Grammar and Dictionary of Quichua (London, 1864). Olmenayo, a Quichua drama, and several songs of the baracues, or bands, have been published.

Quick, John, an English Presbyterian divine, was born at Plymouth in 1636. Having determined to enter the ministry, he was ordained in 1658. When the Nonconformist turmoil of 1662 was perceived, he joined the conforming party, and was subjected to imprisonment. After his release, he went to London, and became the pastor of a Presbyterian congregation. He also interested himself in the French Protestants, and cared for those of the Huguenots who touched London on their way to a refuge from the intolerance of their own countrymen. He even wrote in their defence Symodicon in Gallia Reformata (London, 1692, 2 vols., fol.), being a history of the Reformed Church in France; and James Sacre Gallice, a biography of fifty Reformed French preachers, interrupted by the death of Quick, which occurred in 1706. He left in manuscript several sermons and treatises, which all evince a superior mind. See Allibone, Dict. Brit. and Amer. Auth. s. v.; Hook, Eccles. Bury, viii, 183.

Quickand, the (Σ Σύριας, Vulg. Syria), more properly, The Syria (Acts xxvi, 17), the broad and deep height on the North African coast between Carthage and Cyrene. In the above passage it is stated that when the ship in which Paul was embarked was driven past the isle of Clauda on the south, the mariners, as would now be said, struck the sails, and sculled under bare poles, lest they "should fall into the quickands." There they deliberated how they should proceed, or shal, dangerous to navigation, drawn, or supposed to be drawn (from σπούρω, "to draw"), together by the currents of the sea. According to others, the name is derived from ααρτιος, an Arabic word for "desert." For two reasons this region was an object of peculiar dread to the ancient navigators of the Mediterranean—partly because of the drifting sands and the heat along the shore itself, but chiefly because of the shallows and the uncertain currents of water in the bay. Josephus, who was himself wrecked in this part of the Mediterranean, makes Agrippa say (War, ii, 16, 4), "et Νανας έποιησα Σύριας. So notorious were these dangers that they became a commonplace with the poets (see Horace, Odes, i, 22, 5; Ovid, Fast. iv, 499; Virgil, Ass. i, 111; Tibull. iii, 4, 91; Lucan, Phars. ix, 431). It is to most of our purpose here, however, to refer to Apollonius Rhodus, who was familiar with all the notions of the Alexandrian sailors. In the fourth book of his Argonauta, 1232-1237, he supplies illustrations of the passage before us more respects than one—in the sudden violence (σαράκιος) of the terrible north wind (δυσα) Boreas Styllen, the boreal, whose very name means "the conqueror of the North") Νανας ομοιος και τοις φηρ ερει, and in the terror which the sailors felt of being driven into the Syria (Προαρ Μαλ Ινδις Σύριας, ου ουτε κνησ δημοσιω η ηνώμη πελα). See CLAUDIA; EUBOELYDIA. There were properly two Syree— the eastern, or larger, now called the Gulf of Sidon, and the western, now the Gulf of Cotes. It is the former to which our attention is directed in this passage of the Acts. The ship was caught by a north-easterly gale on the south coast of Crete, near Mount Ida, and was driven to the island of Clada. This line of drift, continued, would strike the greater Syris, whence the natural apprehension of the sailors. See STRV. The danger was not so imaginary in this case, we apprehend, as Dr. Falconer (Disc. on St. Paul's Voyage, p. 13) conceives; for the apprehension does not appear to have been entertained by the sailors driven past the isle of Clauda, which, as we take it, is mentioned merely as the last point of land which had been seen till the ship was wrecked on the isle of Melita. The position of that island must be regarded as indicating the course in which they were driven; and if that were Malta, it is clear that, had that course not been arrested by the intermediate shipwreck, they would, in all probability, have been driven upon the Syris Minor, which we may therefore conclude to have been the subject of their apprehension. That apprehension only becomes "imaginary" when Melita is set in the Atlantic instead of on the island of Clauda, as Dr. Falconer himself takes it, for the Melita of Scripture. It may, therefore, be added to the arguments in favor of Malta that its identification with Melita gives reality to the fear entertained by the mariners, which, under the other alternative, must be supposed to have been imaginary. See MALTA. The best modern account of this part of the African coast is that which is given by Admiral Smyth (in his Memoir on the Mediterranean, p. 87-91, 186-190), who was himself the first to survey this bay thoroughly, and to divest it of many of its terrors. See SHIPWRECK.

Quicquen vult. These are the initial words of the symbol known as the Athanasian Creed. The real composer of this ancient formula being unknown, its origin is a mere matter of conjecture. A cursory notice of its history in ancient and modern times is all that can be here attempted. It probably had its origin in the Gallican Church. It was first used in that Church. Gallican councils and bishops have always treated it with especial deference. Churches which received the Gallican Psalter received with it this "exposition fidei." The oldest known translation into the vernacular was Gallican, as prescribed by Hincmar of Rheims to his priest. The first writers who cite its words were Avitus of Vienne and Cæsarius of Arles; the oldest commentator upon its text was Venantius Fortunatus. The compiler, or at least the editor, was so abundant or so ancient as in Gaul (Waterland). This "Creed," to use its scholastic title, first appeared in Latin, the Greek copies that exist being independent versions from that language. The age also of the oldest Latin MSS. exceeds that of the Greek exemplars by several centuries. The oldest Latin copy is referred by archbishop Usher to the beginning of the 7th century, and was in the Cottonian collection (De Symb. Prof. ii, 8). The Treves MS., aschapel, is of nearly equal antiquity. Five MSS. of the 8th century are known: the Ambrosian of Milan, the Roman in Long. Standan's Psalter, referable with certainty to A.D. 708, and professing to be "Fides St. Athanasii Alexandrensi;" the Colbertine, copied in Saxon character from the Treves MS. shortly after the middle of the century, and, like the original, imperfect at the beginning. The MS. of equal date, also in Saxon character; and the copy written in letters of gold which was presented by Charlemagne, while only king of France, to Adrian I on his accession to the pontificate, A.D. 772. It is still preserved at Vienna. The Greek copies are of much later date, and Montfaucon found three as recent as more than three hundred years old (Dissert., p. 727).

The earliest form in which this "expositio fidei" is found is the commentary of Venantius Fortunatus in the middle of the 6th century, showing that it was then
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of popular use. The fourth Council of Toledo (A.D. 638) adopted many of its more striking expressions. Home, distrustful of novelties, only admitted it after long delay, as Waterland says, about A.D. 680. Thus it was accepted by the churches of the West "as soon as, or sooner than, the Nicene Creed." That adoption has since borne weighty bearing on the Apollinarian error, which was condemned by pope Damasus, A.D. 375. This heresy had much in common with the Eutychian error of the middle of the 5th century; but the latter had certain distinguishing features of which no mention is made, and for this reason the clauses that contravene both errors may be safely applied to Apollinarian notions: we need not look for its origin therefore so low as the Eutychian period (Harvey, Hist. and Theol. of Creeds, p. 549-557), in which the dying embers of Apollinarianism kindled up again. Neither can its production range later than the Nestorian controversy, which commenced with the first year of the patriarchate of Nestorius (A.D. 428), and led to the Council of Ephesus (A.D. 431); otherwise the crucial term Storius must as certainly have found its way into the official creed of the Church as Lysius was made the "lapis Lydus" of orthodoxy by the Nicene fathers; hence this "expositio fidei" must have been written before the year A.D. 428 (Waterland, Harvey). But how many years did it anticipate the council? There are undeniable points of resemblance between many of the expressions and the terminologies and phraseology used by Augustiniae in his work De Trinitate (A.D. 416; Harvey, p. 562-564); which furnished the copy, the father or the Creed? Waterland affirms the former, but reasons quite as cogent point to the latter conclusion. Augustine says that the phrases used by him in defining the three persons of the Godhead were adopted also by catholic writers his predecessors; and, in fact, the writer of the Creed may have borrowed the corresponding terms, in some few cases, from Tertullian, but abundantly from Ambrose. The Creed, then, so far as its phraseology is concerned, is quite as likely to have been written between A.D. 381, when Ambrose completed his work De Spiritu Sancto, and A.D. 416, when Augustine put forth his work De Trinitate, as after this latter date.

Further, the rudimentary statements of the Creed are more fully developed in the work of Augustine. The Creed simply says, "The Holy Ghost is of the Father and the Son; neither made, nor created, nor begotten, but proceeding." The most unblending Greek theologian would have allowed the statement to pass unchallenged; e.g., Cyril of Alexandria in his days of the Holy Spirit. "For in Him is termed the Spirit of Truth, and Christ is truth: and He proceeds (παντοτιτόν) from Him, in as fact he does from God and the Father." (Ep. Synod.; comp. Harvey, Vindex Cath., i, 188). Thus also Basil says the Spirit proceeds from the Father, not by generation as the Son, but as the Spirit of His mouth; where it is manifestly intended that as the Spirit proceeds from God the Father, so also He proceeds from God the Word. Ambrose makes the matter more plain: "Dei Spiritus et Spiritus Christi et in Patre est et in Filio, qui a Patre Spiritum dicit, et Deum Patrem, a quo procedit Spiritus, et Filium, quia Filii quoque est Spiritus, nuncupasti" (ibid.). The third person was universally acknowledged to be of the Father and of the Son, and his origination was allowed to be by procession; that which was denied was the procession from the Son as well as the Father, instead of from the Father by the Son. But the work De Trinitate originated all the discussion that followed, and the reason why this heresy became so strong in the East and of the West which has never again been healed. Augustine expresses himself with his usual roundness and perspicuity upon a point that was a result of scriptural reasonings collected into one focus of light (De Trin. iv, 29; xv, 47). The concluding chapters of his work are filled with statements of the procession of the Holy Spirit, and a comparison of these with the more shadowy lines of the Creed satisfies the judgment that Augustine was indebted to the Creed, and not the Creed to Augustine. Then again the Creed instances by way of illustration the union of a spiritual and a material substance in the individual, a reasonable soul and flesh is one man, so God and Man is one Christ." The illustration is exactly to the point; but Augustine follows out the idea in a strain of subtle argumentation that runs through six books of his work; finding proofs of analogy between the doctrine of a Trinity in Unity and the unity of the mind existing in different states; and falling into modes of expression that are exactly square with others in the Creed: "Hec igitur tria, memoria intelligens, voluntas, quoniam non sunt tres vitae sed una vita; nec tres sentientias una mens; consequenter unique unius substantiae sunt una substantia" (De Trin. x, 18). Both the Creed and Augustine argue from man's bodily and mental constitution, but the convincing simplicity of the former and the strained scholastic reasoning of the latter combine to draw a marked contrast between the two.

The doctrine of a Trinity in Unity and the unity of the mind existing in different states; and falling into modes of expression that are exactly square with others in the Creed: "Hec igitur tria, memoria intelligens, voluntas, quoniam non sunt tres vitae sed una vita; nec tres sentientias una mens; consequenter unique unius substantiae sunt una substantia" (De Trin. x, 18). Both the Creed and Augustine argue from man's bodily and mental constitution, but the convincing simplicity of the former and the strained scholastic reasoning of the latter combine to draw a marked contrast between the two.

The doctrine of a Trinity in Unity and the unity of the mind existing in different states; and falling into modes of expression that are exactly square with others in the Creed: "Hec igitur tria, memoria intelligens, voluntas, quoniam non sunt tres vitae sed una vita; nec tres sentientias una mens; consequenter unique unius substantiae sunt una substantia" (De Trin. x, 18). Both the Creed and Augustine argue from man's bodily and mental constitution, but the convincing simplicity of the former and the strained scholastic reasoning of the latter combine to draw a marked contrast between the two.

It should be borne in mind once more that the Apollinarian heresy is the latest form of error of which the Creed takes cognizance. But that heresy never took root in the churches of the West; therefore no newly appointed Gallican bishop would have gone out of his way to condemn it, as Waterland supposes Hilary to have done on his appointment to the see of Arles. "It is hardly in keeping with the mild 'credos' of a newly installed prelate. But in the year A.D. 401 we can point to a most popular and zealous bishop of Western Gaul, apostolic in his labors among the bereaved population of the Nervii and Morini (Pass. de Calais) as well as in his self-inflicted poverty (Paulin. NoL. Ep. 18 ad Victricius). who was accused publicly of teaching heresy, and that evidently of Apollinarius: who also gave account of his faith in a confession that, without any great degree of improbability, may be identified with this exposition of the catholic faith. This eminent son of the Church was Victricius, confessor and bishop of Rouen, who at the close of the 4th century was considerably advanced in years" (Harvey, Hist. and Theol. of Creeds, p. 157). The controversy is sketched out by Paulinus of Nola (Lips. Ep. 17 et 24) and they harmonize remarkably with those of the Creed (ibid. p. 6, 8). There are historical reasons for believing that this confession was presented at Rome between A.D. 800 and 402 when Anastasius was pope (Harvey, Hist. and Theol. of Creeds). But the name of Victricius was in time expunged, and it then stood as the production of Anastasius. Hence, since one commentator terms it Fides Anastasii, and a codex ascribes it to Ananas, it is highly probable that this was the name and date of an earlier draft of the earlier draft than that of Anastasius, into which it easily passed. The name of Anastasius is first placed at the head in a copy of the 8th century, which leaves a wide margin of three hundred years for the change of title. The earliest MS. (Comtan. now lost) assigned the name to the Creed, but simply styled it Fides Catholicae, as also also Venantius Fortunatus in his commentary. The reasons for assigning it to Victricius have been thus summed up:

(1) Its careful, well-considered terms are more consistent with the mature age of Victricius, who had shown that he attained a high place as the churchmen of the East and of the West has never again been healed. Augustus expresses himself with his usual roundness and perspicuity upon a point that was a result of scriptural reasonings collected into one focus of light (De Trin. iv, 29; xv, 47). The concluding chapters of his work are filled with statements of the procession of the Holy Spirit, and a comparison of these with the more shadowy lines of the Creed satisfies the judgment that Augustine was indebted to the Creed, and not the Creed to Augustine. Then again the Creed instances by way of illustration the union of a spiritual and a material substance in the individual, a reasonable soul and flesh is one man, so God and Man is one Christ." The illustration is exactly to the point; but Augustine follows out the idea in a strain of subtle argumentation that runs through six books of his work; finding proofs of analogy between the doctrine of a Trinity in Unity and the unity of the mind existing in different states; and falling into modes of expression that are exactly square with others in the Creed: "Hec igitur tria, memoria intelligens, voluntas, quoniam non sunt tres vitae sed una vita; nec tres sentientias una mens; consequenter unique unius substantiae sunt una substantia" (De Trin. x, 18). Both the Creed and Augustine argue from man's bodily and mental constitution, but the convincing simplicity of the former and the strained scholastic reasoning of the latter combine to draw a marked contrast between the two.

(2) Its style, though not that of an apology in vindica-
tion of the writer's faith, agrees well with the supposition that he was accused of the errors that he anathematizes. (3.) He must not be entirely paralleled with the subjects upon which Victorinus, if we may judge from the expressions of Paulinus, was called to defend himself. With respect to both of these particulars, the supposition that Hilary should have been the author is singular to the judgment to the contrary. His exposition of faith upon entering upon his episcopal office would scarcely have been pointed with anathemas which the history of his time persuades us were not required. Indeed, the Creed can only be assigned to Hilary upon the supposition that Apollinarism infested the Gallican church, and that his appointment to the see of Arles—a supposition wholly contrary to fact. But since we know that Pelagian tenets had then taken a firm root in the south of France, we know also the direction that any inaugural exposition by Hilary must have taken. (4.) Again, if Hilary had been the author of the Creed, his name must have commanded respect, and he would scarcely have met with such hard words from pope Leo I as may be found in his epistle to the French bishops, A.D. 445: e.g. 'Non est hoc ... salubritatem impendere diligentia pastoralis, sed vim infestationis.' (5.) His excommunication from Dioscorus, and the ideas behind his anathemas, are in the sound doctrine of St. Ambrose, 'Iam nos vestra sanctitatis animus Hilarus pro suo more mentiri' (Leo, Ep. 10). On the other hand, the highly probable communication between Victorinus and Anastasius, and the preparation of a confession of faith by the Gallican church, and the fact that it has its mythical, miraculous questions, i.e. its theological department; and (8) and, finally, the advice of the scholar in this kind of religion to submit himself implicitly to a spiritual guide—his yaro. Of these articles, this, fourth, fifth, and sixth give quietism, properly so called; and it is a question whether the manifestation of this doctrine in Christianity adds anything essential to the definition of article five, so as to save Christian quietism from the pantheistic conclusions of articles three and four.

In the Christian Church this mystical theology is defined by its professors to be that doctrine which reveals to man the hidden essence of God's Being. The way to this wisdom is in three stages, the purgative, the illuminative, the unitive; the first purging the will from low affections, the second communicating to the intellect the knowledge of God, and the third leading the soul to pure union and deification. The table at head of page 846, and taken from Arnold's 'Historia Theologiae Mysticae,' gives this theology in outline. Some parts of it need an initiated interpreter.

It is evident that this scheme, if at all carried out to its legitimate consequences, leads directly to the error of those enthusiasts who supposed the kingdom of Christ to be an earlier and inferior dispensation, the reign of the Spirit the later and perfect dispensation. Men are taught by it, not the superiority of knowledge in St. Paul's sense, but that they may become more perfect by disregarding the knowledge of an earlier state, by becoming again children in understanding. To that earlier state are referred the power of Christ's resurrection and the sacrament of the holy eucharist. What the higher sacrament of unction does not appear. In working out this scheme, Molinos taught as follows: 1. The perfection of men, even in this life, consists in an uninterrupted act of contemplation and love, which contains virtually all righteousness; that this act once effected lasts always, even during sleep, provided that it be not expressly recalled; whence it follows that the perfect have no need to repeat it. 2. In this state of perfection the soul ought not to reflect either on God or on itself, but its powers ought to be annihilated, in order to abandon itself absolutely to God. 3. Perfect prayer is this state of quietude, in which there should be absolutely no thought or wish or hope. Vocal prayer, confession, all external things, are but hindrances. 4. In prayer the first act of
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VIA AD SAPIENTIAM EST VIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Universalis</th>
<th>Pragmatica</th>
<th>Illuminativa</th>
<th>Uniflora</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quo intendit Summum</td>
<td>Bohum</td>
<td>Verum</td>
<td>Unum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>honilis</td>
<td>Naturalis</td>
<td>Spiritualis</td>
<td>Deliciae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quod</td>
<td>Corpus</td>
<td>Animam</td>
<td>Animi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cura</td>
<td>Sanctitas</td>
<td>Scientia</td>
<td>Suntisitas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>est</td>
<td>Sensus</td>
<td>Rationis</td>
<td>Mentis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perfectio</td>
<td>Bolus</td>
<td>Angelica</td>
<td>Potestas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ex Dei</td>
<td>Humanum</td>
<td>Vigilis</td>
<td>Divinam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recensiam naturam</td>
<td>Juculato</td>
<td>Juicis</td>
<td>Oratione</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Que 1° preparatur</td>
<td>subie</td>
<td>Prognoscit</td>
<td>pie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vivendo</td>
<td>organum</td>
<td>Contemplatione</td>
<td>Dieum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Et 2° comparatur</td>
<td>Mortificatio</td>
<td>Veritas</td>
<td>Adhisione</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>membrorum</td>
<td>Carina</td>
<td>Veritas</td>
<td>Virtutis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>per Christum</td>
<td>Passio</td>
<td>Benedictum</td>
<td>Ascensio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qui solus est</td>
<td>Via</td>
<td>Reconsecrat</td>
<td>Sanctum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In lumine</td>
<td>Nature</td>
<td>Vita</td>
<td>Glorie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuja gratia</td>
<td>Aulimur</td>
<td>Sanguis</td>
<td>sanctuarium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In sacramento</td>
<td>Baptismatis</td>
<td>Sanguis</td>
<td>Uctionis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>per Sede in</td>
<td>Paternum</td>
<td>Spiritus</td>
<td>Spiritum S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>constitutissimis</td>
<td>Agna</td>
<td>Spiritus</td>
<td>Spiritus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atque sè conservatur</td>
<td>Pide</td>
<td>Caritatis</td>
<td>Charitate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In seclis</td>
<td>Penitentia</td>
<td>Charitatis</td>
<td>Concordiae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>declaratorum</td>
<td>Incipientium</td>
<td>proficiens</td>
<td>perfectorium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>state</td>
<td>peirae</td>
<td>juvenillis</td>
<td>virilit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uti classis</td>
<td>exterior</td>
<td>media</td>
<td>superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>et gradus</td>
<td>Imaginatio</td>
<td>cognitionis</td>
<td>amoris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>per secum</td>
<td>Angelico</td>
<td>medicis</td>
<td>amoris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ministerio</td>
<td>separatio</td>
<td>seraphico</td>
<td>solidum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3° reparaturque</td>
<td>cor</td>
<td>conjunctio</td>
<td>conum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in altera</td>
<td>impuro</td>
<td>igneo</td>
<td>igneo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cam temperamentum</td>
<td>aqua</td>
<td>in cerum</td>
<td>in cerum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>et sic ascensus</td>
<td>terra</td>
<td>Spiritus</td>
<td>Spiritus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>et ingredium in vitam</td>
<td>Corporis</td>
<td>spiritu</td>
<td>aeternam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

faith, the first intuition of resignation, prevails to constitute the whole an act of worship. "One may persevere in prayer though the imagination be carried about with various and involuntary thoughts. These are not to be actively resisted, but merely neglected. 5. The violent and painful suggestions of impatience, pride, glutony, luxury, rage, blasphemy, cursing, despair, and an infinite number of others, are God's means for purifying those whom he calls. The soul ought not to be dissected on account of them.

An example of pure quietism may be quoted in illustration of these principles: "Gregory Lopez having for the space of three years continued that ejaculation, Thy will be done in time and in eternity, repeating it as often as he breathed, God Almighty discovered to him that infinite treasure of the pure and continued act of faith and love, with silence and resignation; so that he came to say that, during the thirty-six years he lived afterwards, he always continued in his inward man that pure act of love, without ever uttering the least petition, ejaculation, or anything that was possible or sprung from nature" (Spiritual Guide [transl. 1699], p. 75).

Molinos is charged by Romanists with teaching antinomianism. The charge does not appear to be well founded, but that his teaching regarding evil thoughts is most dangerous there can be no doubt. At the same time, the truth of which it is a perversion is very discernible.

Molinos proceeds to his doctrine of self-annihilation through what he calls infused contemplation. The means whereby the soul ascends to infused contemplation are two—the pleasure and the desire of it. The steps of it are three—satiety when the soul is filled with God; intoxication, an excess of mind and elevation of soul arising from satiety of divine love; security, when the soul is so drenched with love that it loses all fear, and would willingly go to hell if it knew such to be the will of God. Six other steps there are—fire, union, elevation, illumination, pleasure, and repose. But there are many other steps besides, as ecstasies, raptures, melting, delequiums, glee, kises, embraces, exaltation, union, transformation, espousals and matrimonies; "which," Molinos says, "I omit to explain, to give no occasion to speculation." Madame Guyon, however, does explain: "The essential union is the spiritual marriage, where there is a communication of substance, when God takes the soul for his spouse, unites it to himself, not personally, nor by any act or means, but immediately reducing all to a unity. The soul ought not, nor can, any more make any distinction between God and itself. God is the soul, and the soul is God" (Expos. du Cont. des Cont.).

Molinos passes through annihilation to the same result of deification. The soul that would be perfect passes, with the divine aid, into the state of nothingness: from the spiritual death the true and perfect annihilation derives its original; insomuch that when the soul is submitted to its will and understanding, it is properly said to have arrived at the perfect and happy state of annihilation, which is the last disposition for transformation and union. The soul no longer lives in itself, because God lives in it. The soul being in that manner the nothing, the Lord will be the whole in the soul.

Quietism aims at an entire abstraction from all externals, and seeks to put the spirit of man into direct and immediate union with the very nature of the Godhead. From this there inevitably results, instead of the Christian faith of the communication of the divine life, a doctrine of a pantheistic identification of the creature with the Creator, and an ultimate absorption of the soul into the substance of God. The Quietists call it indeed a vulgar error to say that in the prayer of rest the faculties operate not, and it is idle and inaccurate; but they assert at the same time that the soul operates neither by means of the memory nor by the intellect, nor by ratiocination, but by simple apprehension (Molinos, Spiritual Guide, I, 12). What an active apprehension is when none of the powers of the mind are exercised is not explained. The Quietists think to attain that repose of the mind which is the result of exertion, and that quiet rest in God which follows from the earnestness of meditative prayer, by altogether surceasing from the exertion and superseding the earnestness. Consequently, the mind being reduced to inactivity, the body has sway; and the state of perfect quietude, supposed to be a waiting for the divine access, becomes that state (which may be produced by "mesmeric" process) in which the body suffers or simulates catalepsy, and the mind asp res a divine trance. Quietism becomes mental sleep.

There is a remarkable similarity between the mysticism of the Quietists and of the Plotinian school of philosophy. The aim of Plotinus was to enter into the immediate vision of Deity. "Unconditioned Being, or the Godhead, cannot be grasped by thinking or science,
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The real founder of quietism in the Church is thus reputed to be Molinos (q.v.), a Spanish priest, whose opinions, published at Rome against the things transient and variable, to raise ourselves to this simple essence, to take refuge in the absolute, this must be regarded as the highest aim of all our spiritual efforts" (Prof. C. A. Brandis, in Smith's *Biol. Dict. art. Plotinus*, p. 427). Plotinian contemplation may find a place also in the works of John Smith and Henry More, but it may also pass as readily into the reveries of Molinos. It is to be considered whether the tendency of such contemplation is not to reduce the Father manifested in the Son to the cold abstraction of the Plotinian Deity.

In the Church there have been two kinds of mysticism, one a churchly mysticism, which allies itself with the ordinances and rites of the Gospel; the other subjective or inward, which gradually rejects more and more all that is external, and even at last passes beyond the contemplation of the humanity of our Lord, and the sacraments which make men partakers of his body, to seek a resting-place beyond all that is created in the Logos as he existed prior to the incarnation and creation (Dorner, *On the Person of Christ*, II, i, 288). This uncritical acceptance of the doctrine that the Logos without its central figure, this removal of God Incarnate from the mystery of godliness, as the result of a perverted or depraved mysticism, is exhibited more than once in the history of the Church. The words quoted from Dorner on the subject were used regarding Maximus Confessor. We may resume and continue them. "True love and knowledge unite to seek a resting-point beyond all that is created, beyond even the humanity of Christ: their final goal is the pure and bare (γονιας) Logos, as he existed prior to the incarnation and creation. It is clear that in the last instance Christ is hereby reduced to the position of a mere theophany, and that the historical significance of his person is destroyed. The same thing appears also from his application to the professes highest stage of the words. Even though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now know we him no longer. So far was Maximus Confessor from attributing eternal significance to the God-man that he regarded the humanity of Christ rather in the light of a hindrance to the full knowledge and love of the pure God—a hindrance which must be surmounted by those who aim to reach the highest stage" (Dorner, l. c., and see note 48 there referred to). So in Italy, Mersiliius Ficinus and John Pico of Mirandole turned Christianity in many respects into a Neo-Platonic theosophy.

In the article Mysticism (q.v.) this subject is more opened, and the schools of mysticism of the Greek and Latin churches classified. In the article Hesychasts (q.v.) is related the quietism of the Greek Church. The directions of the abbot Simon for producing the visions of quietism (supposed to have been written in the 11th century) are still in existence: "Alone in thy cell, shut thy door, and seat thyself in a corner; raise thy mind above all things vain and transitory; recline thy body and chin on thy breast; turn thy eyes and thy thoughts towards the middle of thy belly, the region of the navel; and search the place of the heart, the seat of the soul. At first all will be dark and comfortless; but if you persevere day and night, you will feel an ineffable joy; and no sooner has the soul discovered the place of the heart than it is involved in a mystic and ethereal light." At present it is only necessary to point out that these Hesychasts had the same rule as the Hindū Quietists, viz., that to produce the state of abstraction the eyes must be steadily fixed on some particular object. The Hindū presented the tip of the nose, the Hesychast the navel.

In German medieval mysticism a quietistic element is met with. It; however, borders on pantheism, very much as the pantheism of Dionysius the Areopagite borders on quietism.

QUINQUAGESIMA

The name by which the Sunday before Lent (q.v.) is designated. The first Sunday in Lent being called Quadragesima, this being further from Easter was called Quinquagesima (or
fiftieth Sunday), reckoning the distance from Easter in round numbers. It was sometimes called Quinquagesimae or Quinquagesima, in order to distinguish it from the other Quinquagesima, or interval between Easter and Whit-sunday, called Quinquagesimus posthelas, or latitudine. It is also called Shrove-Sunday (q.v.). In ordinary years Quinquagesima is the forty-ninth day before Easter; in leap-years it is the fiftieth.

Quinquaria, an ancient Roman festival celebrated in honor of Minerva on March 19. Some writers allege that its observance was limited to one day; others, however, say that it lasted for five days. This last is the opinion of Oviedo, who considers it to have been a festival held in commemoration of the birthday of Minerva; and hence it was customary for women on that day to consult diviners and fortune-tellers.

Quinquennalia, games celebrated among the ancient Romans in imitation of the Greek festivals at the end of every four years. On these occasions keen competitions were carried on in music, gymnastics, and horse-racing. Quinquennalia were observed in honor of Julius Caesar, and also of Augustus; but they seem to have been celebrated with peculiar splendor under Nero, from whose time they were discontinued, until at length they were revived by Domitian in honor of Jupiter Capitolinus.

Quintillani were a sect of Montanists who appeared in Phrygia about 189. They were so called from their prophetess, Quintilla of Carthage. One of the peculiar tenets of this strange sect was that women are by the Scriptures entitled to perform episcopal and other ministerial duties. They attributed extraordinary gifts to Eve, in consequence of her having eaten of the forbidden fruit. They also quoted the history of Miriam, and the four daughters of Philip, who were prophetesses, in vindication of their proceedings. In their assemblies virgins appeared in white robes, personating prophetesses. The errors of this sect were condemned in the Council of Laodicea in 320. Tertullian charges the Quintillani with having opposed baptism, and wrote a work on that subject.

Quintillians. See Quintillani.

Quintus Matus, sometimes called the Father of Art and Artificers for having been transformed into a blacksmith to a painter by the force of love. He had followed the trade of a blacksmith and farther near twenty years, when, falling in love with a painter's daughter, who was very handsome, and disliked nothing in him but his profession, he quitted his trade and betook himself to painting, in which art he was assisted by a good natural taste, a master, and the power of love into the bargain, he made a very uncommon and surprising progress. He was a painstaking, diligent imitator of ordinary life, and much better at representing the defects than the beauties of nature. One of his best pieces is a Descant of the Cross, in the chapel at the Cathedral of Antwerp, for which and a multitude of other histories and portraits, he gained many admirers, especially for his laborious neatness, which, in truth, was the principal part of his character. He died in 1525. His works are dispersed through Europe with hope.

Quintus Memmius (2 Macc. xi, 34). See Memmio.

Qui proceédit ab Utrisque (who proceeded from both, i.e. from the Father and the Son) is the beginning of a sequence of Adam of St. Victor to the Holy Spirit, omitted entirely by the compilers of Songs of the Spirit.

The first verse runs thus in the original: "Qui procedit ab utroque, Genitore, Genitori, Patris, Patrisce, Redde ligatas elongantes, Pacis ferventia in te mentes Flamma tua divine."

There is an English translation by S. Wranger, in the Lyra Mystica, p. 170 sq., and by Casswell, in Hymns and Poems, Original and Translated, p. 156 sqq. German translations are given, together with the original, in Königsfeld, Latinische Hymnen, ii, 181 sq.; Simrock, Lauten Sion, p. 209 sq.; Bälder, Auszüge althchristlicher Lieder, p. 111, 221. See Trench, Storied Latin Poetry, p. 187; Daniel, Theaemus Hymnol, ii, 73; Gautier, Æneas de St. Victor, i, 115; Rambach, Anthologie chrétienne Gesänge, p. 253; Fortlage, Gesänge christlicher Völkerei, vol. 5. (B. P.)

Quirinian. See Cyreni.

Quirinalia, a festival celebrated among the ancient Romans in honor of Quirinus. It was kept on Feb. 17, being the day on which Romulus, who was called Quirinus, was said to have been carried up to heaven.

Quirini. See Querini.

Quirk is an architectural term for a small auxa channel or recess much used in mouldings.

Quiroga, Joseph, a Spanish Jesuit, was born at Lugo, in Galicia, and distinguished himself as a missionary in America. During his residence here he collected much information respecting the territories he visited, and on his return to Europe published his travels. He died in 1784.

Quisqueja. This island, one of the Great Antilles, now called St. Domingo or Hayti, was, at the time of the discovery of this part of the world, inhabited by a pacific and harmless population, who were soon annihilated by Spanish cruelty. They adored the sun (Tontika) and the moon (Tona). Both luminaries were held at first on the earth, in the island of Quisqueja, of course, where a splendid cave was their mansion. Finally, they went to Turrii (the heavens), thence to diffuse their light among the world. The cave is still shown; it has a diameter of 200 feet, and is 180 feet high. Its beauty is such as to induce the writers of the ancient times to build temples here. Figures of gods, genii, guardian spirits, are engraved in the walls. In a large number of places idols must have stood in ancient times. This supposition is in accordance with the opinion of Quirinus, and was written a work on that subject.
with the scanty traditions that have reached us. More than a thousand idols were distributed at intervals in the recesses of the caves, representing the sun and moon, stood at the entrance. This seems to have been the only temple of Quiaqueja, for multitudes of worshippers flocked to it every day from all parts of the island. They believed that their country was the cradle of the human race. The first men were shut up in two caves of the Kauta mountain, and there watched by a giant. The jailer, having once ventured out of this recess, was changed into stone by the sun, whose rays were too powerful for him. The captive men, thus liberated, came forth in their turn. Many were those who shared the giant's fate, being transformed into animals, stones, or plants. Little by little those denizens of darkness became used to the light of day. The souls of men repair to the mountains which cover the middle part of the island, and there, in a cool country, rich in springs, they feed on the savory fruit of the hovenmy-tree, called by the Spaniards arpitaca of St. Domingo. The living men piously abstain from tasting those fruits, so as not to deprive the souls of their subsistence.

Their country was, primitively, much larger, and was not an island; but a terrific flood inundated the land, leaving only discovered the tops of the mountains. This happened under the following circumstances: A rich man, called Toja, lost by a sudden death his youngest son, whose mother had died in giving him birth. Not to part from his dear remains, he put them into a large pumpkin. After some time he took off the lid, and saw, to his dismay, that the pumpkin was filled with greenish water, in which a multitude of fishes and aquatic monsters were swimming about. In his terror he had recourse to his friends, and deliberated with them what was to be done. Meanwhile his other children took the pumpkin in their midst to have a look at the sea which, they had heard, was hidden in it. When they saw their father returning from his call, conscious of punishable inquisitiveness, they put the pumpkin roughly on the ground and ran away. The funeral vessel, thus carelessly handled, got a rent, and hence the waters of the sea flowed, without intermission, night and day, until all lower parts of the earth were covered, and the mountain-tops alone protruded from the universal ocean. Those tops became islands in the sea, and the land islands and the islands and the sea and islands and the sky and land and islands and the sea. These gods were thankful for the worship they received, and in return granted the pious people successful fishing and hunting, victory in battle (their images were fastened in battle with a string to the forehead of the combatants), pleasant crops, rain, or sunshine, as circumstances required. The women were blessed with happy children and the girls with pleasant husbands. A great festival was solemnized every year in honor of all these gods. The cacique on that occasion appeared with a shower of precious stones, thrown into the interior of the temple. These gods were thankful for the worship they received, and in return granted the pious people successful fishing and hunting, victory in battle (their images were fastened in battle with a string to the forehead of the combatants). The latter consisted of thin flour cakes, which were broken in the presence of the god, and small portions of them given back to the heads of the families. Those little slices were carefully preserved through the whole year. A general dance followed. It was at this solemn occasion that most of the matrimonial offers and arrangements took place. All traces of this ancient pagan worship were destroyed by the fanatical Spaniards, and the small Indian people was exterminated.

Quishion (pulvinar, cassius, culcitrum), a cushion, usually of velvet, and stuffed with wool or horse-

hair, for the service-book on the south side of the altar, appears in Henry's VII's Book of the Hours, and was used by Bishop Andregray. In the former it is on the south side, in the latter on the north. Albertus mentions the wooden desk, plated (legile), as a modern substitute. The book was first set on the right side and afterwards moved to the left side of the altar at Mass.

Quishtar, a family of Christian theologians, of whom we mention the following: 1. Bernhard Fe., was born at Rostock, April 11, 1718. In 1758 he was made superintendent, in 1766 doctor and professor of theology, in 1779 general superintendent, and afterwards chancellor and curator of the University of Greifswald, where he died, Jan. 4, 1788. He wrote, Dissertatio Epist. de Aethismo Benedicti de Spinassca (Rostock, 1748).—Diez, Epist. de Collatione Librorum Scripturae Sacrae in Interpretatione S. S. Haud Injusa (ibid. 1786).—Diez, Exegetica—dogmatica cæsa Imag. de Judæis Curde Compendia (ibid. 1749).—Sei in Aethismoror et nach der Stübenhuth haben schreiben können? Diss. de Notione Filiorum et Filiiarii Dei (ibid. 1761).—Diez, de Adoptione Ecclesiastica V. T. (ibid. 1758).—Ob, ehe die sogenannte griechische Übersetzung der siebzig Dolmetcher von der Bibel des A. T. zu Stande gekommen, echter griechische Übersetzung des neuen Buches Moses vorhanden gewesen sei? (ibid. 1766).—Num Michaelis Archangelogi cum Diobioli de Corpore Mosti Disciplicana Fabula sit? (Greifswald, 1770).—De Angelis Dei in Legislatione Sinaicae Ministris, Gall. 111, 19 (ibid. 1771).—Diez, de sacrificiis Jülicheri Moses Vivendi fuerint? (ibid. 1785).—Peregrinees in Maris, It. 19 (ibid. 1765).—Peregrinees in Maris, It. 19 (ibid. 1765).

2. Johann (1), was born at Rostock, Aug. 18, 1584. Having completed his studies at his native place and at Frankfort-on-the-Oder, he travelled through Holland, Brabant, and Flanders, and after his return, in 1615, he became professor in his native city. In 1645 he was made doctor of theology. In 1645 he was called as pastor and superintendent of St. Jacob, and died at Dobran, May 2, 1648. He wrote, Annoetationes in Omnes Libros Biblicalos (Frankfort, 1698).—Comment. in Omnes Epp. Pauli:—Castigatio Hebraeorum, etc. See Furs, Bibl. Judaicae, iii, 124 sq.; Winer, Thed. Hebr., p. 428.

3. Johann (2), son of the preceding, was born at Rostock, Feb. 5, 1624. He studied at Greifswald, Königsberg, Copenhagen, and Leyden, was made doctor of theology, and died as rector magistri Dec. 24, 1698. He wrote, Catechismus, later edition, etc. See Jücher, Allgem. Gelehr.-Lexikon, s. v.

4. Johann Nikolaus, son of the foregoing, was born at Rostock, Jan. 6, 1651, studied at his native place and Königsberg, travelled through Germany, Holland, and Denmark, and after his return, in 1678, he was made dean of St. Nicolai, afterwards pastor and superintendent, and finally professor of theology. He died Aug. 9, 1715. His writings, which are very numerous, touch upon almost every department of theology, and are enumerated by Jücher in his Allgem. Gelehr.-Lexikon, s. v. See also, Disc did, Geschichtc der Alten Testamentis der christl. Kirche (Jena, 1685), p. 572. (B. P.)

Quintastil, is, according to Mexican mythology, the serpent woman who, at the beginning of the fourth age of the world, populated the earth by the successive birth of a number of twins. The latter are represented on monuments holding in their hands the shells of the eggs from which they have crept.

Quitman, Frederick Henry, D.D., an eminent American divine of the Lutheran Church, was born in 1760, and after studying theology at home and abroad became pastor at Rinebeck, on the Hudson, and
Quiver is the rendering in the A. V. of two very different Hebrew words. The English word "quiver" is a variation of "cover" (from the French couver), and therefore answers to the second of the two Hebrew words. See Armor.

1. ""ת""ל, tel. This occurs only in Gen. xxvii, 3—"take thy weapons (literally "thy things"), thy quiver and thy bow." It is derived (by Gesenius, Thesaur. p. 1504, and Fürst, Handwörterb. ii. 598) from a root which has the force of hanging. The passage itself affords no clue to its meaning. It may therefore signify either a quiver or a suspended weapon—for instance, such a sword as in our own language was formerly called a "hanger." Between these two significations the interpreters are divided. The Sept., Vulg., and Targum Pseudo-Jon. adhere to the former; Onkelos, the Peshito and Arabic versions, to the latter.

2. נָשְׂן, nashan. The root of this word is uncertain (Gesenius, Thesaur. p. 161). From two of its occurrences, its force would seem to be that of containing or concealing (Ps. cxvii, 5; Isa. xlix, 2). It is connected with arrows only in Lam. iii, 13. Its other occurrences are Job xxxix, 23; Isa. xxii, 6; and Jer. vi, 16. In each of these the Sept. translates it by "quiver" (φαργήμα), with two exceptions, Job xxxix, 23, and Ps. cxvii, 5, in the former of which they render it by "bow," in the latter by ἱσσός.

The quiver is a case or box for arrows, which was slung over the shoulder in such a position that a soldier could with ease draw out the arrows when he wanted them (Isa. xlix, 2; Jer. vi, 16). There is nothing in the Bible to indicate either its form or material, or in what way it was carried. The quivers of the Assyrians are rarely shown in the sculptures. When they do appear, they are sometimes richly decorated with groups of figures and fanciful designs. They were worn at the back, with the top between the shoulders of the wearer, or hung at the side of the chariot. The Egyptian war...
riors, on the other hand, wore them slung nearly hori-
nontal, drawing out from the belt the arm (Wilkinson, *Aegypt.,* abridg'd, i, 354). The quiver was about four inches in diameter, supported by a belt passing over the shoulder and across the breast to the opposite side. When not in actual use, it was shifted behind, or hung at the side of the chariot, like that of the Assyrians. See CHARIOT. Among the ancient Greeks, the quiver was principally made of hide or leather, and was adorned with gold, painting, and braiding. It had a lid (ξύλα), and was suspended from the right shoulder by a belt passing over the breast and behind the back. The presentation was on the left hip, and is so seen in the annexed figures, the right-
hand one representing an Amazon, and the left-hand an Aisatic archer.

"Quiver" is also used figuratively for *house,* and ar-
rows for *children* (Psa. cxxvi, 6). See ARCHER.

**Quoddas** is the magic drum used by physicians and sorcerers among the Laplanders to chase the evil spirits which are supposed to be the cause of the dis-
eases. It is covered with figures of animals and mys-
terious characters, and embossed with divers orna-
tmental appendages.

**Quod permittat** is, in the Church of England, a *schedule* of the successor of a pastor. The *Recover-
ry of Pasture* by the statute of Edward I, c. 34.

**Quolin,** the outer angle of a wall.

**Quotations, Biblical.** The verbal citations con-
tained in Scripture are of three classes: (a) Those which the later writers of the Old Testament make from the earlier. (b) The quotations made by Paul from heathen authors —viz. Acts xvii, 28 from Aratus, *Phenomen,* 5, or Cle-
anchus, *Hymns,* and 1, 2, 3, 4, 10, 12 Manen-
der's *Thesis,* and Tit. ii, 12 from Callimachus, *Hymns,* ad *Jos.* 8, according to Theodoret, or Epimenides accord-
ing to Jerome, *Chrysostom,* *Epiphanius,* and others. To these may be added Gal. v, 23, where the words *καὶ ἔστω ὑμῖν μια ταραττότω* are identical with the words of Aristotle, *Pol.* iii, 8 (Gill, *Notes and Querries,* v, 175). Perhaps also Acts xiv, 17 and James i, 17, from their rhythmical form, may be quotations. (c) Those which the New Testament contains from the Old Testa-
ment. The first and third of these classes are the most important, and the only ones demanding special no-
tice here. The following treatment as to both is com-
plied from the various authorities on Biblical in-
troduction and interpretation, with additions from other sources.

1. *Parallel Passages of the Old Testament Scriptu-
res.* The principal of these are the following: Many sections of the books of Chronicles seem to be quoted from the earlier Scriptures. The historical chapters of the book of Isaiah (xxxvi–xxxvii) are repeated in 2 Kings xviii–xxi. The last chapter of Jeremiah repre-
sents *xxvii–xxv.* Of Ps. xix we have two copies, one in 2 Sam. xxvi. Compare also Gen. xxvi with Numb. xxxvi, and Ezra ii with Neh. vii. Other instances are cited: Hab. ii, 14 from Isa. xi, 9; Jon. ii, 8 from Psa. xliv, 18; ii, 18 from Psa. lixiv, 2; Obad. i, 8 from Jere. xxvii, and several passages in the later Psalms, which are found also in the earlier. The reader will find a list of the variations discovered by a comparison of most of the foregoing passages in the notes to *Cappell,* *Crit. Sac.* (i, 80–84 [ed. 1775]). See also Kennicott, *Biblia Sacra Vulgatae,* ii, 277, etc., and *State of Printed Hebr-

ean Text* (pt. i).

The question to be determined is, Are we to regard each of the textual variations thus brought to light as a blunder to be corrected in one or other of the parallel Scriptures, or as a deviation (intentional or otherwise) on the part of the later writer from the language of the earlier? Considering this question a distinction must be made between two classes of parallel passages—the one class consisting of those in which the same story is told, or the same sentiments expressed, by two different writers, and the later writer avails himself of the lan-
guage of the earlier, though it may write at times exactly or servilely, and at other times not exactly, but the other consisting of those in which a public or other docu-
ment is inserted in two separate records. It would seem that such variations as are met with in passages of the former description are more likely to be designed and original, being probably traceable to the free use of which the later writer made of the materials furnished by the earlier; and that variations met with in passages of the latter description are more likely to be blunders arising from the negligence of transcribers and similar causes. But it is not necessary in all cases to draw the inescapable conclusion that such errors of transcription are found in the for-
mer class of passages, and alterations obviously designed are found in the latter. Let us illustrate this by four examples, two of each class.

1. The very remarkable prophecy contained in Isa.

ii, 1–4 is found also in Mic. iv, 1–3. The variations are few and of no great importance. But, such as they are, there is no reason to suppose that the text of either of these passages ever differed from what it is now. It is of no consequence in the present inquiry whether Micah borrowed from Isaiah or Isaiah from Micah, or both from an older prophet. There is no evidence whatever that the later writer made it a matter of conscience to reproduce in every minute particular the language of his predecessor. His heart was too full of the great thought embodied in the language to permit him to minutely attend to the very fold of the sheep's skin of which it had been presented. Possibly, also, the quotation was made from memory; and, if so, the wonder is not that any variety of expression is found in it, but that they are so few and so trivial. In such a case as this, there-
fore, it would be quite unwarrantable to correct the one passage from the other. The text in both passages is accurate and genuine, and any attempted emendations with the view of bringing the two passages into rigid harmony would certainly be alterations for the worse, not for the better.

2. The prophecy of Nathan in 2 Sam. viii occupies a very conspicuous position in the Old Testament, and, as we might expect, the whole narrative is repeated in 1 Chron. (xvii), not, however, without a very considerable num-
ber of alterations. In this case, also, it is quite evident that most of the alterations are to be traced to the au-
thor of Chronicles, and cannot be regarded as various readings. As is usual, the later writer makes a free use of the earlier narrative, adapting it and the language in which it is conveyed to the circumstances of his own time. Thus he writes פָּרָשַׁת יִרְיוֹת, prefers פְּרָשַׁת יָרָיוֹת, or פָּרָשַׁת יָרָיוֹת, sometimes substitutes תָּרוֹם לְפָרָשָׂת יָרָיוֹת or תָּרוֹם לְפָרָשָׂת יָרָיוֹת, in *royal* kingdom, and alters or omits words or clauses which ap-
ppear to him obscure or unessential. The most remark-
able omission is in ver. 18 as compared with ver. 14 of the narrative in Samuel. Compare also ver. 17 with ver. 19 of Samuel. Still, though it is evident that most of the variations between the two narratives are to be traced to the design of the later author, and cannot be regarded as errors of transcription, we do not think that all of them can be accounted for in this way. Two instances may be given, in one of which the text in Chronicles may fittingly be corrected by that in Samuel; in the other the text in Samuel may be cor-
rected by that in Chronicles. (1.) In 1 Chron. xvii, 18, 19 we read, "What can David speak for the honor of thy servant, *גְּלָדִיד וְעִבְּדֵי גְּלָדִיד וְעִבְּדֵי גְּלָדִיד ... For thy servant's sake, and according to thine own heart hast thou done all this greatness." Not to mention the difficulty in the construction of the Hebrew in ver. 18, it is evident that the spirit of the whole passage is quite out of harmony with the context. Accordingly, accor-
ding to the corresponding verses in Samuel, we are not surprised to find the sentiment expressed very different indeed, the words being "And what can David say more unto thee ... for thy word's sake, and according to
thine own heart," etc. (ver. 29, 31). It is not improbable
that we cannot but regard as the erroneous
readings in Chronicles are to be traced to the similarity
between נָשֵׁל and נָשְׁל and in the former of the two verses,
and נָשֵׁל and נָשְׁל in the latter. It may be added
that in the Septuagint translation of Chronicles the ob-
jectual forms are omitted. (2.) The other instance is in
2 Sam. vii, 25, compared with 1 Chron. xvii, 21.
In the former we read, according to the authorized
translation of our version, that one nation in the earth is like thy
people, even like Israel, whom God went to redeem for
a people to himself, and to make him a name, and to do
for you great things and terrible, for thy land, before
thy people (גֶּבֶל, from before), which thou redeemedst to
thee from Egypt, [from] the nations and their gods?" The
text of this verse is obviously very confused; and
in order to extract from it some tolerable sense, our
translators have rendered גָּבֶל as if it were גֹּפֶל
and have inserted from, without any authority, towards the
close. Now, without venturing to affirm that the text
in Chronicles is to be received as in every particular the
text in Chronicles is to be received as in every particular the
true and genuine one, we have no hesitation in borrow-
ning from it what we believe to be an important emen-
tation. In the latter verse, without the substitution of
גֶּבֶל, to drive out, for בַּעֲלֵית (the words are very simi-
lar), for thy land. This will allow us to give גָּבֶל its
proper force, and render unnecessary the insertion of the
unauthorized from; the meaning of the latter half of
the verse when corrected being as follows: "To
drive out from before thy people, whom thou redeemedest
to thee from Egypt, nations and their gods."
3. The two remaining examples are of a different
description, consisting not of historical or prophetic
passages freely made use of by a later writer, but of
documents of which we have, so to speak, two editions.
The first is David's noble song of thanksgiving; of which
two copies we are made acquainted—the one incorporated
with the history in 2 Sam. xxii, the other with the
psalm-book as Psa. xviii. Now, on comparing these
two copies of the same song, we find scarcely a single
line of the one exactly identical with the corresponding
line of the other, some of the variations being of ex-
remely little importance, others of greater moment.
The question here again arises: How are those variations
to be accounted for? How comes it that two copies of
the same song, handed down to us in the same volume,
should, though identical in the general sentiments ex-
pressed, diverge in their order of thought, and in the order of
the verses, present so many minute differences in the details
of the composition? On first thought, we are disposed
to conclude, somewhat rashly, that all the variations
must be regarded as errors of transcription, and that in
this case there is no room for the hypothesis of design
on the part of the author or editor, insomuch as we have
here the case not of an independent author adapting to
his own purpose the materials furnished by previous
writers, but of a collector giving insertion to a document
which, one would suppose, it is his duty to present as
nearly as possible in the words of the original author.
On comparing, however, the psalm with the history, it
is evident that all the variations cannot be accounted
for in this way. For example, the very first words of the
psalm, "I will love thee, O Lord, my strength," do
not appear in the other copy; and of this the only ad-
mislatable explanation plainly is that the words in ques-
tion constitute an authorized addition to the song in its
original form, the addition being made probably for the
purpose of adapting it more perfectly to liturgical use.
If this explanation be admitted, it follows that of this
song the original portion has been transmitted in two ed-
itions—the one, which is inserted in the history, pre-
senting the song in its original form; the other pre-
senting it in the slightly altered form which was given to it
when incorporated with the authorized hymn-book of the
Hebrew nation. In this way a considerable num-
ber of the variations may be accounted for, but not by
any means, all of them; for, with regard to many of
them, it is impossible to discover any useful purpose
which could be served by their introduction; and se-
veral of them are just the sort of alterations which most
usually arise from the mistake of the copyist, and the
for example, the interchange of letters of similar form, the
transposition of letters, etc. (thus for מַטְרִי, and he was
seen, in 2 Sam. xxii, 11, we find in Psa. xviii, 11 [10]
מַטְדִּי, and he did see; and for מַטְדִּרֶב in 2 Sam. xxii,
46 we find מַטְדָּרֶב in Psa. xviii, 46 [45].) The text in
Samuel is the more antique in form—as, for example, in
the more sparing insertion of vowel letters; but that of
the Psalm appears to have been more carefully
preserved. Thus, there is little doubt that for מַדְבָּר, in 2 Sam.
xxii, 26, we ought to read מַדְבָּר, as in the Psalm;
and in ver. 26, מַדְבָּר of Samuel ought to be read מַדְבָּר,
or מַדְבָּר, as in the Psalm; and in the second clause,
also the reading in the Psalm is much to be preferred.
So in vers. 33, 44, 47, 49. On the other hand, in vers. 5,
48, the reading in Samuel may be preferred to that of
the Psalm.
4. Our last example is the Decalogue, of which we
have two copies in Exod. xx, v. 5, vii, 9, in which there are not a few differences, some of consider-
able importance. But it is very doubtful whether any
of these differences can be laid to the charge of the
抄ist; certainly the more important of them must
be traced to the author. They are principally to be
found in the fourth and tenth commandments; in the
latter, the two first clauses are transposed in Deuter-
onomy, and a slight addition and alteration made;
and in the former, the remembrancer of Exodus is ex-
changed for observe in Deuteronomy; thy cattle is ex-
changed into thy oxen and ass and all thy cattle; and the "re-
som annexed" in Exodus—"For in six days," etc.—is
entirely omitted in Deuteronomy, and another state-
ment substituted for it—"That thy man-servant and
maid-servant may rest as well as thou; and remember
that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt," etc.
The other alterations are of less importance. In each
of the fourth and fifth commandments, the clause "as
the Lord thy God hath commanded thee" is inserted in
Deuteronomy, the promise in the latter being also ex-
panded by the addition of the clause "that it may be
well with thee," and in the ninth, כְּבַדְתֶּם (for כְּבַדְתֶּם) is inserted in Deuteronomy for כְּבַדְתֶּם; no
ot one of these variations which can be certainly traced
to the oversight of a transcriber. It is, indeed, on first
thought, surprising that any writer, however conscious
of the guidance of the Divine Spirit, should have ven-
tured to depart, even in the minutest particular, from the
inspired word of a document which had been laid before
us in so special a manner with the impress of Heaven.
It is, perhaps, the most remarkable example of that com-
plete mastery of the essential over the accidental, of the
spirit over the letter, which distinguishes the entire re-
lation at once of the Old Testament and of the New.
But to explain this point is quite beyond the scope of
our present purpose. It is sufficient to remark that most
of the variations are evidently to be traced to the
first composition of the book of Deuteronomy, and that
none of them can with any degree of certainty be placed
in the case of Moses, the editor of the Deuteronome-
From the four examples of parallel passages which
have been under review, the following conclusions have
been elicited: (n.) That most of the variations are to be
traced to the author or editor, and not to the copyist;
and, in all such cases, both forms of the passage must
be regarded as preserved two guides to the text. (4.)
That, notwithstanding, a considerable number of varia-
tions still remain which cannot be accounted for in
this way, but probably arose through oversight in transcrip-
tion. In such cases it is allowable to correct the more
faulty text by the more accurate; but, in the absence
of any external testimony to the accuracy of the reading which we prefer, such corrections must be introduced with caution, and might, perhaps, with greater propriety be placed in the margin (as was the practice with the ancient Jewish critics) than incorporated with the text. The variations of this class would have appeared still more numerous to the compiler of our examples of parallel passages from those which are occupied with lists of names or numbers. See KENNICOTT, Dissertation on the State of the Printed Hebrew Text, pt. 1.

II. Quotations from the Old Testament in the New—

These form one of the outward bonds of connection between the Testaments of the Bible. They are manifold in kind; but all that we need here to respecting them may be summed up under the following heads:

1. Sources whence the Quotations are made—These are two—the Hebrew original and the Septuagint translation. On comparing the passages, in order to ascertain the quotations between these two sources, we find that by far the larger number are taken, either wholly or chiefly, from the Septuagint, while a very few materially differ from both the Septuagint and the Hebrew. The latter were probably quoted from memory, the occasion requiring a certain degree of accuracy in the translation.

For the most part, the deviations from the text of the Hebrew or the Septuagint are not material. They may be classified as follows:

(1) Changes of person, number, or tense in particular words, in Matt. vi, 31; Luke xxi, 31; Hebrews xii, 25; while the Septuagint gives, πάντως τον ποιμήν, και διασκορπασθήσαιτα το πρόβατα της ποιμήνς; or, while the Septuagint gives, πάντως τον ποιμήν, και διασκορπασθήσαιτα, ε. η. λ. (Zech. xiii, 7) (this is the reading of the Alexandrine Codex; that of the Vatican differs considerably: πάντως τον ποιμήν και θανάσασαι το πρόβατα). John xix, 36, Η ευρέω συντρίβησεν, αύτος, ὁ εὐρέω συντρίβησεν, αύτος, ἵνα ἰδητεί, for, μισθωτοί αὐτοῦ ιδητέοι, for, μισθωτοί αὐτοῦ ιδητέοι, Isa. iii, 5, etc. Comp. also Matt. xi, 10 with Mal. iii, 1; and John xix, 27 with Zech. xiii, 4.

(2) Substitution of synonymous words or phrases for those used in the Septuagint or Hebrew: e.g. John xiii, 18, ὁ τρόφων με' τοῦ τόπου τόπον, εἰπέντε τό, ἤργον τό, σπάσασα τον ποιμήν, και διασκορπασθήσαιτα τα πρόβατα της ποιμήνς; while the Septuagint gives, πάντως τον ποιμήν, και διασκορπασθήσαιτα. Sometimes the words thus substituted are synonymous with those for which they are used only historically; as when Paul (Gal. iv, 30) calls Isaac ὁ νόθος τῆς ἁλεξάνδρας, in a passage quoted from Gen. xxii, 10, where, in the words of Abraham, he is mentioned by name ὁ νόθος τῆς ἁλεξάνδρας. Occasionally, also, this kind of substitution is effected by the use of a word describing a species for one designating the genus to which it belongs; as when Paul, in 1 Cor. iii, 20, substitutes the words τῶν σωφρ. for the more general expression, τῶν αὕτων, used in the passage (Pas. xiv, 11) which he quotes; or as in Matt. iii, 3, where ὁ διάνοιατον is put for ἴδαν, the special kind of strength intended being that of the mind.

(3) Words and phrases transposed: e.g. Rom. v, 19, Ἰσακοῦ τοῦ ἀνέχεται. In Lat. Λατ. εἰκόνας ἀνέχεται τοῦ με ἐκπλήθουσα, for ἤμαρτος ἡ ἡγήμονας τοῦ με ἐκπλήθουσα, εἰκόνος τοῦ με ἡγήμονας, Isa. lx. 1, etc. The Codex Alex. gives this passage exactly as cited by Paul.

(4) Words and clauses interpolated or added: e.g. John vi, 31, ἄρων ἐν τῷ σφαγεῖν ἀνέκειται διὰ του με φαγεῖν, where the words ἐν τῷ σφαγεῖν are an addition, and ἐν τῷ σφαγεῖν is an interpolation, Isa. lxxi. 18. Or, again: ὁ πρῶτος ἀνέκειται ἢ ἀνέκειται, where ὁ πρῶτος ἀνέκειται is added by the apostle (comp. Gen. ii, 7). These additions are sometimes from parallel passages, and sometimes of the writer's own device, for the purpose of rendering the meaning of the passage clearer, or connecting it more readily with the preceding or subsequent context.

(5) Words omitted and paragraphs abridged: e.g. Matt. iv, 6, τοις ἄγγελοις αὐτοῦ ἐντελεία περι σοῦ, and ἔν με χειρῶν ἀφόρυτοι, καὶ μήποτε προσκήνῃ πρὸς λίθον τῶν ποδῶν σου, καὶ τοις ἄγγελοις αὐτοῦ ἐντελεία περι σοῦ, καὶ ἔν με χειρῶν ἀφόρυτοι, καὶ μήποτε προσκήνῃ πρὸς λίθον τ. σ. ρ. Δ. Χ. Χ. Χ., Psa. xxi, 12. Comp. also Matt. xxii, 24 with Deut. xxxii, 5; Rom. ix, 27, 28 with Isa. x, 22, 23; Heb. iv, 4 with Gen. ii, 5, etc.

(6) Passages too paraphrastically rendered, or the general sense only given: e.g. Rom. iv, 25, where we have a paraphrastic rendering of Hos. ii, 28; Rom. x, 6 sqq., a free rendering of Deut. xxxii, 12 sqq.; 1 Cor. i, 31, where the general sense of Jer. ix, 24 is given; comp. also 1 Pet. ii, 22 with Isa. lxxv; 8, etc.

(7) Several passages quoted together, so as to form one connected sense: e.g. in 2 Cor. vi, 16-18 we have a passage made up of no less than three different passages—Lev. xxvi, 11; Isa. iii, 11; Jer. xxxiii, 1. Comp. also Mark i, 2, 3, where Mal. iii, 1 and Isa. xi, 5 are combined; also Matt. xi, 10 and Deut. xiii, 4 are strangely mixed together.

(8) Several of these species of deviations combined together: e.g. Rom. iii, 24, ὁ γὰρ ἀνθρώπος τοῦ θεοῦ ἀδίκος. Here we have a combination of the omission of ἕκαστος ἡμῶν, and the omission of ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ. Comp. also Rom. xi, 8 with 1 Kings xix, 14, for an instance of the conjunction of omission, substitution, and transposition.

(9) Passages rather indicated, or hinted at, than formally quoted: e.g. Eph. v, 1, Ἐγείρω καὶ καθίζω, καὶ ἀνέκαστα ἐν τῷ σωματίῳ, καὶ ἐκτάσσω σοι ὁ Χριστός. The difficulty of assigning this quotation to any passage in the Old Testament, has been felt by all interpreters, and various theories have been proposed for the sake of removing it. The most probable, however, seems that which regards these words as formed upon Isa. ix, 1-5, and the passage as rather hinted at than quoted. Comp. also Heb. xii, 15 with Hos. xiv, 2. To this head may be also referred John v, 38, where no particular passage is quoted, but such passages as Isa. xiv, 3, 4, 11; iv, 1; lviii, ii; Zech. xiv, 8; xiii, 1, are alluded to.

In the quotations of all kinds from the Old Testament, in the New we find a continual variation from the letter of the older Scriptures. To this variation four causes may be specified as having contributed:

First. All the New-Testament writers quoted from the Septuagint, corrected, improved, or left out, especially when it was needful for their purpose: occasionally deserting it altogether; still abiding by it so large an extent as to show that it was the primary source whence their quotations were drawn. Their use of it may be best illustrated by the customary use of our liturgical version of the Psalms—a use founded on love as well as on habit, but which, nevertheless, we forego when it becomes important that we should follow more the accurate version. Consequently, when the errors involved in the Sept. version do not interfere with the purpose of the New-Test. writer had in view, they are frequently allowed to remain in his quotation (see Matt. xii, 9 [a record of our Lord's words]; Luke iv, 18; Acts xiii, 41; xiv, 17; Rom. xv, 10; 2 Cor. iv, 18; Heb. viii, 9; x, 5; xi, 21). The current of apostolic thought, too, is frequently dictated by words of the Sept., which differ much from the Hebrew (see Rom. ii, 24; 1 Cor. xv, 55; 2 Cor. ix, 7; Heb. xii, 15). Or even an absolute interpolation of the Sept. is quoted (Heb. i, 6 [Deut. xxxii, 43]). On the other hand, in conformity with the Sept., they quote from the Hebrew; so, too, in Matt. ix, 18; Luke xxii, 37, there is an effort to preserve an expressiveness of the Hebrew which the Sept. had lost: and in Matt. iv, 16; John xix, 37; 1 Cor. xv, 54, the Sept. disappears altogether.

In Rom. ix, 38 we have a quotation from the Sept. comm-
bined with another from the Hebrew. In Mark xii, 30; Luke x, 27; Rom. xii, 19, the Sept. and Hebrew are superadded the one upon the other. In the Epistle to the Hebrews, which in this respect stands alone, the Sept. is uniformly followed; except in the one remarkable passage (Heb. x, 20), which recording neither with the Hebrew nor the Sept., was probably derived from the last-named passage (Rom. xii, 19), wherewith it exactly coincides. The quotation in 1 Cor. ii, 9 seems to have been derived, not directly from the Old Testament, but either from a Christian liturgy or other document into which the language of Isa. lxiv, 4 had been transferred.

Secondly. The New-Test. writers must have frequently quoted from memory. The Old Test. had been deeply instilled into their minds, ready for service whenever needed; and the fulfilment of its predictions, which they witnessed, made its utterances rise up in life before them (comp. John ii, 17, 22). It was of the very essence of such a living use of Old-Test. Scripture that their quotations of it should not of necessity be verbally exact.

Thirdly. Combined with this there was an alteration of conscious or unconscious design. Sometimes the object of this was to obtain increased force; hence the variation from the original in the form of the divine oath (Rom. xiv, 11); or the result of "I quake" substitute for the cause (Heb. xii, 21); or the insertion of rhymes for the sake of beauty (Heb. xii, 26); or the change of person to show that what men perpetrated had its root in God's determinate counsel (Matt. xxvi, 81). Sometimes an Old-Test. passage is abridged, and in the abridgment so adjusted, by a little alteration, as to present an aspect of completeness and yet omit what is foreign to the immediate purpose (Acts i, 20; 1 Cor. i, 81). At other times a passage is enlarged by the incorporation of a passage from another source. Thus in Luke iv, 18, 19, although the contents are professedly those read by our Lord from Isa. lx, we have not only the words of which we read but others introduced from Isa. viii, 6 (Sept.); similarly in Rom. xi, 8, Deut. xxix, 4 is combined with Isa. xxix, 10. In some cases still greater liberty of alteration is assumed. In Rom. x, 11 the word πείσα is introduced into Isa. xxviii, 16, to show that that is uttered of Jew and Gentile alike. In Rom. xi, 26, 27, the "to Zion" of Isa. lxix, 20 (Sept. Σωτήρ Σώφ) is replaced by "out of Zion" (suggested by Isa. ii, 3); to Zion the Redeemer had already come; from Zion, the Christian Church, his law was to go forth; or even from the literal Jerusalem (comp. Deut. xxxv, 9). In all these cases, destroyed the type was still in a measure kept up. In Matt. xviii, 17 the words of Isa. iii, 4 are adapted to the divine removal of disease, the outward token and witness of that sin which Christ was eventually to remove by his death, thereby fulfilling the prophecy more completely. For other, though less striking, instances of variation see 1 Cor. xiv, 21; 1 Pet. iii, 15. In some places, again, the actual words of the original are taken up, but employed with a new meaning; thus the λόγος, which in Hab. ii, 3 merely qualified the verb, is in 2 Peter iii, used as the subject to which any alteration in the quotation itself is the circumstance that inMatt. xxvii, 9 Jeremiah should be named as the author of a prophecy really delivered by Zechariah; the reason being, as has been well shown by Hengstenberg in his Christology, that the prophecy is based upon that in Jer. xviii, 19, and that without a reference to this original source the most essential features of the fulfilment of Zechariah's prophecy would be misunderstood. The same is the case with the Greek of Mark 1, 2, 3, where Mal. iii, 1 is combined with Isa. xi, 3, the name of Isaiah alone is mentioned; it was on his prophecy that that of Malachi partly depended. On the other hand, in Matt. ii, 23; John vii, 45, the comprehensive mention of the prophets indicates a reference not only to the passages more particularly com-

templated, Isa. xi, 1; iv, 13, but also to the general tenor of what had been elsewhere prophetically uttered.

See NAZARENE. On John vii, 58 it may suffice here to remark that perhaps the best solution of the difficulty is to regard our Lord as not making any direct quotation (of which there is no record), but using in metaphorical language, suited to the strain of his previous address (comp. ver. 37), a fact in which in plainer style is unquestionably announced in the ancient prophecies, viz. the abundant possession of divine knowledge by those who should live under the Messiah's reign. The passage James iv, 6 is beset with difficulty. Not only is there doubt as to what "Scripture" is cited, but much obscurity hangs over the meaning of the words themselves so added. We cannot enter into the details of the investigation. Referring for these to Huther's note on the passage in Meyer's Commentator, pt. 15, the substance of which is given by deis Alford in his notes, we content ourselves here with saying that some interpreters understand ἡ σώματα of the human spirit, and translate, "the spirit [temper, feeling of mind] which dwells in us lusts to envy [covetousness];" whilst others understand it of the Holy Spirit, or the Spirit implanted in the soul by God, and translate, either, "The Spirit which dwells in us lusts [desires, inclines] against envy;" or, "The Spirit which is [God's] hath placed in us jealously desireth [us for himself]." J.H.H.

2. Mode in which Quotations from the Old Test. are introduced.—For this purpose certain forms are used, a few of which are illustrated by our extracts. The commonest is a list, Kατά τὸ γεγραμμένον, ἵνα ἰκανονοῦμεν, οἴκημα πάντων. The words are inserted, to a great extent, wherever there is any single passage in the Old Test.; but if the last rendering be adopted, the writer may be supposed to refer generally to those parts of the Old Test. in which God is represented as dwelling in his people (Numb. xxxiii, 54; Ezek. xxxvii, 27), and as desiring with them a jealous affection (Deut. xxxii, 10 sq.). This is far from satisfactory, but it seems the best solution that has been offered.

"The Scripture saith, nothing more is necessarily implied than that which follows is taken from the Old Test.; but when it is said, "This was the Scripture fulfilled which saith," or "This was done that the Scriptures might be fulfilled," we immediately perceive that the writer would intimate a real connection of some sort between the event he is recording and the Scripture; for in the passage quoted the subject of the writer quoting it is treating. Thus, when it is simply said, "The Scripture saith," nothing more is necessary implied than that which follows is taken from the Old Test. ; but when it is said, "This was the Scripture fulfilled which saith," or "This was done that the Scriptures might be fulfilled," we immediately perceive that the writer would intimate a real connection of some sort between the event he is recording and the Scripture; for in the passage quoted the subject of the writer quoting it is treating. Thus, when it is simply said, "The Scripture saith," nothing more is necessary implied than that which follows is taken from the Old Test.; but when it is said, "This was the Scripture fulfilled which saith," or "This was done that the Scriptures might be fulfilled," we immediately perceive that the writer would intimate a real connection of some sort between the event he is recording and the Scripture; for in the passage quoted the subject of the writer quoting it is treating.
there are a considerable number scattered through the writings of the apostles which are inserted in the train of their own remarks without any announcement whatever of their being cited from others. To the cursory reader the passages thus quoted appear to form a part of the apostolic utterance, but on a closer inspection these passages are only incidental or introductory expressions, in one case the introduction of the apostolic text, in the other its conclusion. In the next passage quoted from the New Testament, the fact of their being quotations can be detected.

In the common version every trace of quotation is in many of these passages lost, from the circumstance that the writer seems to have been entirely in sympathy with the principles and truths of our Lord's teaching, while the version of the Old Testament is made from the Hebrew. Thus, for instance, in 2 Cor. viii, 21, Paul says, "καθὼς ὕπαρκτος ἀλλά τοῦ μόνου ἑαυτοῦ μυστήριος, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἑαυτοῦ ἐκδοθέντος," which, with a change in the mode of the verb, is a verbatim citation of the Septuagint version of Prov. iii, 4. Hardly any trace of this, however, appears in the common version, where the one passage reads, "Providing for honest things not only in the sight of the Lord, but also in the sight of men;" and the other, "So shalt thou find favor and good understanding in the sight of God and man." So also, in 1 Pet. iv, 18, the apostle quotes word for word from the Septuagint version of Prov. xi, 31 the clause οἵ δὲ ἔκτισεν μᾶλλον σάρκα, ὁ ἀνθρώπος καὶ τοιούτῳ ποιοί συνίστημι; a quotation which we should in vain endeavor to trace in the version of the New Testament. Thus the passage in question is rendered, "Behold, the righteous shall be recompensed in the earth; much more the wicked and the sinner." Such quotations evidently show how much the minds of the New Testament writers were imbued with the sentiments and expressions of the Old Testament, as exhibited in the Alexandrian version.

5. Purposes for which these Quotations are introduced. — These, as appears from an examination of the passages, are of the following kinds:

(1) For the explanation or proof of some doctrinal position. Thus Paul, for the sake of explaining and confirming his doctrine of the efficacy of faith, quotes repeatedly from Hab. ii, 4 the sentence "The just shall live by faith." So, also, in order to prove that mere natural descent from Abraham did not of itself entitle any one to the divine favor, the same apostle quotes the terms of God's promise to Abraham, in which he expressly declares that in Isaac alone of all Abraham's family, was the seed of Abraham — i.e., the spiritual Israel, to be called Israel — Gen. xlii, 7; xliii, 12, 13, 15, 17, 20, 21; xiii, 19, 20; xiv, 10, 11, etc. It is to be observed that the passages thus added are almost always found in writings addressed to Jews, and therefore are to be regarded as containing argumenta e concessa. They are always applied, if not in the words, at least in the sense, of the original from which they are taken.

(2) For the purpose of pointing out the application of the passage quoted to some statement or description in the context in which it is introduced. From the circumstance that several of the passages thus adduced are in the phraseology of the New Testament, as well as in that of the Rabbinical writings, said to be "fulfilled," it has been hastily inferred by some that they are all to be regarded as designed prophecies of the events to which they are applied. For this opinion, however, no adequate support seems to be afforded by the phrase in question. The general idea attached to the verb ἐτλήθη is that of filling up to its full capacity anything of which it is predicated. Thus the Jews are said by Christ to have fulfilled the measure (ἐτλήθη τὸ μέτρον) of the ancient prophecies: and in the phrase in question consequently is susceptible of application to whatever is thought of as supplying the complement of any given capacity, and that whether it is used in a literal or metaphorical sense. Hence it is appropriately used in the New Testament with respect to passages quoted from the Old Testament in the following cases:

First. When it announces the accomplishment of a prophecy contained in the words quoted. As the prediction is a mere empty declaration, as it were, until the fact predicted has occurred; so that fact, by giving meaning and force to the prediction, is viewed as its completion. To adduce a New Testament example, according to the facts of our Lord's history, when they came to any which formed the subject of ancient prophecy, whether explicit or typical, direct the attention of their readers to the circumstance by adding the prediction and intimating its fulfillment in the fact they have recorded.

Secondly. When it introduces some description or statement which affords a parallel to what the writer has been saying. Such a description being regarded as involving a fact of general applicability to the human race, or to certain portions of it, is thought of as being, so to speak, in a state of deficiency until the measure of its applicability has been filled up. Each new case, therefore, which affords a parallel to that to which the description was originally applied goes so far to supply this deficiency by affording another instance in which the description obtains. And hence the writers are in the habit of quoting such descriptions as having been fulfilled in the cases to which they are applied by them. Thus a passage from the prophecies of Jeremiah, in which a description is given of the desolation caused by the divine vengeance for sins, in the passage in question is rendered, "Behold, the righteous shall be recompensed in the earth; much more the wicked and the sinner." Such quotations evidently show how much the minds of the New Testament writers were imbued with the sentiments and expressions of the Old Testament, as exhibited in the Alexandrian version.

Besides the passages introduced as fulfilled, there are others referable to the same general head, which are introduced by others of the formule above mentioned. Of these, some belong to both the classes just described — prophecies of which the New Testament announces the fulfillment, and general descriptions to which something parallel is brought forward. Another class consists of moral and religious maxims, which are adduced as applicable to the state of things of which the writer or speaker is discoursing, and which, though not said to be fulfilled thereby, are quoted under essentially the same idea. Such sentences embody, as it were, certain laws of human nature and conduct, certain general facts in the human economy, of which we are to expect the parallel to be supplied whenever the idea is embodied. Like the laws of physical science, therefore, they are dependent for their verification upon the examination of the phenomena appropriate to that region to which they belong; and as no law of science can be said to lie absolutely beyond the possibility of refutation until every one of the phenomena which it em-
QUOTATIONS

It has appeared to some that the hypothesis of an accommodation of words originally used of one thing to designate another is inconsistent with due reverence to the divine Word. But wherein does the alleged irreverence of the use of Scripture to express low and unworthy ideas, or for the sake of giving point to mere worldly reasonings, is to use them irreverently; but to use them to convey ideas as elevated as those originally attached to them, if not more so (which is the case, e.g., in Rom. x. 18), has but little appearance of treating them with irreverence. The only ground on which such a charge could be maintained is, that words once employed by an inspired writer in a peculiar combination became thenceforth sacred to the expression of that combination of ideas they were first used to denote, whatever others may be susceptible of expressing. But who is there that could seriously attempt to defend such a position as this? If this were the case, every quotation not made expressly as authority would be liable to ensure; and, as the number of such in the New Testament is indubitably considerable, hardly any of its writers would stand clear of blame. See ACCOMMODATION.

The truth is, the practice of making use, in this way, of previous and popular writers is one which was common in T. times; and which can hardly fail to be common wherever an established national literature exists. In proof of this we have only to examine the writings of the later classics of Greece and Rome, which abound in quotations direct and accommodated from their earlier authors. We see the same course pursued by the Rabbinical writers towards both the Old Test. and the New Test., as well as towards the profane classics. Indeed, such quotations form so apt and natural an ornament of style that writers of all ages and countries, who in the sense of doing so exist, have availed themselves of it. Why, then, should we wonder that such a practice should have been followed by the sacred writers, who, in other respects, appear to have obeyed in the preparation of their works the ordinary rules and usages, both grammatical and rhetorical, of literary composition?

Literature.—Surenhusius, Βιβλιοκατάλογος, i, 495 secundum Vet. Theol. Hebraeorum Formulas allegandi et Modos interpretandae conscribendae Loca ex tin. N. T. allegata (Ams. 1718, 4to); Drusius, Parallela Sacra: a. Loca directa, b. Loca interpolata, c. Loca accommodata, et Modisque Interpretanda, quae in priscis Homerici et Aesopicis opusculis ab eis in Locos Undae, Pseudocco, Exemplum, 8c, in nost. (1616, 4to); published also in vol. vii of the Critici Sacri; Hoffmann, Demonstration Evangelica per ipsum Scripturum Consensum omni Oraculis T. T. in, et allegatione derura, editio nova, G. H. Robert (1735-78); Michaelis Frizeli in die göttlichen Schriften des K. R. Erster Teil, p. 225-250 (Eng. transl. by Marxh, i, 290-246); Owen, Modes of Quotation used by the Evangelical Writers Explained and Vindicated (1793, 4to); Randall, Prophecies and other Texts cited in the New Test. compared with the Hebrew Original and New Sept. Version (1782, 4to); Koppe, Exercitata 1 in Ep. ad Romanos, N. T. Kepipanumum (1806), iv, 346; Horne, Introduction, ii, 281 (8th ed.); Davidson, Hermeneutics, ch xi; Gough, New Test. Quotations Collected with the Old Test. (Lond. 1858); Alexander, Connexions and Harmonies of the Old and New Test. (Ith. 1858, 2d ed.); Sir, Words of the Lord Jesus (Amcr. ed.), i, 432 sq.

QUOTATIONS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT IN THE TALMUD. In order to understand many quotations which are cited in the Talmud from the Scriptures, we must remember that their purposes, arguments, and questions, did not use a MS., but cited from memory—a mode of citation often found in the New Test. Dr. M. Steinschneider, in his essay Jewish Literature, in Erzeh and Gruber's Allem. Erfug. i, 1890, vol. XXXVII, apud apud., states that the influence of the Bible on geonomics in particular is shown in the following step—(1). Biblical precepts were...
used unchanged in meaning and expression, as sentiments or favorite sayings of particular persons.* (2) Biblical sentences, unchanged in form, were made by extending or contracting their contents, adding new expressions of various truths which had elsewhere been clothed in known proverbs, so that these last were in some sense deduced from the Bible. A wide field was thus opened for the Midrash; and, finally, the words of the Bible were made into proverbs with an entirely different sense.† (3) Lastly, Biblical phrases and ideas were used more or less intentionally in newly formed sentences,‡ and passed into proverbial forms, as they are to be found in the old Halachah (e.g. Pe'ah, ii, 2).

1. As the ancient rabbins made the Bible their study for so long a time, they knew practically all the Biblical sayings, and when in theological colloquies, they were able to quote a correct Biblical text. And yet we must bear three things in mind, in order not to have a misconception of the matter. This makes it intelligible, we will quote the following examples:

(a. The Talmudists sometimes erroneously attribute a Biblical verse to another context. Thus we read in the Talmud (Pe'ahim, fol. 109, col. 1), "It is every man's duty to rejoice with his household on the feast, for it is written, 'And thou shalt rejoice in thy feast.'"

Deut. xvi, 14, where reference is made to the Feast of Tabernacles. The Tosaphoth on this passage, however, reads, 'And thou shalt rejoice, thou and thine household' (טבש הילא ותבש). Now the original reading was that as in the Tosaphoth, which is found in Deut. xiv, 26, where the second time is spoken of. The rabbins, however, thought that the reading alluded to in the Tosaphoth is found in the section which treats of the Feast of Tabernacles; hence, when the editors of the Talmud found out the mistake, they substituted for the reading קריע תואר התשע תואר of that of תColumnType17="םש ותבש." (b.) Sometimes sentences are quoted in the Talmud as Biblical which are not found in the Bible. In Berakoth, fol. 61, col. 1, in fine, we read: Rab Nachman said Manoah was an ignorant man (אמר עא איה), for it is written, 'He went after his wife' (Judg. xiii, 11). Rab Nachman, the son of Isaac, asked, should this not also apply to Elkanah, for it is written, 'And Elkanah went after his wife;' and to Elijahu, of whom the Scripture says, "And he arose and followed her" (2 Kings iv, 80)? He followed her indeed! Yes, but he followed her words and advice, and so here likewise he (Manoah) went after her words and counsel. The Tosaphoth correctly remarks on what the Talmud says concerning Elkanah and Elijahu: it means a child and a wife respectively (טבש הילא ותבש), i.e. "It is an error, for this verse is not found in the whole Scripture."* To illustrate Stielensnyder's statement, we give the following example. In the Talmud (Nedarim, fol. 61, col. 9) it is said in the school of R. Ishmael, "He will magnify the law and make it honorable" (לנשראנ תוא). In the Talmud (Berakoth, fol. 10, col. 1) the question was raised, how long the judges were obliged to sit at court. R. Sherai answered, "Until mid-day." To which R. Chama said, "Where do you find the law in the Scripture?" The answer was, "It is said, 'Woe to thee, O land! for a child is a child, and a wife is a wife in the morning'" (Eccles. x, 16). R. Jeremiah once engaged himself with R. Sera in the law. When the time for the evening prayer had already advanced, R. Jeremiah besought himself quickly to read it. To this R. Sera replied the passage (Prov. xxviii, 9), "He that turneth away his ear from hearing my law, even his prayer shall be abhorred." (Šabbath, fol. 10, col. 1). Of Rl. Tarphon it is said that when he was told something he rejected it, he would say to use it (סבש⁸ יבש כן), "A knap and a flower in one branch" (Ezod. xxviii, 83); but when the tale was not according to his taste, he used the words (Gen. xxii, 90), "You shall no go down with your (Sabbath Robbas, ch. xxv).

* E.g. "He already drank for thee the cup of consolation," i.e. He already drank for thee the cup of consolation (Sabbath Robbas, fol. 20, col. 3). To be contradicted in another something? The phrase "cup of consolation" is found in Jer. xvi, 1.
have seen that in the ancient Book of the Crowns, even though it states in Deut. 18:18 is written with a after the first ב. 
   The latter statement proves that our present reading is correct.

28. Exod. xxxi, 1, רֵעֶה: in Berakoth, fol. 56, col. 1,_decorator;  
   Jer. iv, 20, 24, בֵּית דָּמָם, defective; in Sanhedrin, fol. 4, col. 1, we read that the school of Shammai read בֵּית דָּמָם, while that of Hillel, בֵּית דָּמָם, (I. e. once piena written: the same is also said in Zohar,  
   col. 3. comp. also the note in Michaelis, Biblis Hebr. ad loc.)

29. Lev. x, 12, רֵעֶה: in Berakoth, fol. 61, col. 1,_decorator. 

30. Lev. xxv, 10, שָׁבָתָּא: Nidda, fol. 33, col. 1,_decorator. 

31. Lev. xviii, 16, נְפֵשׁ וּבֵן בּוֹ: in BeThanan, fol. 56, col. 2,_decorator, אָרְזָא אֲנַחְנוּ אֵין אִיהָ בָּא אָלֶה, here the reading is erroneous.

32. Numb. v, 19, מִצָּאֵל נָא: Gittin, fol. 50, Yoma, 
   fol. 57, col. 3,_decorator, מִצָּאֵל נָא. 

33. Numb. xviii, 16, רֵעֶה בֵּית דָּמָם: in the 
   Talmud seems once to have stood דָּמָם after שָׁבָתָּא, at least this is intimated in the Tosepohoth, or additional 
   commentary to the Talmud; Berakoth, fol. 56, col. 1, in 
   the Talmud it is stated שָׁבָתָּא רֵעֶה בֵּית דָּמָם, i.e. 
   "We sought for this reading, but could not find it." 

34. Deut. vi, 7, רֵעֶה: Berakoth, fol. 5, col. 1,_decorator. 
   (thus likewise the Samar. and Vulg.)

35. Deut. vi, 9, קְשָׁרָא: Menachoth, fol. 54, col. 1,Decorator, R. Meir seems to have read קְשָׁרָא.

36. Deut. vi, 40, מִצָּאֵל נָא: Jerusalem Talmud, Pesac 
   ch. 2, 4,_decorator.


38. Deut. xxv, 7, בֵּית דָּמָם: Yoma, fol. 16, col. 2, R. Ashai found B. Kahana, who, being perplexed about it, read בֵּית דָּמָם (with conjunctive). 
   In correct codices, as is also evident from the Masoroth, it is read דָּמָם נָא (some Hebr. MSS. 1 Sanm., the Sym., Ar. 
   Vulg. have דָּמָם.)

39. Jos. iii, 17, quoted in Berakoth, fol. 54, col. 1,_decorator. 
   But instead of בֵּית דָּמָם it reads דָּמָם נָא and for בֵּית דָּמָם the reading is דָּמָם נָא.

40. Jos. xiv, 11, מִצָּאֵל נָא: Berakoth, fol. 54, col. 1,_decorator.

41. Jos. xiv, 7, 10. These two verses for the sake of 
   brevity are thus contracted (see No. 1, c. above), Yoma, 
   fol. 18, col. 1,_decorator. יַעֲבֵר לָעֲבֵר (נָרָכִים) (I. e. "I am called Caleb, forty years old was I when Moses 
   carried the land, and now I am this day fourscore and five years old."

42. Josb. xvi, 6, 8. These two verses for the sake of 
   brevity are thus contracted (see No. 1, c. above), Yoma, 
   fol. 18, col. 1,Decorator. יַעֲבֵר לָעֲבֵר (נָרָכִים) (I. e. "I am called Caleb, forty years old was I when Moses 
   carried the land, and now I am this day fourscore and five years old."

43. Judg. xv, 8, 21, where Samson is said to have 
   judged Israel twenty years (xvi, 8). The Talm. Hierosol. 
   Sanadh, fol. 17,Decorator. the passages reads, and he judged Israel 
   forty years, and another that he judged Israel twenty 
   years. R. Acha answered, from this we see that the 
   Philistines feared him twenty years after his death, just 
   as they feared him ten years before it." (On this passage 
   R. Chayim, in his preference to the Rabbinic Bible, makes 
   the following interpretation: "To me it appears, however, 
   that the text had no difficulty in it; and he judged Israel 
   twenty years, and another that he judged Israel twenty 
   years."

The Book of Crowns (תנ"ך דרא) is an ancient treas-

ure, containing Masoretic rules on the ornamental 

letters. It has lately been published, for the first time, by 

Burges (Paris, 1866).

80. Raa, one of the principal deities of the Polynesian, or South-Sea Islanders. The third order of divinities appears to have consisted of the descendants of Raa. These were numerous and varied in their character, some being gods of war and others of medicine.

Raah. See GLIDE.

Ra‘amah [some Raa‘amah] (Heb. Ramah), רָפָה בָּ֫מָה

Once Rama‘, רָפָה בָ֫מָה [1 Chron. i. 9], a skudding, hence a horse’s mane, as in Job xxxix. 19; Sept. Papyrus, but Paruma [v. r. Paruma] in Ezek. xxvii. 22; Vulg. Roma and Reoma), the fourth son of Cush, and the father of Sheba and Dedan (Gen. x. 7: 1 Chron. i. 9), B.C. post 2518. It appears that the descendants of Cush colonized a large part of the interior of Africa, especially the southern continent probably by the strait of Bab-el-Mandeb. A
RAAMIAH

section of the family, however, under their immediate progenitor, Raamiah, settled along the eastern shores of the Arabian peninsula. There they founded nations which afterwards became celebrated, taking their names from Raamiah's two sons, Sheba and Dedan. See CUSH. Though Sheba and Dedan became nations of greater importance, and notoriety, yet the name Raamiah did not wholly disappear from ancient history. Ezekiel, in enumerating the distinguished traders in the marts of Tyre, says, "The merchants of Sheba and Raamiah, they were thy merchants: they occupied in thy fairs with chief of all spices, and with all precious stones, and gold" (Ezek. xxvii. 22). The eastern provinces of Arabia, (Damas, in all ages for their spices. The position of Sheba (q.v.) is well known, and Raamiah must have been near it.

There can be little doubt that in the classical name Regma (Prus of Potemly, vi, 7, and *Ptyzum of Steph. Byzantium), which is identical with the Sept. equivalent for Raamiah, we have a memorial of the Old-Test. patriarch and of the country he colonized. The town of Regma was situated on the Arabian shore of the Persian Gulf, on the northern side of the long promontory which separates it from the ocean. It is interesting to note that on the southern side of this promontory, a few miles distant, was the town called Datena, evidently identical with Dedan (q.v.). Around Regma Potemly locates an Arab tribe of the Aaurit (Geog. vi, 7). Pliny appears to call them Epimariani (vi, 26), which, according to Porzio (Geog. of Arabia, 323), is just an anagrammatic form of Rammanie, the descendants of Raamiah—an opinion not improbable. Forster traces the migrations of the nation from Raamiah along the eastern shores of Arabia to the mountains of Yemen, where he finds them in conjunction with the family of Sheba (Ibid. p. 66-71). There the mention of the Rammani tribe by Strabo, in connection with the expedition of Gallus (xvi, p. 781), seems to corroborate the view of Forster. Of Sheba, the other son of Raamiah, there has been found a trace in a ruined city so named (Sheba) on the island of Adaw (Marask, s. v.), belonging to the province of Arabia called El-Bahryen, on the shores of the gulf. See SHEBA. Be this as it may, however, there can be no doubt that the original settlements of the descendants of Raamiah were upon the south-western shores of the Persian Gulf. Probably, like most of their brethren, while remaining a permanent nucleus, they wandered with their flocks, herds, and merchandise far and wide over Arabia. For the different views entertained regarding Raamiah, see Bochart (Philog. iv, 5) and Michaelis (Siegenen, i, 185). The tribe of Rammanie (Geog. v, 16) and the "area Rammanie" cannot, on etymological grounds, be connected with Raamiah, as it wants an equivalent for the; nor can we suppose that it is to be probably traced three days' journey from Sanh, the capital of Yemen.

Raamiah (Heb. Raamayh, רָמוֹאָה, thunder of Jehovih; Sept. Poa máy [v. r. Naqem]), one of the chief Israelites who returned from exile with Zerubbabel (Neh. vii, 7), B.C. 445. In the parallel list (Ezra ii, 21) he is laid down with the three above-mentioned equated and similar. A possible explanation of the name in the Sept. of Nehemiah appears to have arisen from a confusion of the two readings, unless, as Burrington (Gewal, ii, 68) suggests, Poa máy is an error of the copyist for Poa Aava, the uncial letters of having been mistaken for m. In 1 Esdr. ii, 7, the name appears as Ezrak.

Raam'ses (Exod. i, 10). See RAMSES.

Rab. See RABBI; RABBINISM.

Rab, properly Arba Arikha, a noted Jewish teacher, was born at Kaphri, a small place between Sur and Nehardea, in Babylon, about A.D. 170. In early life he went in quest of knowledge into Palestine, and became one of the most favorite scholars of Jehudah the Holy (q.v.). On his return to the East he labored, some say for thirty years (between A.D. 188 and 219), at Nehardea as metugenam, or amora, under Shila and Samuel; and at the close of that relationship, he entered upon the higher sphere of school rector and judge at Sura (or Sora), where he exercised those offices till the end of his life. "In this college, which was called Be-Rab (בֶּרַב), being an abbreviation of Beth-Rab (בְּרָב), the school of Rab, the disciples assembled two months in the year—viz. the month of Elul—in the cool air and spring, for which they were denominat Yarche Kallah (יֶרֶךְ קָהָלָה, the months of assembly) and into it all the people were admitted a whole week before each principal festival, when this distinguished luminary delivered expository lectures for the benefit of the nation at large. So eager were the people to hear him, and so great were the crowds, that many could find no house accommodation, and were obliged to take up their abode in the open air on the banks of the Sora River (Succa, 26 a). These festival discourses were denominated Rite (רִית), and during the times in which they were delivered all courts of justice were closed (Baba Rama, 118 a)." After holding the presidency for about twenty-eight years, Rab died in A.D. 247, lamented by the whole nation. The esteem in which he was held during his lifetime is best expressed in the title "Rab," i.e., teacher, by which they called him; just as Jehudah the Holy was called *Rabbi" or "Rabbenu" in Palestine. One of Rab's main works was the systematic exposition of the Mishna (q.v.), a copy of which, as revised and somewhat amended by Rab himself, in his later years, he had brought from Palestine. This second recension of the Mishna became the authorized or canonical form of that work, and, under the Aramaic name of Matica be-Rab, "the Mishna of the School of Rab," constituted the text of the Babylonian Talmud. But, besides his labors as an oral expositor on the Mishna, Rab was the author of two important works which greatly contributed to the advancement of Biblical exegesis. These were, Siphra or Siphry de be-Rab, *"the Book of the School of Rab" (בֶּרַב בֶּשֶר בְּלָדֹת), a Midrash on Leviticus; and Siphre or Siphry de be-Rab (בֵּית רַב בֶּשֶר), a similar commentary on Numbers and Deuteronomy. These works have, indeed, been sometimes attributed to other authors, but the greatest weight of authority assigns them to the doctor of Sura. An analysis of these works is given in the article MIDRAH, where also some of the editions are mentioned. The best edition of the Siphra is that of M. L. Malbim, with the commentaryيثו(2) (De Voland, 1870). But, besides his many Midrashim, Rab was also a highly distinguished expositor of the Hebrew Scriptures. His "Etzeh über die Bücher Siphra" (1878) is certainly the best, but above all, the excellent monograph by Muhlfield, Rab: ein Lebensbild zur Geschichte des Talmud (Leips. 1871). (B. P.)

Rabad (רַבָּד), or Abraham Ibn-Daud, for which the acrostic stands, a noted rabbi, was born at Toledo about 1110, and died as a martyr 1180. He was one of the most renowned Talmudists of his time, highly esteemed for his historical knowledge. He was the author of the הַסֵּכִּים (The Successions of Tradition), written in the form of annals, giving the history of the world from Adam to his own time (1161), and showing the uninterrupted chain of tradition to his day, against the opinion of the Karaites, who denied all tradition. As a supplement to this chronicle, Ibn-Daud wrote a succinct
RABANUS MAURUS. See Rabanus.

Rabardeau, Michel, a French Jesuit, was born at Orleans in 1572, and became a member of the order in 1595. He had enjoyed the very best educational facilities, and was therefore employed by the Society in its schools. He taught philosophy and moral theology, and became successively rector of Bourges and of Amiens. He died at Paris in 1649. He is celebrated especially for his mastery of casuistry and his intimate knowledge of the canon law. In the domain of the latter he displayed his power in 1640, when Harsaut the Oratorian sought a schism in the Church of France by his work Optati Galli de Creato Schismate, in which Rambaud showed the assumption of the patriarchate. Rabardeau, in his Optatus Gallus Benignus Manus Sectus (Paris, 1641, 4to), defended the cardinal, and tried to prove that such an assumption bore in it no trace of a schism, as the patriarchates of Jerusalem and Constantinople are in no wise interfaced in power with the Pope, and the Roman Popacy and its supreme authority. Of course, at Rome the book was displeasing, and was put into the Index. See Setheh, Bibl. Scriptor. Soc. Jesu.—Hoefler, Nouv. Biog. Générale, s. v.

Rabat is a linen neck-collar worn by ecclesiastics.

Rabaudy, Bernard de, a French theologian, was born in 1801, at Toulouse, of an ancient noble family. At an early age he took the monastic vow with the Dominicans, and, after having completed his education, he taught at Limoges and in the University of Toulouse. In 1706 he was nominated superintendent of the order in France, and in 1716 was made successor to the general of the order at Toulouse. He died there Nov. 3, 1731. He wrote, Exercitationes Theologicae (Toul. 1714, 2 vols. 8vo), and Questions de Deo Uno (ibid. 1718, 8vo). See Échard, Bibl. Script. Ord. Predicat. vol. ii.—Hoefler, Nouv. Biog. Générale, s. v.

Rabaut, Paul, a French Protestant divine, who was a martyr to the cause of true Christianity in France, was born at Béthune, near Montpellier, in 1718. He was educated at the seminary in Lausanne for the holy office of the ministry, and became one of the "Preachers of the Desert," among whom he soon ranked as first in many respects. In 1743 he was made pastor of the Reformed Church of Nantes, and there became the leader of French Protestantism. This was a time of persecution indeed. The government of Louis XV had taken upon the task of rooting out the heretical doctrines which had flourished their banner in the face of the very man who had given authority to his government by saying "L'État c'est moi." In spite of all opposition, and in the face of a host of plotting enemies, Rabaut maintained his position, and in 1728 he was even emerited. But in 1738, when the great Revolution succeeded, he was arrested as a traitor, and only gained his freedom in 1774 by the reversal of the 9th Thermidor. He died shortly after Sept. 25, 1794. Rabaut took part in the Reform of the Calendars, and in 1791, he wrote a treatise in which he defined the Revolution. He was a man of great wit and courage of that in 1738; and although his heterodox views on many important points made him a pronounced Chiliasm in doctrine and an Episcopalian in government, he was yet so greatly revered for his fortitude, consistency, frankness, and devotion to Protestantism that his leadership was never rejected, but always gladly accepted by the Huguenot successors. He was not a great man. His education was moderate, his power in the pulpit ordinary. It was his sterling qualities of character that made him a leader in the Israel of France. His eldest son, Paul, also called St. Etienne, who was born in 1748, and was both preacher and lawyer, distinguished himself as a leader of the Revolution, to which both he and his wife fell martyrs. It was his influence that carried through the National Council religious equality for all citizens. His novel Te Deum or La Révérence (Lond. 1779; republished at Paris in 1820 and 1826 under the title Le Dieu Céleste) is important for the history of French Protestantism. Another son (the second), Antoine R-Pommer, who was born Oct. 21, 1744, was also a preacher, and likewise distinguished himself in the Revolution. He finally entered the civil service, but in 1815 he was obliged to quit France on account of his having voted for the execution of Louis XVI, and was only allowed to return in 1816. He died at Paris in 1820. He published Amansier Ecclésiastique, et l'Éloignement de Stancrur P. R. de Pess, Francia au XVIIIe Siècle (Lausanne, 1859). See New York Nation, xviii, 267; London Academy, Aug. 1, 1874, p. 119; De Felice, Hist. of the French Protestants, p. 416, 416; Register, Studia u. Kräften, 1888-47; Smith, Hist. of the Huguenots; Bidel,Sketches of Paul Rabaut and the French Protestants of the 16th Century (transl. from the French, with an Appendix containing portions of Paul Rabaut's writings now first published [Lond. 1861, 12mo]).

Rab'bah (Heb. Rab'baḥ, רַבְּבָה), the name of several ancient places both east and west of the Jordan, although it appears in this form in connection with only two in the Bible. The root is rab, mighty, and hence great, whether in size or importance (Genesis, Thesaur. p. 1254; Fürst, Handwörterb. ii, 347). The word survives in Arabic as a common appellative, and is also in use as the name of places—e.g. Rabba, on the east of the Dead Sea; Rabba, a temple in the tribe of Menash (Yez誼, ii, 107 a); and perhaps also Rabob, in Morocco. In the following account we chiefly follow the usual Biblical and archaeological authorities, with additions from other sources. See Rabbah.

2. A very strong place on the east of Jordan, which, when it was first introduced, was the chief city of the Ammonites. In five passages (Deut. iii, 11; 2 Sam. xii, 26; xvi, 27; Jer. xlix. 1: Ezra xx, 20) it is styled at length יַרְבָּבָה יְבֵנָה יְבֵנָה יָבָה יַרְבָּה יְבֵנָה יְבֵנָה יָבָה יַרְבָּה יְבֵנָה יְבֵנָה Yarbaḥ-ben-Abanain, A. V. "Rabbah of the Ammonites," or "the Children of Ammon;" but elsewhere (Josh. xiii, 28; 2 Sam. xi, 18; Jer. 27, 29; 1 Chron. xxi, 29; Jer. 48, 28; Amos i, 14) simply "Rabbaḥ." The Sept. generally has Ραβάσι, Ραβασίον, or in some MSS. occasionally Ραβάσιον or Ραβασίον. In Deut. iii, 5 it is Ραβάσιον τῶν ἀμώνων in both MSS. In Josh. xiii, 25 the LXX has Ραβάσιον καὶ τὰ σημαντικὰ περὶ τοῦ τοῦ ποταμοῦ τοῦ Ἰωάννου. The first and last words of this sentence seem to have changed places. Other various readings likewise occur.
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Rabbah appears in the sacred records as the single city of the Ammonites; at least no other bears any distinctive name, a fact which contrasts strongly with the abundant details of the city life of the Moabites. Whether it was originally, as some conjecture, the Ham of Amnon—there were dispersioners of Ammonites (Gen. xiv, 5), will probably remain forever a conjecture. The statement of Eusebius (Onomast. n. v. *'Apddô) that it was originally a city of the Rephaim implies that it was the Ashtaroth Karmaim of Gen. xiv. In agreement with this is the fact that it was in later times known as Antara (Staph. BzS, quoted by Ritter, p. 1155). In this case, the dual ending of Karmaim may point, as some have conjectured in Jerusalemim, to the double nature of the city—a lower town and a citadel. When first named it is in the hands of the Ammonites, and is mentioned as containing the bedstead of the giant Og (Deut. iii, 11), possibly the trophy of some successful war against the more ancient Rephaim. With the people of Lot, their kinsmen the Israelites had no quarrel, and Rabbah—of the children of Ammon remained to all appearance un molested during the first period of the Israelitish occupation. It was not included in the territory of the tribes east of Jordan; the border of Gad stops at "Aroer, which faces Rabbah" (Josh. xiii, 25). The attacks of the Bene-Ammon on Israel, however, brought these peaceful relations to an end. Benjamin, Enc. Bibl. 804, through embassies sent to the west of Jordan in attacking and repelling the Philistines and in pursuing David through the woods and ravines of Judah to prevent his crossing the river, unless on such special occasions as the relief of Jabesh. At any rate, we never hear of his having penetrated so far in that direction as Rabbah. But David's armies were often engaged against both Moab and Ammon. His first Ammonitish campaign appears to have occurred early in his reign. A part of the army, under Abishai, was sent as far as Rabbah to keep the peace, while the main force under Joab remained at Medeba (1 Chron. xix, 7). The following year was occupied in the great expedition by David in person against the Syrians at Helam, wherever that may have been (2 Sam. x, 19). After their defeat the Ammonitish war was resumed, and this time Rabbah was made the main point of attack (xi, 1). Joab took the command, and was followed by the whole of the army. The expedition included Ephraim and Benjamin, as well as the king's own tribe (ver. 11), the "king's slaves" (ver. 1, 17, 24), probably the officers of the old regiments and seven chief captains. Uriah was certainly there, and, if a not improbable Jewish tradition may be adopted, Ittai the Gittite was there also. See ITTAI. The ark accompanied the camp (ver. 11), the only time that we hear of its doing so, except that memorable battle with the Philistines, when its capture caused the death of the high-priest. On a former occasion (Numb. xxxix, 6) the "holy things" only are specified—an expression which hardly seems to include the ark. David alone, to his cost, remained in Jerusalem. The country was wasted, and the enemy was driven with their property (xii, 30) into their single stronghold, as the Bedouin Knites were driven from their tents inside the walls of Jerusalem when Judah was overrun by the Chaldeans. See JEROBOAM. The siege must have lasted nearly, if not quite, two years; since during its progress David formed his connection with Bathsheba, and the two children, which then died and Solomon, were successively born. The sallies of the Ammonites appear to have formed a main feature of the siege (2 Sam. xi, 17, etc.). At the same time it ceded 1 in capturing a portion of the place—the "city of waters," that is, the lower town, so called from its containing the perennial stream which rises in and still flows through it. The fact (which seems undoubted) that the source of the stream was within the lower city, explains its having held out for so long. It was also called the "royal city" (אֶרֶץ הַכִּסָּר), perhaps from its connection with Molech or Milcom—"the king"—more probably from its containing the palace of Hazan and Nahash. But the citadel, which rises abruptly on the north side of the lower town, a place of very great strength, still remained to be taken, and the honor of this capture, Joab (with that devotion to David which runs like a bright thread through the dark web of his character) insists on reserving for the king. "I have fought," writes he to his uncle, then living at ease in the harem at Jerusalem, in all the satisfaction of the birth of Solomon—"I have fought against Rabbah, and have taken the city of waters; but the citadel still remains: now, therefore, gather the rest of the people together and come; put yourself at the head of the whole army, renew the assault against the citadel, take it, and thus finish the siege which I have carried so far," and then he ends with a rough banter (comp. 2 Sam. xix, 6)—"half jest, half earnest,—lest I take the city and in future it go under my name." The waters of the lower city once in the hands of the besiegers, the fate of the citadel was certain, for that stronghold, as we learn from the invaluable notice of Josephus, Ant. vii, 5, but one well of limited supply, quite inadequate to the throng which crowded its walls. The provisions also were at last exhausted, and shortly after, David's arrival, the city surrendered with a very great booty, and the idol of Molech, with all its costly ornaments, fell into the hands of David. We are not told whether the city was demolished or whether David was satisfied with the slaughter of its inmates. In the time of Amos, two centuries and a half later, it had again a "wall" and "palaces," and was still the sanctuary of Molech—"the king" (Amos i, 14). So it was also at the date of the invasion of Nebuchadnezzar (Jer. xxxix, 2, 8), when its dependent towns ("daughters") were mentioned, and when it is named in the prophecy of Ezekiel (Ezra xi, 20) that Ammon, with Jerusalem (Ezra xxi, 20). At Rabbah, no doubt Baalas, king of the Bene-Ammon (Jer. xi, 14), held such court as he could muster, and within its walls was plotted the attack of Ishmael which cost Gedaliah his life and drove Jeremiah into Egypt. The denunciations of the prophets just named may have been fulfilled either at the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, or five years afterwards, when the Assyrian armies overran the country east of Jordan on their road to Egypt (Josephus, Ant. x, 9, 7). See JEROBOAM, on AMOS i, 41.

In the period of the New Testament, Rabbath-Ammon appears to have been a place of much importance and the scene of many contests. The natural advantages of position and water supply, which had always distinguished it, still made it an important citadel by turns to each side during the contentions which raged so long over the whole of the district. It lay on the road between Hebron and Bozrah, and was the last place at which a stock of water could be obtained for the journey across the desert; while, as it stood on the confines of the richer and more civilized country, it formed an important station for all the incursions of the wild tribes of the desert. From Ptolemy Philadelphus (B.C. 285-247) it received the name of Philadelphia (Jerome, on Ezra xxv, 1), and under this name it is often mentioned by Greek and Roman writers (Pliny, Hist. Nat. v, 16, Philostr. Epiphanus, in Ritter, p. 118, 119), B.C. 218. David. It was taken from the then Ptolemy (Philopator) by Antiochus the Great, after a long and obstinate resistance from the besieged in the citadel. A communication with the spring in the lower town had been made since (possibly in consequence of) David's siege, by a long
secret subterranean passage, and had not this been discovered to Antiochus by a prisoner, the citadel might have been enabled to hold out (Polybius, v, 17). During the struggle between Antiochus the Pious (Sidetes) and Ptolemy, the son-in-law of Simon Maccabaeus (B.C. cir. 184), it is mentioned as being governed by a tyrant named Cotylas (Ant. xiii, 8, 1). Its ancient name, though under a cloud, was still used; it is mentioned by Polybius (v, 71) under the hardly altered form of Rabbatammon (Podonerou). About B.C. 50 we hear of it as in the hands of Aretas (one of the Arab chieftains of that name), who retired thither from Judea when menaced by Scaurus, Pompey's general (Josephus, War, i, 6, 5). The Arabs probably held it till the year B.C. 50, when they were attacked there by Herod the Great. But the account of Josephus (War, i, 10, 5, 6) seems to imply that the city was not then inhabited, and that although the citadel formed the main point of the combat, yet that it was only occupied on the instant. The water communication above alluded to also appears not to have been then in existence, for the people who occupied the citadel quickly surrendered from thirst, and the whole affair was over in six days.

At the Christian era Philadelphia formed the eastern limit of the region of Persea (Josephus, War, iii, 5, 3). It was one of the cities of the Decapolis, and as far down as the 4th century was esteemed one of the most remarkable and strongest cities of the whole of Coele-Syria (Eusebius, Onomast.; Ammianus Marc. in Ritter, p. 1157). Its magnificent theatre (said to be the largest in Syria), temples, odeon, mausoleum, and other public buildings were probably erected during the 2d and 3d centuries, like those of Jerash, which they resemble in style, though their scale and design are grander (Lindsay). Among the ruins of an "immense temple" on the citadel hill, Mr. Tipping saw some prostrate columns five feet in diameter. Its colonn is extant, some bearing the figure of Astarte, some the word Herakleion, implying a worship of Hercules, probably the continuation of that of Molech or Milkom. From Stephanus of Byzantium we learn that it was also called Astarte, doubtless from its containing a temple of that goddess. Justin Martyr, a native of Shechem, writing about A.D. 140, speaks of the city as containing a multitude of Ammonites ( Dial. with Trypho), though it would probably not be safe to interpret this too strictly.

Philadelphia became the seat of a Christian bishop, and was one of the nineteen sees of "Palestina tercia" which were subordinate to Bostra (Reland, Palest., p. 228). The church still remains in excellent preservation with its lofty steeples (lord Lindsay). Some of the bishops appear to have signed under the title of Bakatha; which Bakatha is by Epaphnius (himself a native of Palestine) mentioned in such a manner as to imply that it was but another name for Philadelphia, derived from an Arab tribe in whose possession it was at that time (A.D. cir. 400). But this is doubtful (see Reland, Palest., p. 1157).

When the Moslems conquered Syria, they found the city in ruins (Abulfeda in Ritter, p. 1158; and in note to lord Lindsay); and in ruins remarkable for its extent and desolation even for Syria, the "land of ruins," it still remains. The ancient name has been preserved among the natives of the country. Abulfeda calls it Ammon (Talb. Syr., p. 19), and by that name it is still known. The prophet Ezekiel foretold that Rabba should become a "stable for camels," and the country a "couching-place for flocks" (Ezek. xxx, 5). This has been literally fulfilled, and Borchardt, in his Notes of Syria, tells that a party of Arabs had stabled their camels among the ruins of Rabba. Too much stress has, however, been laid upon this minute point by Dr. Keith and others (Evidence from Prophecy, p. 150). What the prophet meant to say was that Ammon and its chief city should be desolate; and he expressed it by reference to facts which would certainly occur in any forsaken site in the borders of Arabia; and which are now constantly occurring not in Rabba only, but in many other places. Rabba lies about twenty-two miles from the Jordan at the eastern extremity of which Hebron and es-Salt form respectively the southern and northern points. It is about fourteen miles from the former and twelve from the latter. Jerash is due north, more than twenty miles distant in a straight line, and thirty-five by the usual road (Lindsay, p. 278). It lies in a valley which is a branch, or perhaps the main course, of the Yarmuk, usually identified with the Jabbok. The Moab Ammon, or water of Ammon, a mere streamlet, rises within the basin which contains the ruins of the town. The main valley is a winter torrent, but appears to be perennial, and contains a quantity of fish, by one observer said to abound (see Borchardt, p. 588; G. Robinson, ii, 174; a perfect fish-pond," Tipping). The stream runs from west to east, and near the point of its confluence with the Jordan is the citadel on its isolated hill. The public build-
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Amman, as seen in approaching it from the South.

fragments are said to be Roman, in general character like those at Jerash, except the citadel, which is described as of large square stones put together without cement, and which is probably more ancient than the rest. Among the ruins are chiefly noticeable a spacious church, built with large stones, and having a steeple; a temple, with part of the side walls and a niche in the back wall remaining; a curved wall along the water-side, with many niches, and in front of it a row of large columns, four of which remain, though without capitals; a high-arched bridge over the river, still perfect, apparently the only one that had existed. The citadel on the hill, a structure of immense strength, and the theatre have been referred to above. The remains of private houses scattered on both sides of the stream are very extensive. They have been visited, and described in more or less detail, by Burchhardt (Syria, p. 357-380), Seetzen (Reisen, i, 186; iv, 212-214), Irby (June 14), Buckingham (E. Syria, p. 68-82), lord Lindsay (5th ed. p. 278-284), G. Robinson (ii, 172-178), lord Claud Hamilton (in Keith, Edin. of Prov, ch. vi), De Saulcy (Dead Sea, i, 387 sq.), Tristram (Land of Israel, p. 544 sq.), Porter (Handb. for Pal., p. 392), Budeker (Palastina, p. 319), and the Rev. A. E. North-ern, in the Quart. Statement of the "Pal. Explor. Fund," April, 1872, p. 57 sq., where a plan is given.

2. (7277, with the definite article; Sept. Ζωνιαίδα v. r. 'Aposiaiá; Vulg. Ardeba) a city of Judah, named, with Kirjath-jearim, in Josh. xv, 60 only. It lay among the group of towns situated to the west of Jerusalem, on the northern border of the tribe of Judah (Keil, Comment, ad loc.). It is probably only an epitaph for Jerusalem itself, which otherwise would not appear in the list. See JUDAH ( Tribe of ).

3. In one passage (Josh. xi, 8) Zidon is mentioned with the affix Rabbath—Zidon-rabbath. This is preserved in the margin of the A. V., though in the text it is translated "great Zidon."

4. Although there is no trace of the fact in the Bible, there can be little doubt that the name of Rabbath was also attached in Biblical times to the chief city of Moab. Its Biblical name is "Ar," but we have the testimony of Eusebius (Onomast. a. v. Moab) that in the 4th century it possessed the special title of Rabbath-Moab, or, as it appears in the corrupted orthography of Stephanus of Byzantium, the colon, and the Ecclesiastical Lists, Rabbathmohr, Rabbothmoum, and Ratha or

Robba Mochita (Roland, Palaut., p. 226, 957; Seetzen, Reisen, iv, 227; Ritter, p. 1229). This name was for a time displaced by Areopolis, in the same manner that Rabbath-Ammon had been by Philadelphia: these, however, were but the names imposed by the temporary masters of the country, and employed by them in their official documents; and when they passed away, the original names, which had never lost their place in the mouths of the common people, reappeared, and Rabbath, like Amman, still remains to testify to the ancient appellation. Rabbath lies on the highlands at the south-east quarter of the Dead Sea, between Kerak and Jibbel Shihin. Its ruins, which are unimportant, are described by Burchhardt (July 15), Seetzen (Reisen, i, 411), De Saulcy (Jan. 18), and Porter (Handb. for Pal., p. 297 sq.). See AR.

Rabbath of the Children of Ammon, and of the Ammonites. (The former is the more accurate, the Hebrew being in both cases יְרָבָת. יְרָבָת. Sept. יָרָבָת אֲרוֹם יְרָבָת אֲרוֹם; Vulg. Rabbath filiorum Ammon.) This is the full appellation of the place commonly given as RABBATH (q. v.). It occurs only in Deut. iii, 11 and Ezek. xxii, 20. The th is merely the Hebrew "construct state," or mode of connecting a word ending in ah with one following it. Comp. GIMATH; KIRJATH; RAMATH, etc.

Rabbenu Gershom, or, more properly, Rabbi Gershon bens-Jeshua, the reputed founder of the Franco-German Rabbinical school, in which the studies of that of Babylonia were earnestly revived, was born about 960, and died in 1028. He was called "The Ancient," "The Light of the Exile," and was the founder of monogamy and other "institutions" among the Jews, which were for a long time disputed and rejected, and himself was placed under ban for attempting to abrogate the Mosaic precept respecting the marriage of a man with the childless wife of his deceased brother. Gershom also wrote a commentary on the Talmud, and some hymns and penitential prayers, which are extant in the Mezuzah. For reasons unknown he went to Mayence, where he founded a college, which soon attracted the youth of Germany and Italy. See Furst, Bib. Jud. i, 328; De Rossi, Dizionario Storico (Germ. trans.), p. 114; Grätz, Gesch. der Juden (Leips. 1871), v, 364 sq.; Braunschweiger, Gesch. der Juden in den romanischen Staaten, p. 82 sq.; Jost, Gesch. d. Juden, VII–28.
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Rabbenu Tam. See TAM.

Rabbi ('Pa'ysi, 'Pa'ysi'), a title of honor given by the Jews to their learned men, authorized teachers of the law, and spiritual heads of the community, and which in the New Test. is frequently given to Christ. In the following article we combine the Biblical and Talmudical statements on the subject, with additions from later sources.

I. Different Forms, and the Signification of the Title.

—The term 'Pa'ysi, Rabbi, is a form of the noun 'Pa'ysi, Rab (from 'Pa'ysi, to multiply, to become great, distinguished), which in the Biblical Hebrew denotes a great man; one distinguished either for age, position, office, or skill (Job xxxii, 9; Dan. i, 3; Prov. xxvi, 10); but in the canonical books it does not occur with this suffix. It is in post-Biblical Hebrew this term is usually used as a title, indicating sundry degrees by its several terminations for those who are distinguished for learning, who are the authoritative teachers of the law, and who are the appointed spiritual heads of the Jewish community. Thus, for instance, the simple term 'Pa'ysi, Rab, without any termination, and with or without the name of the person following it, corresponds to our expression teacher, master, i.e., rashi, and is the lowest degree; with the pronominal suffix first person singular—viz. "Pa'yi, Rabbi", 'Pa'ysi, my Rabbi (Matt. xxiii, 7, 8; xxvi, 25, 49; Mark ix, 5; xi, 21; xiv, 45; John i, 38, 49; iii, 2, 26; iv, 31; vi, 23; ix, 2; vi, 8)—it is a higher degree; and with the pronominal suffix first person plural—viz. "Rabbi, our teacher, our master" in the Chaldee form—it is the highest degree, and was given to the patriarchs ('Pa'ysi, or 'Pa'ysi) or the presidents of the Sanhedrin. Gamaliel I, who was patriarch in Palestine A.D. 30-50, was the first that obtained this extraordinary title, and not Simon ben-Hillel, as is erroneously affirmed by Lightfoot (Harmony of the Four Evangelists, John i, 38). This is evident from the following statement in the Aruch of K. Nathan (s. v. 'Pa'ysi): "We do not find that the title Rabbi began before the patriarchs rabbin Gamaliel I, rabbin Simon his son (who perished in the destruction of the second Temple), and rabbin Johanan ben-Zakkai, the last of whom were present." Lightfoot's mistake is all the more strange since he himself quotes this passage elsewhere (comp. Hebrew and Talmudical Exercitations, Matt. xxiii, 7). 'Pa'ysi, however, which, as we have said, is the noun 'Pa'ysi, with the Chaldee pronominal suffix first person plural, is also used in Aramaic as a noun absolute, the plural of which is 'Pa'ysi and 'Pa'ysi (comp. Chaldee paraphrase on Psa. xxxi, 11; Ruth ii, 2); pronominal suffix second person singular 'Pa'ysi (Song of Songs vi, 4); pronominal suffix third person plural 'Pa'ysi and 'Pa'ysi (Psa. xxxii, xi, 12). Accordingly 'Pa'ysi, in Mark x, 51, which in John xx, 16 is spelled "Pa'ysi, is the equivalent of "Pa'ysi, Rabbi, my master, giving the Syriac pronunciation to the Kameset under which the title is interpreted by the evangelists (Tob. i, 29, 30; 6, 16; Matt. xxiii, 8).

II. Origin and Date of these Titles.—Nathan ben-Jechei (q. v.) tells us, in his celebrated lexicon denominated Aruch (s. v. "Pa'ysi", which was finished A.D. 1001, that Mar Rab Jacob asked Sherira Gaon, and his son Hai, the co-Gaon (A.D. 990), for an explanation of the origin and import of these different titles, and that these spiritual heads of the Jewish community in Babylon re-

plied as follows: "The title Rabbi ('Pa'ysi) is Babylonian, and the title Rabbi ('Pa'ysi) is Palestinian." This is evident from the fact that some of the Tannaim and Amo-

raim are simply called by their names without any title—e.g. Simon the Just, Antigonus of Sobo, Jose ben-

Johanan, Rab, Samuel, Abaye, and Rabbi; some of them bear the title Rabbi ('Pa'ysi)—e.g. rabbi Akiba, rabbi Jose, rabbi Simon, etc.; some of them have the title Mar ('Pa'ysi)—e.g. mar Ubka, mar Januka, etc.; some of the title Rab ('Pa'ysi)—e.g. rab Hana, rab Jehudah, etc.; while some of them have the title Rabbi ('Pa'ysi)—e.g. rab Gamaliel, rabbin Johanan ben-Zakkai, etc. The title Rabbi ('Pa'ysi) is that of the Palestinian sages, who received there of the Sanhedrim the laying-on of the hands, in accordance with the laying-on of the hands as transmitted in unbroken succession by the elders ('Pa'ysi), and were denominated Rabbi, and received authority to judge penal cases; while Rab ('Pa'ysi) is the title of the Babylonian sages, who received the laying-on of hands in their colleges. The more ancient gen-

erations, however, who were far superior, had no such titles as Rabbi ('Pa'ysi), Rabbi ('Pa'ysi), or Rab ('Pa'ysi), either for the Babylonian or Palestinian sages, as is evident from the fact that Hillel I, who came from Babylon, had not the title Rabbi ('Pa'ysi) attached to his name: and that of the prophets, who were very eminent, it is simply and simply 'Pa'ysi, and on the whole, the name up from Babylon, etc., without the title Rabbi being af-

fixed to their names. Indeed, we do not find that this title is of an earlier date than the patriarchate. It be-

gan with rabbin Gamaliel the elder (A.D. 30), rabbin Simon, his son (who perished in the destruction of the second Temple), and rabbin Johanan ben-Zakkai, all of whom were patriarchs or presidents of the Sanhedrin ('Pa'ysi, or 'Pa'ysi). The title Rabbi ('Pa'ysi), too, comes into vogue among those who received the laying-on of hands at this period—as, for instance, rabbi Zaddok, rabbi Eliezer ben-Jacob, etc., and dates from the disciples of rabbin Johanan ben-Zakkai downwards. Now the or-

der of these titles is as follows: Rabbi is greater than Rab; Rab, again, is greater than Rabbi; while the simple name is greater than Rabbin. No one is called Rabbin except the presidents." From this declaration of Sherira Gaon and Hai, that the title Rabbi obtained among the disciples of Johanan ben-Zakkai, the erudite Gritz concludes that "we must regard the title Rabbi, which in the Gospel, with the exception of that by Luke, is given to John the Baptist and to Jesus, as an anachronism. We must also regard as an anachro-

nism the tradition put into the mouth of Jesus against the ambition of the Jewish doctors who be-

come by this title, and the admonition to his dis-

fiples not to suffer themselves to be styled Rabbi —

kai filoian (οἱ γραμματίζοις) ... καὶ λεγομένοι κατά τοὺς ἱεροσόλυμας ἑταῖροι. Γαίρεις ἐν μὴ ἐλαχιστο-

τερεῖ ἑαυτόν (Matt. xxiii, 7, 8). This, moreover, shows that when the Gospel were written down the title Rabbi stood in so high a repute that the fathers could not but transfer it to Christ ("Geschichte der Juden" [Berlin, 1855] iv, 500). But even supposing that the title Rabbi came into vogue in the days of Johanan ben-Zakkai, this would by no means warrant Gritz's conclusion, inasmuch as Johanan lived upwards of a hundred years, and survived four presidents—viz. Hillel I (R.C. 30-10), Simon I (A.D. 10-30), Gamaliel I (A.D. 30-50), and Simon II (A.D. 50-70), and it might therefore have obtained in the early days of the Sanhedrin, which would be shortly after the birth of Christ. The Tosaphoth at the end of Edgylah, however, quoted in the Aruch in the same article, gives a different account of the origin of this title, which is as follows: "He who has disciples and has disciples again, his disciple is called Rabbi; when his disciples are forgotten (i.e. if
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he is so old that his immediate disciples already belong to the past age), he is called Rabbin; and when the disci- ples of his disciples are also forgotten, he is simply called by his own name." This makes the titles coeval with the origin of the different schools, and at the same time accounts for the absence of them among the earliest doctors of the law.

Some account of the rabbins and the Mishnaical and Talmudical writings may be found in Pridaux's (Con- nection, pt. i, bk. 5, under the year B.C. 446; pt. ii, bk. 8, under the year B.C. 37); and a sketch of the history of the school of Rabbinical learning at Tiberias, founded by rabbi Judah Hai-kadosh, the compiler of the Mishna in the 2d century after Christ, is given by Robinson (Biblical Researches, ii, 391). See also Note 14 to Bur- ton, Hampton Lectures, and the authorities there quoted — for instance, Birket (ii, 820) and Basmage (Hist. des Juifs, iii, 5, p. 136). Compare Hill, The Rabbinic (Jen. 1741); Bohn, ibid. (Erf. 1750); Müller, De Doctoribus (Viteb. 1740). See Masters.

Rabbim. See RABBI RABBI.

Rabbino Bibles, also called Mikraoth Gedolah (םיקרות גדולות), or Great Bibles, is the name given to the following Hebrew Bibles, which, besides the original text, also contain the commentaries of sundry Jewish rabbins.

1. הַרְבֵּינוּתָהּ הָשָׁているָהּ וְשָׁטִים הָאָנָפִים לָמֶלֶת יְדֵי תָּלְמִידִים וּלְדוּתִים וְקָרָאתִים וּלְרַבְּרַבִּים. This is the first Rabbinic Bible published by Bomberg, and carried through the press by Felix Pratensis (q. v.) (Venice, 1516-17) (724 = 278). It consists of four parts, with a separate title-page to each, and with the following commentaries:

a. The Pentateuch, with the Caldean paraphrase of Onkelos (q. v.) and the commentaries of Rashi (q. v.).

b. The Prophets, with the Chaldee paraphrase of Jonathan ben-Uziel (q. v.) and the commentaries of Rashi (q. v.).

c. The Haftorahs, viz., the Psalms, with the Targum of Joseph ben-Chaja (q. v.) and D. Kimchi's (q. v.) commentary: Proverbs, with Joseph's Targum and David Huc- Jachja's (q. v.) commentary; Job, with Joseph's Targum and the commentaries of Nachmanides (q. v.) and Farris-...
could not be got into the margin of the text in alphabetical order. Jacob ben-Chajim’s directions: 2; the various readings of Ben-Asher and Ben-Naphtali, and the Eastern and Western cod. 3; and, 4, a treatise upon the points and the various readings. The first edition must still thank the printer and the editor of this work, and Richard Simon, in his Histoire Critique de 1. P. 518, certainly does great injustice when he says: “Bien qu’il pretende que son edition est plus exacte que les autres, les Juifs cependant ne l’existent pas beaucoup, à cause des fautes qui s’y rencontrent.” 5. Concerning the revision and the translation of the Massorot, seeinfra. 6. Le Longchamps, Bible, ii. 363 sq.; Le Longchamps, Bible, i. 350 sq.; Rosenmuller, Handbuch der bibl. Literatur, i. 249 sq.; Steinschneider, Catalogus Librorum Heb., in Bibliotheca Bodleiana, col. 6 sq.; Ginsburg, in Kuts. 7. See FRANKFURTER.

2. A revised and improved edition of the second Bombergian Bible was published at Venice in 1546-48, under the supervision of Cornelius Adelkind. The changes made in this edition consist in omitting Aben-Ezra’s commentary on Isaiah and the Minor Prophets, while Jacob ben-Asher’s (q.v.) commentary on the Pentateuch and Isaiah in Trani’s (q.v.) commentary on Judges and Samuel are inserted. 3. Bomberg’s fourth Rabbinic Bible, by Joan de Gori, was carried through the press and corrected by Isaac ben-Joseph Halevi and Isaac ben-Gershom Treves (Venice, 1568, 4 vols. fol.). The correctors remark at the end that they have not revised in this edition the portion of the Masorah which was omitted in the edition of 1546-48. Appended is the so-called Jerusalem Targum on the Pentateuch. Wolf (Biblia Sacra Hebr. ii. 574 sq.) elsewhere states that this Targum was printed in Venice in 1585, codicim Hebr. Bibl. Bodleian, 537. It is not a Targum, but a commentary on the Hebrew text, and the references to the Targum in the text are incorrect. 4. Bomberg’s fifth Rabbinic Bible, published at Venice in 1617-19 (4 vols. fol.) by Pietro and Lorenzo Bragadin, and edited by the celebrated Leon di Modena (q.v.), and Abraham Chabr-Tob ben-Solomon Chajim Sopher. It contains the whole matter of the foregoing edition, and is preceded by a preface written by Leon di Modena. This edition, however, is of less value to the critical student, is printed by the Institute, under whose authority it was published, and consequently the censorship it was published, as may be seen from the remark of the censor at the end: “Visto per me, Fr. Rettato da Mod. a 1626.”

5. As a rule, the Hebrew text is printed in the middle of the page, and the comments of Rashi, and the Targum, and the Misnagdim, and the Rabbis, are printed in the margin. The text is divided into lines, and each line has a number, and the numbers are arranged in order, and the numbers are used in the margin. The text is divided into paragraphs, and each paragraph has a number, and the numbers are used in the margin. The text is divided into sections, and each section has a number, and the numbers are used in the margin. The text is divided into chapters, and each chapter has a number, and the numbers are used in the margin. The text is divided into verses, and each verse has a number, and the numbers are used in the margin. The text is divided into sentences, and each sentence has a number, and the numbers are used in the margin. The text is divided into words, and each word has a number, and the numbers are used in the margin. The text is divided into letters, and each letter has a number, and the numbers are used in the margin.
chajal: Adlai Sefero on the Psalms, and extracts from the 
Nimroh Lottara of Samuel Arepeh; on the Proverbs, by 
Rashi, Aben-Ezra, Rablai, Aben-Jecheia, Menahem Ham-
mel; and, in a digressive and decorative style, by Solomon 
Abraham; on Job, by Rashi, Aben-Ezra, Aben-Jecheia, 
Baal, Perillo, Aben-Sefero, and Simon ben-Zemach; on 
the Conticile, by Rashi, Aben-Ezra, Rablai, Aben-Jecheia, 
Isaac Alber, Merti Arvino, and Isaac; on Ruth, by Rashi, 
Aben-Ezra, Rablai, Aben-Jecheia, and Isaac; on 
Ecclesiastes, by the same commentators, with the addi-
tion of Adlai Sefero; on Leviticus, by Rashi, Aben-
Ezra, Rablai, Aben-Jecheia, Isaac Alber, Merti Arvino, 
and Isaac; on Chronicles, by Rashi, Babak, and Aben-
Jachna. The editors have collected the materials from the 
whole period that they thought the great Maschita in 
the study of the Ten Commandments throughout this volume of the work, under the title Minae 
Schechab Ere. At the end of the volume are the 
Great Maschit, the variations of the Eastern and Western 
Recensions (so-called), and the treatise on the acccents. 
Each of the assistants in the work is celebrated in Hebrew 
verse.

According to Wolff, this edition of the Rabbinical Bible 
is the most copious and the best. Some interpolations 
from MSS. have been introduced, in some instances 
entirely, in others by way of commentaries. Verses 37 and 38 of Josh. 32, 
have been rejected, and this is marked in the margin, 
which states that they exist in some MSS., but not in 
the manuscripts designed for the use of Christians. Tychendorf has remarked that 
the treatise of H. Adlai Sefero, De Iisopa Leja, is want-

8. The latest Rabbinical Bible, with thirty-two commenta-
tories, is the מויית היספיטא, published at Warsaw by Lebenbon (1859-68, 12 vols. 
small fol.). It contains, besides the original Hebrew, 
the Chaldee of Oukelos and Jerusalem on the Penta-
tuch, the Chaldee on the prophets and Hagiographa, 
and the second Tarquam on Esther. Of commentaries, 
it contains that of Rashi on the whole Bible; Aaron 
Pesaro's (q. v.) Toldot Aaron; Asheri's and Norati's 
(q. v.) commentary on the Pentateuch; Aben-Ezra on 
the Pentateuch, the Five Megilloth, the Minor Prophets, 
the Psalms, John and Daniel; Moses Kimchi on 
Proverbs, the Nachot on the Pentateuch; Obadias de 
Sefero (q. v.) on the Pentateuch, Song of Songs, and 
Ecclesiastes; El. Wilna (q. v.) on the Pentateuch, Joshu-
a, Isaiah, and Hezekiah; S. L. Enczyz and S. Edles 
on the Pentateuch; J. H. Abkach on the prophets 
and Hagiographa; D. Kimchi on the later prophets; 
Rablai on Joshua, Kings, Proverbs, and Job; Is. di 
Trani on Judges and Samuel; S. Oceda (q. v.) on Ruth 
and Lamentations; Eliezer ben-Elia Harohe on Esther; 
Sadasso on Daniel. It also contains the Masorah Magna 
and Parva, as a text-parallel and accent, and the 
various readings between Ascher and Naphtali, and 
the introduction of Jacob ben-Chajim. This edition is 
recomended by the greatest Jewish authorities in Po-
land, as Meisels, of Warsaw; Muscat, of Prague; 
Hieprin, of Bialystock, etc. (B. F.)

Rabbinical Dialect. By this term we understand 
that form of the Hebrew language in which the 
principal Scripture commentators among the rabbis 
 wrote, as Kimchi, Aben-Ezra, Abrahabal, Rashi, together 
with the Mishna, the Jewish Prayer-books, etc. Books 
in this dialect are generally printed in a round charac-
ter, resembling the ordinary square Hebrew letters; but the power, value, and pro-
nunciation of the letters are precisely the same as in 
 Biblical Hebrew. The Rabbinical characters are given 
below. Although substantially Hebrew, yet this dialect 
has so many peculiarities as to require a separate study. 
The principal work on the subject is by Eliezer ben-Shah 
Leija (1840, 3 vol.). A classic Hebrew of the Holy Scriptures would be unable to read 
the first two lines in the Talmud without an especial 
indoctrination in its grammatical forms, aside from the 
difficulty of explaining words derived from the Greek, 
Latin, or Parva, as the like. The orthography, 
too, of this dialect has, to the reader of pure Hebrew, 
often an uncouth, and at first sight unintelligible, ap-
pearance. This is caused by the habit of inserting the 
letters נ, כ, כ כ instead of using the corresponding vowel-

points, and thus נ stands for כ, כ for נ, י for י, ה for ה, ל for ל, א for א, ד for ד, ה for ה, ל for ל, א for א, ד for ד, ה for ה, ל for ל, א for א, ד for ד, ה for ה, ל for ל, א for א, ד for ד, ה for ה, ל for ל, א for א, ד for ד, ה for ה, ל for ל, א for א, ד for ד, ה for ה, ל for ל, א for א, ד for ד, ה for ה, ל for ל, א for א, ד for ד, ה for ה, ל for ל, א for א, ד for ד, ה for ה, ל for ל, א for א, ד for ד, ה for ה, ל for ל, א for א, ד for ד, ה for ה, ל for ל, א for א, ד for ד, ה for ה, ל for ל, א for א, ד for ד, ה for ה, ל for ل, א for א, ד for ד, ה for ה, ل for ل, א for أ, د for د, ه for ه, ل for ل, أ for أ, د for د, ه for ه, L
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Levy, Neubüdiches und chaldisches Wörterbuch (Leips., 1875 sq.); Rabbinel, Rabinishch-aramäisches Wörterbuch (Leips., 1878); Young, Rabbinische Volksausgabe, etc. (Edinb. a. a.); (iii.) Miscellaneous.—For the abbreviations, comp. Wolf (Hdb. Hebr., vols. ii, iv), and also Buxtorf (ed. Fischer), where at the end of each letter the abbreviations of the respective letter are given (B. F.);

RABBINISM is the development of Judaism which, after the return from Babylon, but more especially after the ruin of the Temple and the extinction of the public worship, became a new bond of national union, and the great distinctive feature in the character of modern Judaism. After the captivity, in the Babylonian captivity, the Mosaic constitution could be but partially re-established. The whole structure was too much shattered, and its fragments too widely dispersed, to reunite in their ancient and regular form. The Levites who had returned from the captivity, it is true, were the officiating priesthood, and no more. They were bound to be acquainted with the forms and usages of the sacrificial ritual; but the instruction of the people and the interpretation of the law by no means fell necessarily within the bounds of the Levites. From the captivity the Jews brought with them a reverential, or, rather, a passionate, attachment to the Mosaic law; and this it seems to have been the prudent policy of their leaders, Ezra and Nehemiah, to encourage by all possible means as the great bond of social union, and the unifying principle of separation from the world. By degrees, attachment to the law sank deeper and deeper into the national character: it was not merely at once their Bible and their statute-book; it entered into the most minute detail of common life. But no written law can provide for all possible exigencies. Whether general and comprehensive, or minute and multifarious, it equally requires the expositor to adapt it to the immediate case which may occur, either before the public tribunal or that of the private conscience. Hence the law became a deep and intricate study. Certain men rose to acknowledged eminence for their ingenuity in explaining, their readiness in applying, their faculty in quoting, and their clearness in offering solutions of the difficult passages of the written statutes. Learning of the law became the great distinction to which all alike paid reverential homage.

The first stage of development appears in the work of the so-called Sopherin, the last of whom was Simon the Just (q. v.); and their work will be more fully described in the art. Scriptura. The Sopherin were followed by another class of men, known as the Tanaim, or teachers of the law (v. v. t. q. l. a. k. a. n. t. n.), comprising a period from B.C. 200 to A.D. 220. While we reserve a description of their work for the art. Scriptura, we will only mention that from this school proceeded the oldest Midrashim, as Mechina, Siphra, and Siphri [see Midrashim], and the Mishna (q. v.). The most distinguished rabbins of the Tanaim (who are in part given already, or will be given, in this Cyclopaedia) were: 1. Antonius of Soho (b. C. 200-170), whose famous maxim—

"Be not like servants who serve their master for the sake of receiving wages, but be like servants who serve their master without expecting to receive wages; and let the fear of the Lord be upon you" (Abot, i. 3)—a maxim preserved by Josephus in his Jesus Christ: Anticens, Ais Times, etc. (as) [a noble and almost evangelical one.] truly a most beautiful maxim, and one denoting a legitimate reaction from the legal formalism which was in process of development—"is said to have given rise to Judaism; and to his companion, Jose ben-Jochanan, of Jerusalem; 3. Jo- chanan, the high-priest (commonly called John Hyrcanus, q. v.); 4. Jehoshua ben-Pe-rachi, the reputed teacher of Christ, and his colleague, Nathai of Arbela (q. v.); 5. Johanan ben-Tal-Et (or Tal El); 6. Shemaja (q. v. and Abtalian); 7. Hillel I (q. v.); 8. Simon ben-Hillel (q. v.); 9. Gamaliel I (q. v.); 10. Simon II ben-Gamaliel (q. v.); 11. Joshuah ben-Sacaliah (q. v.); 12. Gamaliel II, of Jabne (q. v.); 13. Simon II ben-Ga- mali (q. v.); 14. Joshua ben-Nathan, the so-called Jose (q. v.); 15. Jehudah I the Holy (q. v.); and, 15. Gamaliel III.

The Tanaim were followed by the Amoraim, or later doctors of the law; and the fruits of their work are laid down in the Talmud (q. v.), the compilation of which (about A.D. 500) terminated the period of the Amoraim, to be opened by that of the Saboraim, or the teachers of the law after the conclusion of the Talmud. To this period (A.D. 500-657), perhaps, belongs the collection, or final redaction, of some of the lesser Talmudic treatises (q. v.). 

The Talmud became the so-called Gemara, or the last doctors of the law in the chain of Rabbinic succession, comprising a period from A.D. 657 to 1040. The work of these different schools, together with the biographies of the most distinguished men, will be treated more fully in the art. Scandal.

On the dissolution of the Babylonian schools, Spain, Portugal, and Southern France became the centre of Rabbinism. As early as about A.D. 1000 the Talmud is said to have been translated into Arabic. In Spain, the most flourishing school was that of Cordova, founded by Moses ben-Chanoq (q. v.). Besides Cordova, Rabbinism flourished in Granada, then in Lucena, the most famous representative of which was Isaac ben Jacob Alfasi (q. v.). To the 11th and 12th centuries belong especially Jehudah ha-Levi ben-Samuel (q. v.), Aben-Exra (q. v.), the Kitchens (q. v.), and Solomon Parchon (q. v.). In France flourished Gericho ben-Jehudah, or Rabbenu Gericho (q. v.), and Rashi (q. v.). But the most distinguished of all was Moses Maimo- nides (q. v.), of Cordova, whose philosophical treatment of tradition divided Judaism, after his death, into two hostile parties; and the Spanish and French schools were divided for some time. When, in 1305, Asher ben-Jechiel, of Germany, came into Spain, he succeeded in bringing the French school, which was hostile to the philosophy of Maimonides, back to the path described by him. But there was another kind of philosophy—if it deserve that name at all—which was especially cultivated in these times—the so-called Cabala, as it especially appears in the Sopher (q. v.). As the foremost representatives of this branch of literature, we may mention Meir ibn-Gabbai (q. v.), Joseph Karo (q. v.), Salomo al Kabez, Moses Cordovero (q. v.), Isaac Loris (q. v.), Moses Galante (q. v.), Samuel Laniado (q. v.), Jacob Zemach, and Hajim Vidal. The invention of the art of printing produced a new activity in the Church as well as in the Synagogues, the first printed edition of the Talmud, in 1520, at Venice; the edition of the second Bomberg Rabbinic Bible, by Jacob ben-Chajim, in 1526; and the writings of Elias Levita (q. v.), are the first Jewish fruits of the art. Rabbinism was again revived in the schools of Bredy, Lemberg, Lublin, Cracow, Prague, Firth, Frankfort, Venus, and Amsterdam. The pious spirit which, in former ages, was represented in the Spanish and French schools was revived in the Protes- tant sects. Solomon Mendessohn (q. v.), and his friends—as Hartwig Wessely, David Friedlander, and others—opened a new ep- och, and endeavored to enlighten their coreligionists; but the chasm was not healed. On the contrary, a final division was produced; and Reformed and Ortho-
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do Judaism are the two antipodes of the present day. As a religious system, "Rabbinism," says the late Dr.
McCaul, "has fared like all other religious systems: it has had prejudiced assailants to attack, and over-zelous
admirers to defend it. The former have produced whatever they could find objectionable; the latter have
carried it further to its disadvantage. The truth is, that it is a mixed system of good and bad. Founded on the inspired writings of
Moses and the prophets, it necessarily contains much truth and wisdom; but, expounded and enlarged by
prejudiced men, it presents a strange mixture of materials." See "Rabbinism" in Herzog's Real-Encyk.; the same art. in Theol. Universe-Leck-
ion; Wsren der Rabbinismus, in Just, Gesch. d. Judenthum, u. s. Secten, i, 257 sq.; McCaul, Sketches of Judaism and the Jews

Rabbith (Heb. רַבְבִּית, Rabbith) [always with the art.], medite.; Sept. Ἐράββις y r. Ἰάπωτος, a city in the tribe of Issachar (Josh. xix. 20).—Schwarz (Pleist, p. 166) found a village, Arubuni, three English miles west of Beth-shan, which he is disposed to identify with the Rebbah of Jeroboam, and the Rabbith of Joshua. But this is beyond the bounds of Issachar.

Possibly the locality in question is in the north-east part of the tribe, possibly at the ruins Avith (Avathr). (2 Sam 9.)

Rabbiling, a term employed to denote the summary ejcction, on Christmas-day, 1668, of Episcopalian clergymen and their families by the Scottish populace, after the Revolution. The incumbents were turned out of their houses, and often into the snow; the church doors were locked, and the key was taken away. These measures were certainly harsh and uncalled for; but the people had been exasperated, especially in the west country, by twenty-five years of bloodshed and persecution. Though they were "rule, even to brutality," yet, as lord Macaulay says, "they do not appear to have been guilty of any intentional injury to life or limb." The better part of the people put a stop to the riotous proceedings on the part principally of the Cameronians; but a form of notice, or a threatening letter, was sent to every curate in the Western Lowlands.

RABBING: ACT, a law passed by the Scottish Parliament, in 1698, to prevent disturbance and riots at the settlement of ministers. The Episcopalians in the North rabbled the Presbyterians, especially on the day of an ordination; for they did not like to see their incumbents supplanted. So violent were these measures that the legislature had to interfere to arrest them. See REVOLUTION SETTLEMENT.

Rabbo'nî (Pa'ﾗ�英勇, or Pa' ///英勇, for Chaldaic 곶, my master), the title of highest honor applied by the Jews to the teachers of the law. See Rabb. In Mark x, 51 (where it is translated "Lord"), and John xx. 16, it is applied to Christ; but, as it seems to us, rather in its literal acceptation than with reference to the conventional distinction which it implies (it is a distinction then existed) in the Jewish schools. There were but seven great professors, all of the school of Hillel, to whom the title was publicly given. There is some difference as to their names, and even in the Talmud varies in its statements. But the only one there whose name occurs in Scripture is Gamaliel, unless, indeed, as some suppose, the aged Simeon, who blessed the infant Saviour (Luke ii. 25), was the same as the Rabban Simeon of the Talmud. See SIMON.

Rabe. See ROSENTHAL.

Rabb. See RAL.

Rab'mag (Heb. רַבִּמָג, Rab-mag, chief magelion: Sept. Ρᾶβμαγ or Ρᾶβμαγις, a word found only in Jer. xxxvii. 3, as a title borne by a certain Nergal-
sharerzer who is mentioned among the "princes" that accompanied Nebuchadnezzar to the last siege of Jeru-
salem. Nergal-sharerzer is probably identical with the king, called by the Greeks Nergilissar, who ascended the throne of Babylon two years after the death of Neb-
uchadnezzar. See NERGAL-SHAREZER. This king, as well as certain other important personages, is found commonly identified with the word "Magus" (Gesenius, ad voc. מָגַע; Calmet, Commentaire Littéral, vi. 203, et seq.; but this identification is somewhat uncertain, since an entirely different word—one which is read as Magaui—is used in that sense throughout the Behistun inscription (Oppert, Expédition Scientifique en Mésopotamie, ii. 209). Sir H. Rawlinson inclines to translate empas by "priest," but does not connect it with the Magi, who in the time of Nergilissar had no footing in Babylonia. He regards this rendering, however, as purely conjectural, and thinks we can only say at present that the office was one of great power and dignity at the Babylonian court; and probably a sacerdotal office in the same sense as the word is used in the rubric of the Ashurian liturgies.

Rab'saces (Pa' ///英勇, a Grecized form (Eccles. xlviii, 18) of the name Rab-shakeh (q. v.).

Rab-saris (Heb. רַבָּשָׂרִי, Rab-Saris), a name applied to two foreigners, but probably rather the designation of an office than of an individual, the word signifying chief eunuch; in Dan. i, 3, Ashpenaz is entitled the master of the eunuchs (Rab-sarisim). Lether translates the word sar, "the places where the king's body, his name, office, the arch-chamberlain (der Erzklämmerer, der oberste Kämmerer). Josephus (Ant. x, 8, 2) takes them as the A. V. does, as proper names. The chief officers of the court were present attending on the king; and the instance of the eunuch Names would show that it was not impossible for the Rab-saris to possess some of the qualities fitting him for a military command.

In 2 Kings xxy, 19, a eunuch (מָגַע, Stasis, in the text of the A. V. "officer," in the margin "eunuch") is spoken of as set over the men of war; and in the sculptures at Nineveh "eunuchs are represented as commanding in war, fighting both on chariots and on horseback, and receiving the prisoners and the heads of the slain after battle" (Layard, Nineveh, ii, 325). But whether his office was really that which the title imports, or some other great court office, has been questioned. The chief of the eunuchs is an officer of high honor and dignity in the Oriental courts; and his cares are not confined to the harem, but many high public functions devolve upon him. In the Ottoman Porte the Kišlar Ağa, or chief of the black eunuchs, is one of the principal personages in the empire, and in an official paper of great solemnity solemnly by the sultan the most illustrious of the officers who approach his august person, and worthy of the confidence of monarchs and of Sovereigns (D'Olasson, Tob. Gen. iii, 308). It is, therefore, by no means improbable that such an office should be associated with a military commission; perhaps not for directly military duties, but to take charge of the treasure, and to select from the female captives such as might seem worthy of the royal harem. See EUNUCH.

1. (Sept. Pa' ///英勇 v. r. Pa' ///英勇.) An officer of the king of Assyria sent up with Tarshish and Rab-shakeh against Jerusalem in the time of Hezekiah (2 Kings xviii, 17). B.C. 718.

2. (Sept. Nāṣīwāqīq v. r. Naḥbāqīq.) One of the princes of Nebuchadnezzar, who was present at the capture of Jerusalem, B.C. 588, when Zechariah, after en-
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deavoring to escape, was taken and blinded and sent in chains to Babylon (Jer. xxxix, 3). Rab-saria is mentioned afterwards (ver. 18) among the other princes who at the command of the king were sent to deliver Jere-
mom from the power of the Invested. It is not improbable that we have not only the title of this Rab-saria given, but his name also, either Sarsechim (ver. 8) or (ver. 13) Nebu-
shakin (witness of Nebo, Isa. xiv, 1), in the same way as Nergal-shar-ezer is given in the same passages as at the time of the Rab-mag.

Rab-shakeh (Heb. Rab-shakeh, רַב-שַׁקָּה), Sept.-Pseudo-v. v. Pseudo-v. Petiebr, an Aramaic name, signi-
fying chief cup-bearer, but applied to an Assyrian gen-
eral (2 Kings xviii, 17, 19, 26, 28, 57; xix, 4, 8; Isa. 
xxvi, 2, 4, 12, 13, 22; xxvii, 4, 8). B.C. 718. Not-
withstanding its seemingly official significance, it ap-
ppears to have been used as a proper name, as Butler 
with us; for the person who bore it was a military
chief in high command under Sennacherib, king of As-
syria. Yet it is not impossible, according to Oriental 
usages, that a royal cup-bearer should hold a military 
command; and the office itself was one of high distinc-
tion, in the same way as Rab-saria denotes the chief 
eunuch of Ahasuerus, possibly the chief priest. See 
Rawlinson, Ancient Monarchies, ii. 440. Luther, in 
his version, is not quite consistent, sometimes (2 Kings 
xxviii, 17; Isa. xxxvi, 2) giving Rab-shakeh as a proper 
name, but ordinarily translating it as a title of office— 
arch-cup-bearer (der Erzessizer). The word Rab 
may be found translated in many other English ver-
sions; for instance, 2 Kings xxv, 8, 20; Jer. xxxix, 11; 
Dan. ii, 14 ((אֶרֶב-שַׁקָּה), Rab-tabuschim, "captain of 
the guard"—in the margin, "chief marshall," "chief 
of the executioners;" Dan. i, 3, Rab-saraisim, "master of the 
eunuchs;" ii. 48 ((אֶרֶב-שַׁקָּה), Rab-sginim, "chief of the 
governors;" iv. 9; v. 11 (אֶרֶב-שַׁקָּה), Rab-khartum 
"master of the magicians;" iii. 16, Rab-buchel, "ship-master."
It enters into the titles Rabbi, Rabboni, and the name Rabiah.
See Rabbi.

Rab-shakeh is the last named of three Assyrian gen-
erals sent against Jerusalem in the reign of Hezekiah. 
Sennacherib, having taken other cities of Judah, was 
now besieging Lachish; and Hezekiah, terrified at his 
progress, and seeing, for a time, his firm faith in God, 
seemed to become reconciled to the conciliatory and tribu-
tute. This he strains himself to the utmost to pay, 
giving for the purpose not only all the treasures of the 
Temple and palace, but stripping off the gold plates 
with which he himself, in the beginning of his reign, 
had overlaid the doors and pillars of the house of the 
Lord (2 Kings xxvii, 16; 2 Chron. xxviii, 3; see Raw-
linson, Buntmann Lectures, iv. 141; Layard, Nineveh and 
Babylon, p. 145). But Sennacherib, not content with 
his—cupidity being excited rather than appeased—
sends a great host against Jerusalem under Tartan, 
Rab-saria, and Rab-shakeh; not so much, apparently, 
with the object of at present engaging in the siege of 
the city as with the idea that, in its present disheart-
ened state, the sight of an army, combined with the 
threats and specious promises of Rab-shakeh, might 
induce a surrender at once. In Isa. xxxvi, xxxvii, 
Rab-
shack alone is mentioned, the reason of which would 
seem to be that he acted as ambassador and spokesmen, 
and came so much more prominently before the people 
than the others. Keil thinks that Tartan had the su-
preme command, inasmuch as in 2 Kings he is men-
tioned first, and, according to Isa. xxx, 1, conducted the 
siege of Ashdod. In 2 Chron. xxxii, where, with the 
addition of some not unimportant circumstances, there 
is given an abstract of these events, it is simply said 
that (ver. 9) "Sennacherib king of Assyria sent his ser-
Voir le texte du mur de la ville, en tout cas la honte-
ce de trahir à aucun pouvoir, humain ou divin, de 
délivrer eux-mêmes de la main du "grand roi, s'as-
seoir sur le trône d'Assyrie et de se donner les avantages 
qui seraient obtenus par la soumission. Many have in-
stanced the familiarity of Rab-shakeh with Hebrew, that he be 
other was a Jewish deserter or an apostate captive of 
Israel. Whether this be so or not, it is not impossible 
that the assertion which he makes on the part of his 
master, and that Sennacherib had even taken the council 
and command of the Lord Jehovah for his expedition against 
Jerusalem ("Am I now come up without the Lord to 
destroy it? The Lord said to me, Go up against this 
and to destroy it"); may have reference to the prophe-
cies of Isaiah (viii, 7, 8; x. 6) concerning the destruc-
tion of Judah and Israel by the Assyrians, of which, in 
some form, more or less correct, he had received 
information. Being unable to obtain any promise of 
submission from Hezekiah, who, in the extremity of his 
peril returning to trust in the help of the Lord, is en-
couraged by the promises and predictions of Rab-
shakeh goes back to the king of Assyria, who had now 
departed from Lachish. See HEBREWS.

Rabulas of Edessa, an Eastern prelate who flour-
ish near the opening of the 6th century, was a stu-
dent of Theodorus of Mopocastus, and, in 431, was 
prominently associated with the Anti-christian party in 
Ephesus. In the following year, however, Cyril of 
Alexandria succeeded in gaining Rabulas to his side: 
and after this we hear of him as a devout orthodox.
He energetically opposed Nestorius, and greatly weak-
sened the Nestorians. He condemned the bishop of 
Edessa, and charged the bishops of Diodorus of Tarsus and of The-
odorus of Mopocastus, banished and drove off the teach-
ers from the school at Edessa who were reputed favor-
able to their doctrines, and thus became an unwilling 
instrument in the founding of the school at Nisibis 
by Barlaam, and in the spread of Nestorianism in the 
East. He died in 436. His successor at Edessa was Ibas (q.v.).
Under the name of Rabulas there is extant an old 
canonical collection of the Syrian Church, pieces of which 
are contained in the edition of the Nomocanon of Bar-
Rabulas.

Rabassier (Rawl.), a French noun, was born Sept. 5, 1634, at Gannat. After having entered monas-
tic life among the Cluniacins, he taught theology in the 
abbey of St. Martian at Avignon, and St. Martin des 
Champs at Paris. He was also made twice the general 
of his order (1698-1705, 1706-14). He died at Paris, 
Oct. 29, 1708, and wrote works of importance, of which 
he was the student of his order. See Niecor, Memoires, 

Raca (Ραξα), a term of reproach used by the Jews 
of our Saviour's age (Matt. v. 22). Critics are agreed 
that it is but the Greek form of the Chaldee term 
Nacc, "regal" (the terminal N being the definite arti-
cle, used in a vocative sense), with the sense of "worth-
less," but they differ as to whether this form should be 
connected with the root פֶּנָא, conveying the notion of 
emptiness (Genes. Theocr., p. 1279), or with one of the 
cognate roots פֶּנָא (Tobulac) or פֶּנָא (Ewad), con-
veying the notion of thinned (Olahabans, De Wette, on 
Matt. r, 22). The first of these views is probably cor-
rect. We may compare the use of פֶּנָא, "rain," in 
Judg. ix. 4; xi. 3, &c, and of אֶבֶּר in James ii. 10. Jesus 
contrasting the law of Moses, which could only take 
notice of overt acts, with his own, which renders man 
liable for every form of transgression: he was in effect: "Whosoever is rashly angry with his brother is li-
able to the judgment of God; whoever calls his brother 
raca is liable to the judgment of the Sanhedrin; but 
whosoever calls him fool (παραφή) becomes liable to 
the judgment of Christ. Thus he inflicts the higher 
criminality here attached to the term fool, which may 
not at first seem very obvious, it is necessary to observe
that while “race” denotes a certain looseness of life and manners, “fool” denotes a wicked and reprobat person; foolishness being in Scripture opposed to spiritual wisdom (Lightfoot, Hor. Heb., ad loc.). See Fool.

Racchei is the name sometimes given by mistake to the Zucchi (q.v.).

Racett, Matteo, a noted Jesuit missionary of the 16th century, is closely identified with the Romanizing work of that era in the Chinese empire. The very year which marks the death of Xavier (1552), marks the occurrence of an event which opened China to the Europeans. A party of Jesuit missionaries, at whose head was Racett, in that year landed stealthily at Macao. These missionaries of Rome had determined to win over the Chinese to Christianity by stratagem. They had studied mathematics and natural science, with a view to astonish the natives by their exhibitions. Some objects, common enough in Europe, but unheard of in China, were prepared as presents for the mandarins and others. A clock that showed the rising and setting of the sun and moon; a prism that by the emission of its rainbow-rays was mistaken for a fragment of the celestial hemisphere, and maps which exhibited the world of barbarians, with China filling the east and Europe in the remote west, produced sensations of wonder such as he had never before stirred the placid spirit of the viceroy of Canton. Instead of driving them away from the country, as they feared, he actually detained the Jesuits to exhibit and explain their wonders; for only they had the secret of keeping that curious machine in action, and only they could manage the spectrometer, and expand the new system of geography. Literary men crowded the palace to see the Jesuits and to hear their wisdom, and the missionaries thus gained an influence which they knew well how to utilize. The popularity thus acquired by Racett, Ruggiero, and others was truly astonishing; and by virtue of an imperial edict, Racett took up his residence near the royal palace, and enjoyed the highest reputation for learning. He courted the literati; withheld from their knowledge such parts of the sacred history and doctrine as were likely to offend their prejudices or wound their pride; by his influence at court secured the protection of his brethren in the provinces; and by extreme sagacity surrounded himself with a considerable number of persons who might be variously described as pupils, partisans, converts, or novices. In a secret chapel he disposed of the favored symbols of his worship, yet, so shaped as not to be repugnant to their heathen notions, and intermingled with other symbols from the religion of Confucius. Racett died in 1610, and was honored with a solemn funeral. The remains of the foreigner never before had such a distinction. It is said that both mandarins and the people saluted with a mournful admiration the corpse of the Jesuit as it was taken to the grave by a company of Christians, with a splendid cross going before it; and that it was interred, by the order of the emperor, in a temple dedicated to the true God.

Racconeqian Catechism was a Polish Protestant compilation stating the different articles of the Slavic Reformers. It was published in 1560 at Racovia, a city in the Polish palatinate Sandomir, which owed its origin to the Reformer John Sieminsky, and by his son. The acceptance of the Slavic doctrines became the headquarters of this branch of the Polish Reformed Church. Racovia became the seat of a theological school. The general synods were held there, of which those of 1569 and 1663 are of historic importance, and the printing of the Socinians being done there, the catechism came to be known as the Racovian. It was prepared by Schmalz, Morzowski, and Volkel, and was based on the theological writings of F. Secinus. A Latin edition was published in 1609, dedicated to King James I of England; a German edition in 1608, dedicated to the Wittenberg University. In 1819 Rees made an English version of the Racovian Catechism. An abridgment was published in Polish and German in 1605, 1623; and in 1629 in Latin. See Krasiczyn, Hist. of the Ref. in Poland, ii, 370; Gieseler, Eccles. Hist. vol. iv; Mosheim, Eccles. Hist. vol. iii; Leignon, Diction. of Christ (see Index); Farrar, Critical Hist. of Free Thought, p. 391; Waterland, Works, vol. vii; Hallam, Introd. to Hist. of Lit., 554; ii, 335. (J. H. W.)

Race (prop. ῥάσα, Eccles. ix, 11; ῥασαμός, “course,” but in the A. V. the rendering, likewise, of ῥοδα, a path, and in the New Test. only of ῥασίαν and στρατιάς). Races were evidently known to the Hebrews (Eccles. ix, 11). In the New Test. there are allusions to the various gymnastic sports and games celebrated by the Greeks. So the term “race” is often used in comparisons drawn from the public races and applied to Christians, as expressing strenuous effort in the Christian life and cause; and we are exhorted to strive after the rewards of the Gospel as strenuously as the athletes did in the public games (1 Cor. ix, 24-27; Gal. ii, 2; v, 7; Phil. ii, 16; iii, 14; 2 Tim. ii, 5; iv, 6-8; Heb. xii, 1). Among the principal public games noticed by the historians are the Olympic, which were celebrated every fifth year, the Pythian, Nemian, and the Isthmian. These exercises principally consisted in trials of strength and skill—in running on foot, wrestling, leaping, throwing the dart and discus, also in the horse-race and chariot-race. See Gymnastics.

The stadium in which they took place was an oblong area terminated at one end by a straight line, at the other by a semicircle having the breadth of the stadium for its base. Around this area were ranges of seats rising above one another in steps. After the Roman conquest of Greece, the form of the stadium was often modified, so as to resemble the amphitheatre, by making both its ends semicircular, and by surrounding it with seats supported by vaulted masonry, as in the Roman amphitheatre. The Ephesian stadium still has such seats around a portion of it.

The most strict and laborious preparation was made for these agonistic contests, and the whole course of preparation, as well as the contest, was governed by strict and established rules. The athletes who contended for the prize were divested of clothing; every impediment was removed; the prize was placed on a tripod in the middle of the stadium, in the full view of the competitors; and the crown was placed upon the conqueror’s head the moment the issue was proclaimed by the judges. Those per-
sons who designed to contend in these games were obliged to repair to the public gymnasium at Elis ten months before the solemnity, where they prepared themselves by continual exercises. No man who had omitted to present himself in this manner was allowed to contend for any of the prizes; nor were the accustomed rewards of victory given to such persons, if by any means they introduced themselves and overcame their antagonists. No person who was himself a notorious criminal, or nearly related to any such, was permitted to contend; and, further, if any person were convicted of bribing his adversary, a severe fine was laid upon him. Nor were these precautions alone thought a sufficient guard against evil and dishonorable contracts and unjust practices, but the contenders were obliged to swear that they had spent ten whole months in preparatory exercises; and both they and their fathers, or brethren, took a solemn oath that they would not, by any sinister or unlawful means, endeavor to stop the fair and just proceedings of the games (Potier, Greek Antiq.).

The races themselves were (1) the foot-race, (2) the horse-race, (3) the chariot-race, (4) the torch-race, either (a) on foot or (b) on horseback. Of all these the first was the simplest and the best test of personal capacity. Hence the exercise of running was in great esteem among the ancient Greeks, insomuch that those who prepared themselves for it thought it worth their while to use means to burn or parch their spleen, because it was believed to be a hindrance to them and to retard them in their course. Homer tells us that swiftness is one of the most excellent endowments a man can be blessed withal:

“No greater honor e’er has been attain’d
Than what strong hands or nimble feet have gain’d.”

Indeed, all those exercises that conduced to fit men for war were more especially valued. Swiftness was looked upon as an excellent qualification in a warrior, both because it serves for a sudden assault and onset, and likewise for a nimble retreat; and therefore it is not to be wondered at that the constant character which Homer gives of Achilles is, that he was swift of foot; and in the Holy Scripture, David, in his poetical lamentation over those two great captains Saul and Jonathan, takes particular notice of this warlike quality of theirs: “They were swifter than eagles, stronger than lions” (2 Sam. i, 20). See AHIMAAS.

Such as obtained victories in any of these games, especially the Olympic, were universally honored—nay, almost adored. At their return home they rode in a triumphal chariot into the city, the walls being broken down to give them entrance; which was done (as Plutarch is of opinion) to signify that walls are of small use to a city that is inhabited by men of courage and ability to defend it. At Sparta they had an honorable post in the army, being stationed near the king’s person. At some towns they had presents made to them by their native city, were honored with the first place at shows and games, and ever after maintained at the public charge. Cicero reports that a victory in the Olympic games was not much less honorable than a triumph at Rome. Happy was that man esteemed who could but obtain a single victory; if any person merited repeated rewards, he was thought to have attained the utmost felicity of which human nature is capable; but if he came off conqueror in all the exercises, he was elevated above the condition of men, and his actions adorned wonderful victories. Nor did their honors terminate in themselves, but were extended to all about them; the city that gave them birth and education was esteemed more honorable and august; happy were their relations, and thrice happy their parents. It is a remarkable story which Plutarch relates of a Spartan who, meeting Diagoras, that had himself been crowned in the Olympic games, and seen his sons and grandchildren victors, embraced him and said, “Now die, Diagoras; for thou
canst not be a god?" By the laws of Solon, a hundred drachms were allowed from the public treasury to every Athenian who obtained a prize in the Isthmian games, and five hundred drachms to such as were victors in the Olympic. Afterwards, the latter of these rewards maintained in the Prytaneum, or public hall of Athens. The rewards given in these games have been thus rendered into

"Greeks, in four games your martial youth were train'd, For heroes two, and for two gods ordain'd: Jove bade the olive round his victor wave; Phoenix in his an apple-garland gave; The pine Palœmon; nor with less renown, Archermus conferr'd the parsley crown."

(Anon. Med. Dial. 9.)

Compare with these fading vegetable crowns that immortal life which the Gospel offers as a prize to the victor, in order to understand the apostle's comparison (1 Cor. ix. 25; 1 Pet. v. 4). See CROWN.

Ra'chab (Matt. i. 5). See Rahab.

Ra'chal (Heb. Rakal, רָכָל, trade; Sept. Ρακαλ v. r. 'Rakål), a town in the tribe of Judah, and apparently in the southern part: being one of those to which David sent presents out of the spoil of the Amalkeites (1 Sam. xxx, 20). The Vatican edition of the Sept. omits this name, but inserts five names in this passage between 'Eastemsa' and 'the Jerahmeelites.' The only one of these which has any similarity to Rachel is Carmel, which would suit very well as far as position goes; but it is impossible to consider the two as identical without further evidence. See DAVID.

Racham, Rachamah. See GIER-EAGLE.

Rachel. See Shek.

Ra'chel (Heb. Rachel, רָכֶל, a "ewe" or "sheep," as in Gen. xxxi, 38; xxxii, 14; Cant. vi. 6; Isa. lli. 7; Sept. and New Test. Ρακηλ, Iosephus Ρακηλας), the younger daughter of the Aramean grazier Laban (Gen. xxix, 16), whom Jacob, her near blood-relation, earned for his wife, as wages for a second seven-years' service (ver. 18 sq.). B.C. 1290. See LEAH. After a long period of unfruitfulness, she bore him a son (xxx, 31), Joseph (xxx, 22 sq.). She went with him to Canaan, on which occasion she stole the household gods of her father and hid them artfully (xxx, 10, 84), and finally died on the journey, after the birth of Benjamin, not far from Ephrath (xxxv, 16 sq.). See RACHEL'S TOMB.

"The story of Jacob and Rachel has always had a peculiar interest: there is that in it which appeals to some of the deepest feelings of the human heart. The beauty of Rachel, the deep love with which she was loved by Jacob from their first meeting by the well of Haran, when he showed to her the simple courtesies of the desert life, and kissed her and told her he was Rebekah's son; the long servitude with which he patiently served for her, in which the seven years' seemed to him but a few days, for the love he had to her; their mar-

— and has preserved to this day a reverence for her tomb; the very infidel invaders of the Holy Land having respected the traditions of the site, and erected over the spot a small, rude shrine, which conceals whatever remains may have once been found of the pillar first set up by her mourning husband over her grave. Yet, from what is related to us concerning Rachel's character, there does not seem much to claim any high degree of admiration and esteem. The discernment and trenchant invective shown in her grief at being for some childish move, even her fond husband to anger (xxx, 1, 2). She appears, moreover, to have shared all the duplicity and falsehood of her family, of which we have such painful instances in Rebekah, in Laban, and, not least, in her sister Leah, who concerned herself so little in the deception practiced upon Jacob. See, for instance, Rachel's stealing her father's images, and the ready dexterity and presence of mind with which she concealed her theft (ch. xxxi): we seem to detect here an apt scholar in her father's school of untruth. From this incident we may also infer (though this is rather the misfortune of her position and circumstances) that she was not altogether free from the superstitions and idolatry which prevailed in the land whence Abraham had been called (Josh. xxiv, 2, 14), and which still to some degree infected even those families among whom the true God was known. The events which preceded the death of Rachel are of much interest and worthy of a brief consideration. The presence in his household of these idolatrous images, which Rachel, and probably others also, had brought from the East, seems to have been either unknown to or connived at by Jacob for some years after his return from Haran; till, on being reminded by the Lord of the vow which he had made at Bethel when he fled from the face of Esau, and being bidden by him to erect an altar there which he appeared to him, Jacob felt the glaring impiety of thus solemnly appearing before God with the taint of impiety cleaving to him or his, and 'said to his household and all that were with him, Put away the strange gods from among you' (Gen. xxxv, 2). After thus casting out the polluting thing from his house, Jacob journeyed to Bethel, where, amid the associations of a spot consecrated by the memories of the past, he received from God an emphatic promise and blessing, and, the name of the Supplanter being laid aside, he had given to him instead the holy name of Israel. Then it was, after his spirit had been there purified and strengthened by communion with God, by the assurance of the divine love and favor, by the consciousness of evil put away and duties performed—then it was, as he journeyed away from Bethel, that the chastening blow fell and Rachel died. These circumstances are alluded to here not so much for their bearing upon the spiritual discipline of Jacob, but rather with reference to Rachel herself, as suggesting the hope that they may have had their effect in bringing her to a higher sense of her relations to that Great Jehovah in whom was all her hope and in whose faults of character, so firmly believed." The character of Rachel cannot certainly be drawn from the few features given in the history; yet Niemeyer (Charak. ii, 315) thinks that sufficient ground exists for preferring the disposition of Leah to that of her sister.
Those who take an interest in such interpretations may find the whole story of Rachel and Leah, allegorized by St. Augustine (Contra Faustum Manichaeum, xxii, lib. viii, v. 492, ed. Migne) and Justin Martyr (Dialogue with Trypho, c. 134, p. 369; see also Archer, Rachel a Type of the Church [Lond. 1843]).

In Jer. xxxi, 15, 16, the prophet refers to the historical event of the exile of the ten tribes (represented by "Ephraim") under Shalmaneser, king of Assyria, and the sorrow occasioned by their dispersion (2 Kings xvii, 20), under the symbol of Rachel (q. v.), i.e. Rachel, the maternal ancestor of the tribes of Ephraim and Manasseh, bewailing the fate of her children. This lamentation is here another symbol of the early history of our Lord, which met with its fulfillment in the mournful scene at Bethlehem and its vicinity, when so many infants were slaughtered under the barbarous edict of Herod (Matt. ii, 16-18).

Rachel's Tomb (רחל, Kbrath Hachel: Sept. in Gen. for the former half of the title pvepassv, but in Jer. lxxviii, 7, and 2 Kings v, 19, Xeb[pat]a). This seems to have been accepted as the name of the spot [Demetrius in Eus. Ev. Li, i. 21], and to have been actually considered there by a church in the 12th century [Burchard de Strasburg, by Saint-Genois, p. 35], who gives the Arabic name of Rachel's tomb as Cabrata, or Carbata. The present name is Kubet Rahel, i.e. "Rachel's grave". "Rachel died and was buried in the way to Ephrath, which is Bethlehem. And Jacob set a pillar upon her grave: that is the pillar of Rachel's grave unto this day" (Gen. xxxv, 19, 20). As Rachel is the first related instance of death in child-bearing, so this pillar over her grave is the first recorded example of the setting-up of a sepulchral monument: caves having been up to this time spoken of as the usual places of burial. The spot was well known in the time of Samuel and Saul (1 Sam. x, 2); and the prophet Jeremiah, by a poetical figure of great force and beauty, represents the buried Rachel weeping for the loss and captivity of her children, as the bands of the exiles, led away on their road to Babylon, passed near her tomb (Jer. xxxi, 15-17). Matthew (ii, 17, 18) applies this to the slaughter by Herod of the infants at Bethlehem. See Rachel.

The position of the Ramah here spoken of is one of the sites in the topography of Palestine [see Ramah]; but the site of Rachel's tomb, "on the way to Bethlehem", "a little way to come to Ephrath," "in the border of Benjamin," has never been questioned. It is about five miles south of Jerusalem, and half a mile north of Bethlehem. "It is one of the shrines which Mohammedans, Jews and Christians agree in honouring, and concerning which their traditions are identical." It was visited by Maundrell in 1697. The description given by Dr. Robinson (i, 218) may serve as the representative of the many accounts, all agreeing with each other, which may be read in almost every book of Eastern travel. It is "merely an ordinary Moslem velly, or tomb of a holy person—a small square building of stone with a dome, and within it a tomb in the ordinary Mohammedan form, the whole plastered over with mortar. Of course the building is not ancient: in the 7th century there was here only a pyramidal of stones. It is now neglected and falling to decay, though pilgrimages are still made to it by the Jews. The naked walls are covered with names in several languages, many of them in Hebrew. The general correctness of the inscriptions which have fixed upon this spot for the tomb of Rachel cannot well be drawn in question, since it is fully supported by the circumstances of the Circumstantial narrative. It is also mentioned by the Itin. Hieros. A.D. 383, and by Jerome (Ep. lxxvi, ad Eustoch. Epiphat. Pand. in the same century). Since Robinson's visit the site has been enlarged by the addition of a square court on the east side, with high walls and arches (Later Researches, p. 273). Schwarz (Palest. p. 109 sqq.) strongly supports the identity of the true grave of Rachel with the monument which now bears that name (see also Bibliotheca Sacra, 1850, p. 607; Journ. of Sac. Lit. April, 1864). This monument is particularly described by Hackett (Illustr. of Script. p. 101 sqq.). See Bethlehem.

Rachel's Tomb.

Racine, Bonaventure, a French priest and historian, was born at Chauny, Nov. 29, 1708, and was the son of the most illustrious of French poets. He was educated at Paris, in the College Mazarin, and made remarkable progress in the languages and in theology. In 1729 he was placed at the head of the College de la Rambuteau; but in 1731, becoming satisfied of the injustice done the Jansenists in the bull Unigenitus [see Jansenism], he took ground against it, and thereby so displeased the powers that were at Rome and at Paris that he was displaced. The bishop of Moosteller, however, took his part, and gave him the presidency of the college at Lunel. But the Jesuits set the flames of opposition going, and Racine was obliged to quit Lunel in much haste. He went to Paris, and there supported himself by teaching as a private tutor after having been ousted, by order of the cardinal Fleury, from a minor position he had secured at a Paris college. Finally the bishop of Auterne, M. de Caylus, took an interest in Racine, called him into his diocese, and gave him a canonicate in his cathedral. He died May 15, 1755. He wrote much. His principal work is an Abrégé de l'Histoire Ecclésiastique (Paris, 1748-56, 13 vols. 4to), which clearly reveals the position of its author on the important ecclesiastical questions of his time, and is a valuable index to the Jansenistic proclivities of France in the 19th century. His Réflexions sur l'Histoire Ecclésiastique (2 vols. 12mo) are not less valuable. See Feller, Dict. Historique, a. v.—Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, a. v.

Radbertus. See Pascharius.

Radbod, St., a Dutch prelate of the Church of Rome, flourished in the second half of the 9th century. He was educated at Cologne, and, being of noble birth, was much at the court of Charles the Bald. In 859 he was placed over the church at Utrecht, and he ruled this episcopal charge with great devotion and honor. He died, according to Mabillon, in 918. For his writings, see Histoire Littéraire de la France, vi, 158.

Rad' dal (Heb. Radday), רַדְדַּאֹּל, raddal; Sept. Pddal v. r. Xeb[pat]; the fifth of the seven sons of Jesea, and an elder brother of King David (1 Chron. ii, 14). B.C. 1008. He does not appear in the Bible elsewhere than in this list, unless he be, as Ewald conjectures (Geschichte, iii, 266, note), identical with Rei (q. v.).

Ragdundra, St., daughter of Berthar, a prince of Thuringia, flourished in the earlier part of the 9th century. She is said being carried as a prisoner to France in the twelfth year of her age by Clothaire V, at that time...
king of the district whose capital is now called Soissons, she was educated in the Christian religion, and when she reached a mature age was induced, very reluctantly, to become his wife. Her own wish having been to become a nun, her married life was in great measure given up to works of charity and religion, and Clothaire complained that he "had married a nun rather than a queen." Romansians delight in extolling her virtues, and many curious facts are reported to have been performed by her. Thus they tell that one day, as she walked in her garden, she heard the prisoners, who were only separated from her by a wall, weeping and imploring pity. She thought only of her own sorrows in the past, and she prayed earnestly for them, not knowing how else to help them, and as she prayed her tears burst asunder, and they were freed from captivity. Eventually, about the year 558, Radegunda obtained the king's leave to retire to a monastery at Noyon, where she was consecrated a deaconess by the bishop Medard. Soon afterwards she founded a monastery at Poitiers, in which she lived as a simple sister, but which she endowed richly, not only with money and lands, but also with relics and other sacred objects obtained from the Holy Land and all the more eminent churches of the East and West. It was on the occasion of the translation of the relics of church at Poitiers, a relic of the holy cross that the Christian poet Venantius Fortunatus composed the celebrated and truly magnificent Latin hymn, *Vexilla Regis Prodeunt*. Radegunda outlived him by more than a quarter of a century, during which she was regarded as a model of Christian virtue; and her life has formed the subject of many beautiful legends, still popular in Germany and France. Her monastery, before her death, which took place in 589, numbered no fewer than 200 nuns. Her feast is held on August 13, the anniversary of her death. In medio peccati painting she is represented with the royal crown, and beneath it a long veil. See Butler, *Lives of the Saints*, Aug. 13; Montalembert, *Moms of the West*, vol. ii. b. vi.; Chamber's *Encyclop.*; Wetzer, *Kirchengesch. Deutschlands*, vol. ii.

Rader, Matthias, a learned German Jesuit, was born at Jechingen, in the Tyrol, in 1561. He flourished for nearly forty years at Augsburg, then joined the order, and was engaged in various important missions for the Jesuits. He died at Munich in 1634. He published several editions of classical and ecclesiastical writers, and wrote, among others, *Fuit Comans* (1611); *Soli Deo* (1615); *Soparium Pia* (1628).—*Virkirius Sanctorum* (1604-12).

Radevin, Florentinus, a Roman Catholic of note, was born at Leyeram, in Holland, about 1550. He studied at Prague, and was for some time canon at Utrecht. He became associated with Gerard de Groot, and was one of the founders of the Brethren of the Common Life, and after De Groot's death (1664) was placed at the head of the brotherhood. He died about 1640. He was also the founder of the convent of the regular canons at Windeisheem, near Zwolle, and of the fraternity at Deventer; he thus became, so to speak, the second founder of the Brethren of the Common Life. His Life was written by Thomas a Kempis. See Ullmann, *Reformers before the Reformation*, ii. 81 sq.; Gieseler, *Kirchengesch.,* ii. 3, 226 sq. (J. H. W.)

Radha Vallabha, a Hindó sect which worships Krishna as Radha Vallabha, the lord or lover of Radha. This favorite mistress of Krishna is the object of adoration to all the sects who worship that deity, but the adoration of Radha is of very recent origin. The founder of this sect is alleged to have been a teacher named Haré Vana, who settled at Vrindavan, and established a matha there, which, in 1822, comprised between forty and fifty resident ascetics. He also erected a temple there which still exists.

Raej, John Dr., a Dutch theologian and philosopher, flourished in the second half of the 17th century, at Leyden. He was a devoted Cartesianist, and distinguished himself greatly as such in 1665 at public disputation. He was in English opposed to the doctrine of philosophy from religion, and had a dangerous tendency to scepticism of the very worst character. See Spanheim, *Epistolae*, in Opp. i, 999.

Raffaele. See Raphael.

Rafflenhein, Franz, a Dutch theologian of note, was born at Lancy, near Ryssele, in 1589. He was educated at Leyden University, and greatly distinguished himself in the Greek and Oriental languages. He was first made professor of the former at Cambridge, and later of the latter languages at his alma mater. He died in 1597. Rafflenhein corrected the *Antwerp Polyglot*, and wrote, *Lexicon Arab.* (Leyden, 1699).—*Dict. Chald.:*—Grimm, *Hebr.*, and other works.

Raffles, Thomas, D.D., LL.D., an English Independent divine of great celebrity as a pulpit orator and theologian, was born in London in March 1778, of good parentage, and was connected with Sir Thomas S. Raffles. He pursued his theological studies at Homerton College, and in 1809 was settled as a Congregational minister at Hammersmith. In 1812 he accepted a call from the Great George Street Chapel in Liverpool, and remained there until 1828, when he removed to Manchester. He was a colleague as an assistant. In 1820 he resigned his charge, and withdrew from the responsibilities of the stated ministry altogether, his health having become inadequate to any considerable labor, yet he preached at times frequently after that at the temporary and at the request of other similar public occasions. He died Aug. 18, 1863. Probably no minister in the Congregational body in England has been more widely or more favorably known during the last half century than Dr. Raffles. Idealising being one of the most popular preachers in Great Britain, and being called abroad on occasions of public interest oftener, perhaps, than any other one, he has done good service to the cause both of literature and religion by his pen. In 1817 he published a highly interesting volume of *Letters during a Tour through Some Parts of France, Surrey, Switzerland, Germany, and the Netherlands*. Shortly after the commencement of his ministry he preached a sermon before the London Missionary Society, which attracted great attention and was very widely circulated; and several other of his discourses were published at the request of his friends and with great favor. He was accustomed to celebrate the return of the new year by an appropriate piece of poetry, which was printed and sent forth among his friends as a most welcome remembrance. He has, in addition to these pieces, written many beautiful hymns, some of which the hrich have made their way into some of the collections of sacred song. He is also the author of *A Memoir* of the life and ministry of his predecessor, the Rev. Thomas Spencer, a work which passed through many editions, and in America it has been several times reprinted. His *Lectures on Christian Faith and Practice*, though widely circulated, deserve to be better known than they are, being a clear and conclusive exposition and vindication of the Gospel and the rule and motives of morality. He published several separate sermons preached on various public occasions, and contributed frequently to periodicals. See The *Patriot* (Liverpool), Aug. 20, 1863; *N. Y. Observer*, Sept. 19, 1863; *Princeton Rec.*, April, 1870, art. iii.

Raffles, Thomas Stamford, Sir, an English philanthropist, born July 5, 1781, was British governor of the island of Java from 1811 to 1816, and, after a visit home, returned to the East as resident at Bencoolen. In Sumatra, and was instrumental in founding a college for the promotion of Anglo-Chinese literature. He died in England, July 4, 1825. He published a *History of Java*.

Rafin, Gaspari, a French Protestant minister, was born at Revalmont (Tarn), in the first half of the 16th century. He was a devoted Huguenot, and his home
Ragau was the rallying-place of French Protestants during the days of oppression and persecution.

1. A place named only in the Apocalypse (Judith i, 5, 15). In the latter verse the "mountains of Ragau" are mentioned. It is probably identical with Rages (q.v.).

2. One of the ancestors of our Lord, son of Phalec (Luke iii, 35). He is the same person with Ricu (q.v.), son of Peleg; and the difference in the name arises from our translators having followed the Greek form, in which the first letter g was frequently suppressed by γ, as is the case in Raguel (which once occurs for Reuel), Gomorrha, Gotholiah (for Atholiah), Phogor (for Peror), etc.

Rages (Ῥάγους, Ῥάγους; Vulg. Rages, Ragau) was an important city in north-eastern Media, where that country bordered upon Parthia. It is not mentioned in the Hebrew Scriptures, but occurs frequently in the book of Tobit (i, 14; v, 5; vi, 9, 12, etc.), and twice in Judith ("Raguel" [1, 5, 15]). According to Tobit, it was a place to which some of the Israelitish captives taken by Shalmanezer (Enememar) had been transported, and thither the angel Raphael conducted the young Tobias. In the Apocrypha it is often made the scene of the great battle between Nebuchodonosor and Arphaxad, wherein the latter is said to have been defeated and taken prisoner. Neither of these accounts can be regarded as historic, but the latter may conceal a fact of some importance in the history of the city.

Rages is a place mentioned by a great number of profane writers. The name is said to have been derived from the chama (gayadz) made in the vicinity by earthquakes (Strabo, i, 13). It appears as Rogha in the Zendavesta, in Isidore, and in Stephen; as Rupi in the inscription of the Tageres in Duria of Samos (Etr. 25). It is made the scene of one of the greatest battles that ever took place, in which the Persian and the Greek armies met (Plut. Artax. 1). Properly speaking, Rages is a town, but the town gave name to a province, which is sometimes called Rages or Rhages, sometimes Rhagiana. It appears from the Zendavesta that here was one of the earliest settlements of the Ariana, who were mingled, in Rhagiana, with two other races, and were thus brought into contact with heretics (Bunsen, Philosophy of Universal History, iii, 485). Isidore calls Rages "the greatest city in Media" (p. 6), which may have been the case in his day; but other writers commonly regard it as much inferior to Ecbatana. It was the place to which Frawartish (Praortotes), the Median rebel, fled when defeated by Darius Hystaspis, and at which he was made prisoner by one of Darius's generals (Dek. Inscr. col. ii, par. 19). See Media. This is probably the fact which the apocryphal writer of Judith had in his mind when he spoke of Arphaxad as having been captured at Rages. When Darius Codomannus fled from Alexander, intending to make a final stand in Bactria, he must have passed through Rages on his way to the Caspian Gates; and so we find that Alexander arrived there, in pursuit of his enemy, on the eleventh day after he quitted Ecbatana (Arrian, Exp. Alci, iii, 20). In the troubles which followed the death of Alexander, Rages appears to have gone to decay, but it was soon after rebuilt by Seleucus I (Nicator), who gave it the name of Europus (Strab. xi, 13, 6 §; Steph. Bry. ad voc.). When the Parthians took it, they called it Aracina, after the Aracae of the day; but it soon afterwards recovered its ancient appellation, as we see by Strabo and Isidore. That appellation has been preserved in the name of Rhey.

These ruins lie about five miles south-east of Teheran, and cover a space 4500 yards long by 3500 yards broad. The walls are well marked, and are of prodigious thickness; they appear to have been flanked with a range of towers, and the city was a lofty citadel at their north-eastern angle. The importance of the place consisted in its vicinity to the Caspian Gates, which, in a certain sense, it guarded. Owing to the barren and desolate character of the great salt desert of Iran, every army which seeks to pass from Bactria, India, and Parthia to Media and Persia, or vice versa, must skirt the range of mountains which runs along the southern shore of the Caspian. These mountains send out a rugged and precipitous spur in about long. 52° 25' E. from Greenwich, which runs far inland, and can only be rounded with the utmost difficulty by a direct passage across this spur of which even the Pyle Caspice of the ancients—and of this pass the possessors of Rhages must have at all times held the keys. The modern Teheran, built out of its ruins, has now succeeded Rhey; and it is perhaps mainly from the importance of its position that it has become the Persian capital. For an account of the ruins of Rhey, see Ker Porter, Travels, i, 357-364; and compare Fraser, Khorasan, p. 286.

Ragged Schools is the popular name for a voluntary agency providing education for destitute children, and so preventing them from falling into vagrancy and crime. Vagrant children, and those guilty of slight offences, are provided for in the English Certified Industrial School; but the two institutions are in Great Britain frequently combined. See INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS. In the 18th century, the ragged schools was almost simultaneous with that which instituted reformatories. John Borgia, an unlettered laboring mason, established a "ragged school" towards the close of the last century, composed of thievish and vagrant children gathered from the streets and by-ways of Rome. A few years later, John Pounds, an uneducated cobbler, for twenty years, till his death in 1839, gathered into his shop the most destitute and degraded children of Portsmouth, and thus instituted the first ragged school in England. Both wrought miracles among the ragged children, by such means as moral, industrial, moral, and religious training which they imparted to the juvenile generation of their time was a work most appropriately honored as "the beginning of the greatest of all social problems." It saved thousands of children from beggary and vice, and raised multitudes from the verge of infamy to the rank of a useful and honored life. The first school in which education was accompanied by offer of food was opened by Sheriff Watson in Aberdeen in 1841, and from thence ragged feeding-schools spread over all the country. London had a ragged school founded by the Hon. Mrs. Burdett, which became a free day-school. Field Lane followed in 1843. The Ragged School Union of London in 1864 numbered 201 day-schools, with 17,365 scholars (of these, 2949 were industrial); 180 Sunday-schools, with 28,560 scholars; and 205 readers. The number of ragged schools throughout the country cannot be ascertained, as they are not officially known. A Privy-council minute of 1866 allowed a capitation grant of £2 10s. to every child fed in the schools. This was withdrawn in 1869, as it was also the grant of one of the last of the material used in industrial training. Many of the existing schools certified under the Act of 1857, as in Scotland under Mr. Dunlop's Act of 1854; but these acts operated very slightly in changing the character of the schools, though introducing the principle of compulsory detention, more fully worked out under recent acts. In the present code of government education, ragged schools are left out. They can obtain grants on the same conditions as other schools—conditions to them often difficult and unnecessary. For industrial teaching, they receive no assistance, but a certificate of industrial is precluded from aid from any quarter. There are still, it is estimated, 25,000 ragged children in the streets of London. Schools for the instruction of poor colored children were established by the Friends of Philadelphia as early as 1776, and their benevolent care has been continued in this respect for an entire century. See also SUNDAY-SCHOOLS.
RAGSTATT

Ragstatt, Friedrich von, a minister of the Reformed Church, was born, of Jewish parents, at Metz in 1648. In the year 1671 he was baptized at Cluses in the faith of the Reformed Church; and his conversion and public confession of the divine truths of Christianity were not less remarkable. Shortly after his baptism, when scarcely twenty-three years of age, he published a Latin apology: Theatum Lucidanum, exhibens Verum Messiam, Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum, ejusque Honorem Defendens contra Acusationes Judeorum seu Rabbinorum in Generi, speciisim R. Lipmanii Nizzachon (Amst. 1671), in which the name of the Messiah, our Lord Jesus Christ, was gloriously maintained against the abominable Nizzachon of the Rabbin Lipman (q. v.). Having studied at Groningen and Leyden, in 1680 he was called to the pastorate at Spayk, near Gorcum, in South Holland, where he labored with great blessing, bringing many of his former coreligionists to the foot of the cross. Besides his Thesaurus, he published some other writings. See Fürst, Bibl. Jud. Medic., iii, 128 sq.; Jücher, Gelehrten Lexikon, s. v. "Von Weise;" Wolf, Biblioth. Heb. i, iii, 4 (Nurembr. 1850); Bayle, Dictionnaire, s. v.; Kalkar, Israel u. die Kirchen, p. 63 sq.; Delitzsch, Wissenschaft, Kunst u. Judäum, p. 138; Da Costa, Israel und die Guten, p. 661 sq. (B. F.)

Raguel (Heb. Ræuel, רָעֵל; Sept. "Parevōnja," a less correct Anglicism of the name Raguel (q. v.).

1. A prince-priest of Midian, the father of Zipporah, ancestor of the tribe of the Is. i, 21, and of Moses according to Numb. x. 29. As the father-in-law of Moses is named Jethro in Exod. iii. 1, and Hobab in Judg. iv. 11, and perhaps in Numb. x. 29 (though the latter passage admits of another sense), the prima-facie view would be the Jethro, Reuel, and Hobab, to be different names for the same individual. Such is probably the case with regard to the two first, at all events, if not with the third. See Hobab. One of the names may represent an official title, but whether Jethro or Raguel is uncertain, both being appropriately significant (Jethro = "pre-eminent," from בה ב "excellence," and Raguel = "friend of God," from בר ב). Josephus was in favor of the former (Ant., i. 16, 18), and the application of more than one name to the same individual was a usage familiar to the Hebrews. Jethro is also applied to Solomon and Judicial, and other similar cases. Another solution of the difficulty has been sought in the loose use of terms of relationship among the Hebrews; as that chothên (ךֹּתֵן) in Exod. iii. 1, xviii. 11, xumb. x. 29, may signify any relation by marriage, and consequently that Jethro and Hobab were brothers-in-law of Moses; or that the terms db (דבד) and bath (תָּבָת) in Exod. i. 16, 21, mean grandfather and granddaughter. Neither of these assumptions is satisfactory, the former in the absence of any corroborative evidence; the latter because the omission of Jethro, the father's name, in so circumstantial a narrative as in Exod. ii. 12, is inexplicable; nor can we conceive the indiscriminate use of the terms father and grandfather without good cause. Nevertheless, Jethro has a strong claim to the dignity of authority in its favor, being supported by the Targum Jonathan, Aben-Ezra, Michaelis, Winer, and others. See Jethro.

2. Another transcription of the name Reuel, occurring in Tobit, where Raguel, a pious Jew of "Ecbatane," a fact that he is father of Sara and wife of Tobias (Tob. iii. 7, 17, etc.). The name was not uncommon, and in the book of Enoch it is applied to one of the great guardian angels of the universe, who was charged with the execution of the divine judgments on the (material) world and the stars (xx. 4; xxiii. 4, ed. Dillmann).

Raguenau, Frédéric de, a French prelate who flourished in the second half of the 16th century. He was of noble birth, and after taking holy orders, his uncle vacated the bishopric of Marseilles in order to make room for him. He became a zealous and devoted ecclesiastic, and in many instances displayed more than ordinary manliness. As he was suspected of a strong leaning towards Protestantism, the leaguists greatly annoyed him, and he finally quitted the country, as his life was threatened. He took refuge with Christina of Lorraine in Italy, until after the abjuration of Henry IV, when Raguenau returned to France; but he paid for his trust in the change of the times by his life's blood. He was assassinated Sept. 26, 1603, in his castle. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Générale, xliii, 473, 474; Arrêt du Parlement de Provence contre les Auteurs de l'Assassinat commis sur la Personne de F. de Raguenau (new ed. Marseilles, 1854, 8vo).

Rahab, the form, in the A. V., of two names quite different in the Hebrew. (Heb. רָחָב; רָהָב; red; Sept. "Pa'ach;" פַּאָח; Josephus, "Păaĥag;" Ant. v. 1, 2.) A woman of Jericho at the time of the Exode, whose name has become famous in that connection (Josh. ii) and in Jewish lineage (B.C. 1618). In the following account of her we chiefly follow the Biblical and other ancient authorities, with additions from modern sources. See Exodus.

1. Her History.— At the time of the arrival of the Israelites in Canaan she was a young unmarried woman, dwelling in a house of her own alone, though she had a father and mother, and brothers and sisters, living in Jericho. She was a "harkot," and probably combined the trade of judge-keeper for wayside travelers. She seems also to have been engaged in the manufacture of linen, and the art of dyeing, for which the Phcenicians were early famous; since we find the flat roof of her house covered with stalks of flax put there to dry, and a stock of scarlet or crimson (דָּשָּׁן, דָּשָּׁן) thread in her house—a circumstance which, coupled with the mention of Babylonish garments at vii. 21, as among the spoils of Judah, points to the existence of a trade in such articles between Phcenicia and Mesopotamia. Her house was situated on the wall, probably near the town gate, so as to be convenient for persons coming in and going out of the city. Traders coming from Mesopotamia or Babylonia and returning through Jericho, situated as it was near the fords of the Jordan; and of these many would resort to the house of Rahab. Rahab, therefore, had been well informed with regard to the events of the Exodus. She had heard of the passage through the Red Sea, of the utter destruction of Shphon and Og, and of the irresistible progress of the Israelish host. The effect upon her mind had been what one would not have expected in a person of her way of life: it led her to a firm faith in Jehovah as the true God, and to the conviction that he would protect his people in the extremity of a trade. When, therefore, the two spies sent by Joshua came to her house, they found themselves under the roof of one who, alone, probably, of the whole population, was friendly to their nation. Their coming, however, was quickly known; and the king of Jericho, having received information of it, was afraid at first, according to Josephus; sent, that very evening, to require her to deliver them up. It is very likely that, her house being a public one, some one who resorted there might have seen and recognised the spies, and gone off at once to report the matter to the authorities, and the king had reason to think that Rahab's suspicious; for she immediately hid the men among the flax-stalks which were piled on the flat roof of her house, and, on the arrival of the officers sent to search her house, was ready with the story that two
men—of what country she knew not—had it was true, been to her house, but had left it just before the gates were shut for the night. If they pursued them at once, she added, they would be sure to overtake them. Misled by the false information, the men started in pursuit to the banks of the Jordan, the gate of Jericho, which had been opened to let them out, and immediately closed again. When all was quiet, and the people were gone to bed, Rahab stood up to the house-top, told the spies what had happened, and assured them of her faith in the God of Israel, her recent, but shallow impression of the capture of the whole land by them—an expectation, she added, which was shared by her countrymen, and had produced a great panic among them. She then told them her plan for their escape: it was to let them down by a cord from the window of her house, which looked over the city wall, and that they should flee into the mountains which bounded the plains of Jericho, and lie hidden there for three days, by which time the pursuers would have returned, and the gates of the Jordan be open to them again. She asked, in return for her kindness to them, that they should swear by Jehovah that, when their countrymen had taken the city, they would spare her life, and the lives of her father and mother, brothers and sisters, and all that belonged to them. The men readily consented; and it was agreed between them that she should mark out a white line on the window from which they had escaped, and bring all her family under her roof. If any of her kindred went out-of-doors into the street, her blood would be upon his own head; and the Israelites, in that case, would be guiltless. The event proved the wisdom of her precautions. The pursuers returned to Jericho after a fruitless search, and the spies got safe back to the Israelite camp. The news they brought of the terror of the Canaanites doubtless inspired Israel with fresh courage, and within three days of their return the passage of the Jordan was effected. In order to destroy Jericho which they had ensured, Joshua gave the strictest orders for the preservation of Rahab and her family; and, accordingly, before the city was burned, the two spies were sent to her house, and they brought out her, her father, and mother, and brothers, and kindred, and all that she had, and placed them in safety in the Israelite camp. The narrator adds, "and she dwelt in Israel unto this day: not necessarily implying that she was alive at the time he wrote, but that the family of strangers of which she was reckoned the head continued to dwell among the harlot's children. The Maccabees and forty-five "children of Jericho" mentioned in Ezra ii, 34; Neh. vii, 36, and "the men of Jericho" who assisted Nehemiah in rebuilding the walls of Jerusalem (Neh. iii, 2) have been their posterity? Their continued sojourn among the Israelites of the tribes of Judah, and the fact that they were in the wilderness: that she became a proselyte when the spies were received by her; and that, after the fall of Jericho, no less a personage than Joshua himself made her his wife. She is also counted as an ancestress of Jeremiah, Micah, and Huldah, the prophetesses. See Talm. Babyl. Moqilla, fol. 14, col. 2: Yechayin, x, 1; Shalahelet Hakohal, vii, 2; Abaranbél, Kimchi, etc., on Josh. vi, 25; Mitzroth Toarah, p. 112; Lightfoot, Hor. Heb, ad Matt. i, 4; Moschen, N. T. Talmud, p. 40. See JOSUA.

2. Rahab's Character. This has been a subject of deep interest and no little controversy. In the narrative of these transactions, Rahab is called מַּרְאֵה, "morah," which our own, after the ancient versions, renders "harlot." The Jewish writers, however, being unwilling to entertain the idea of their ancestors being involved in a disreputable association at the commencement of their great undertaking, chose to interpret the term "morah" less, one who keeps a public-house, as if from מַרְאֵה, "to nourish" (Josephus, Ant. v, 1; ii and vii; comp. theTar- gum, and Kimchi and Jarchi on the text). Christian translators, also, are inclined to adopt this interpretation for the sake of the character of a woman of whom the apostle speaks well, and who would appear, from the narrative, to be as unexceptionable as the woman with whom Salmon, prince of Judah, an ancestress of Jesus. But we must be content to take facts as they stand.
and not strain them to meet difficulties; and it is now universally admitted by every sound Hebrew scholar that הַשָּׁלוֹם means "harlot," and not "hostess." It signifies "harlot" in every other word where it occurs, the idea of "hostess" not being represented by this or any other word in Hebrew, as the function represented by it did not exist. (See Frisch, De Muliere Peregrina op. Heb. [Lips. 1741].) There were no inns; and when certain substitutes for inns eventually came into use, they were never, in any Eastern country, kept by women. On the other hand, strangers from beyond the river might have repaired to the house of a harlot without suspicion or remark: the Bedawin from the desert continued to wander about in their tents throughout the days of the Litra and Bagdad. The house of such a woman was also the only one to which they, as perfect strangers, could have had access, and certainly the only one in which they could calculate on obtaining the information they required without danger from male inmates. This concurrence of analogies in the word, in the thing, and in the probability of circumstances ought to settle the question. If we are concerned for the morality of Rahab, the best proof of her reformation is found in the fact of her subjection to Salmon: this implies the previous conversion to Judaism, for which, indeed, her discourse with the spies evinces that she was prepared. Dismissing, therefore, as inconsistent with truth and with the meaning of הַשָּׁלוֹם and פָּרֹת, the attempt to clear her character of stain by saying that she was only an innkeeper, and not a harlot (רֶשֶׁת, חַנָּיָם, and Chal. Vena), we may yet notice that it is very possible that to a woman of her country and religion such a calling may have implied a far less deviation from the standard of morality than it does with us ("vice genus vitis majis quam flagitiose.") Grotius, and, moreover, that with a purer faith she seems to have endured even more (see Har. xxvii). As a case of casuistry, her conduct in deceiving the king of Jericho's messengers with a false tale, and above all, in taking part against her own countrymen, has been much discussed. With regard to the first, strict truth, either in Jew or heathen, was a virtue so utterly unknown before the promulgation of the Gospel, that so far as Rahab is concerned, the discussion is quite superfluous. The question, as regards ourselves, whether in any case a falsehood is allowable—say to save our own life or that of another—is different, but need not be our concern. The question of Rahab's reference, both to Rahab and to Christians, is well discussed by Augustine, Contra. M. Mendaciorum (Opp. vi. 33, 34; comp. Bullinger, 3d Dec. Serm. iv). With regard to her taking part against her own countrymen, it can only be justified if, as is supposed in the Litra, she was not a Canaanite, but a some, under Gentile rule, and was only a sojourner in Jericho. The Gemara of Babyl. mentions the above-noted tradition that she became the wife of Joshua—a tradition unknown to Jerome (1. de Israel). Josephus (Ant. v. 1) describes her as an innkeeper, and her house as an inn (אֲבָרָהַם), and never applies to her the epithet פָּרֹת, which is the term used by the Sept.

See the Cr. Sacri, Theou. No. i. 487; Simeon, Works, ii. 544; Gordon, Christ as Made Known, etc. ii. 288; Ewald, Gesch. Isr. ii. 246; Niemeier, Chorazin, iii. 429 sq.; Ahlstr., De Rahabber Messteress (Lips. 1714); Caunter, Hist. and Char. of Rahab [j]navis that she could not have been a harlot (Lond. 1850); Hoffmann, Rahab's Eretting (Berlin 1861). See Joshua.

2. (Heb. Rahab, הַשָּׁלוֹם, strength; Sept. Pa 2.) Ps 117, and Ps. xxxii, 4; זֹּרַח, Job xvi, 12; פָּרֹת-אֲסָד, Ps. lxxxix, 10; omits Isa. ii, 9. A poetical name signifying "sea monster," which is applied as an appellation to Egypt in Ps. xlv, 18, 14; lxvii, 4; lxix, 10; Isa. ii, 9; and to the sixty-ninth century of its own people, in order to establish the supremacy either of Brahms or Mohammed.

This view of Rahab's is fully borne out by the references to her in the N. T. The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews tells us that "by faith the harlot Rahab perished not with them that believed not, when she had received the spies with peace" (Heb. xii, 31); and James applies this doctrine of salvation by works by asking, "Was not Rahab the harlot justified by works, when she had received the messengers, and had sent them out another way?" (James ii, 25). In like manner Clement of Rome says, "Rahab the harlot was saved for her faith and hospitality" (ad Corinth. xii). The fathers generally ("mire concensus") Jacobonei consider the deliverance of Rahab as typical of salvation, and the scarlet line hung out at her window as typical of the blood of Jesus, in the same way as the ark of Noah and the blood of the paschal lamb were—a view which is borne out by the analogy of the deliverances, and by the language of Heb. xi, 31 (רְאוֹי הַשָּׁלוֹם, "the disobedient"), compared with 1 Pet. iii, 20 (רְאוֹי הַשָּׁלוֹם פָּרֹת). Clement (ad Corinth. xii) is the first to do so. He says that by the symbol of the scarlet line it was "made manifest that there shall be redemption through the blood of the Lord to all who believe and trust in God," and adds that Rahab in this was a prophetess as well as a believer—a sentiment in which he is followed by Origen (in ib. Jen. Hom. iii). Justin Martyr, in like manner, calls the scarlet line "the symbol of the blood of Christ, by which the children of all nations who once were harlots and unrighteous are saved," and in a like spirit Irenæus draws from the story of Rahab the conversion of the Gentiles, and the admission of publicans and harlots into the kingdom of heaven through the way of the scarlet line, which he compares with the Passover and the Exodus. Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine (who, like Jerome and Cyril, takes Ps. lxxvii, 4 to refer to Rahab the harlot), and Theodoret, all follow in the same track; but Origen, as usual elsewhere, carries the analogy further. Irenæus makes the singular mistake of calling the scarlet three, and makes them symbolical of the Trinity! The comparison of the scarlet line with the scarlet thread which was bound round the hand of Zarah is a favorite one with them.


The Jews, as above observed, are embarrassed as to what to say concerning Rahab. They praise her highly for her conduct; but some rabbis give out that she was not a Canaanite, but a some, under Gentile rule, and was only a sojourner in Jericho. The Gemara of Babyl. mentions the above-noted tradition that she became the wife of Joshua—a tradition unknown to Jerome (1. de Israel). Josephus (Ant. v. 1) describes her as an innkeeper, and her house as an inn (אֲבָרָהַם), and never applies to her the epithet פָּרֹת, which is the term used by the Sept.
diles, hippopotami, and other aquatic creatures of the Nile (q. v.). As the word, if Hebrew, radically denotes "fierceness, insolence, pride," when applied to Egypt, it would indicate the natural character of the inhabitants. (Genesis it was probably Egyptian origin, but accommodated to Hebrew, although no likely equivalent has been found in Coptic, or, we may add, in ancient Egyptian (Thesaur. s. v.). That the Hebrew meaning is alluded to in connection with the proper name does not seem to prove that the latter is Hebrew, but this is rendered very probable by its appropriate character and its sole use in poetical books. See BEHEMOTH.

The same word occurs in a passage in Job, where it is usually translated, as in the A. V., instead of being treated as a proper name. Yet many interpreters, comparing this passage with parallel ones, insist that it refers to the Exodus: "He divideth the sea with his power, and by his understanding he smiteth through the proud" [or "Rahab"] (xxvi, 12). The prophet Isaiah calls on the arm of the Lord," [Art] not thou it that hath cut Rahab, [and] wounded the dragon's [Art] not thou it which hath dried the sea, the waters of the great deep; that hath made the depths of the sea a way for the ransomed to pass over?" (li, 9, 10; comp. 15). In Ps. lxiv the division of the sea is mentioned in connection with breaking the heads of the dragons and monsters of Leviathan (ver. 13). So, too, in Ps. lxviii God's power to subdue the sea is spoken of immediately before a mention of his having "broken Rahab in pieces" (ver. 9, 10). Rahab, as a name of Egypt, occurs once only without reference to the Exodus: this is in Ps. lxxxvii, wherein Rahab, Babylon, Philistia, Tyre, and Cush are compared with Zion (ver. 4, 5). In one other passage the name is alluded to with reference to its Hebrew signification, where it is prophesied that the aid of the Egyptians should not avail those who sought it, and this sentence follows: פֶּלַל עָפָר נָהָר הָיָה, "Insolence (i.e. 'the insolent'), they sit still" (Isa. xxx, 7), as Ge-"sequence, regarding Jorkoam as a place, of which Raham was founder and prince.

RAHMAUS, FREDERICK A., a German Reformed minister, was born in York Co., Pa., in 1762, of humble but excellent parentage. He was brought up as a weaver, the profession of his father. His early educa- tion was very limited. At the age of twenty-one he went to Hanover, Pa., entered the German Reformed Church, with a Lutheran minister, and then determined to prepare for the work of the ministry. His brother Jonathan greatly aided him, and Frederick Rahmaus pleased as a preacher as soon as he entered upon the ministerial task. He was ordained in 1809, and preached for nearly half a century. He served during this period several large and laborious charges, which are now among the most prosperous and prominent places in the Reformed Church. In those early days all ministers did hard work, for then the fields were large and the laborers were yet fewer than now. His first settlement was at Emmertsburg, Md., in the summer of 1808. This charge, which he served with great acceptance for about eight years, then included Gettysburg, Taneytown, Apples, and other distant points. Some of the congrega- tions were more than ten miles, and twenty miles apart. But during all his hard service his general health was good, so that he rarely failed to meet an appointment. In 1816 he accepted a call to the church at Harrisburg, Pa., to which he ministered till 1819, when he removed to Chambersburg. Considering this charge, he gave his matured and most vigorous labors, and the faithfulness also was attended with success for a period of seventeen years. In 1836 he removed to Tiffin, O., and for four years was pastor of the German Reformed Church in that city. In 1840 he took charge of some country churches in Sandusky and Seneca counties, in a region called the Black Swamp. Here he continued the work of ruling years and failing energies disabled him from the active duties of his office. He lived with his children until his death, July 15, 1865.

RAHEL, a form originally adopted everywhere in the A. V. (in the edition of 1611) for the present fami- liar name Rachel (q. v.), but retained in our present Bible only in Jer. xxxvi, 15, apparently by a mere oversight of the later editors.

Rāhu is, in Indian mythology, the demon who is imagined to be the cause of the eclipses of sun and moon. When, in consequence of the burning of the millet, the gods had obtained the amrita, or beverage of immortality, they endeavored to appropriate it to their exclusive use; and in this attempt they had also succeeded, after a long struggle with their rivals, the Dāityas, or demons, when Rahu, one of the latter, insinuating himself among the gods, obtained a portion of the amrita by tricking detected by the god Indra: when his head was cut off by Viṣṇu; but, the amrita having reached his throat, his head had already become immortal; and out of revenge against sun and moon, it now pursues them with implacable hatred, seizing them at intervals, and thus causing their eclipses. Such is the substance of the legend as told in the Purāṇas, especially in the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Purāṇa (q. v.). In the Purāṇas (q. v.), it is ampli- fied by allowing both head and tail of the demon to ascend to heaven, and produce the eclipses of sun and moon, when the head of the demon is called Rāhu and his tail Ketu, both, more or less being rep- resented in some Purāṇas as the sons of the demons Vīpūrachiti and his wife Sīhika. In the Vāyū Purāṇa, Rahu is also spoken of as the king of the meteors.

Rāj Đāsā, a Hindu sect founded by Rāj Đās, a disciple of Ramānad. It is said to be confined to the emblem, or workers in hides and in leather, and among the very lowest of the Hindu mixed tribes. This cir- cumstance, as Prof. H. H. Wilson thinks, renders it difficult, if not impossible, to ascertain whether the sect still exists.

RAIČFORD, Matthew, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Jefferson Co., Ga., July 12, 1879. He enjoyed the comfortable assurance of grace at or before the tenth year of his age, and joined the Church in his eleventh year. He was licensed to preach March 28, 1816, and was licensed to preach December 12, 1850. He entered the Georgia Conference at the ensuing session, and filled various appointments until 1842, when he ceased to be an effective preacher. He was sorely afflicted for several years before his death, but often spoke of it with calmness and Christian confidence. He died in Monroe Co., Ga., April 16, 1869.

RAIKES, Henry, an Anglican divine of considerable note, was born Sept. 24, 1782, and was the second son of Thomas Raikes, a gentleman distinguished in English civil life. He was educated at Eton and Cam- bridge University, where he graduated at St. John's College, in 1804, with second-class honors. The next three years were spent on the Continent in extensive travels. He enjoyed the society of the most cultured, and with many who had returned, in 1808, to enter the service of the Church with more than usual intellectural and social qualifications. He became curate of Betchworth, in Surrey, and later of Burnham, in Buckingham, whence he removed to Bognor, in Sussex; and finally enjoyed the distinction of holding the chancellorship of Chester for eighteen years. He refused, about 1828, the bishopric of Mer- rist and a valuable prebendary in the North of Ireland
and in Lincolnshire. He was attached to his home, and
loved the quiet and retirement of his parish. He
died in February, 1854. Chancellor Raikes's varied
and great learning was scarcely known by his most intimate
friends. He was so unpretentious a nature that few were aware
that he was one of the ablest in his learning
and patristic subjects. His printed productions are his
least valuable efforts. Yet among these lesser works
and contributions to the religious periodicals of the day,
he published a volume of Sermons of a very original
type and format. Theology in all its branches included
the fate of most works adopted by a party as its
manifesto in great temporary popularity and early ob-
livion. A far more important work, and one of vast in-
fluence on the Church, was his Essay on Clerical Educa-
tion. It materially influenced the universities to the
recognition of a higher truth, of a more precious learn-
ing than had, at that time, scarcely found a place in
the extensive range of university studies and examinations.
It is to be regretted that, besides the repeated publica-
tion of series of sermons, the productions of Chancellor
Raikes are left in MS. form. He was so well qualified
for original work, and did so much of it in certain un-
explored fields, that it is to be hoped his writings will,
some day, find their way to print in a complete edition.
See Gentleman's Mag. (London), 1855, i, 198 sq. (J. H. W.)

Raikes, Richard, uncle of Henry, was a clergym-
man of the Church of England, and flourished near the
middle of the 18th century. He was educated at St.
John's College, Cambridge, and held a professorship in
that university. After taking holy orders, he was made
prebendary of St. David's. He was a man of exact
learning and of refinement in taste. He was the early
teacher of Henry. The founder of Sunday-schools also
received much of his education and encouragement from this
divine, who himself published Essays on Sunday-schools.
See Gentleman's Magazine (London), 1855, p. 199.

Raikes, Robert, the noted English philanthropist
who founded the modern Sunday-school (q. v.), was
a native of Gloucester, England, where he was born Sept.
14, 1735. His ancestors were people of good rank, and
some of them are distinguished as clergy and politi-
cians. His father was a printer and an editor. He
published the Gloucester Journal, a county Tory news-
paper, and the first journal that attempted to give a re-
port of parliamentary proceedings, which was consider-
ated, at the time, so great a breach of privilege that he
was arrested and brought before the Commons at the
dark days of George I and under the partisanship of
lord-chancellor King. Robert was brought up with
a view of succeeding his father in business, and en-
joyed, therefore, a liberal education. Having finally
become proprietor of the Journal, he managed to give
his paper a wide influence and respectful reading. He
was a truly devout man, and carried his Christianity
into every-day life. He was not only scrupulous about
his church attendance on the Sabbath, but made it the
to rule to frequent early morning prayers on weekdays at
the Gloucester cathedral. A man who could thus de-
vote the hours of a working-day to the glory of his
God was likely to cherish an interest in his fellows
also. Raikes was particularly interested in the lowly
and the degraded. He visited prisons and went about
the streets seeking to do good wherever there was need
of aid or counsel. The improvements in prison disci-
pline at the close of the last century in England are
largely due to Robert Raikes. His newspaper was an
important agency which he used freely, and thus pow-
fully affected the life of suffering and degraded classes of society. In 1781 his attention
was directed to the children of the poor. He had, by
frequent intercourse with the common people, learned
of their low intellectual state and the absolute neglect
suffered by rising generation. He set out, as he himself tells it in
his letter written in 1784, with the number of wretched children whom he found
in the suburbs of Gloucester, chiefly in the neighbor-
hood of a pin manufactory, where their parents were
employed, wholly abandoned to themselves, half clothed,
half fed, and growing up in the most degrading vices.
The state of the streets was worse on Sunday, when
the younger children, who were enrolled on week-days, were joined to their younger associates;
and all manner of excesses became the theme of com-
plain on the part of the shopmen and the property-
owners generally. Even the farmers near came
complaining of the lack of discipline among the juvenile offenders. Raikes determined to provide
a remedy for this growing evil. He saw very clearly
the surest result in education, and therefore sought the
help of four excellent teachers and devoted Christian
women, whom he paid a small allowance for their ser-
vice, and, gathering the children on the Sabbath-day,
tried a kind of work which has given shape to the
modern Sabbath-school. He procured the help of the
clergy, and the enterprise began in such an unpre-
tending manner grew into proportions of which Raikes
himself had not had the faintest idea. The instruction
was at first confined to reading and writing. Instead
of secular text-books, the Bible was the principal read-
ning-book used, and so the children were made familiar
with the Gospel's great benefits to man. How he got
inside the children with the text he himself tells us in his
letter: "I went around," he says, "to remonstrate with num-
bers of the poor on the melancholy consequences that
must ensue from a fatal neglect of their children's mor-
als. I prevailed with some, and others soon followed;
and the school began to prosper in numbers. The chil-
dren were to come soon after ten in the morning and
stay till twelve; they were then to go home and re-
turn at one, and, after reading a lesson, they were to be
conducted to church. After church they were to be
employed in repeating the catechism till half-past five,
and then to be dismissed with an injunction not to
be without making a noise, and by no means to play in
the street. With regard to the rules adopted, I only re-
quired that they come to the school on Sunday as clean
as possible. Many were at first deterred because they
wanted decent clothing; but I could not undertake to
supply this defect. Although without shoes and in a
ragged coat, I rejected none on that account; all that I
required were clean hands, a clean face, and the hair
combed. If they had no clean shirt, they were to come
in that which they had on. The want of decent app-
arel at first kept many of the children from attending;
but gradually became wiser, and all pressed to learn. I
had the good luck to procure places for some that were
deserving, which was of great use. The children attend-
ing the school varied from six years old to twelve or
fourteen. Little rewards were distributed among the
most diligent; this excited an emulation." The mode
of procedure is thus described by himself: "Upon the
Sunday afternoon the mistresses take their scholars to
church, a place which neither they nor their ancestors
ever entered with a view to the glory of God. They
assemble at the house of one of the mistresses, and walk
before her to church, two and two, in as much order as
a company of soldiers. I am generally at church, and
after service they all come round me to make their
bow, and, if any animosities have arisen, to make their
complaint. The great principle1 I inculcate is to be
kind and good-natured to each other; not to provoke
one another; to be dutiful to their parents; not to of-
fend God by cursing and swearing, and such plain pre-
cepts as all may comprehend." Although other schemes
may have been proposed on this subject, and with a more
romantic interest, none were ever so productive of
more extensively beneficial results. The necessity,
and the advantages to be derived from the establish-
ment, of such schools seem to have occurred about the same
time to several individuals in various parts of the en-
croachment and communications of Dr. John, and of the late Dr. John, and of the late Mr. VﺶV谋划1.
tion and superintendence of the Sunday-schools in that city, yet, for the energetic development of the principle, for the carrying-out into practical details and bringing it in the most advantageous form before the country so as to render it a prolific source of public benefit, to Robert Raikes, is due all dispute, belonged to the honorable title of the Founder of Sunday-schools. Three years after the inauguration of the Gloucester institution, the inhabitants of an obscure district where he had fixed a school remarked that 'the place had become quite a house of amusement.' So zealous were compared to that it used to be. Schools of the same kind were, ere long, opened in most of the large towns in England. A Sunday-school Society was opened in London under the auspices of such men as Henry Thornton, bishops Barrington, Porteus, and other well-known Christians of the period; and, at a general meeting of that association, held on July 11, 1787, it was resolved unanimously that, in consideration of the zeal and merits of Robert Raikes, he be admitted an honorary member of the society. Within the sphere of his own immediate experience, Raikes had the satisfaction of seeing the happiest fruits spring from the institutions in Gloucester; for, out of all the thousands of poor children who were educated at those Sunday-schools, it was found, after a long series of years, that not one had ever been either in the city or county pauper. See Gentleman's Magazine (London), 1784-1831, pt. ii, 132, 294; Sketch of the Life of Robert, Raikes, and the History of Sunday-Schools (N. Y., 1880); Cornell, Life of Robert Raikes (N. Y. 1864); Jameson, Christian Biography, a. v.

Raikes, Timothy, the grandfather of Robert Raikes, was a clergyman of the Church of England, and of some note. He was born near the middle of the 18th century, and was educated at St. John's College, Cambridge. After taking holy orders, he was vicar of Tickhill. He held the vicarage of Heasle, near Hull, at the time of his death, in 1722.

Raillon, Jacques, a French prelate, born at Bourgoigny, July 17, 1602, was educated for the priesthood at the seminary in Lübeck, in which he had been placed by bishop Mercy of that place. After graduation he made a curate of Montaigu, but was obliged in the Revolutionary period to quit his parish, and lived for some time at Paris, where he took the defence of the priests in his Épui pes au Peuple Catholique (1792, 6 vols.). But he became a royalist, and, by the gravity of that situation, was forced from the country. He lived for a while at Soleur, in Switzerland, then at Venice, in Italy, and only returned to France in 1804. He at once became teacher in the house of Portalis, then minister of cults, and under the influence Raillon was in 1809 made professor of puplit oratory in the theological faculty at Paris, and titular canon of Notre Dame. In the latter capacity he pronounced the funeral orations upon mar-shal Lamarque and other distinguished countrymen of his, and so markedly acquitted himself in this task that he was given the episcopacy of Orleans in 1810. The unpleasant relations then existing between the government of France and the papacy, however, prevented his confirmation, and in 1816 he went into retirement at Paris. The government, however, was unwilling to suffer the loss of such a faithful and efficient ecclesiastic, and in 1829 he was nominated bishop of Dijon and promptly confirmed as such. In 1830 he was made archbishop of Aix, and there he resided until his death, in 1835. On his departure from Dijon a medal was struck in his honour, and the inscription was as he below: The recently expired Dupanloup (1874), who figured as bishop, and more recently as archbishop, of Orleans, at one time involved Raillon in controversy and took offensive ground; but Raillon was universally supported by the French press and a majority of the French clergy, and the bishop Dupanloup changed the direction of his popularity on account of his conduct in this affair. His works are of a secular character, excepting the Histoire de Saint-Amboise (which was to form four or five volumes in 8vo, but of which the MS. was lost). See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, a. v. (J. H. W.)

Ralls of the Altar date from the time of bishop Andrews, who calls them "wainscot banisters," and Laud, who intended to preserve the altar from profanation by their use. They are, in fact, a kind of altar rail, resembling the mediaval "reclinatorium," and answer to the primitive altar-veils and Greek ἱεροστάται. At Leicester Priory, St. Germain's, and Wimborne they are covered with a white linen cloth at the time of holy communion, a relic of the custom for communicants to hold the houseline-cloth (see houseline-cloth, for the Lord's body) below their chin for the purpose of retaining upon it any portion of the sacrament which might fall during the administration. The custom was discarded at the coronation of William IV. St. Augustine's and Canons of Arles mention a linen cloth (lincemen) used by women for the same purpose.

Raimbault. See CLOTHING; DRESS; GARMENT.

Raimondi, Giovanni Battista, a celebrated Italian Orientalist, was born at Cremona in 1540, removed in his youth to Naples, where he studied at the universities of Naples, Sorrento, philosophy, and medicine, and then spent some time in Asia studying Eastern civilization and languages. Returning to Italy, he became engaged in various literary enterprises, and enjoyed the society of the great and the learned. He brought out an edition of the Psalms in Arabic with a Latin interlinear translation (1591), and wrote grammars of Syriac and Arabic. He was also engaged on a polyglot Bible more complete than that of Alcalâ or Antwerp, and only ceased labor when the death of pope Gregory XIII (1567) deprived him of the necessary funds for such an enterprise. He died about 1610. He was engaged after 1587 in the compilation of Oriental MSS. and other like labors. See Tiraboschi, Della Letteratura Italiana.—Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, a. v. Raimondi, Marc Antonio, an Italian engraver who devoted himself to classical and sacred art, was born at Bologna in 1487. He was a student first of Francesco Francia, but perfected himself under Raphael, who favored him so greatly that Raimondi may be placed by the side of his great master. The two artists worked together, and Raimondi was especially the particular branch of art that the works of that time have never been excelled in drawing and clearness of outline, though much surpassed in gradation of tone and delicacy of modelling. It should be remembered that it was Raphael who first obtained for his pupil the commission of the cartoons for the School of Athens, which Raphael that Marc Antonio worked. He was especially remarkable for the exactness with which he copied; he seems to have been willing to lose himself entirely in the master he reproduced. His life may be said to have been devoted to multiplying the works of Raphael. He also executed a few plates after Michelangelo, Mantegna, Bandinelli, and Giulio Romano. He was imprisoned on account of some plates after the designs of the latter, which were so indecent as to excite Clement VII, and it was with difficulty that his release was obtained by some of the cardinals and Bandinelli. In 1527 Raimondi was in full favor in Rome, when he was driven away by the sacking of the Spaniards. He was plundered, and fled to Bologna. His last work was done in 1558, in which year he is said to have been killed while engraving a picture. He is said to have engraved a second plate of the Murder of the Innocents, contrary to his agreement. His works are numerous, and in selecting them great attention should be paid to the different impressions, for some of the plates have been re touched by those who have had them, until they are greatly changed. The brass plate engraved in his name. Heineken gives a complete catalogue of his prints. Very few collections are in the Louvre and in

RAIN. Heb. הָרַע, malak, and also מַגְּרֶש, gezham, which, however, rather signifies a shower of more violent rain; it is also used as a generic term, including the early and latter rain (Jer. v. 24; Joel ii, 23). Another word, of a more poetical character, is רָעָם, râ'âm (a plural form, connected with rub, "many," from the multitude of the drops), translated in our version "showers" (Deut. xxxii, 2; Jer. iii, 3; xiv, 22; Mic. v, 7 [Heb. 6]; Psa. lxv, 10 [Heb. 11]; lxxvi, 6). The Hebrews have the word צְרֵם, tzerem, expressing violent rain, storm, tempest, accompanied with hail—in Job xxii, 8, the heavy rain which heavy down on mountains; and the word מַגְּרֶשׁ, magrash, which occurs only in Prov. xxvii, 15, continuous and heavy rain (Sept. εἰς ηδονήν ἀπαντοῦντος).

Early Rain means the rains of the autumn, הִנְנִי, hinni, yoreh, part. subst. from הִנָּה, he scattered (Deut. xi, 14; Jer. v, 24); also the Hiphil part. הִנְנָה, hinnah, morchel (Joel ii, 23); Sept. εἰς πρωίων.

Latter Rain is the rain of spring, מַגִּיר, magir, (Prov. xvi, 15; Job xxii, 23; Jer. iii, 3; Hos. vi, 3; Joel ii, 23; Zech. x, 1); Sept. εἰς ἐρυθρόν. The early and latter rains are mentioned together (Deut. xi, 11; Jer. v, 24; Joel vi, 24); the latter rain is especially frequent in the autumn and winter (Hosea vi, 4).

In a country comprising so many varieties of elevation as Palestine, there must of necessity occur corresponding varieties of climate. An account that might correctly describe the peculiarities of the district of Lebanon would be in many respects inaccurate when applied to the deep water courses of the almost tropical climate of Jericho. In any general statement, therefore, allowance must be made for not inconsiderable local variations. Contrasted with the districts most familiar to the children of Israel before their settlement in the land of promise—Egypt and the Desert—rain might be spoken of as one of its distinguishing characteristics (Deut. xi, 10, 11; Herodotus, iii, 10). For six months in the year no rain falls, and the harvests are gathered in without any of the anxiety with which we are so far acquainted. In the rest of the months rain comes in storms. In this respect, at least, the climate has remained unchanged since the time when Boaz slept by his heap of corn; and the sending of thunder and rain in wheat harvest was a miracle which filled the people with fear and wonder (I Sam. xii, 18)—so that Solomon could exclaim: "There are two things which are too wonderful for me, both too high for me to reach: one is the ways of the sea, and the one the wind, which will not be known (Prov.xxxi, 6). These are, however, very considerable, and perhaps more than compensating, disadvantages occasioned by this long absence of rain: the whole land becomes dry, parched, and brown; the cisterns are empty; the springs and fountains fail; and the autumnal rains are eagerly looked for, to prepare the earth for the reception of the seed. These, the early rains, commence about the end of October or beginning of November, in Lebanon a month earlier—not suddenly, but by degrees: the husbandman has thus the opportunity of sowing his fields of wheat and barley. The rains come mostly from the west or south-west (Luke xii, 54), continuing for two or three days at a time, and falling chiefly during the night. The wind then shifts round to the north or east, and several days of fine weather succeed (Prov. xxv, 23). During the months of November and December the rains continue to fall heavily, but at intervals; afterwards they return, only at longer intervals, and are less heavy; but at no period during the winter are they entirely cease. January and February are the coldest months, and snow falls, sometimes to the depth of a foot or more, at Jerusalem, but it does not lie long: it is very seldom seen along the coast and in the low plains. Thin ice occasionally covers the pools for a few days, and while Porter was writing his Handbook, the snow was eight inches deep at Damascus. But in the midst of this rain less than an inch thick, Rain continues to fall more or less during the month of March; it is very rare in April, and even in Lebanon the showers that occur are generally light. In the valley of the Jordan the barley harvest begins as early as the middle of April, and the wheat a fortnight later; in Lebanon the grain is sowed, and the plants ripen in rich thickets. Rain continues to fall more or less during the month of June, See Robinson (Biblical Researches, i, 429) and Porter (Handbook, ch. xlviii). See PALESTINE.

With respect to the distinction between the early and the latter rains, Robinson observes that there are not at the present day any particular descriptions of the one or of succession of showers which might be regarded as distinct rainy seasons. The whole period from October to March now constitutes only one continued season of rain, without any regularly intervening term of prolonged fine weather. Unless, therefore, there have been some change in the climate, the early and the latter rains for which the husbandman waited with longing seem rather to have implied the first showers of autumn which revived the parched and thirsty soil and prepared it for the seed; and the later showers of spring, which continue in March and April, and forwards the ripening of crops and the vernal products of the fields (James v, 7; Prov. xvi, 15). In April and May the sky is usually serene; showers occur occasionally, but they are mild and refreshing. On May 1 Robinson experienced showers of rain and lightning (which are frequent in winter), with pleasant and reviving rain. May 6 was also remarkable for thunder and for several showers, some of which were quite heavy. The rains of both these days extended far to the north, . . . but the occurrence of rain so late in the season was as a very unusual circumstance (Biblical Researches, i, 430) [he is speaking of the year 1888]. In 1856, however, "there was very heavy rain accompanied with thunder all over the region of Lebanon, extending to Beirût and Damascus, on May 28 and 29; but the oldest inhabitant had never seen the like before, and it created," says Porter (Handbook, ch. xlviii), "almost as much astonishment as the thunder and rain which Samuel brought upon the Israelites during the time of wheat harvest." During Dr. Robinson's stay at Beirût, the climate of the country, in 1852, there were heavy rains in March, once for five days continuously, and the weather continued variable, with occasional heavy rain, till the close of the first week in April. The "latter rains" thus continued this season for nearly a month later than usual, and the result was afterwards seen in the more than usual moisture of winter grain (Robinson, Biblical Researches, iii, 9).

These details will, it is thought, better than any general statement, enable the reader to form his judgment on the "former" and "latter" rains of Scripture, and may serve to introduce a remark or two on the question, about which some interest has been felt, whether there have been any change in the frequency and abundance of the rain in Palestine, or in the periods of its supply. It is asked whether "these storied hills, these desert valleys," can be the land flowing with milk and honey: the land which God cared for: the land upon which were always the eyes of the Lord, from the beginning of the year to the end of the year (Deut. xii, 12). So far as relates to the other considerations which may account for diminished fertility, such as the decrease of population and industry, the neglect of terrace-culture and irrigation, and husbanding the supply of water, it may suffice to refer to the article on Agriculture, and to Stanley (Sinai and Palestine, p. 120-123). With respect to our more immediate subject, it is urged that the expression "flowing with milk and honey" implies abundant rains to keep alive the grass for the pasture of the numerous herds supplying the milk, and to nourish the flowers clothing the
now bare hill-sides, from whence the bees might gather their stores of honey. It is urged that the supply of rain in its due season seems to be promised as continua- 
gence of the people (Deut. xi, 13-15; Lev. xxvi, 5-5), and that as from time to time, to punish 
the people for their transgressions, "the showers 
have been withheld, and there hath been no latter rain" (Jer. iii, 3; 1 Kings xvii, xviii), so now, in 
the great and long-continued apostacy of the children of Is- 
rael, there had if upon them the end of their for- 
feited inheritance a like continued withdrawal of 
the favor of God, who claims the sending of rain as one 
of his special prerogatives (Jer. xiv, 22). See Calen- 
dar, Jewish.

The latter rains, it is urged, are by comparison scanty and 
interrupted, the latter rains have altogether ceased, and 
hence, it is maintained, the curse has been fulfilled, 
"Thy heaven that is over thy head shall be brass, and 
the earth that is under thee shall be iron. The Lord 
shall make the rain of thy land powder and dust" (Deut. 
xxviii, 23, 34; Lev. xxvi, 19). Without entering here 
into the consideration of the justness of the interpreta-
tion which would assume these predictions of the with-
holding of rain to be altogether different in the manner 
of their infliction from the other calamities denounced in 
the Restoration of Israel. Of threatening, it would appear that, 
so far as the question of fact is concerned, there is scarcely 
sufficient reason to imagine that any great and marked 
changes with respect to the rains have taken place in Pal-
estine. In early days, as now, rain was unknown for half 
the year, and we may judge from the allusions in Prov. 
xvi, 15; Job xxix, 23, the latter rain was even 
then, while greatly desired and longed for, that which 
was somewhat precarious, by no means to be absolutely 
counted on as a matter of course. If we are to take as 
correct our translation of Joel ii, 23, "the latter rain in the 
first (month)"; i.e. Nisan, according to the 
attending of the latter part of March and the early part of April, 
times of the latter rain in the days of the prophets 
would coincide with those in which it falls now. The 
same conclusion would be arrived at from Amos iv, 7, 
"I have withheld the rain from you when there were 
yet three months to the harvest." The rain here spoken of 
is the latter rain, and an interval of three months be-

tween the ending of the rain and the beginning of har-
vest would seem to be in an average year as exceptional 
now as it was when Amos noted it as a judgment of 
God. We may infer also from the Song of Solomon, ii, 
11-18, where is given a poetical description of the bursting-
forth of vegetation in the spring, that the winter was 
past, the rain was also over and gone. We 
can hardly any extension of the term "winter", 
bring it down to a later period than that during which 
the rains still fall. But it may be added that travellers have, perhaps uncon-
sciously, exaggerated the barrenness of the land, from 
confining themselves too closely to the southern portion 
of Palestine; the northern portion, Galilee, of such pecu-
nial interest to the readers of the Gospel, is fertile and 
beautiful (see Stanley, Sinai and Palestine, ch. x, 
and Van de Velde, there quoted), and in his description of 
the valley of Nablus, the ancient Shechem, Robinson 
(Biblical Researches, ii, 275) becomes almost enthusias-
tic: "Here a scene of luxuriant and almost unparalleled 
verdure bursts upon our view. The whole valley was 
filled with gardens of vegetables and orchards of all 
kinds of fruits, watered by several fountains, which 
burst forth in the spring, and the air is perfumed in re-
freshing streams. It came upon us suddenly, like a 
scene of fairy enchantment. We saw nothing like it in 
all Palestine." The account given by a recent lady 
traveller (Egyptian Sepulchres and Syrian Shrines, by 
Miss Beaufort) of the luxuriant fruit-trees and vegeta-
bles at and near the town of Mishmarah's farm in the valley of 
Urtas, a little south of Bethlehem (possibly the site of Sol-
oman's gardens, Eccles. ii, 4-6), may serve to prove how 
much now, as ever, may be effected by irrigation (q.v.).

Rain frequently furnishes the writers of the Old Test, 
with forcible and appropriate metaphors, varying is their 
character according as they regard it as the beneficent 
and fertilizing shower, or the destructive storm, pouring 
down the mountain-side and sweeping away the latter 
years. Thus Prov. xxviii, 3, of the poor man that 
oppresseth the poor; Ezek. xxxviii, 22, of the just punish-
ments and righteous vengeance of God (comp. Ps. xi, 
6; Job xx, 25). On the other hand, we have it used 
of speech and fitting, refreshing the souls of men; of 
words earnestly waited for and heedfully listened to 
(Deut. xxxii, 2; Job xxix, 23); of the cheering favor 
of the Lord coming down once more upon the pestilent 
soul; of the gracious presence and influence for good 
of the right hand of him who is bearing gifts, and graces of the reign of the Messiah (Hos. vi, 1; 
2 Sam. xxiii, 4; Ps. Ixxxii, 6).

Rain Dragon, Tse, a Chinese deity, from whose 
capacious mouth it is believed the waters are spouted 
forth which descend upon the earth in the form of rain. 
This god is worshiped by the Chinese to cultivate the soil; 
only, however, when his power is felt either by the ab-


Rainald of Citeaux, a medieval ecclesiastic, 
flourished in the first half of the 12th century. 
He was son of Milon, and had St. Bernard for tutor. 
On the death of St. Stephen, he became abbot of Citeaux, 
and here he gave shelter to Abbadieu, and became the 
mediator for the restoration of that great medieval phi-
losopher and theologian to papal favor. In 1146 
Rainald was president of a general chapter of his order. 
He died Dec. 18, 1151. He published a Recueil (in 
eighty-seven chapters) on divers chapters of the Order 
of Citeaux, etc. See Galula Christianna, vol. iv, col.985, 
Histoire Litteraire de la France, xii, 418; Remusat, Tie 
de Abbadieu, i, 281.—Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s. v.

Rainald of Vicoasse, an Italian warrior, was born 
at Matelica, in the Ancona marshes, in 1500. At ten-
year-two he entered the Order of the Jesuits, and passed 
his life at Rome in the house of the Society of the 
Jesuits. He died in 1677. We mention of his writings, Lues 
Homines Dreciti (Rome, 1633, 34mo.)—Cibo dell' Asiase 
(1637, 1639).—Vida J. J. Liones (1671, 1674, 1675). 
Biog. Generale, s. v.

Rainald, Theophilius. See Rainald.

Rainbow (Heb. מֶּ֫אָן, me'ah, i.e. a bow which 
with shoot arrows, Gen. ix, 13-16; Ezek. i, 28; Sept. réger, 
sic Eccles. xxii, 11; Vulg. arcus. In the New Test. [Rev. 
iv, 8; vi, 1, ] Log., the tokens of the covenant which God 
made with Noah when he came forth from the ark that 
the waters should no more become a flood to destroy all 
beast. With respect to the covenant itself, as a charter of 
natural blessings and mercies ("the world's covenant.") 
not the arc in the sky, but the peace and order of 
physical nature, which in the flood had undergone so 
great a conversion, see Davidson, On Prophecy, lect. iii. 
p. 76-80. With respect to the token of the covenant, 
the right interpretation of Gen. ix, 13 seems to be that 
God took the rainbow, which had hitherto been but 
a beautiful, but not a sign of the promise which was 
made by Noah when he came forth from the ark and 
consecrated it as the sign of his love and the witness of his promise. The bow in 
the cloud, seen by every nation under heaven, is an un-
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falling witness to the truth of God. Was the rainbow, then, we ask, never seen before the flood? Was this "sign in the heavens" beheld for the first time by the eight days that by the Mermaid? There is no reason to suppose that in the world at large there has been such a change in meteorological phenomena as here implied. That a certain portion of the earth should never have been visited by rain is quite conceivable. Egypt, though not absolutely without rain, very rarely sees it. But the country of Noah and the ark was a mountainous country; and the ordinary atmospheric conditions must have been suspended, or a new law must have come into operation after the flood, if the rain then first fell, and if the rainbow had consequently never before been painted on the clouds. Hence, many writers have supposed that the meaning of the passage is, not that the rainbow now appeared for the first time, but that it was now for the first time invested with the sanctity of a sign; that not a new phenomenon was visible, but that a new meaning was given to a phenomenon already existing. The following passages, xiv, 13; 1 Sam. xii. 18; 1 Kings ii. 55, are instances in which יָרֵא, nathen, literally "give"—the word used in Gen. ix. 13, "I do set my bow in the cloud"—is employed in the sense of "constitute," "appoint." Accordingly, there is no reason for concluding that ignorance of the natural cause of the rainbow occasioned the account given of its institution in the book of Genesis.

The rainbow is frequently seen in Palestine in the rainy season, and thus furnishes a common image to the sacred writers. There is a reference to the rainbow, though not named, in Isa. liv. 9, 10; and it is mentioned in other passages. "As the appearance of the bow which is in the cloud in the day of rain, so was the appearance of the brightness round about" (Ezek. i. 28). "And there was a rainbow round about the throne in sight like unto an emerald" (Rev. iv. 3). "And I saw another mighty angel come down from heaven, clothed with a cloud, and a rainbow was upon his head" (x. 1). These three passages correspond with the direct light upon each other. The rainbow in all of them is the designated token of God's covenant and mercy, and of his faithful remembrance of his promise. "Look upon the rainbow," says the son of Sirach (Eccles. xiii. 11, 12), "and be glad, and be comforted; for that made it: very beautiful is it in the brightness thereof; it compasseth the heaven about with a glorious circle, and the hands of the Most High have banded it." Among the Greeks and Romans, the personified rainbow, Iris, became the messenger of the gods, and the natural rainbow seems to have been conceived as the passage-way on which Iris came down to men (Serv. on Virgil's Æn. v, 610). The Indian mythology made a yet nearer approach to the Biblical view (Von Böhlen, India, i, 287); but the Edda represents the rainbow as a bridge connecting heaven and earth (see, in general, Menzel, Mythol. Forsch. p. 253 sq.). On the physical views of the ancients with regard to the rainbow, see Forbiger, Handb. d. alt. Geog. i, 596 sq. See Schlichter, De Iride ejusque Emblem. (Hal. 1739); Ausfeld, De Iride Dilucis non redituri Signo (Gies. 1756). See Bow.

Scientifically considered, the rainbow is a natural phenomenon which is formed by rays of light from the sun (occasionally the moon) striking drops of falling rain, being refracted in entering them, reflected back, in part, from the opposite side of the drops, and refracted again on emergence. It produces prismatic colors, some of which meet the eye. In the inner or primary bow, the light is refracted downwards, and under-
Minutes of Annual Conferences of the M. E. Church, 1877, p. 149.

Rain-makers are, in Kaffreland, a class of crafty and designing men who profess to have supernatural influence and powers. When no rain has fallen upon the land for several months, and the ground is parched and the cattle suffer, the rain-makers become rare; ceasingly scarce, the people apply to the rain-maker, who immediately exerts himself on their behalf, if they bring him satisfactory presents. A large gathering of the people now takes place, an ox is slaughtered, and a large quantity of Kaffree beer is imbibed; and when the rain-maker has become sufficiently animated by the part he takes in the feast, he commences his incantations. He dances round the camp-fire, and exerts himself with such violent gestures that the perspiration streams down his naked body. He then commands the people to go and look towards the western horizon for the appearance of the rain-clouds. If no indication of coming showers is seen, the wily rain-maker tells the deluded natives that the presents which they have brought him are not sufficient. They then go to bring more, the feast is renewed, and the business of the ceremonies are repeated to gain time; and if the foolish exercises are continued till a shower actually falls, the rain-makers triumph in their success. The presence of Christian missionaries in Kaffreland has of late years greatly increased the power and influence of the rain-makers, and bids fair to annihilate the gross deception altogether.

Rainold(e)s (also written Reynolds, Reynolds, and occasionally in the Latin Regulinius), John, was a cele
erated English divine of the second half of the 16th century. He was born at Fishoe, Devonshire, in 1549, was educated at Merton College, Oxford, and Corpus Christi College, of the same university; and was chosen probationer fellow in 1556. He finally took holy orders, and in 1558 was promoted to the deanery of Lincoln. In 1598 he was offered a bishopric, and at the same time was called to the presidency of Corpus Christi College. He cared less for distinctions than for scholarly tasks, and therefore gave the preference to the offer of his alma mater. In this new position he became famous beyond seas, as well as in England. His learning and readiness of application gave him a reputation not to lose in England; and the king, who prided himself on his own reputation for scholarship, and desired above all things to maintain this reputation, leaned greatly on this distinguished divinity, and always favored his projects. It is thus that we owe to Rainold the King James Version of the scriptures. It is well known that Rainold urged the vice--chancellor, the undertakers, and demonstrated its necessity. He was a great Hebraist, and made translations c. small portions at first, and, reading these to the king in his private chamber, convinced his royal master of the want, and the good likely to be accomplished as well as the renown to be gained. See English Versions. Rainold died in 1607. Bishop Hall speaks of Rainold as being near to a miracle in his prodigious treasury of knowledge; John Milton refers to him always as "our famous Dr. Rayold;" and Wood, in his Athenae Oxoni., (ii, 18), calls him "the very treasury of erudition." Hallam, in his Constitutional Hist. of England, calls him "nearly, if not altogether, the most learned man in England" (i, 297), and in his Literary Hist. of Europe (i, 560), "the most eminently learned man of the queen's reign." He published a number of separate sermons, treatises against the Church of Rome, and some other theological productions, of which there is a complete list in Wood (Athenae Oxoni., ii, 11-19). We have room here to mention only, See Theses de S. Scriptura et Ecclesia (Lenz, 1589); Regiments; and, in English, 1558, 12mo; (1599, 4to) — The Summary of the Conference between John Rainoldes and John Hart touching the Head and Faith of the Church, etc. (1584, 1588, 1589, 1609, 4to; Latin, Oxon, 1619, fol.) — Orationes duo in Coll. Corp. Christi (Oxon. 1587, 8vo) — De Romanae Ecclesiae Idolatria in Cultu Sacramentorum, Invoc., Nov., etc. (1586, 4to; Oxon. 1609, 4to) — Collier, Hist. of Dramatic Poetry, iii, 201, and his Bibl. Account of Early English Literature (1865), a. v. "Rainoldes," Arked, Nov., 1841, p. 114 — Defence of the Judgment of the Reformed Churches that a Man may lawfully not only put away his Wife for her Adultery, but also marry Another, etc. (1609-10, 4to) — Commentaria Librum Apocryphorum Vetus Testamenti (Oppenheim, 1611, 2 vol. 4to), very rare; not only in this was, but in the Hampton Court Conference also (where, by the way, he sided with the Puritans), Rainoldes protested against the reading of apocryphal passages in the public service of the Church: — The Prophete of Obediah, sermons (Oxon. 1613, 4to) — Orations adversaria (Including the Summe of the Conference, etc.) in Coll. Corp. Christi (1614, 1628, 8vo); the first oration was published in an English translation by J. Leicester (Lond. 1638, 12mo) — The Original of Bishops and Metropolitans (1614, 4to) — Judgment concerning Episcopacy, whether it be God's ancient ordinance (1614, 4to) — Prophete of Hagg, sermons (1649, 4to). See the literature quoted in Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, a. v.; Middle
town, Evangel. Bisg., vol. ii; Soames, Hist. of the Church of England in the Elizabethan Reign (see Index); Froude, Hist. of England, see Index in vol. xii.

Rainor, Menezis, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church near the opening of our century, was admitted to the work of the itineracy in 1730, and travelled in Dutchess (N. Y.) Circuit with Peter Mor
tery, under the superintendence of Freeborn Garretson (q. v.). In 1731 he was colleague of Lemuel Smith at Hartford. In 1732 he labored in Mons. Sub
dsequently he travelled the Elizabethtown (N. J.) and Middletown (Conn.) circuits. In 1735 he withdrew from the conference, and afterwards from the Church. He was a young man of promise, and acceptable among the people as a preacher. After his withdrawal from the Methodist Church, he joined the Protestant Episcopal Church, and afterwards became a Universalist. See Stevens, Memoirs of New England Methodism, p. 127.

Rainisant, Jean Firmin, a noted French Bene
dictine monk, was born at Suippe, near Chalons-sur-
Marne, in 1596, and took the monastic vow in 1618 at Verdun. In 1621 he became prior of the monastery attached to the diocese of Rheims, and so distinguished himself by austerity and purity that he was by cardinal Richelieu selected in 1630 as one of the thirty who were to reform the Cluny Congregation. In 1633 he became prs. of Ferrières, in Gâtine; but after the union of the Cluniacs and Maurists ceased in 1644, he gave the preference to the last congregation. In 1645 he was elected prior of the abbey of St.-Germain-des-Prés, at Paris. In 1651 he was elected visitor of the province of Bretagne. On his very first journey in the country he fell from his saddle and broke a leg; from the injuries thus sustained he sickened and died, Nov. 8, 1651, in the convent of Lehon, near Dinan. He contributed largely to the literature on monasticism in later medi
teval times; and whatever he wrote is valuable to the student of this subject. Because Rainisant confessed the failings of the ascetics of the Church of Rome, and earnestly sought their reform. We have no room here to insert a list of his writings, but refer to Hoder, Nouv. Études, xii, 497, and Le Cerf, Dictionnaire de l'Église et de la Confraternité de St. Maur.

Rainis (Cebu, Cebu, tomasinas. 1 Sam. xxv, 18; xxx, 20; 2 Sam. xvi, 1; Chron. xii, 20) signifies dried grapes, or rather cakes made of them, such as the Italians still call simonini. Grapes are often thus preserved for food (Numb, vi, 8). See Grape; Vine.
RAISSE, ARNOLD, a French theologian, was born at Douai near the opening of the 17th century. He was canon of the Church of St. Peter, and as such had ample opportunity to explore the vast treasures of this church and neighboring churches and monasteries for the ecclesiastical history of the Low Countries. He died in 1644, leaving a large material for the history of the saints in the Netherlands, and its stores have not yet been fully exhausted. His other writings are of no special interest now.—Hoefcr, Notiz. Bibl. Generale, s. v.

R'ak'm (1 Chron. vii, 16). See Rekem.

Rak'kath (Heb. Rakkath, 'rkk['h, shore; Sept. 'rkk[v, n. Ράκαθ), a fortified city in the tribe of Naphtali, mentioned only in Josh. xxi. 35, where it is grouped between Hammoth and Chinnereth. We may hence infer that it lay on the western shore of the lake of Galilee, not far distant from the warm baths of Tiberias, which are on the site of the ancient Hammath (q. v.). According to the rabbins (Megill. 6a), Rakkath stood upon the spot where the city of Tiberias was afterwards built (see Lightfoot, Opp. ii. 229). See Cinnereth.

Rakkath appears to have fallen to ruin at an early period, or at least it was not a place of sufficient note to be mentioned in history, and the name passed away altogether when Tiberias and Josephus of Jerusalem had the ancient tombs to have been removed to make room for the buildings of Tiberias does not, as Dr. Robinson supposes, make it impossible that the city stood on the site of Rakhe (Josephus, Ant. xviii. 2, 8; Robinson, Bib. Res. ii, 389). Rakkath may have stood close on the shore where there were no tombs; while Tiberias, being much larger, extended some distance up the adjoining rocky hill-sides, in which the tombs may still be seen. Thomson (Land and Book, ii, 66) identifies Hammath with the Emmaus of Josephus (Ant. xvii. 5, 3), and supposes Rakheh to be the same name with the Arab Arkeh, at the mouth of the Jordan; but this latter rather represents the ancient Tarichea (q. v.). The enumeration of the towns in the connection requires us to understand this to be the same with the Rackath preceding, i.e., Hammoth-Rakkath. See Naphat-tal, Tribe of.

Rakkon (Heb. An-Rakkon), 'rkk'on, with the article the temple [of the head]. Geera, a well-watered place, first Sept. 'rkk'on, Vulg. Arecos, one of the towns in the inheritance of Dan (Josh. xix. 46). It appears not far distant from Joppa. As it is mentioned between Me-jarkon and Japho, the site is possibly that of the village Kalschock or Kalsheik, marked on the maps as lying north of the Nah Rabin, west of Akir (Ekon).

Rakshas, or Rakshasa, is, in Hindî mythology, the name of a class of evil spirits or demons, who are sometimes imagined as attendants on Kuvera, the god of riches, and guardians of his treasures, but more frequently as mischievous, cruel, and hideous monsters, haunting cemeteries and hallowed places, terrorizing men and demons, and ever ready to oppose the gods and to disturb pious people. They have the power of assuming any shape at will, and their strength increases towards the evening twilight. Several of them are described as having many heads and arms [see, for instance, Ravana], large teeth, red hair, and, in general, as being of repulsive appearance; others, however, especially the females of this class, could also take beautiful forms in order to allure their victims. In the legends of the Mahabharata, Ramayana, and the Puranas, they play an important part. In the Valmiki Ramayana, part of the verse, they are sometimes mentioned as the offspring of the patriarch Pulasya, at other times as the sons of the patriarch Kasyapa. Another account of their origin, given in the Vishnu-Purâna, where, tracing the creation of the world (bk. i. ch. v), is the following: "Next, from Brahma, in a form composed of the quality of foulness, was produced hunger, of whom anger was born; and the god forth with hunger, with hunger, of hideous aspect, and with long beards. Those beings hastened to the deity. Such of them as exclaimed, 'Not so; oh! let him be saved,' were named Rakshas (from ruksh, save): others who cried out, 'Let us eat,' were denounced, from that expression, Yaksha (from yaktah, for, yaktah, eat). This popular etymology of the name, however, would be at variance with the crude nature of these beings, and it seems, therefore, to have been improved upon in the Bhagavata-Purâna, where it is related that Brahma transformed himself into night, instead of a body; thus the Yaksas and Rakshasas seized upon, exclaiming, 'Do not spare it—devour it!' when Brahma cried out, 'Don't devour me (m a m a n a j a k h a t a) — spare me! (rakhati)." (See F. E. Hall's note to Wilson's Vishnu-Purâna, i. 82.) The more probable origin of the word Rakshas—kindled with the Germanderic or Rinnie—is that from a radical rash, "lurt," or "destroy," with an affix sus; hence, literally, the destructive being.

Rakusians is the name of a Christian sect whom Mohammedan writers speak of as having existed among the Arabs in the 7th century. The identity of the sect is uncertain, but it is generally supposed that there were at least two distinct branches of it. Their tenets appear to have been those of the Manichæans (q. v.) or Sabians (q. v.), still further corrupted by Ebonite influence. See Smrger, Mohomed. 1, 41; ii, 155; iii, 387, 395; Weil, Mohomed. p. 249, 386; Ueberweg, Hist. of Philosophr, i, 491.

Rabag, so called by Jews from the initial letters of his name, לֶאָבִי אָבָד (L'ebi Aba'd), and known by Christian writers by the name Magister Leo de Bar-mul or Germonis, was born in 1298 at Rafaels, not far from Gerona, and died about 1345. Little is known about the personal history of this remarkable Hebrew beyond the fact that, by virtue of his residence in Orange and Avignon, he was providentially exempted from the fearful sufferings inflicted upon his brethren in 1306, by the cruel government of Philip the Fair and his successors, and that he was thus enabled quietly to consecrate his extraordinary powers to the elucidation of the Scriptures, as well as to the advancement of science. His principal work, and perhaps the greatest on religious philosophy, is his הבש הפסנתר, The Wars of God (Riva di Trento, 1560; Leipzig, 1866). In this work Gerondys had the audacity to confess the eternity of matter, so that it was ironically called "The Wars with (against) God." But, as free as God's sun, he uttered his convictions, careless of consequence, and without fear of offending this or that path, sect, or established opinions. He believed in the progressive nature of thoughts, and added his to those of his predecessors, leaving the consequence in the hand of God, and believing that "time develops truth." "Truth," he says, "must be brought to light even if it wound me; the revealed law must emphatically: as the Bible is no tyrannical law which intends to impose untruth for truth, but its design is to lead us to true knowledge" (intro. p. 2 b., sect. vi, p. 68 a). This great philosophical work treats: 1. Of the immortality of the soul (on which there are eight chapters); 2. On dreams and prophecy (eight chapters); 3. On the omniscience of God and the conflict between philosophy and religion (six chapters); 4. On Providence, viewed from the philosophical and religious standpoint (seven chapters). The remaining portion of the work deals with the harmony between the statements of the Bible and the phenomena of the universe. That part of his work which treats on astronomy, and which describes an astronomical instrument invented by Gerondys to facilitate observations, was so much appreciated that Pope Clement VI, in 1342, had it translated into Latin; and Kepler, as he says in a letter to John
Remus, took much trouble to get the book of rabbi Levi, as he calls him (uunum oapul Rabbinos invenit puerum tractatum K. Levi quinque defensionum Dei). The same work was published by P. de Millot, and by Reuchlin, who quotes largely from Gersonides. Though he began his authorship with philosophical and scientific productions when about thirty (1614), yet he published no exegetical work till he was thirty-seven years of age, from which time he unremittingly devoted himself to the exposition of the Bible. His first commentary is on the book of Job, and was finished in 1325. Twelve months later (1326) he published a commentary on the Song of Songs, and in 1326 a commentary on Cohelet, or Ecclesiastes. About the same time Rabbiag finished his commentary on the first chapters of Genesis, treating on the hexameron; and shortly after issued an exposition of Esther (1329). The Pentateuch now engaged his attention, and after laboring on it eight years (1329-1337), he completed the interpretation of this difficult part of the Old Test. In 1339 he finished a commentary on the earlier prophets—i.e. Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings—with his comment on Proverbs, Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles. The following are the editions of his exegetical works: היערף ע"ל ח"ש, Commentary on the Pentateuch (first printed at Mantua before 1490, then by Corn. Adolphus, 1634, in the Laws of Maimonides, and in Frankurt's Rabbinc Bible, 1634. 1524-1577). י"ע ח"ש, Commentary on the Earlier Prophets (Leira, and in all the Rabbinc Bibles; latest edition, Koningsburg, 1860)—except of the commentaries on the Pentateuch and the earlier prophets, entitled היערף ע"ל ח"ש, Utility, were published in 1560, and a Jewish-German version of them is given in Jekuteil's German translation of the Bible (Amst. 1676-78): י"ע ח"ש, Commentary on Proverbs (Leira, 1492, and in all the Rabbinc Bibles); a Latin translation was published by P. Ghuguy (Milan, 1620). י"ע ח"ש, Commentary on Job (Ferrara, 1677, and in all the Rabbinc Bibles); a Latin translation of ch. iv-viii was published by L. H. d'Aquino (Vicenza, 1628), and of ch. iv-viii by Chr. Ludovici (Leipzig, 1708) י"ע ח"ש, Commentary on Song of Songs, Esther, Ecclesiastes, and Ruth, with an introduction by Jacob Morkaria (Riva, 1560). י"ע ח"ש, Commentary on Daniel, published in Italy before 1490, in Pratenis's Rabbinc Bible, and in Frankurt's. The commentaries on Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles, which he finished in 1534, were still in MS, Cod. MSS. Op. 193, fol. 623. "As to his mode of interpretation, Rabbiag first gives an explanation of the words מ"ע ח"ש in each section, posterior meaning according to the context, י"ע ח"ש, and finally gives the utility or application of the passage מ"ע ח"ש. See Furst, Bibliotheca Judaica, 1, 85-84; Steinlschneider, Catalogus Libr. Heb. in Bibl. Coll. col. 1607-1615; Wolf, Bibliotheca Heb. i, 726, etc.; Iv, 892; Ginsburg, in Kitto, s. v.; Jost, in Frankel's Monatschr. x, 225, etc. (Col. 1690), x, 41-60, 93-111, 137-145, 297-312, 333-344, xi, 20-31, 65-75, 101-114; Grütz, Geschichte d. Juden, vii, 345-352 (Leips. 1873); Jost, Gesch. d. Juden, u. S. Seeten, ii, 83; Etheridge, Introduction to Hebrew Literature, p. 261 sq.; De Rossi, Dizionario Storico degli Autori Ebrei, 1114 sq. (Germ. transl.); Bousag, Histoire des Juifs (Taylor's transl.), p. 675; Ueberweg, History of Philosophy, i, 421; Prantl, Gesch. d. Logik, ii, 394-396; Margoliouth, Modern Jews Investigated, p. 253 (London, 1815); Levy, Die Eroberung der franz. Juden. Eireu, etc., p. 24 sq. (Leips. 1873).

RALE (Ralle, or Raale). SEBASTIAN, a French Roman Catholic missionary, was born in 1657 or 1658, in the province of Franche-Comté. Having entered the Order of the Jesuits, he was dispatched to the foreign work in 1689. He arrived at Quebec in the fall of that year, and labored faithfully among the Indians for their conversion to the Catholic faith, and the great success. But his venturesome spirit led him into dangerous paths: he frequently went far beyond the territory of those savages friendly to him, and he finally paid for his daring with his life. He was killed in 1724, while on an expedition with Indians; but not by the savages—he fell pierced with English bullets. He had been guilty of great cruelty to Englishmen who had fallen into the hands of Indians, and this was only a revenge for his treachery to the whites. His death was a loss not only to Roman Catholics, but to the world of learning. He was the first of the tribe to translate the hexameron, and shortly after issued an exposition of Esther (1329). The Pentateuch now engaged his attention, and after laboring on it eight years (1329-1337), he completed the interpretation of this difficult part of the Old Test. In 1339 he finished a commentary on the earlier prophets—i.e. Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings—with his comment on Proverbs, Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles. The following are the editions of his exegetical works: היערף ע"ל ח"ש, Commentary on the Pentateuch (first printed at Mantua before 1490, then by Corn. Adolphus, 1544, in the Laws of Maimonides, and in Frankurt's Rabbinc Bible, 1634. 1524-1577). י"ע ח"ש, Commentary on the Earlier Prophets (Leira, and in all the Rabbinc Bibles; latest edition, Koningsberg, 1860)—except of the commentaries on the Pentateuch and the earlier prophets, entitled היערף ע"ל ח"ש, Utility, were published in 1560, and a Jewish-German version of them is given in Jekuteil's German translation of the Bible (Amst. 1676-78): י"ע ח"ש, Commentary on Proverbs (Leira, 1492, and in all the Rabbinc Bibles); a Latin translation was published by P. Ghuguy (Milan, 1620). י"ע ח"ש, Commentary on Job (Ferrara, 1677, and in all the Rabbinc Bibles); a Latin translation of ch. iv-viii was published by L. H. d'Aquino (Vicenza, 1628), and of ch. iv-viii by Chr. Ludovici (Leipzig, 1708) י"ע ח"ש, Commentary on Song of Songs, Esther, Ecclesiastes, and Ruth, with an introduction by Jacob Morkaria (Riva, 1560). י"ע ח"ש, Commentary on Daniel, published in Italy before 1490, in Pratenis's Rabbinc Bible, and in Frankurt's. The commentaries on Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles, which he finished in 1534, were still in MS, Cod. MSS. Op. 193, fol. 623. "As to his mode of interpretation, Rabbiag first gives an explanation of the words מ"ע ח"ש in each section, posterior meaning according to the context, י"ע ח"ש, and finally gives the utility or application of the passage מ"ע ח"ש. See Furst, Bibliotheca Judaica, 1, 85-84; Steinlschneider, Catalogus Libr. Heb. in Bibl. Coll. col. 1607-1615; Wolf, Bibliotheca Heb. i, 726, etc.; Iv, 892; Ginsburg, in Kitto, s. v.; Jost, in Frankel's Monatschr. x, 225, etc. (Col. 1690), x, 41-60, 93-111, 137-145, 297-312, 333-344, xi, 20-31, 65-75, 101-114; Grütz, Geschichte d. Juden, vii, 345-352 (Leips. 1873); Jost, Gesch. d. Juden, u. S. Seeten, ii, 83; Etheridge, Introduction to Hebrew Literature, p. 261 sq.; De Rossi, Dizionario Storico degli Autori Ebrei, 1114 sq. (Germ. transl.); Bousag, Histoire des Juifs (Taylor's transl.), p. 675; Ueberweg, History of Philosophy, i, 421; Prantl, Gesch. d. Logik, ii, 394-396; Margoliouth, Modern Jews Investigated, p. 253 (London, 1815); Levy, Die Eroberung der franz. Juden. Eireu, etc., p. 24 sq. (Leips. 1873).
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gained the royal favor, he was made, in 1586, admiral in the expedition against Cadiz, commanded by Howard and the earl of Essex, and was admittedly the main instrument of its success. Also, in the year following, he took part in the attack on the Azores made by the same commanders. In the court intrigues which ended in the defeat of Essex in 1587 and the death of the earl, Raleigh became deeply involved; and certain points of his conduct—as, notably, the sale of his good offices with the queen in behalf of such of the earl’s adherents as would buy them—though easily regarded by the current morality of the time, have been somewhat of a stain on his fame otherwise so splendid. With the death of Elizabeth, in 1603, ends his brilliant and successful career. Her successor, James, from the first regarded him with suspicion and dislike. He had, besides, made powerful enemies; and, when accused of complicity in a plot against the king, though no jott of evidence of his being any way concerned in it was produced at his trial, a verdict was readily procured finding him guilty of high treason. The language of the prosecutor, attorney-general Coke, was outrageously abusive. He called Raleigh “a heathenable atheist and follower of hell,” a “viperous traitor,” etc. Sentence of death was passed, but James did not venture to execute him; and he was sent to the Tower, where, for thirteen years, he remained a prisoner, his estates being confiscated, and made over to the king’s favorite, Carr, subsequently earl of Essex. The literary-minded and religious devotion of Raleigh devoted himself to literary and scientific pursuits, his chief monument in this kind being his History of the World, a noble fragment, still notable to the student as one of the finest models of quaint and stately old English style. Certain of his poetical pieces, giving hint of a genius at once elegant and sententious, also continue to be esteemed. In 1615 he procured his release, and once more sailed for Guiana. The expedition, from which great results were expected, failed miserably. He himself, in consequence of severe illness, was unable to accompany it inland; and nothing but disaster ensued. To add to his grief and disappointment, his eldest and favorite son was killed in the storming of the Spanish town of St. Thomas. He returned to England, broken in spirit and in fortunes, only to die; On the morning of Oct. 29, 1618, he was immolated, nominally on the sentence passed on him sixteen years before, but really, there is reason to suppose, in base compliance, on James’s part, with the urgencies of the king of Spain, who resented his persistent hostility. Raleigh left a record of noble presence, versatile and commanding genius, unquestionably one of the most splendid figures in a time unusually prolific of all splendid developments of humanity. In the art and fineness of the court, the political wisdom of the statesman, and the skilful daring of the warrior, he was almost alike pre-eminent. The moral elevation of the man shines out eminently in the darkness which beset his later fortunes; and the calm and manly dignity with which he fronted adverse fate conciliated even those whom his haughtiness in prosperity had offended. Raleigh’s Life has been written by Oldys, Carevly (Lond. 1690, 2 vols.); and P. F. Tytler (Edin. 1808). His poems were collected and published by Sir E. Brydges (Lond. 1814); his Miscellaneus Writings, by Dr. Birch (1751, 2 vols.); and his Complete Works, at Oxford (1829, 8 vols).

Raleigh,Walter, D.D., nephew of the foregoing, was born in 1586, and was educated at Magdalen College, Oxford. He took holy orders, and finally became, in 1620, rector of Chedzoy, Somersetshire. In 1630 he was made chaplain to the king, and won much favor from Charles L. In 1634 he was made prebend of Wakefield. In 1639 he was made bishop of Worcester and later became rector of Streat, with the chapel of Walton, Wiltshire. During the rebellion, he fell under suspicion, and was imprisoned in his house. While thus confined, he was stabbed, one day (1645), in an encounter with the guard, from whose impertinent curiosity he was determined to hide a private letter. England lost in this divine an eloquent preacher and a scholarly man. Chillingworth said of him that he was the best disputant he ever met with. His works are—Reliquiae Raleighanae: being discourses and sermons on several subjects, with an account of the author by bishop of Patrick (Lond. 1670, 4to):— Certain Querries Proposed by Roman Catholica, and Ansewered by Dr. Walter Raleigh (pub. by Howell, 1718, 8vo). See Wood, Athenae Oxoni.; Gentleman’s Magazine (Lond.), 1857, ii, 643; 1858, i, 82.

Raiston, Samuel, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born fixed serum in county of Donegal, Ireland, in 1756; studied at the University of Glasgow; and, after entering the ministry, emigrated to this country in the spring of 1784. After itinerating about two years in Eastern Pennsylvania, he went west, and in 1786 became pastor of the united congregations of Mingom Creek and Williamsport (now Monogahela City), where he remained for the rest of his life, being pastor of the latter branch thirty-five years, and of the former forty years. In 1822 he was made D.D. by Washington College, Pa., and died in Washington County, Pa., Sept. 25, 1851. As a religious man he was eminent, and his writings are distinctive, clear, copious, and profound in the exposition and defence of truth. His published works are mostly of a controversial character; among them we find—The Curry-comb (1805)—a work on baptism, containing an objection to its comprizing of the two classes, and letters in reply to his attack upon this review:—A Brief Examination of the Principal Prophecies of Daniel and John:—A Defence of Ecclesiastical Priesthood.—Sprague, Annals, iv, 146.

Ram (Heb. id. דָּאָר, ignis), the name of three men in Scripture.

1. (Sept. 'Apekt, r. 'Aḥādār; Vulg. Arum.) The son of Hezron and father of Amminadab, B.C. cir. 1780. He was born in Egypt after Jacob’s migration there, as his name is not mentioned in Gen. xiv, 4. He first appears in Ruth iv, 19. The genealogy in 1 Chron. ii, 9, 10 adds no further information concerning him, except that he was the second son of Hezron, Jerahmeel being the first-born (ver. 25). He appears in the New Test. only in the two lists of the ancestry of Christ (Matt. i, 4, 8; Luke iii, 39), where he is called Aram.

2. (Sept. 'Pāv, r. 'Pāv, 'Apekt; Vulg. Ram.) The first-born of Jerahmeel, and therefore nephew of the preceding (1 Chron. ii, 25, 27). B.C. post 1780. He had three sons—Maaz, Jamin, and Eker.

3. (Sept. 'Pāv, r. 'Apekt; Vulg. Ram.) Elifin, the son of Barachel the Buzite, is described as “of the kindred of Ram” (Josh. xxi, 2). Rashi’s note on the passage is curious: “of the family of Ram, Abraham; for it is said, ‘the greatest man among the Anakim’ (Josh. xiv); this [is] Abraham.” Ewald identifies Ram with Aram, mentioned in Gen. xxvii, 21 in connection with Huz and Buz (Gesen. l, 44). Elifin would thus be a collateral descendant of Abraham, and this may have suggested the extraordinary explanation given by Rashi.

See Aram.

Ram (בָּשָׂר, dylî; spōc). As this animal, fattened, was a favorite article of food (Gen. xxxvi, 38; Ezek. xxxix, 18), it was considered, when offered as sacrifice, of higher value than sheep and lambs (Gen. xv, 9, Numb. xvi, 5, 6). Certain a 18 sq.; Mic. vi, 7), and the legal rite gave exact directions on the sacrifice of the. The rams were sometimes burnt-offerings (Lev. viii, 18, 21; ix, 2; xvi, 3; xxix, 18; Numb. vii, 15; Isa. lixiv, 15; Isa. i, 11; Ezek. lv, 22, etc.,) sometimes frank-offerings (Lev. ix, 4, 10; Numb. vi, 14, 17; vii, 17; xxvii, 11, etc.), sometimes trespass-offerings (Lev. v, 15, 18, 25; vi, 6; comp. Lev. xiv, 21; Numb. v, 8; Ezr a xx, 19, etc.). The ram, too, appears not only in public and private offerings in general, but especially in the purifying sacrifices of the
Nazarite (Numb. vi, 14) and the sacrifices of Priestly Consecration. It was not used as a sin-offering. In 2 Chron. xxix, 21 only the seven he-goats belong to the sin-offering, as ver. 25 shows; the rams, with the other sacrifices, form the burnt-offering. The use of the ram as thank- and trespass-offering is pointed out in Exod. xxix, 22 (comp. Lev. viii, 16; ix, 19; Isa. xxxiv, 6). The Greeks and Romans used rams for sacrifice only exceptionally; yet comp. Pliny, H. N. xxxiv, 19, 19. In Egypt this was more frequent (Wilkinson, v, 191 sq.); and in the Thebais it was imitated, save at the great annual festival of Ammon (Herod. ii, 42). On the symbolic use of the ram in Daniel to signify the Persian empire, see Cattel, N. ii; and on the Battier-ram, see a. The use of ram's skins for covering is alluded to in Exod. xxv, 5; xxxi, 14; xxxvi, 19; xxxix, 34; and is still common in Palestine, where they are also "dyed red" (Exod. xxx, 5) for the use of the shoemakers (Thomson, Land and Book, i, 189). See Sheep.

Ram, Battiering ("Г. 7; Sept. βατήριον; χιερός; Vulg. arius). This instrument of ancient siege operations is twice mentioned in the Old Test. (Ezek. iv, 2; xxii, 22 [27]); and as both references are to the battiering of the Assyrians and Babylonians, it will only be necessary to describe those which are known from the monuments to have been employed in their sieges. With regard to the meaning of the Hebrew word there is but little doubt. It denotes an engine of war which was called a ram, either because it had an iron head shaped like that of a ram, or because when used for battering down a wall, the movement was like the butting action of a ram.

In attacking the walls of a fort or city, the first step appears to have been to form an inclined plane or bank of earth (comp. Ezek. iv, 2—"cast a mount against it"), by which the besiegers could bring their battering-rams and other engines to the foot of the walls. "The battering-rams," says Mr. Layard, "were of various kinds. Some were joined to movable towers which held warriors and armed men. The whole then formed one great temporary building, the top of which is represented in sculptures as on a level with the walls, and even turrets, of the besieged city. In some bas-reliefs the battering-ram is without wheels; it was then, perhaps, constructed upon the spot, and was not intended to be movable, while in others it was probably sometimes unprovided with the ram, but it is probable that it was represented. When the machine contained the battering-ram it was a simple framework and did not form an artificial tower, a cloth or some kind of drapery, edged with fringes and otherwise ornamented, to avoid being thrown horizontally over it. Sometimes it may have been covered with hides. It moved either on four or on six wheels, and was provided with one ram or with two. The mode of working the rams cannot be determined from the Assyrian sculptures. It may be presumed, from the representations in the bas-reliefs, that they were partly suspended by a rope fastened to the outside of the machine, and that men directed and impelled them from within. Such was the plan adopted by the Egyptians, in whose paintings the warriors working the ram may be seen through the frame. Sometimes this engine was ornamented by a carved or painted figure of the presiding divinity kneeling on one knee and drawing a bow. The artificial tower was usually occupied by two warriors: one discharged his arrows against the besieged, whom he was able, from his lofty position, to harass more effectually than if he had been below; the other held up a shield for his companion's defence.

Warrors are not unfortunately represented as stepping from the machine to the battlements. . . . Archers on the walls hurled stones from slings and discharged their arrows in that way. So deep was the artificial tower in the cruel massacre, that the cry of distress went through the whole...
RAMA

land of Benjamin, reaching to the capital of the tribe.

Rama is, in Hindu mythology, the name common to three incarnations of Vishnu, of Parasurama, Rama-chandra, and Balarama. See Vishnu.

Ramadán, the ninth month in the Mohammedan year. In it Mohammed received his first revelation, and every believer is therefore enjoined to keep a strict fast throughout the entire course of the month when the white thread can be distinguished from a black thread to sunset. Eating, drinking, smoking, bathing, smelling, perfumes, and other bodily enjoyments, even swallowing one's spittle, are strictly prohibited during that period. Even when obliged to take a bath, the Moslem will make some kind of amends for it, such as spending a certain sum of money upon the poor. During the night, however, the most necessary wants may be satisfied—a permission which, practically, is interpreted by a profuse indulgence in all sorts of enjoyments. The fast of Ramadán, now much less observed than in former times, is sometimes a very severe affliction upon the orthodox, particularly when the month—being lunar—happens to fall in the long and hot days of summer. The sick, travellers, and soldiers in general, are temporarily released from this duty, but they have to fast an equal number of days at a subsequent period, when this impediment is removed. Nurses, pregnant women, and those to whom it might prove really injurious, are expressly exempt from fasting. We may add that according to some traditions (Al-Bukhari), not only Mohammed, but also Abraham, Moses, and Jesus received their respective revelations during this month. The principal passages treating of the fast of Ramadán are found in the second Surah of the Koran, called "The Cow." See Wellsted, City of the Copts, ii. 245.

Ramah (Heb. Ramah, רַמָּה) signifies a height, or a high place, from the root רָמָה, to be high; and thus it is used in Ezek. xxiv. 24. Very many of the ancient cities and villages of Palestine were built on the tops of hills, so as to be more secure, and hence, as was natural, such of them as were especially conspicuous were called by way of distinction רַמָּה (with the article), the Height; and this in the course of time came to be used as a proper name. We find no less than five Ramahs mentioned in Scripture by this simple name, besides several compounds, and in modern Palestine the equivalent Arab word occurs very frequently. With regard to most of them the traveller can still see how appropriate the appellation was. In the A. V. we have various forms of the word—Ramath (רַמָּת), the status constructus (Josh. xiii. 36), Ramoth (רָמֹת), and Ramathaim (רָמֹתִיאָם), the plural (Josh. xxi. 36; 1 Sam. xxx. 27); and Ramathaim-zophim (רָמֹתִיָּם אֵזוֹפִים), a dual form (1 Sam. i. 1). Remeth (רְמֶת) appears to be only another form of the same word. In later Hebrew, ramah is a recognized word for a hill, and as such is employed in the Jewish versions of the Pentateuch for the rendering of Pisgah. See also ARMATHEA. In the following account we largely follow the usual geographical authorities, with important additions from other sources.

Ramah, Ramasseum, Sept. 'Ramath and Apamá, v. r. 'Ramá, Porpy, Porpy, Pápy, Bajad, Volg, Ramá), frequently mentioned in Scripture. Joshua, in enumerating the towns of Benjamin, groups Ramah between Gibeon and Beeroth (xxvii, 28). This position suits the present Ram-Allah, but the considerations named in the text seem to oblige us to identify this with the other site than er-Rám. It is probably this place which is mentioned in the story of Deborah, "She dwelt under the palm-tree of Deborah, between Ramah and Bethel in Mount Ephraim" (Judg. iv. 5). The Targum on this passage substitutes for the Palm of Deborah, Ataroth-Deborah, no mention to the town of Ataroth.

This has everything in its favor, since 'Atara is still found on the left hand of the road north, very nearly midway between er-Rám and Beitin. Its position is clearly indicated in the distressing narrative of the Levite recorded in Judges xix. He left Bethlehem for his home in the plain of Ephraim in the afternoon. Near Jerusalem, he journeyed northward, and, crossing the ridge, came in sight of Gibeah and Ramah, each standing on the top of its hill; and he said to his servant, "Come and let us draw near to one of these places to lodge all night, in Gibeah or in Ramah." (vii. 5). The towns were on either road on the right, and about two miles apart. The position of these two ancient towns explains another statement of Scripture. It is said of Saul (1 Sam. xxvii, 6) that "he abode in Gibeah under a tree in Ramah." The meaning appears to be that the site of his standing camp was in some commanding spot on the borders of the two territories of Gibeah and Ramah. When Israel was divided, Ramah lay between the rival kingdoms, and appears to have been destroyed at the outbreak of the revolt; for we read that "Ishshah, king of Israel, went up against Judah, and built Ramah." (1 Kings xv. 17). It was a strong position, and commanded the great road from the north to Jerusalem. The king of Judah was alarmed at the erection of a fortress in such close proximity to his capital, and he stopped the work by bribing the Syrians to invade northern Israel (vers. 18-21). The town was never carried off all the building materials (ver. 22). There is a precise specification of its position in the catalogue of the places north of Jerusalem which are enumerated by Isaiah as disturbed by the gradual approach of the king of Assyria (Isa. x. 28-32). At Michmethah he crosses the ravine; and then successively dislodges or alarms Geba, Ramah, and Gibeah of Saul. Each of these may be recognized with almost absolute certainty at the present day. Geba is Jeba, on the south brink of the great valley; and a mile and a half beyond is, directly between it and the main road to the city, the elevation which its ancient name implies. Ramah was intimately connected with one of the saddest epochs of Jewish history. The full story is not told, but the outline is sketched in the words of Jeremiah. In the final invasion of Judah by the Babylonians, Nebuchadnezzar established his headquarters on the plain of Hamath at Riblah (Jer. xxxix, 5). Thence he sent his generals, who captured Jerusalem. The principal inhabitants who escaped the sword were seized, bound, and placed under a guard at Ramah, while the vanguard was burning the temple and palace, and levelling the ramparts. Among the captives was Jeremiah himself (xi, 1, 5, with xxxix, 8-12). Perhaps there was also a slaughter of such of the captives as, from age, weakness, or poverty, were not worth the long transport across the desert to Babylon. There, in that heart-rending scene of captives in chains waiting over slaughtered kindred and desolated sanctuaries, was fulfilled the first phase of the prophecy uttered only a few years before: "A voice was heard in Ramah, lamentation and bitter weeping: Rachel weeping for her children, refused to be comforted for her children because they were not" (Jer. xxxi, 15). That mourning was typical of another which took place six centuries later. When the infants of Bethlehem were murdered, and the second phase of the prophecy was fulfilled (Matt. ii. 17). As Ramah was in the plains, the prophet introduces Rachel, the mother of that tribe, bewailing the captivity of her descendants. See RAMAH.

Ramah was rebuilt and recolonized by the descendants of its old inhabitants after the captivity (Ezra ii, 26; Neh. vii, 2). The inhabitants of Ramathaim-Zophim were left by some to occupy a different position in the list, and may be a distinct place situated farther west, nearer the plain. (This, and Jer. xxxi, 15, are the only passages in which the name appears without the article.) The Sept. finds an allusion to Ramah in Zech. xiv, 16, where it renders the words which are translated in the A.V.
and shall be lifted up (אֶפְסָר), and inhabited in her place," by "Ramah shall remain upon her place." According to Josephus (who calls it Παπαζων), it was forty stadia distant from Jerusalem (Ant. viii. 12, 3); and Eusebius and Jerome place it in the sixth mile north of the holy city (Onomast. s. v. "Rama"); but in his comment on Josh. vii. 18, Jerome says in septimo locis); and the latter states that in his day it was a small village (id Sophoniam, i, 15).

Modern travellers are right in identifying Ramah of Benjamin with the village of er-Rami (Brocadus, vii; Robinson, Bibl. Res. i, 255), though Maunoir and a few others have located it at Nely Samwil. Er-Rami is five miles north of Jerusalem and four south of Bethel. The site of Gibeah of Saul lies two miles southward, and Gaba about the same distance eastward. Rama is a small, ruined village; but in the walls and foundations of the houses are many large hewn stones, and in the lanes and fields broken columns and other remains of the ancient capital. The situation is commanding, on the top of a conical hill, half a mile east of the great northern road, and overlooking the broad summit of the ridge. A view is intercepted by bare ridges and hill-tops. The whole country round Ramah has an aspect of stern and even painful desolation; but this is almost forgotten in the great events which the surrounding heights and ruins recall to memory. The identity of this Ramah with that of Samuel, see RAMATHEIM-ZOPHEM.

2. RAMAH OF ASHER (Sept. 'Pepa: Vulg. Horuma), a town mentioned only in Josh. xix, 29, in the description of the boundaries of Asher. It would appear to have been situated near the sea-coast, and not far from Tyre, towards the north-east. Eusebius and Jerome mention this place, but in such a way as shows they knew nothing of it further than what is stated by Joshua. In the Vulgate Jerome calls it Horuma, making the Hebrew article π a part of the word; this, however, is plainly an error (Onomast. s. v. "Rama"); and note by Benammi.

Robinson visited a village called Ramleh, situated on the western declivity of the mountain-range, about seventeen miles south-east of Tyre. It "stands upon an isolated hill in the midst of a basin with green fields, surrounded by higher hills." In the rocks are numerous ancient sarcophagi, and the village itself has some remains of antiquity. He says there is no room for question but that this village represents the ancient Ramah of Asher" (Bibl. Res. iii, 64). Its position, however, notwithstanding the住了 which so high an authority, does not at all correspond with the notice in Scripture. The name Ramlah was too common to indicate identity with any degree of certainty. Another Ramleh has been discovered on a little tell, two miles south-east of modern Tyre, and about one mile northeast of Ras-el-Ain, the site of ancient Tyre (Van de Velde, Map and Memoir, p. 512). In position this village answers in all respects to the Ramah of Asher.

3. RAMAH OF GILEAD (2 Kings viii, 29; 2 Chron. xxiii, 6), identical with Ramoth-Gilead (q. v.).

4. RAMAH OF NAPHTALI (Sept. 'Apqul v. r. 'Pqul: Vulg. Arama), one of the strong cities of the tribe, mentioned only in Josh. xix, 36, and situated apparently to the south of Hazor, between that city and the Sea of Galilee. Roland seems inclined to identify it with the Ramah of Asher; but they are evidently distinct cities, as indicated both by ancient geographers and the sacred writer (Palest. p. 963). Eusebius and Jerome record the name, though they appear to have known nothing of the place (Onomast. s. v. "Rama"). Beth-Rimah (בֵית־רְמוֹה), a place in Galilee on a mountain, and famous for its wine, according to the Talmud (Menachoth, viii, 6), is thought by Schwarz (Palest. p. 178) to be the Ramah of Naphtali. About six miles west by south south-west, on the leading road to Akka, is a large modern village called Rimah. It stands on the declivity of the mountain, surrounded by olive-groves, and overlooking a fertile plain. It contains no visible traces of antiquity; but the name and the situation render it highly probable that it occupies the site of Ramah of Naphtali. It was visited by Schulte in 1847 (Ritter, Pal. and Syr. iii, 772), and by Robinson in 1842 (Bibl. Res. i, 78). See also Hackett, Illustr. of Script. p. 240; Thomson, Land and Book, i, 515. See RAMATHEIM.

5. RAMAH OF SAMUEL, the birthplace and home of that prophet (1 Sam. i, 19; ii, 11, etc.), and the city elsewhere called RAMATHEIM-ZOPHEM.

6. RAMAH OF THE SOUTH. See RAMATHEIM-NEGER.

7. A place mentioned in the catalogue of towns re-inhabited by the Benjamites after their return from the captivity (Neh. xi, 33). It may be the Ramah of Benjamin (above, No. 1), or the Ramah of Samuel, but its position in the list (remote from Gela, Michmash, Bethel, ver. 31; comp. Ezra ii, 29, 28) seems to remove it farther west, to the neighborhood of Lod, Hadid, and Ozo. There is no further notice in the Bible of a Ramah in this direction; but Eusebius and Jerome allude to one, though they may be at fault in identifying it with Ramathaim and Arimathaim (Bibl. Res. i, 279; comp. the remarks of Robinson, Bibl. Res. ii, 239). The situation of the modern Ramleh agrees very well with this, a town too important and too well placed not to have existed in the ancient times. The consideration that the Ramah of Samuel was "a city," and Ramah, "a height," is not a valid argument against the site being the legitimate successor of the other, if, so far, the identifications of modern travellers must be reversed. Beit-ar can no longer be the representative of Beth-horon, because ar means "year," while horon means "caves"; nor Beit-lahm, of Bethlehem, because lahm is "flesh," and lamed "bread;" nor el-Aal, of Eleashe, because el is in Arabic the article, and in Hebrew the name of God. In these cases the tendency of language is to retain the sound at the expense of the meaning.

8. RAEMEH in Hammon, called Er-Rameh, or Ramet el-Khalil—Ramah of Hebron, or Ramah of the Friend, i.e. Ramah of Abraham, or the High-place of Abraham the Friend of God. It lies about two miles north of Hebron, a little to the right or east of the road from Hebron to Jerusalem, on an eminence, the top and southern slope of which are covered with ancient foundations, the principal of which are those of a large building, apparently a Christian church. The ruins are described by Wollcot (Bibl. Soc. i, 45), and by Dr. Wilson (Lambs of the Bible, i, 582). The top command the view of the Meonothas through a gap in the mountains towards the north-west. Ramah the Jews call the "House of Abraham," where, they say, Abraham lived when he dwelt at Mamre. But the "plain of Mamre," with the great Simon, or everlasting oak in the middle of it (if not the same, the offspring, most probably, of the tree), under which Abraham entertained the angels, would seem to have anciently lain to the west of Hebron, as Machpelah, which is at Hebron, is said to be before, i.e. to the east of Mamre.

It is very possible, however, that Abraham may have had his habitations or tenant farms at this point in the time he was at Mamre or near Hebron, or which is still more probable, the altar which he erected (Gen. xiii, 18), his high-place, or place of worship, may have been at er-Rameh, or Ramet el-Khalil—"the high-place of the Friend," i.e. of Abraham the friend of God, while he dwelt or had his tent in the plain of Mamre.

Some suppose that this Ramah may be the Ramah of Samuel and the place where Saul was anointed. Wollcot and Van de Velde contend for this. But this place is far too distant from Rachel's tomb (1 Sam. xi, 11-14) to support the notion, not to speak of other insuperable difficulties. The place where Samuel was when he anointed Saul was evidently near or not far from Rachel's tomb (1 Sam. x, 1-11). It is much more probable that Bethlehem, or the high-place of, or near Bethlehem,
RAMANANDIS was the place where Samuel anointed Saul. The name of Ramet el-Khalil implies that that place had to do with Abraham the friend of God, and not with Samuel.

Ramanandis, a Hindustan sect which addressed its devotions particularly to Ramachandra, and the divine manifestations connected with Vishnu in that incarnation. The originator of this sect was Ramdass, who is calculated by Prof. H. H. Wilson to have flourished in the end of the 14th or beginning of the 15th century. He resided at Benares, where a math or monastery, of his followers is said to have formerly existed, but to have been destroyed by some of the Mughal princes in the 17th century. The Ramanandis were a sort of heretics, the whole of the incarnations of Vishnu, but they maintain the superiority of Rama in the present age or Kali-Yug, though they vary considerably as to the exclusive or collective worship of the male and female members of this incarnation. The ascetic and mendicant followers of Ramanand are by far the most numerous sectaries in Gangetic India. In Bengal they are comparatively few; beyond this province, as far as to Allahabad, they are probably the most numerous, though they yield in influence and wealth to the Saiva branches. From this province they have no abundant assemblage to encroach the whole of the country along the Ganges and Jumna, in the district of Agra they constitute seven tenths of the ascetic population. The numerous vortaries of the Ramanandis belong chiefly to the poorer classes, with the exception of the Rajputs and a few princely Brahmins.

Gardner, Faiths of the World, n. v.

Ramathaim-zophim (Heb. with the art. ha-Ramathaim Zophim, the two heights, watchers; Sept. Αρμοθιασα τοφημι, Vulg. Ἰερουσαλημ Σωποθι), the birthplace of the prophet Samuel (1 Sam. i. 19), his own permanent and official residence (vii, 17; viii, 4), and the place of his sepulture (xxvii, 1). It was in Mount Ephraim (i, 1). It had apparently attached to it a place called Naioth, at which the "company" (or "school", as it is called in modern times) of the sons of the prophets was maintained (xix, 18, etc.; xx, 1); and it had also in its neighborhood (probably between it and Gibeah of Saul) a great well, known as the well of Has-Sechua (xix, 22). See Sechu. This is all we know of it with any degree of certainty.

Ramathaim, if interpreted as a Hebrew word, is dual -- the double eminence. This may point to a peculiar character in the name or place, or may be an instance of the tendency, familiar to all students, which exists in language to force an archaic or foreign name into an intelligible form. It is given in its complete shape in the Hebrew text and A. V. but once (1 Sam. i. 19). Elsewhere (i, 19; ii, 11; vii, 17; viii, 4; xvi, 54; xvi, 13; xix, 18, 19, 22, 23; xx, 1; xxii, 12; xxvii, 3) it occurs in the shorter form of Ramathaim (q. v.). The Sept., however (in both MSS.), gives it throughout as Ramathaim, and inserts it in i, 9 after the words "his city," where it is wanting in the Hebrew and A. V. In the Ommatsektion of Josephus it is recorded as Ramathaim (Theosaurus, p. 1275); but a comparison of 1 Sam. i. 1 with ver. 19 shows without doubt that the same place is referred to. It is implied by Josephus, and affirmed by Eusebius and Jerome in the Ommatsektion ("Armatheam Seipha"); nor would it ever have been questioned had there not been other Ramaths mentioned in the sacred history. Of the force of "Zophim" no feasible explanation has been given. It was an ancient word on the east of Jordan (Num., xxi, 14), and there, as here, was attached to an eminence. In the Targum of Jonathan it is rendered "Ramath of the scholars of the prophets:" but this is evidently a late interpretation, arrived at by regarding the prophets as watchmen (the root of zophim, also that of mizpeh, having the force of looking out afar), coupled with the fact that at Naioth in Ramathaim Zophim was a school of prophets. The most natural explanation appears to be that Zophim, one of Samuel's ancestors, had migrated from his home in Ephraim (1 Sam. i. 1; 1 Chron. vi, 30), and settled in a district to which he gave his own name, and which was afterwards called the land of Zophim (1 Sam. i. 5). Ramathaim, or Ramathaim-zophim, was the chief town of this district, and was hence called Ramathaim-Zophim, that is, "Ramath of the Zophites" (see Robinson, Bib. Res., ii, 7). See Zophim.

The position of Ramathaim-zophim is regarded by many scholars as one of the puzzles of Biblical geography. As the city is one of great interest, it may be well to give the principal theories as to its site, and then to state the data on which alone the site can be determined.

(1) Eusebius and Jerome locate it near Diospolis or Lydda (Damasus, n. v. "Armatheam Seipha"), and identify it with the Arimathea of the N. T. (Matt. xxvi, 57). Jerome's words are: "Armatheam Seipha: the city of Heliana and Samuel. It lies near (παράστασις) Diospolis: thence came Joseph, in the Gospel said to be from Arimathea." So also is Lydda, a modern Lulid, and the reference is, no doubt, to Ramathaim, the well-known modern town, two miles from Lulid. Jerome agrees with Eusebius in his translation of this passage; but in the Epist. Pauli. (vii, 28) he connects Ramathaim with Arimathea only, and places it "about three miles from Lulid." The site may be correct; for the Sept. "Arsamāthia" seems to be the same as the "Armatheam Seipha" of the New-Test. " Arsamathia," and represents the Hebrew אַרְמַתָּה, with the article. There is no doubt there was a city called Armatheam or Ramathaim on the plain near Lydda at an early period; and its modern representative may be Ramle, as suggested by Reland and others (Reland, Palast. p. 598, 599; see, however, Robinson, Bib. Res., ii, 238). But Ramathaim of Samuel could not have been so far distant from Gibeah of Saul; and there is a fatal obstacle to this identification in the fact that Ramlele ("the sandy") lies on the open face of the maritime plain, and cannot in any sense be said to be in Mount Ephraim or any other mountain district. Eusebius possibly refers to another Ramathaim named in Neh. xi, 33.

(2) Some would identify this city with Ramathaim of Benjamin (Genesis, Theaur., p. 1275; Winer, Red-Worterb. n. v. "Rama"); but this Ramathaim seems too close to Saul's residence at Gibeah to suit the requirements of the sacred narrative in 1 Sam. xix, 18. (Yet see below.)

(3) Robinson strongly suggests that Ramathaim may be the city now occupied by the village of Sibba, which stands on a lofty and conspicuous hill-top, about six miles west of Jerusalem. Sibba, he thinks, may be a corruption of the old name Zophim. Its elevation would answer well to the designation Ramathaim. It might be regarded as included in the mountains of Ephraim, or, at least, as a natural extension of them; and a not very wide detour would take the traveller from Sibba to Gibeah by the tomb of Rachel (Bib. Res., ii, 7-9). The arguments are plausible, but not convincing; and it must be admitted that the Robinsons' remarkable geographical knowledge has failed to throw light on the site of Ramathaim-zophim.

(4) Woolcott, seeing on the spot the difficulties attending Robinson's theory, and finding a remarkable ruin, called Ramet el-Khalil, near Sibba, pronounced that this was the site of Samuel's city. A summary of his reasons is given by Robinson in the Biblical Cyclopedia (xiii, 51; see also Bib. Res., ii, 279). They are not more convincing than those advanced in favor of Sibba, yet they have been adopted and expanded by V. van de Velde (Journet, 48-54; Memoirs, p. 341). This is also supported by Stewart (Test and Khan, p. 247).

(5) Gesenius thinks that Jebel Faradul, or, as it is usually called, Frank Mountain, the conspicuous conical hill three miles south-east of Bethlehem, is the true
site of Ramah (Thesaurus, p. 1576). This, however, is pure conjecture, without any evidence to support it.

(6.) Ewald is in favor of the little village of Ramah, a mile west of Beeoth (Geschichte, i, 550, note). It is doubtless situated in Mount Ephraim, retains the old name of Ramah, or Ram, "the rood," but it might be an indication of some old, peculiar sanctity; but it is open to the same objections as all others north of Rachel's tomb. Lieut. Conder inclines to this position (Tant Work in Palestine, ii, 116), remarking that near it is a ruined village called Surikeh, perhaps the Scopus of 1 Sam. xix, 22.

(7.) One of the most ancient, and certainly one of the most plausible, theories is that which locates Ramatham-zophim at Neby Samwil. It is most probably to this place Pecopalis alludes in the statement that Josiah caused a wall and a wall to be erected for the court of St. Samuel (2 Esd. 4, 20; 9, 3; comp. Robinson, Bib. Res. ii, 459). From the 7th century, when Adamanaus described Pecopalis, and spoke of "the city of Samuel, which is called Ramatha" (Early Travels [Bohn], 195, down through the Middle Ages to the present day, the name of the prophet has been connected with this spot; and the uniform tradition of Jews, Christians, and Mohammedans has made it the place of his birth and burial (see authorities cited in Robinson). The Crusaders built a church over the alleged tomb, which, after the fall of Islam, was converted into a mosque; and its walls and tall minaret are still visible from afar (Quaresmius, ii, 727; Puseoke, ii, 49). Neby Samwil is unquestionably the site of a very ancient city; its position on the summit of a high conical hill would give it a just title to the name Ramah; it probably lay within the region termed the "Mountains of Ephraim"; and it would form an appropriate residence for the great judge of Israel. It is near this place that the great well of Neby Samwil, or New waters, of which the word Samwil is supposed to be a misrepresentation, stands. It has been shown, besides, that Neby Samwil is most probably the site of Mizpah (q. v.).

(8.) Bonar (Land of Promise, p. 178, 594) adopts Jericho, which he places a short distance north of Bethelhem, east of Rachel's sepulchre. Eusebius (Onomast. s. v. Pthor) says that "Rama of Benjamin" is near "Pthor" Bethlehem, where "the voice in Rama was heard," and in our times the name is mentioned, besides Bonar, by Prokesch and Salzburger (cited in Robinson, Bib. Res. ii, 8, note); but this cannot be regarded as certain, and we are not told that it is too close to Rachel's monument to suit the case.

(9.) Schwartz (Palest. p. 152-158), starting from Gibeah of Saul as the home of Kish, fixes upon Ramath, north of Samaria and west of Samur, which he supposed also to be Ramoth, or Jarumoth, the Levitical city of Isachar. All that is directly said as to its situation is that it was in Mount Ephraim (1 Sam. i, 1); and this would naturally lead us to seek it in the neighborhood of Shechem. But the whole tenor of the narrative of the public life of Samuel (in connection with which alone, I suppose, the city is restricted to this region of the tribe of Benjamin), and to the neighborhood of Gibeah, the residence of Saul, that it seems impossible not to look for Samuel's city in the same locality. It appears, from 1 Sam. vii, 17, that its annual functions as prophet and judge were confined to the narrow round of Bethel, Gilgal, and Mizpah—the first on the north boundary of Benjamin; the second near Jericho at its eastern end; and the third on the ridge in modern times known as Scopus, overlooking Jerusalem, and therefore near the southern confines of Benjamin. In the centre of these was Gibeah of Saul, the royal city and the religious and ecclesiastical centre of his kingdom, and the centre of his operations. It would be doing a violence to the whole of this part of the history to look for Samuel's residence outside these narrow limits.

Those Scriptural allusions which tend to indicate the position of Ramath-zophim are the following, and they are our only trustworthy guides. The statements of Eusebius and later writers can have little weight; and, indeed, it appears that all knowledge of the city was lost before their time.

(a.) In 1 Sam. i, 1 we read, "There was a certain man of Ramath-zophim, of Mount Ephraim." From this it would appear, at first sight, that Ramathaim was situated in the district called Mount Ephraim. The construction of the Hebrew, however, does not make this quite certain. The phrase רמא תטרפ ולש לארשי might possibly mean, not that Ramathaim was in Mount Ephraim (which would be expressed rather by נבמל), but that Ekanah was in some way of Mount Ephraim (the Hebrew is נבמל); though residing in Ramathaim. The statement of the text, therefore, does not form a suitable objection to a theory that would locate Ramathaim beyond the bounds of Mount Ephraim.

(b.) In the mouth of an ancient Hebrew, the expression would mean that portion of the mountain allotted to the tribe of Ephraim, or it may have extended so as to include part, or even the whole, of Benjamin. In the catalogue of the cities of Benjamin (Josh. xix, 22), it is placed between Bethel and Ramoth. The palm-tree of Deborah was in "Mount Ephraim," between Bethel and Ramathaim, and is identified with great plausibility by the author of the Targum on Judg. iv, 5, with Araoth, one of the landmarks on the south boundary of Ephraim, which still survives. The name Ramathaim, or Ramath, or Ramathaim-zophim (er-Ram), Bethel itself, though in the catalogue of the cities of Benjamin (Josh. xii, 22), was appropriated by Jeroboam as one of his idol sanctuaries, and is one of the "cities of Mount Ephraim" which were taken from him by Baasha and restored by Aza (2 Chron. xiii, 12; xv, 8). Jeremiah (c. xxiii) connects Ramathaim of Benjamin with Mount Ephraim (ver. 6, 9, 15, 18). It could scarcely have embraced any portion of Judah, since the two tribes were rivals for sovereignty. The allusions to Mount Ephraim in 1 Sam. ix. 4; Josh. xvii. 15, Judges xvii. 1, appear to confine the name to the territory of the tribe.
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... in Rama." Eusebius, in his Onomasticon (s. v. 'Papad'), characterizes Ramah as the "city of Saul." In any case, there seems to be no insuperable objection against the identity of Ramah of Saul with Ramah of

(c) It is usually assumed that the city in which Saul was anointed (1 Sam. ix, x) was Samuel's own city, Ramah. Josephus certainly (Ant. vi, 4, 1) gives the name of the city as Armatham, and, in his version of the occurrence, implies that the prophet was at the time in his own house; but neither the Heb. nor the Sept. contains any statement which confirms this, if we except the slender fact that the "land of Zuph" (1 Sam. ix, 5) may be connected with the Zophim of Ramathaim-zophim. Robinson admits that "the answer of the maidens (ix, 11, 12) would, perhaps, rather imply that Samuel had just arrived, possibly on one of his yearly circuits in which he judged Israel in various cities" (Bib. Res. ii, 10). It cannot be questioned, indeed, that, apart from all theories, the whole course of the narrative leaves the impression that Samuel was in his own house in Ramah when Saul visited him. He was there when the Lord informed him, apparently on the preceding day (comp. 1 Sam. viii, 4, 22; ix, 15, 16), of his intention to appoint a king. The words of Saul's servant, too, convey the same impression: "When they went out of Ramah, the land of Zuph, let us go back!" but the servant said, "Behold now, there is in this city a man of God ... let us go thither" (ib., 5, 6, 6). This would scarcely apply to a place in which Samuel was but a casual visitor. But, on the other hand, the place of the interview could not have been within the tribe of Benjamin, because [1] the Lord, in foretelling to Samuel the coming of Saul, said, "To-morrow, about this time, I will send thee a man out of the land of Benjamin" (1 Sam. ix, 16); and [2] Saul, when in search of the asses, "passed through Mount Ephraim, and passed through the middle of the land of Shalim; and he passed through the land of the Benjaminites" (ver. 6). Then they came "to the land of Zuph." The land of Zuph was consequently south of Benjamin. So, in returning home (apparently to Gibeah), the city of the interview, Saul's way led past Rachel's tomb, the site of which is well known, near Bethlehem. It follows, from the minute specification of Saul's route in 1 Sam. x, 2, that the city in which the interview took place was near the sepulchre of Rachel, which, by Gen. xxxv, 15, 12, and other reasons, appears to be with certainty at or near Bethlehem. This supplies a strong argument against its being Ramathaim-zophim, since, while Mount Ephraim, as we have endeavored already to show, extended to within a few miles north of Jerusalem, there is nothing to war-rant the supposition that it ever reached so far south as the neighborhood of Bethlehem. Saul's route will be most conveniently discussed under the head of Saul; but the question of both his outward and his homeward journey, minutely as they are detailed, is beset with difficulties, which have been increased by the assumptions of the commentators. For instance, it is usually taken for granted that his father's house—and therefore the starting-point of his wanderings—was Gibeah. True, Saul himself, after he was king, lived at Gibeah; but the residence of Kish would appear to have been at Zela, where his family sepulchre was (2 Sam. xxi, 14); and of Zela no trace has yet been found. The A. V. has added to the difficulty by introducing the word "meet" in x, 3 as the translation of the term which is more accurately rendered "find" in the preceding verse. A. J. Dillmann accepts the "hill of God" at El-Ela; but with the notion of the Philistines? A notion of the Philistines is mentioned later in Saul's history (1 Sam. xiii, 3) as Geba, opposite Michmash; but this is three miles north of Gibeah of Saul, and does not at all agree with a situation near Bethlehem. The modern rendering of Saul's statement interprets the "hill of God" as "the place where the ark of God was," meaning Kirjath-jearim. There is no necessity whatever for supposing that Samuel was at Ramah when he anointed Saul. The name of the place where Samuel was at the time is not given in the sacred narrative, the language of which rather implies that it was not his regular abode. Cloudy says that he had gone out that day into the city to attend a sacrifice or a feast of the people (1 Sam. ix, 11, 12). The city was most probably Bethlehem, with the inhabitants of which Samuel was connected, being a descendant of Zuph, an Ephrathite, and was likely to have been invited to their feast; and the land of Zuph, into which Saul had come, must have been the region of Bethlehem. That Samuel was in the habit of visiting Bethlehem for the purpose of sacrificing is certain from 1 Sam. xvi, 1-5 (comp. xx, 29). We may therefore conclude that he had come at this time thither from Ramah of Benjamin.

On the whole, Ramathaim-zophim is as likely to have been the Ramah of Benjamin as any other.

Ramathem (Ραμαθέμ) v. r. Ραμαθεία; Josephus, 'Papadai [Ant. xiii, 4, 9]; Vulg. Ramatham), one of the three "governments" (vōnoi và τοποπλανί, which were added to Jubea by king Demetrius Nikator of the Kingdom of Samaria (1 Mace. iii, 84), the others were Aphierea and Lydda. It no doubt derived its name from a town of the name of Ramathaim, probably that renowned as the birthplace of Samuel the prophet. —Smith.

Ramathite (Heb. Ramathiti, רמאתית, an inhabitant of Ramath; Sept. Ραμαθητος, an epithet of the region of Shimei (q. v.) who was over the vineyards of king David (1 Chron. xxvii, 27). The name implies that he was native of a place called Ramath, but of the various Ramaths mentioned none is said to have been remarkable for vines; nor is there any tradition or other clue by which the particular Ramath to which this worthy belonged can be identified. See RAMATH.

Ramath-lehi (Heb. Ramath LEHI (Lehi, רמאתי, "hill of height" [see below]; Sept. Ραιμαθαλει, handheld instrument of mason). The origin of this name, which occurs only in Judg. xvi, 17, forms one of the most romantic episodes in Scripture history. Samson, having been bound with two new cords, was given up to the Philistines at a place called Lehi, a name which signifies "jawbone." When the enemy attacked him, he burst his bonds, seized the jawbone (lehi) of an ass that lay upon the ground, and with this old weapon slew a thousand of them. Then he threw away the jawbone, and, as a memorial of the event, and by a characteristic play upon the name, he called the place Ramath-lehi—that is, the lifting (or wounding?) of the jawbone; and so it is interpreted in the Vulgate and in the Sept. See SAMSON. But Geuenius has pointed out (Theseaur. p. 752 ὡτι to be consistent with this the vocal points should be altered, and the words become רמאתי, and that as they at present stand they are exactly parallel to Ramath-mispeh and Ramath-negev, and mean the "height of Lechi." If we met with a similar account in ordinary history, we should say that the name had already been Ramath-lehi, and that the writer of the narrative, with that fondness for parrhesia which distinguishes these ancient records, had indulged himself in connecting the name with a possible exclamation of his hero. But the fact of the positive statement in this case may make us hesitate in coming to such a conclusion in less authoritative records. For the topography of the place, see RAMATH.

Ramath-mispeh (Heb. Ramath ha-Mispeh, רמאתי מַסֶּפֶּה, high-place of the watch-tower; Sept. Σταυρος τουρανους, v. r. Παπαδιου τουρανους; Vulg. Ramath Mispheh). In defining the boundaries of the tribe of Gad, Joshua states that Moses gave them inheritance ...: "from Heshbon}
RAMATH-NEGEB, or RAMATH OF THE SOUTH

Rambach, Johann Jakob, was born at Halde Feb. 24, 1603, and died April 19, 1675, at Giessen, where he was professor of theology and first superintendent. During his comparatively short life he devoted himself to sacred studies, and produced some valuable works. Besides assisting Michaelis in the preparation of his Hebrew Bible, and of his Adnotationes in Hab. in Historiographia, he was the author of Institutiones Hermeneutica Suecorum, of which the eighth edition appeared in 1764: Esercitationes Herenianae, nec p. ii Institut. Herm. (Jena, 1728; 2d ed. 1741).—Comment. Herm. de Semus Mystici Critere (ibid. 1728, 1731). His other works are dogmatical and polemical.

Ramban. See MAIMONIDES.

Rambam. See Nachmanides.

Rambour, Abraham, a French Protestant theologian, was born at Sedan, the seat of a large French evangelical Christianity, about 1500, studied at the academy in that place, and closed his career there by his thesis De Potestate Ecclesia (1608, 8vo). After ordination, he became pastor of the parish of Francheval. In 1561 he was summoned to Paris, and preached there until 1629, when he made a professor in his alma mater. He held the chair of theology and Hebrew, and so greatly distinguished himself that he was four times honored with the rectorate of that excellent Protestant seminary of divinity. He died in 1631, and left his colleagues to mourn the loss of a great and good man. All his writings give proof of profound scholarship, and a more than usual mastery of ancient Bible lore. He was an excellent polemic, and what he wrote as such the Romanists always found unanswerable. We note here, of his writings of this character, De Christo Redemptore (Sedan, 1620, 4to), and Traite de l'Adoration des Images (ibid. 1633, 8vo). His sixty-one theses on different Biblical subjects have been inserted in the Thesaurus Theologic Sedanensis, vol. ii. See Haag, La France Protestant, s. v.—Hoef, Nost. Hist. Generale, s. v.

Rameau, Jean-Philippe, a very celebrated French musician who afterwards became a noted organist, was a native of Dijon. He was born in 1683. His father was also a musician, and was, at the time of Jean-Philippe's birth, organist in the Sainte-Chapelle of Dijon. He was an enthusiast in his love for music and taught his children the classical works long before they knew their letters. After travelling for some time creating everywhere great sensation by his wonderful musical genius, Jean-Philippe settled as organist of the cathedral at Clermont, in Auvergne. In middle life he removed to Paris, and became organist of Sainte-Croix de la Bretone. In 1722 he published his Traite de l'Harmone, which laid the basis of his future renown. He died in 1764. His compositions were mostly of a secular character. One of his operas, Samson, was never permitted to be put on the stage, because, as it was an action of the sacred musical drama, the German D'Alember were personal friends and warm admirers of Rameau. See Hoef, Nom. Hist. Generale, s. v.

Rammelgh, Bartolomeo, an Italian artist of note, usually called II Bagnacavallo, from the place of his birth (Bagnacavallo, on the road from Ravenna to Lugo), which took place in 1484, was a pupil of Raphael, and one of his principal assistants in the Vatican, and, after the death of his great master, carried the principles of his style to Bologna, and assisted to enlarge the character of that school. Raphael was his model and test of excellence, and he did not attempt to look beyond him. Though possessing less vigor than Giulio Romano or Perino del Vaga, Bagnacavallo acquired more of the peculiar grace of Raphael's style, especially in his infants, in which he was much admired by the great scholars of the Caracc. There are, or rather were, works by Bagnacavallo in the churches of San Michele in Bosco, San Martino, Santa Maria Maggiore, and Sant' Agostino agli Scapellatoi in Bologna. He died at Bologna in 1542. See Landi, Lire di Pittori; English Cyclop. s. v.; Spooner, Bong. Dict. of the Fine Arts, s. v.

Rameses (Heb. Ramesses, רמאַסֶע, Sept. Ραμανιατος, or Ραμανος, v. r. Ραμασσων), or Rashaem (Heb. Raamases, רמאַסֶע, only in Exod. i. 11; Sept. Ραμασσων), the name of a city (Exod. i. 11; xii. 37; Numb. xxxiii. 3, 5) and district (Gen. xlvii. 11) in Lower Egypt. There can be no reasonable doubt that the same city is designated by the Rameses and Ramasses of the Hebrew text, and that this was the chief place of the land of Rameses, all the passages referring to the same region. The name is Egyptian, the same as that of several kings of the empire, of the eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth dynasties. In Egyptian it was written Ra-aweses or Ramaeses, it being doubtful whether the short vowel understood occurs twice or once. The first vowel is represented by a sign which usually corresponds to the Hebrew letter Nun in Egyptian transcriptions of Hebrew names, and Hebrew transcriptions of Egyptian names. The name means Son of the Sun, such titles being common with the ancient kings of Egypt, one of whom was probably the founder of the city. See EGYPT.

The first mention of Rameses is in the narrative of the settling by Joseph of his father and brothers in Egypt, where it is related that a possession was given them in the land of Ramasses (Gen. xlvii. 11). This land of Rameses (רמאַסֶע, רמאַסֶע) either corresponds to the land of Gozen, or was a district of it, more probably the former, as appears from a comparison of a parallel passage (ver. 6). The name next occurs as that of one of the two cities built for the Pharaoh who first oppressed the children of Israel. "And they built for Pharaoh treasure cities (רמאַסֶע, רמאַסֶע), Pithom and Ramesses" (Exod. i. 11). So in the A. V. The Sept., however, reads πως φηγαν, and the Vulg. urbes terrae Rameses, as if the root had been רמאַסֶע. The signification of the word רמאַסֶע is decided by its use for storehouses of corn, wine, and oil, which. Hezekiah had (2 Chron. xxxii. 28). We should therefore here read store-cities, which may have been the meaning of our translators. The name of Pithom indicates the region near Heliopolis, and therefore the neighborhood of Gozen, or that tract itself; and there can therefore be no doubt that Ra-aweses is "Rameses in the land of Gozen." In the narrative of the Exode we read of Rameses as the starting-point of the journey (Exod. xii. 37; see Numb. xxxiii. 3, 26). See GOSIANNES.

If, then, we suppose Rameses or Ramasses to have been the chief town of the land of Rameses, either Gozen itself or a district of it, we have to endeavor to determine its situation. Lepsius supposes that Abi-Khenen (See RAMSES) is on the west side of Rameses. He places the capital of the Pharaoh in the Sept. Hieropolis is placed in the land of Ramasses (אֲבִי׳ Πυρίνων πόλιν, ἐν γῆς Ῥαμασσῶν, οτί τῆς γῆς Ραμασσῶν), in a passage where the Hebrew only mentions "the land of Gozen" (Gen. xlvii. 28), and that there is a monolithic group at Abi-Khenen representing Tum and Ra, and between them Ramses II, who was probably there worshipped. There would seem, therefore, to be an indication of the situation of the district and city from this mention of Hieropolis, and the statue of Rameses might mark a place named after that king. It must, however, be observed (a) that the region of Hieropolis is a matter of great doubt, and that there-
fore we can scarcely take any proposed situation as an indication of that of Rameses; (8) that the land of Rameses may be that of Gothen, as already remarked, in which case the passage would not afford any more pre- cise indication of the position of the City Rameses than that it was in Gothen, as is evident from the account of the Exodus; and (c) that the mention of Heliopolis in the Sept. would seem to be a gloss. It is also neces- sary to consider the evidence in the Biblical narrative of the position of Rameses, which seems to point to the western part of the land of Gothen, since two full marches, and part at least of a third, brought the Isra- elites from this town to the Red Sea; and the narra- tive appears to indicate a route for the chief part of directly towards the sea. After the second day's journey they "encamped in Etham, in the edge of the wil- derness" (Exod. xiii. 29), and on the third day they appear to have turned back. If, however, Rameses was where Lep- sius places it, the route would have been almost wholly through the wilderness, and mainly along the tract bor- dering the Red Sea in a southerly direction, so that they would have turned almost at once. Even could it be proved that it was anciently called Rameses, the case would not be made out, for there is good reason to suppose that many cities in Egypt bore this name. Apart from the ancient evidence, we may mention that the Hebrew word ?Bnem?o or "Bnem" in the Hophi (the great province on the west of the Rosetta branch of the Nile), mentioned in the list of towns and villages of Egypt in De Sax's Abd-alatif, p. 604. It gave to its district the name of "Hof-Ren- mes", or Rameses. This "Hof" must not be con- founded with the "Hof" commonly known, which was in the district of Belbelie.-Smith. Of the old transla- tors, only Saadia and Pseudo-Jonathan point out a place for Rameses: the rest all preserve the name from the Hebrew (comp. Arab. of Erpes, On Exod. i, 11). Sadiad (Paschippus) and Tischendorf also (It. i, 176, and Dissert, de Isr. per Murei. Tob. Trans. p. 13 sq) makes to be Rameses, is elsewhere always elided (q. v.), and is expressly distinguished from Rameses by the Sept. (Exod. i, 11; here the Cod. Medi- olan, reads instead ?r zlt ?r, but this amounts to nothing against the Hebrew text). Others (as Hengstenberg, Bible, i, p. 1 sq; Ewald, 1st Greek, ii, 52 sq; Forbiger, Hortafa, 178) understand it as at a city on the Nile (comp. Sept. in Gen. xlviii. 28; where, however, the region of Rameses is spoken of, as above, and it is only asserted that He- liopolis lay in this district). To the same purpose is the view of Clericus, Lamarche (Osserv, Phil., ci, S. 411), who understands it as a city of the district of Rameses is Areop (Gr. Apo, ?Apo), in the Saitic, or, according to Bernard's plausible emendation, the Sethotic district (Ptolomey, iv, 5, 58), a place fortified by the king of the Kyklos (Josephus, Apion, i, 14, 26; comp. Michaelis, Sept. p. 2261). For Aratus (according to Manetho, in Josephus, Apion, i, 26) is the city of Typhon, and this is probably Heliopolis itself (comp. Rosenmuller, Alterth., iii, 261; Ewald, ii, 58) - Winer. The location of Rameses is doubtless indicated by the present Tell Rames, a quadrangular mound near Belbelie. See Red Sea, TAMMUGE OF.

An argument for determining under what dynasty the Exode happened has been founded on the name Rameses, which has been supposed to indicate a royal builder. See PHARAOH. We need only say that the last supposed to whose Rameses was reasonably as- signed (B.C. 1302) is inconsistent with the true date of the Exode (B.C. 1658), although we find a prince of the same name two centuries earlier, so that the place might have taken its name either from this prince, or a yet earlier king or prince Rameses. That the last supposed to whose Rameses was reasonably as- signed is in and identifiable by the occurrence of the name in Gen. xlviii. 11, as early as the time of Joseph (B.C. 1874). See CHRONO- LOGY.

Rames'seb (Pames'seb, the Greek form (Judith i, 9) of the name of the land of Rameses (q. v.).

Rami ah (Heb. Ramah), ??, fixed of Jedoroth; Sept. "Pamys", an Israelite of the sons of Parosh, who divorced his wife under the influence of Ezra (Ezra 2:54). B.C. 468.

Ramos, Francisco, a Roman Catholic prelate of Mexico, was born in the city of Mexico in 1825. He early decided upon the priesthood, and was educated at home and in Europe, where he became a great favorite with many distinguished ecclesiastics, and therefore en- joyed an honored position in the Curia. After holding several positions of responsibility, he became identified with the opposition against Suarez in politics, and prepared the way for the imperial rule under Maximilian. He was then bishop of Carasis. When the empire had been established, Rames became the emperor's almoner, and subsequently cabinet minister. He made himself an apostolic of Tamaulipas, Mexico. With the downfall of Maximilian, Rames's stay in Mexico became an im- possibility. He escaped to Texas, and lived in obscurity and sat at the San Juan until July 18, 1869.

Ramiides, the followers of Peter Ramus, a French logician known also as the "(successor) of the head of himself by his opposition to the philosophy of Aristotle. From the high estimation in which the Stoic was at that time held, it was accounted a heinous crime to con- vert his opinions; and Ramus, accordingly, was tried and con- demned as being guilty of subverting sound mora- lity and religion. The sole ground of his offence was that he had framed a system of logic at variance with that of Aristotle. "The attack which Ramus made," says the elder M'Crie, in his Life of Morello, "on the Peripatetic philosophy was direct, avowed, powerful, and persevering, and its effect was to possess an age of mind, acquaintance with ancient learning, an ardent love of truth, and invincible courage in maintaining it. He had applied himself with avidity to the study of the logic of Aristotle; and the result was a conviction that it was an instrument utterly unfit for discovering truth in any of the sciences, and answering no other purpose than that of scholastic wrangling and dilapidation. His conviction he communicated to the public; and, in spite of all the resistance made by ignorance and prejudice, he succeeded in bringing over a great part of the learn- ing of Europe to his views. What Luther was in the Church, Ramus was in the schools. He overthrew the infallibility of the Scholastic, and proclaimed the right of mankind to think for themselves in matters of phi- losophy — a right which he maintained with the most unalloyed success. He was regarded as a traitor to the blood. If Ramus had not shaken the authority of the long-venerated Organon of Aristotle, the world might not have seen the Novum Organum of Bacon. The faults of the Ramean system of dialectics have long been acknowledged; but it was an acknowledged master princi- ples of the logic of Aristotle; its distinctions often turn- ed more upon words than things; and the artificial method and uniform partitions which it prescribed in treating every subject were unnatural, and calculated to fetter, instead of forwarding, the mind in the discovery of truth. But it discarded many of the useless specula- tions and much of the unmeaning jargon respecting problematics, predicates, and topics which made so great a figure in the ancient logic. It incited upon its disciples the necessity of accuracy and order in ar- rangements and made them more exact in the science of logic. And as it advanced no claim to infallibility, submitted all its rules to the test of practical usefulness, and set the only legitimate end of the whole logical apparatus constantly before the eye of the student, its faults were soon discovered, and yielded readily to a more improved method, the foundations of which were established by the occurrence of the name in Gen. xlviii. 11, as early as the time of Joseph (B.C. 1874). See CHRONO-LOGY.
tensive favor and acceptance in various countries of Europe. He defined logic to be "are bene disserendi," and like Ciceron considered rhetoric an essential branch of it. It was introduced by Melancthon into Germany; it had supporters also in Italy; and even in France itself, where the logic of the Scaggyrie was held in veneration, the Royal Society, when Mathers was made a freeman, taught the doctrines of Ramus at Glasgow, and his work on logic passed through various editions in England before 1600. The same system was also known at this time in Switzerland, Holland, and Denmark. The most noteworthy of his later works are: Amant Talmes (Talon) and his two disciples, Thomasius Frigius, of Friebourg, and Franciscus Fabricius; Fr. Benchus, Wilh. Ad. Scribonius, and Gaspar Paffrad. There was also a class of ecclesiasts who tried to unite the method of Ramus with the Aristotelian logic of Melancthon. Among these, most noteworthy is Rudolph Goeclesius, who was of service to psychology, and whose pupil, Otto Casman, prosecuted his researches into psychological anthropology. To these may be added the poet John Milton. See Waddington, *Ramus* (Paris, 1835, 8vo), where a catalogue of Ramus's work is given; *J. G. Aretin's* *Cantor,* in *Gelerz's Protest*, *Monatsblätter,* Aug. 2, 1867.

**Rammohun Roy** (also known as Rammohan Roy), a celebrated Hindu convert to Western civilization and a liberal Christianity, was noted especially as the founder of a theistic school of thought among the Hindus, and in a certain sense may be pronounced the father of the modern Hindu Renaissance. He was born about 1774 at Bordman, in the province of Bengal, of Brahmin parentage of high caste. Reared like other youths of India, he enjoyed his elementary training at home, and was then placed under the care of the great masters of the Vedas and the Shastras, and, both at Patna and afterwards at Benares, acquired great proficiency in the sacred writings of Hindustan. His familiarity with the Arabic, Persian, and Sanscrit languages led him to an examination of the religious doctrines of the various sects of India, and finally to those of the West. He had evinced a sceptical turn of mind while yet a youth; and, once led away into these inquiries, he was soon forced to abandon the ground of his ancestry. But instead of accepting the inspired religion of the Christians, he sought the engraving of its ethics upon the old faith of India, and the restoration of Hindustan in its ancient purity, as the first step to this accomplishment. His parents unyieldingly opposed his purpose. His father sent him away and disinherit him. His mother concealed the superstitious basis of her faith from her son, and, at the same time, urged disciples of the Brahmins and superstition, and my interference with their custom of burning widows, and other pernicious practices, revived and increased their animosity against me; and, through their influence with my family, my father was again obliged to withdraw his countenance openly, though his limited pecuniary support was still continued to me." His father died in 1808, and he then published various books and pamphlets against the errors of the Brahmins, in the native and foreign languages. He says: "The ground which I took in all my controversies was, not the Brahmin, but the Brahminism of the time in a perverted form of it; and I endeavored to show that the idolatry of the Brahmins was contrary to the practice of their ancestors and to the principles of the ancient books and authorities which they professed to reverence and obey." In order to deprive him of caste, the Brahmins commenced a suit against him, which, after many years of litigation, was decided in his favor. Of the body of Hindu theology comprised in the Vedas there is an ancient extract called the Vedant, or the Resolution of all the Vedas, written in Sanscrit. Rammohun Roy translated it into Bengalee and Hindustanee, and afterwards published an astronomical translation. Of this abridgment he published an English translation in 1816. He afterwards published some of the principal chapters of the Vedas in Bengalee and English. He was at different times the proprietor or publisher of newspapers in the native languages, in which he expressed his opinion freely against abuses, political as well as religious, especially the burning of widows. He was also, in conjunction with other liberal Hindus, proprietor of the *Bengal Herald,* an English newspaper. His intimate association with the English, and the constant intercourse with European thought and familiarity with the West generally, led him at last to abandon the old ground entirely, and he brought before his countrymen the excellence of the moral theories of Christianity in 1820 in a work which he entitled *Canticle of Peace and Happiness.* It was written in English, Sanscrit, and Bengalee, and consists, besides selections from the New Testament, of such commentaries as a Hindoo apostate who abandoned heathenism for baid theory would be likely to produce. The divinity of Christ is ignored, and the doctrine of the transmigration of the soul, which is another portion of the Gospel held to be fundamental in orthodox Christianity; and the simple morality of Jesus is held up as a guide to happiness and peace. The position taken in this work not only encountered the opposition of his abandoned friends; his new association also felt grieved and disappointed, and, in the first hour of disappointment, severely rebuked his false theology. He was replied to, and a controversy opened on the great question of the Trinity. His *Appeal,* published not under his own name, but as coming from a 'friend of truth,' and, later, his treatise on the unity of God, entitled *One Supreme Being,* greatly modified his first position, and showed that he took, at least, the advanced ground of a Unitarian of the Old School, and, in the real sense, was not the young advocate of the Reform Bill who wrote that it "would, in its consequences, promote the welfare of England and her dependencies—nay, of the whole world." His society was universally courted in England. He was oppressed with invitations to attend social parties and political and ecclesiastical meetings. His anxiety to see everything and to please all led him to overtask himself to such an extent that his health, long failing, at last broke down. He died at Bristol, Sept. 27, 1833. The adverse circumstances of his birth were such that he might have easily have ended his life in idleness and superfluity, or, still more easily, might have perverted it to selfish ends; but he won his high position by an inflexible honesty of purpose and energy of will, and had he lived he might have become an important factor in the propagation of Christianity in the East. Of his life, written by himself, in the *Athenaeum,* No. 310, Oct. 5, 1833; *Chambers's Edinburgh Journal,* Aug. 2, 1844; Carpenter, *Review of Laboris, Omissions, and Character of Rajah Rammohun Roy* (Poole, in the *Revue Encyclopaïque,* 1833; *Artistic Journal, vol. xi.* Theol. Eccl., June, 1852; *Encyclop. d. v.*

**Rammohun Roy.** See DORDERMY. **Ramat.** See CORAL.

**Ra'moth** (Heb. *Ramos*), רַמּוֹת [but רַמִים in Deut. iv. 43; Josh. xx. 8; 1 Chron. vi. 73, 80], heights,
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plus of Ramah [q. v.] ; Sept. usually 'Rama', but 'Pa-
môd' in Ezra x, 29. 'Râmôd' in 2 Chron. xviii, 2, 3, 5,
etc.), the name of three towns in Palestine, and also of
one man.
1. (Sept. 'h'Râmôd.) One of the four Levitical cities of
Issachar according to the catalogue in 1 Chron. (vi, 73).
In the parallel list in Josb. (xxi, 29, 29), among
other variations, JARMUTH (q. v.) appears in place of
Ramat. It seems impossible to decide which is the cor-
correct reading; or whether, again, Rameth (q. v.), a town of
Issachar, is distinct from them, or one and the same.
2. A city in the tribe of Gad (Deut. iv, 43; Josh. xx,
8; xxii, 38; 1 Chron. vi, 80), elsewhere called Ramoth-
gilead (q. v.).
3. (Sept. 'Pâmôd.') A city in the tribe of Simeon
("South Ramoth," 1 Sam. xxx, 27). See RAMATH-
NEGEB.
4. (Heb. text, Yirmoth', רבעוֹת, marg. re-'Ramatoh',
רבעוֹת, and Ramoth ; Sept. 'Râmôd v. t. Mâmôd.) An
Israelitish layman of the sons of Bani, who denounced his
strange wife at Ezra's instigation (Exra x, 29). B.C. 458.
Ramoth-gilead (Heb. Ramoth Gilead, רבעוֹת הגלְלָ֖ד; Sept.
'Râmôd', רבעוֹד, and 'Râmôd Gâlûd': Ἱορμαθ-γαλαύδ, v. t. Râmôd; Josephus, Ἰορμαθαῖος; Vulg. Ramoth
Gilead), the 'heights of Gilead;' or RAMOTH IN
GILEAD (יִשְׂרָאֵל גִּלְּד; Sept. 'h'Râmôd iv Gâlûd,
' רומד גאלאד', v. t. Rêmôd; Rêmôd; Rûmôd; Vulg.
Ramoth in Gilead, Deut. iv, 43; Josh. xx, 8; xxii, 38;
1 Kings xxii, 3 [in the A. V. only], also written plemo,
רבעוֹד', in 2 Chron. xxix, 5; and simply Ramah, רַמָּה,
in 2 Kings viii, 29, and 2 Chron. xxii, 6), one of the
chief cities of the tribe of Gad, on the east side of the
Jordan. It was allotted to the Levites, and appointed
a city of refuge (Deut. iv, 43; Josh. xx, 8). The latter
fact would seem to indicate that it occupied a central
position in the tribe, and also probably in the country
assigned to the Israelites east of the Jordan. Ramoth
played for a time an important part in Israelitish his-
tory, and was the scene of many a hard struggle. It
was apparently a strong fortress, and considered the key
of the country. Hence, when taken by the Syrians, the
kings of Israel and Judah regarded it as a national loss,
affecting both kingdoms, and they combined to drive
out the common enemy (1 Kings xxii, 4 sq.). The
united attack was unsuccessful, and the king of Israel
was mortally wounded in the battle (xxii, 34-37). At
a later period, apparently in the reign of Joram (2 Kings
ix, 14, 15; comp. Josephus, Ant. ix, 6, 1). Ramoth was
taken from the Syrians and held, notwithstanding all
the efforts of Hazael to regain it. Joram, having been
wounded in the struggle, left his army under the com-
mand of Jehu, and returned to Jezreel to be healed (2
Kings viii, 29). During his absence Jehu was anointed
by order of Eliah (ix, 1, 2), and commissioned to ex-
cecute vengeance on the wicked house of Ahab (ver. 7-10).
Leaving Ramoth, Jehu drove direct to Jezreel. The
king, expecting news from the seat of war, had watch-
men set on the towers, who saw his chariot approach-
ing (ver. 16, 17). The rest of the story is well known.
See AHAZ; JOSHT. After this incident Ramoth-gilead
appears no more in Jewish history.
The exact position of Ramoth is nowhere defined in
Scripture. The name (Ramoth, "heights") would seem
to indicate that it occupied a commanding position
on the summit of the range of Gilead. In 1 Kings iv, 13,
we read that when the districts of Solomon's purveyors
were arranged, the son of Geber was stationed in Ra-
moth, and had charge of all the cities of Jair the son of
Manasseh, both in Gilead and Bashan; and these cities
extended over the whole north-eastern section of Pale-
tine beyond Jordan. Various opinions have been enter-
tained regarding the site of this ancient city. Some
would identify it with Jerafs, the old Roman Gerusa, 
whose ruins are the most magnificent and extensive
east of the Jordan (see Benjamin of Tudela, by Asher);
but this is too far north, and Jerafs, besides, lies in a
valley. Ewald would locate it at the village of Reiem
among the mountains, five miles west of Jerafs (Georg.
Jer. iii, 500). For this there is no evidence whatever.
(Others locate it on a site bearing the name of Jerfil, ex-
actly identical with the ancient Jerpho Gilead, which is
mentioned by Seetzen (Reisen, March 11, 1809), and
marked on his map (ibid. iv) and that of Van de Velde
(1858) as four or five miles north of es-Salt. Schwarz
(Filastin, p. 232 sq.) identifies this Ramoth with Kallaf
el-Rub, which is situated on one of the highest points of
the mountain of Gilead, not far from the Wady Rajib,
and west of Ajlun. It is even now strongly fortified,
and is visible at a great distance, especially to the north-
east. The most probable opinion regarding the site of
Ramoth is that which places it at the village of es-Salt.
This is indicated (a) by its position on the summit of a
steep hill; (b) by its old ecclesiastical name Saltus Hieraticus, which appears to point to its original "ac-
cerdtal" and "holy" character, Ramoth having been
both a Levitical city and a "city of refuge" (see Reland,

Re-Salt (Ramoth-gilead. From a photograph by the Editor.)
RAMOTH-NEGBE

Palest. p. 213; (c) by the fact that about two miles to the north-west of es-Salt is the highest peak of the mountain-range still bearing the name Jebel Jilad, "Mount Gilad," and (d) by the statement of Eusebius that Ramoth-gilead lay in the fifteenth mile from Phil- adelphia. The situation is so limited and the soil so well-watered that it is not surprising to find traces of ancient dwellings of es-Salt from Rabbanah-Ammon (Onomast. s. v. "Ramoth"). The situation of es-Salt is strong and picturesque. The hill on which it stands is separated by deep ravines from the lofty mountains that encompass it, and its lower slopes are covered with vineyards, while the neighboring hill-sides and valleys abound with olive-groves. On the summit stands the castle, a rectangular building with towers at the corners, and defended by a deep moat hewn in the rock. The foundations appear to be Roman, if not earlier, but the upper walls are Saracenic. In the town itself, which contains some three thousand inhabitants, there are few remnants of antiquity. In the cliffs and ravines beneath it are great numbers of tombs and grottons (Handbook for Sinai and Palestine, p. 308). E-Salt is famous for its vineyards, and its raisins are esteemed the best in Palestin. They are carried in large quantities to Jerusalem (Burchhardt, Syræa, p. 349; Irvy and Mangles, Travels, p. 321; Ritter, Pala. u. Syr. p. 1121-38; Absulfeida, Tab. Syr. p. 92; Buckingham, Travels, p. 20). - Kitto. It is now the only inhabited place in the province of Belesa. It is supplied with a very strong and long fortification, and overawes the Bedawin by a garrison under the pasha of Damascus. Tristram says of it, "Ramoth- gilead must always have been the key of Gilad—at the head of the only easy road from the Jordan, opening immediately on the rich plateau of the interior, and with this isolated cone (the Osha) rising close above it, fortified from very early times, by art as well as by nature. Of the fortress only a tall fragment of wall remains, and a pointed archway, with a sort of large dial-plate, carved deeply in stone, surrounded by a rose-work decoration. It appears to be all modern Turkish work" (Land of Israel, p. 555). There is a plateau, he further tells us, on the road towards Jordan, and there probably the battle was fought where Ahab received his mortal wound—that being the only place where chariots could come into play. Winer and others identify Ramoth-gilead, Ramoth- mishpah, and Mizpah of Gilad. On this, see MIZPÁH;

RAMAH.

Ramoth-negeb. See Ramath-neger.

Rampalle, Jeanne, a French female ascetic of note, was born Jan. 3, 1583, at Saint-Remy; displayed at an early age a tendency to a contemplative life; and when old enough to be admitted to a monastery, joined the convent at Avignon, until, in 1602, she determined to found a home of her own, and established it on the rule of St. Augustine. She then took the name Jeanne de Jésus, provided the constitution and such religious books as she believed her companions to be in need of, e.g. Retraite Spirituelle; Pratique de Dévotion, etc., also hymns and songs. She died July 6, 1636. See Vie de la Made Jeanne de Jésus (Avignon, 1751, 12mo). - Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, s. v. - Rampart (רַפָּא), chyf, Lam. ii, 8; Nah. iii, 8; elsewhere "trench," "bulwark," etc., a fortification or low wall surrounding and protecting a military trench (2 Sam. xxv. 15, 16; Isa. xxxvii. 1, etc.; comp. 1 Kings xi. 29; Psa. lxviii. 14). See ARMY; SHIELD. In the Talmud the Hebrew word is applied to the interior space surrounding the wall of the Temple (Lightfoot, Opp. ii. 198). See TEMPLE.

Rampelogo (or Rampeloco), Antonio, an Italian theologian, was born at Genoa and flourished in the second half of the 15th century. He was an Augustinian monk, and passed for a learned controversialist in his day. He was a favorite and intimate friend of the humanistic writers of Rome, Rampelogo was such an eloquent and persuasive disputant that he was called to the Council of Constance in order to convert the Hussites. He is the author of Repertorium Bibliicum, which was put in the Index by pope Clement VIII, but which, nevertheless, has often been printed (Ulm, 1476, fol.; Nuremb. 1481; Milan, 1494, etc.). See Oudin, De Script. Eccles. iii. 2910. - Hoeffer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, s. v.

Rampen, Hans, a Belgian divine, was born at Hui, Nov. 18, 1572. Studied successively at Cologne, Mayence, and Louvain, and taught Greek and philosophy at the college in Lyons. From 1620 to 1637 he taught exegesis of the Scriptures at the university, of which he was several times rector. He finally entered the practical work of the ministry, and secured a canonicate at Breda, but did not like this work, and returned to pedagogy as rector at St. Anne College. He died March 4, 1641. He published Commentarius in Quatuor Evangelia (Lond. 1631-41, 4 vols. 4to). - Hoef er, Nouv. Biog. Générale, s. v.

Ramayara, a sect of the Sikhs, deriving their appellation from Rama Raya, who flourished about A.D. 1660. They are by no means numerous in Hindostan.-Gardner, Faiths of the World, s. v.

Ram's Horn (םז' תַּלּ, p'lid), Josh. vi. 4, 13; else-where "jubilee," "trumpet." The Hebrew word keren, i.e. oren, is also used for the crooked trumpet, a very ancient instrument. Sometimes it was made of the horns of rams, rams' horns, and other long and strong horns. It is probable that in later times they were made of metal. They were employed in war, and on solemn occasions (Exod. xix. 13). The latter word is also rendered cornet (Dan. iii. 5, 7, 10-15). See JUBILÉE; MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS.

Rama's Skins Dyed Red (רַמָּא הָנָּפְשָׁה יָרָדָה קְפָרַר, Josh. xxxv. 5, xxxv. 7). "oroth elam moqodamim, Sept. דֹּרְתֵּה יָרָדָה קְפָרַר פְּרֵרְתֵּה יָרָדָה קְפָרַר Vulg. pellea orientum rubricata) formed part of the materials that the Israelites were ordered to present as offerings for the making of the tabernacle (Exod. xxxv. 5), of which they served as the outer covering, those being under the rams' skins another covering of badgers' skins. See TABERNACLE. The words may be rendered "rams' skins," and then may be understood as the produce of the African aoudad, the Ovis tragelaphus of naturalists, whereof the bearded sheep are a domesticated race. The tragelaphus is a distinct species of sheep, having a short horn and the common species, and incontinent tars-pits. Its normal color is red, from bright chestnut to russochocolate, which last is the cause of the epithet purple being given to it by the poets. Dr. Harris thinks that the skins in question were tanned and colored crimson; for it is well known that when cloth formed of ram's wool, embossed or silver, was manufactured in the remotest ages in Libya, especially about the Tritonian Lake, where the original agin, or goat-skin breastplate of Jupiter and Minerva, was dyed bright red; and the Egyptians had most certainly red leather in use, for their antique paintings show harness-makers cutting it into strips for the collars of horses and furniture of chariots. It is much more probable, however, that the skins were those of the domestic breed of rams, which, as Rashi says, were dyed red after they were prepared." See RAM.

Ramsauer, Otto Heinrich David, a hymnist of the Reformed church, was born Nov. 19, 1829, at Oldenburg. Having made his preparatory studies at the gymnasia of his native place, he went, in 1848, to Zurich, in Switzerland, where the well-known Dr. J. P. Lange especially attracted him. While yet a student he wrote a collection of hymns, entitled Die Freude und die Freude der Kirche, which were edited by his teacher in 1851. In 1852 he was appointed vicar to dean Frei in Trugen, in Switzerland, whom he also succeeded in the pastorate. Three years afterwards, May 27, 1856, he died in the vigor of life. His publications are very fine, but have not yet found a place in any of our modern German hymn-books. See Koch, Geschichte des
deutsche Kirchengeschichte, vii, 384; Zuchold, Bibliotheca Theologica, ii, 1027. (B. P.)

RAMASY, James P., a Presbyterian minister, was born near Canonsburg, Pa., Aug. 26, 1809. He graduated from Jefferson College, Canonsburg, Pa., in 1827; prosecuted the study of theology under his venerable father, the late Rev. B. P. Ramasy, professor in the Theological Seminary of the Associate Church; was licensed to preach Aug. 27, 1838, by the Presbytery of Chartiers, and was ordained and installed pastor of the congregation of Deer Creek, New Bedford, Lawrence Co., Pa., July 1, 1835, by the Rev. D. M. Zwole. For about two years he continued faithfully testifying the Gospel of the grace of God among this people. But, his health failing, he subsequently located himself in New Wilmington, and for a time exercised his ministry there. He died Jan. 16, 1862. See Wilson, Penn. Hist. Almanac, 1863, p. 362. (J. L. S.)

Ramek, Hizzekiah S., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born at Chatham, Conn., Dec. 4, 1804. When ten years old, the death of his father left him to support himself. At sixteen he was converted, and commenced preaching at nineteen. He joined the Indiana Conference in 1822, and his successive appointments were Needham, Chelsea, Vt.; Craftsbury, Vt.; Isambur, Vt.; Tolland, Conn.; Windsor, Conn.; Tolland and Stafford, Manchester, Conn.; East Putnam, Conn.; Colchester, Conn.; East Putnam, Vernon, Conn.; Vernon and Windville, East Putnam, Conn. From 1823 to 1861, and again from 1868, impaired health prevented him from active work. He frequently spoke on temperance, of which he was an earnest, able advocate. He also served with marked ability in the Senate of the State of Connecticut, and filled various offices of responsibility and trust. Those conversant with his comparatively brief, active ministry speak of him as an able, eloquent preacher, and as equally an indefatigable pastor. In one locality his earnest advocacy of truth raised the anger of some, and they resolved his next visit to tar and feather him. It was no idle threat; the preparations were made; his brethren urged him not to go, but he was fearless, and went. The leader of the mob was awakened, converted, and became his fast friend. Mr. Rameek lived to see his views prevail among his fellows. He died Oct. 29, 1877. See Minutes of the Conference, 1878.

Ramsay, William B., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Rutherford Co., Tenn., March 12, 1831. He embraced religion in 1846, was licensed to preach in 1853, and was admitted on trial in the Memphis Conference in the fall of that year. His health failing in 1854, he entered Andrew College, from which he graduated in 1858. He was readmitted into the Conference the same year, granted a super-numerary relation in 1862, and in 1863 served in the Confederate army as chaplain for four months. He died of consumption, July, 1865. Mr. Ramsay was sweet-spirited, modest, and unassuming.—Minutes of Annual Conference of the Meth. Episc. Church, South, 1865, p. 594.

Ramsey, Petrus, also known by his original name Pierre de la Ramée, was the French philosopher of the 16th century who broke the fetters of barbarous scholastic thought and led men into the clear light of Platonist philosophy. He is usually called one of the founders of modern metaphysics, and this is certainly true in so far as Ramsey prepared the way for Descartes (q. v.) in philosophy, and for Pascal in theology, as we shall see presently. Ramsey was born of very humble parentage at Curb, a village in Vermandois, in 1515. He was obliged, at an early age, to leave the university and begin the humble duties of a shepherd. He loved the broad, open fields, but he loved books more. He studied as much as his humble associations could afford him the means of knowledge, and finally, satisfied that he could only get more away from home, left for the city. He went straight to the capital, though yet a youth of a little over eight. Homesickness compelled him to return to the paternal roof, and he walked home as he had walked to Paris, but only to return soon again to the city where he had found so much to learn, and before he was twelve he was once more at Paris. He could not enter school, being too young, as his parents were empty and his house empty. He hired out as a servant to a rich student at the College de Navarre, and, by devoting the day to his duties, obtained the night for study, and, under his master's guidance and help, made rapid progress. At the age of twenty-one he was ready to pass examination as if he had been within the walls of a college. The indomitably brave spirit of the boy had made a resolute man; and, unlike most students, he had not only learned the dicta of the savans, but had formed an opinion which was his own alone. In presenting himself for the degree of master, he came forward as the champion of reform in the schools of thought. He undertook to prove the then almost impious task that Aristotle was not infallible. He had gradually withdrawn from Aristotelianism as an authority, and pleaded now for the exercise of individual reason as against the "authority," which scholasticism imposed on all students. Enthusiast as he was, he was led to make the extravagant statement in his thesis that "all that Aristotle had said was false" (quoniam ab Aristoteleo dicta esse, commentu tuae). It speaks, however, a great deal for the ability of its author. Based on this occasion, and the studies in which he had engaged since his college days, although himself Aristotelian, were compelled to applaud him. Ramsay was immediately made a teacher in the College du Mans, and along with two learned friends opened a special class for reading the Greek and Latin authors, designed to combine the study of eloquence with that of philosophy. His audience was large, and his success as a teacher remarkable. He now turned his attention more particularly to the science of logic, which, in his usual adventurous spirit, he undertook to reform; and no one acquainted with his system is there that many of his ideas will not seem both rational and beneficial. His attempts excited much hostility among the Aristotelians; and when his treatise on the subject (Dialectica Partitionum) appeared in 1545, it was fiercely assailed by the doctors of the Sorbonne, the Academia of Geneva, the majority of the high-schools of the Continent, which had all, in alliance with the Church, given Aristotelianism the supreme rule. The University of Paris linked itself with jurists, counsellors, the king's ministers, the king himself, to crush the innovator. He was charged with impiety and sedition, and with a desire to overthrow all science and religion through the medium of an attack on Aristotle. On the report of an irregular tribunal appointed to consider the charges made against him, the king ordered his works to be suppressed, and forbade his teaching or writing against Aristotle or in the pain of corporal punishment. Ramsay now devoted himself exclusively to the study of mathematics, and to prepare an edition of Euclid. Cardinals Charles de Bourbon and Charles de Lorraine befriended him, and through their influence he was permitted to begin a course of lectures on rhetoric at the College de Presles, the plague having driven away numbers of students from Paris. He was finally, in 1545, named principal of this college, and the Sorbonne ineffectually endeavored to eject him on the ground of the royal prohibition decree. The decree was cancelled in 1550, through the influence of the cardinal de Lorraine. Ramsay raised the College de Presles from a condition of decay to the height of prosperity, and his reputation went over all the land as an educator as well as a philosopher. In 1561 he became of any service, to perform duties as a shepherd. He loved the broad, open fields, but he loved books more. He studied as much as his humble associations could afford him the means of knowledge, and finally, satisfied that he could only get more away from home, left for the city. He went straight to the capital, though yet a youth of a little over eight. Homesickness compelled him to return to the paternal roof, and he walked home as he had walked to Paris, but only to return soon again to the city where he had found so much to learn, and before he was twelve he was once more at Paris. He could not enter school, being too young, as his parents were empty and his house empty. He hired out as a servant to a rich student at the College de Navarre, and, by devoting the day to his duties, obtained the night for study, and, under his master's guidance and help, made rapid progress. At the age of twenty-one he was ready to pass examination as if he had been within the walls of a college. The indomitably brave spirit of the boy had made a resolute man; and, unlike most students, he had not only learned the dicta of the savans, but had formed an opinion which was his own alone. In presenting himself for the degree of master, he came forward as the champion of reform in the schools of thought. He undertook to prove the then almost impious task that Aristotle was not infallible. He had gradually withdrawn from Aristotelianism as an authority, and pleaded now for the exercise of individual reason as against the "authority," which scholasticism imposed on all students. Enthusiast as he was, he was led to make the extravagant statement in his thesis that "all that Aristotle had said was false" (quoniam ab Aristoteleo dicta esse, commentu tuae). It speaks, however, a great deal for the ability of its author. Based on this occasion, and the studies in which he had engaged since his college days, although himself Aristotelian, were compelled to applaud him. Ramsay was immediately made a teacher in the College du Mans, and along with two learned friends opened a special class for reading the Greek and Latin authors, designed to combine the study of eloquence with that of philosophy. His audience was large, and his success as a teacher remarkable. He now turned his attention more particularly to the science of logic, which, in his usual adventurous spirit, he undertook to reform; and no one acquainted with his system is there that many of his ideas will not seem both rational and beneficial. His attempts excited much hostility among the Aristotelians; and when his treatise on the subject (Dialectica Partitionum) appeared in 1545, it was fiercely assailed by the doctors of the Sorbonne, the Academia of Geneva, the majority of the high-schools of the Continent, which had all, in alliance with the Church, given Aristotelianism the supreme rule. The University of Paris linked itself with jurists, counsellors, the king's ministers, the king himself, to crush the innovator. He was charged with impiety and sedition, and with a desire to overthrow all science and religion through the medium of an attack on Aristotle. On the report of an irregular tribunal appointed to consider the charges made against him, the king ordered his works to be suppressed, and forbade his teaching or writing against Aristotle or in the pain of corporal punishment. Ramsay now devoted himself exclusively to the study of mathematics, and to prepare an edition of Euclid. Cardinals Charles de Bourbon and Charles de Lorraine befriended him, and through their influence he was permitted to begin a course of lectures on rhetoric at the College de Presles, the plague having driven away numbers of students from Paris. He was finally, in 1545, named principal of this college, and the Sorbonne ineffectually endeavored to eject him on the ground of the royal prohibition decree. The decree was cancelled in 1550, through the influence of the cardinal de Lorraine. Ramsay raised the College de Presles from a condition of decay to the height of prosperity, and his reputation went over all the land as an educator as well as a philosopher. In 1561 he became of any service, to perform duties as a shepherd. He loved the broad, open fields, but he loved books more. He studied as much as his humble associations could afford him the means of knowledge, and finally, satisfied that he could only get more away from home, left for the city. He went straight to the capital, though yet a youth of a little over eight.
and published three grammars successively—Greek, Latin, and French. He also mingled largely in the literary and scholastic disputes of the time, and on account of his bustling activity came under the satire of Kavelais. But though Ramus had innumerable adversaries, he might not have defied them all. That he was highly indignant against him, had his love of "repetition" not displayed itself in religion as well as in logic. In an evil hour (for his own comfort) he embraced Protestantism. He had long been suspected of a leaning that way, and, as we have seen, his intellect was by nature so far inclined towards the spirit of "authoricity," that he had for years secretly conformed to the practices of the Catholic cult, and it was only after cardinal Lorraine, in reply to the Conference of Poissy (1561), frankly admitted the abuses of the Church and the vices of the clergy that he ventured formally to abjure the old faith. The outbreak of the religious wars in France plunged him into the dangers of the time, and he finally perished in the fatal massacre of St. Bartholomew, August, 1572. It is believed that he was assassinated at the instigation of one of his most violent and persistent enemies, Chaperon, rector of the Collège de Pordes. See RAMISTA.

Rancé, Armand Jean le Bouthillier de, the well-known founder of the reformed order of La Trappe, was born Jan. 9, 1628, at Paris, where he was educated. Having taken his degree in the Sorbonne with great applause, and embraced the ecclesiastical profession, he was soon consecrated as a priest, and through the favor of cardinal Richelieu obtained more than one valuable benefice. He possessed as a young man a large fortune, and, notwithstanding his clerical character, was carried away by the gayety and dissipation of Parisian life. At a time, however, having embraced the cause of cardinal Rohan, he was imprisoned and finally forsook the favor of cardinal Mazarin; and being deeply moved by the death of a lady, the duchesse de Montbazon, to whom he was much attached, he withdrew altogether from Paris, resolved to distribute all his property among the poor, and to devote himself exclusively to the practice of pious and penitential works. Finally, he resigned all his preferments (of which, by the abusive practice of the period, he held several simultaneously) with the exception of the abbacy of La Trappe, to which convent he retired in 1652, with the intention of restoring the strict discipline of the religious rule of St. Benedict, in which he was a reformer, and over which he finally died, under the name of Martin. See TRAPIST.

He lived in this seclusion for thirty-three years, during which he published a large number of works, chiefly ascetical. He died Oct. 27, 1700. The only remarkable event of his literary life was his correspondence with Mabillon, in reply to his Études Monastiques, on the subject of the studies proper for the monastic life, which is entitled Traité de la Société des Découverts de l'État Monastique, and his controversy with Arnauld, which drew upon Rancé the hatred of the Jansenists. Rancé's works are numerous. In his youth he edited Analecta in one volume, octavo (Paris, 1639), with a dedication to cardinal Richelieu. His most noteworthy publications of his religious life, aside from those referred to, are: Exégèse sur la Règle de St.-Benoît (Paris, 1679, 2 vols. 4to); — Exégèse sur la Règle des Clérks-Chrétiens: Réflexions Morales sur les Quatre Evangélies (Paris, 1699, 12mo); — Conférences (on the same, 1699); — Réflexions sur la Vie et de la Mort de quelques Religieuses de la Trappe (1696, 4 vols. 12mo), and other works on monastic life and its reforms, etc. See Tillemont, Vie de Rancé (1719, 2 vols. 12mo); Marmollier, Vie (1703); Chateaubriand, Vie; Moreliri, Dict. Hist. s. v.; Hoefer, Nouv. Encyclopédie, s. v.

Ranconnier, Jacques, a French Jesuit missionary, was born in 1600 in the county of Bourgogne, entered the novitiate of the Jesuits at the age of nineteen in Malines, and in 1625 went into the missionary work in Paraguay. He labored very successfully for seven years among the Itatines, whom he converted to Christianity, such as he had to offer, and died among this new people of the Gospel about 1640. He wrote frequent reports of the progress of his work in Paraguay, which are valuable contributions to the history of that South American country. See Sothoff, Bibl. Script. Jesu, p. 209; Charlevoix, Hist. de Paraguay, liv. viii.—Hoefer, Nouv. Encyclopédie, s. v. See also PARAGUAY.

Rand, Asa, an American Congregational divine, born at Rindge, N. H., Aug. 6, 1783, was educated at Dickinson College, where he took his degree in 1806, studied for the ministry, and was ordained, St. James' Church, Me., Jan. 18, 1809, as pastor of a Congregational Church. In 1822 he undertook the editorial care of the Christian Mirror at Portland, Me., and held this until 1825, when he took the principalship of a female seminary at Brookfield. In July, 1826, he accepted the editorship of the Boston Recorder, the Youth's Companion, and the Volunteer, the last a religious monthly. His health, which had for some time been failing, and had originally forced him from the ministry, finally compelled him also to leave the editorial chair, and he connected himself with a book-store and printing-office at Lowell, Mass. He finally went back to editorial work, and started the Lowell Observer, a weekly paper. In 1834 he again began to preach and address public audiences. He took up the slavery question and spoke in behalf of abolition in Maine and Massachusetts. From that point he preached in Pompey, N. Y., then became pastor of the Presbyterian church in Peterborough, N. Y., the home of the celebrated abolitionist Gerrit Smith. His last years Mr. Rand spent at Ashburnham, Mass., where he died Aug. 24, 1871. He was, while at Gorham, a frequent writer for the religious quotient during the struggle for the abolition of slavery, and after removing to Portland for 1814-18, and, besides occasional sermons, put in print a volume of Familiar Sermons:—A Review of Fanny's Sermons:—New Divinity Theology, a vindication of the same:—And a Letter to Dr. Lyman Beecher. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, vol. 1.

Rand, William, an American divine of colonial times, flourished in the first half of the 18th century. He was a student at Harvard University, class of 1721, then took holy orders, and became pastor at Sunderland, Mass., of a Congregational Church. In 1746 he removed, in the same capacity, to Kingston, N. Y., and died there in 1777. He published a separate sermon (1739-1757). See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, i. 886.

Randall, John, an English divine of note, was born about the middle of the 16th century. He was educated at Oxford University, in St. Mary's Hall, and Trinity College, and, after taking holy orders, he became rector of St. Andrew Hubbard, London, in 1599. He died in 1622. His published works are: Sermons on Matt. ii. 20, and on 1 Pet. ii. 11, 12 (1620-40);—Sermons on Rom. viii. 38, 39 (1623-40);—Nature of God and Christ (1624, 4to);—Great Mystery of Godliness (1624, 4to);—3d ed. (1640);—The Sacraments (1630, 4to);—Lectures on the Lord's Supper (1630, 4to); Twenty-nine Lectures of the Church (1631, 4to).

Randall, Matthew, a distinguished layman of the Baptist denomination, was born in London. His mercantile tastes led him into business operations, where he met with success. As a merchant, seen in the peace of 1783, he came to the United States, and took up his residence in Philadelphia, where he remained nearly all his life. For two or three years he lived in Burlington, N. J. While in this place he was baptized by Rev. Dr. Stoughton, and continued a member of the Burlington Church until his death, which took place in Philadelphia, Sept. 14, 1833. Dr. Baron Stow says of him that "he was highly esteemed in Christian circles, and his early familiarity with Robert Hall and Drs. Ryland and Stennett was of importance to him in matters of theology, as well as of taste and piety." He
Randleites. See Free-will Baptists.

Randle, Richmond, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was originally a member of the Tennessee Conference, where he traveled five years. He was transferred in 1836 to the Arkansas Conference, which then included Louisiana west of the Mississippi River. Here he labored efficiently in stations and as presiding elder until the Conference of 1844, when he took a superannuated relation. In 1845 he became again a presiding elder, and so continued until 1861, serving as presiding elder for nine of these years. His sons having volunteered, he accompanied them to the war, soon to die. He was a man of deep and fervent piety, a true friend, a noble and useful preacher.—Minutes of Annual Conf. M. E. Church, South, 1861, p. 829.

Randle, Thomas Ware, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Stewart County, Tenn., April 13, 1815. He was admitted on trial in the Tennessee Conference in 1832, and continued to be an active and very efficient preacher until within two months of his death, which took place Aug. 26, 1859. He was several times a delegate to the General Conference. Mr. Randle was a Christian gentleman, modest and kind. His talents as a preacher were excellent, and his zeal knew no abatement.—Minutes of Annual Conf. M. E. Church, South, 1859, p. 116.

Randle, William, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Brantford, Ont., in September, 1867. He was converted when about thirty years of age, and was received on trial in the Tennessee Conference in 1841. He labored successfully until 1862, when he became superannuated. In 1866 he resumed active work as presiding elder on Cross Plains (on Cross Drain and Fountain Head) district, where he closed his life, May 2, 1869. He was a man of artless simplicity, true sincerity, and ardent zeal.—Minutes of Annual Conf. M. E. Church, South, 1869, p. 349.

Randolph, Francis, D.D., an English divine, was born in 1753. He was made prebend of Bristol in 1791, and died in 1831. He published, Letter to William Pitt on the State Trade (Lond. 1788, 8vo);—Scriptural Revision of Socinian Arguments in Answer to B. Hobhouse (1792, 8vo);—Correspondence with the Earl and Countess of Jersey (1796, 8vo);—Sermons on Adversity (1800, 8vo);—Sermons on Union (1803, 8vo);—State of the Nation (1806, 8vo);—Book of Job (from the Heb. by Elizabeth Smith, with Preface and Annotations by F. R. [Bath, 1810]).

Randolph, John, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Trigg County, Ky., May 3, 1829. He was converted in 1847 (or 1848), licensed to preach Nov. 25, 1850, and admitted on trial in the Louisville Conference in 1851. He filled twelve important fields of labor, continuing his work until the first Sunday in June, 1863. The staple of his preaching, as of all he did, was strong practical sense, sanctified and ordered efficient by deep piety.—Minutes of Annual Conf. M. E. Church, South, 1864, p. 481.

Randolph, Samuel B., a minister in the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Tennessee. He entered the Tennessee Conference, from which he was transferred in 1869 to the Florida Conference. He enlisted in 1861 with the Lowndes Volunteers, and in three months fell a victim to disease at Camp Alleghany, Va., Aug. 29, 1861.—Minutes of Annual Conf. M. E. Church, South, 1861, p. 345.

Randolph, Thomas, an English divine of note, was born Aug. 30, 1701, at Canterbury, studied at Oxford University, where he was bursar, and after completing his theological course was in 1725 admitted to orders. He was taught for a while at Trin. College, and finally accepted two benefices in Kent. In 1748 he was elected president of Corpus Christi College, and later was given a professorship in theology (1768). He died at Oxford March 24, 1788. Dr. Thomas Randolph published a work on the Prophecies cited in the New Testament compared with the Hebrew Original and the Septuagint Version, which is exceeding rare and scarce. It presents, says Orme, "at one view the Heb. text, the Sept. version of it, and the quotation in the Greek New Test." The substance of the work is incorporated in Horne's Chapter on Quotations.

His son John, who was born July 6, 1748, and was educated at Oxford, became under his father's administration professor of Greek and theology, in 1799 made bishop of Oxford, was transferred to the see of Bangor in 1807, and in 1809 to that of London, where he died July 28, 1813. He was a member of the Royal Society of London, and published several sermons. See Gentleman's Magazine, lxxxiii, lxxxiv, and the biographical sketch prefixed to the collected writings of Thomas Randolph; Saunders, Evesnings with Sacred Poets, p. 251: Hook, Eccles. Bio!. viii, 191. (J. H. W.)

Ranew, Nathaniel, an English divine of the 17th century, noted as a Nonconformist who was ejected at the Restoration, was minister of Little Easheep, London, and his wife was the vicar of Tithebarn. He died in 1673, aged about seventy-two. He published, Solitude Improved by Divine Meditation, etc. (Lond. 1670, 8vo; last ed. 1847, 18mo), a very excellent work in the domain of practical theology:—Account concerning the Saint's Grace, etc., equally devout in spirit and excellent in composition and purpose.

Ranfaing, Marie Elisabeth de, a French lady, celebrated as the foundress of a religious order, and known under the name of Elizabeth of the Cross of Jesus, was born, Nov. 30, 1592, at Remiremont, of a noble Lorraine family, and was noted for her beauty. She was advanced to a man for whom she had not the shadow of affection, and therefore objected to wedlock: and when her parents persisted, she sought the retirement of the monastery. She was, however, brought back to society, and married M. Dubois, by whom she had three children. Her husband's death and other misfortunes led her to determine the founding of a religious community made up wholly of women reclaimed from a life of debauchery. The number of these women having increased, the prince bishop of Toul thought proper to convert them into a religious order, under the name of "Our Lady of Refuge." Mrs. Dubois and her three daughters took the dress belonging to the monastery Jan. 1, 1681. In 1684 Urban VIII gave his approval to this order. It extended over several of the cities of the realm, especially Avignon, Toulouse, Montpellier, and Béziers. They also survived the storm of revolution. The mother of Ranfaing died the death of a saint, Jan. 14, 1649. See Hoefer, Nouv. Bio!. Générale, s. v.

Range is the rendering of two Heb. words of marked import, besides one or two in an ordinary sense.

 strncpy(func, &str, &num)
   "range", 2 Kings xi. 8; 15; 2 Chron. xxiii. 14; also timber or chambers in the stories of a building ("board," 1 Kings vi. 9). See Athitall. Temple.

Rangiereas (us), a French cardinal of mediæval times, was born, about 1535, in the diocese of Rheims. St. Bruno sent his pupil to that country as a tutor. One of his pupils was the Count of Châtillon, pope under the name of Urban II. Rangier went to take the habit of Benedictine, to Marmontiers, where he would probably have died in obscurity, had it not been for contention which arose among the monks, and Rangier of Sangerville, abbot of Tours. Rangier's abbot, Bernard of Saint-Venant, charged him with a
mission to Rome, to maintain the rights of the abbey. The two ecclesiastics obtained a bull confirmed to their wishes; but Ranieri was kept at Rome by Urban II, who soon made him Archbishop of Reggio. In 1095 he went with the pope to France, and took part in the Council of Clermont, where the first crusade was decided upon. After the Council, Ranieri followed Urban II to Limoges and to Toulouse, and found himself in difficulties with the Archbishop of Marmoutiers. He soon after returned to his own diocese, and left it no more, excepting to assist Pascal II at the Council of Gutasta (1106). Ughelli speaks of him as a man of great power ("vir magus auctoritas").


Ranieri, Sr., an Italian ascetic of medi eval times, was born, in or about the year 1100, of a noble family of Pisa. In his youth, the Romish legends say, he had a vision: an eagle appeared to him, bearing in his beak a blazing light, and said, "I come from Jerusalem to enlighten the nations." But Ranieri refused to heed this call to a religious life, and gave himself up to pleasure. In the midst of his delights, however, he was one day surprised by the visit of a holy man, who persuaded him to desert his sinful life. Soon he embarked for Jerusalem, where he took off his own garments, and wore the schiaccian, or slave- shirt, ever after in token of his renunciation of the world. As a hermit in the deserts of Palestine, and during this time is reputed to have had numberless visions. On one occasion, he felt his vows of abstinence to be almost more than he could keep. He then had a vision of a golden vase, set with precious stones, and full of oil, pitch, and sulphur. These were set on fire, and none could quench the flames. Then there was put into his hands a small ewer of water; and when he turned on but a few drops, the fire was extinguished. This vision he believed to signify human passions by the pitch and sulphur, and the ewer of water, the water of temperance. He then determined to live on bread and water alone. His reverence for water was very great, and most of his miracles were performed through the use of it; so that he was called San Ranieri dell' Acqua. But when he carried with a host who cheated his guests by putting water in his wine, the saint did not hesitate to expose the fraud; for he revealed to all present the figure of Satan, sitting on one of the wine-casks, in the form of a huge cat with the wings of a bat. He did many miracles after his return to Pisa, and made converts by the sanctity of his life and example. He was buried (Jul. 17, 1161), many miraculous manifestations bore witness to his eminent holiness. All the bells in Pisa were spontaneously tolled; and the archbishop Villani, who had been sick in bed for two years, was cured to attend his funeral. At the moment in the funeral service when it was the custom to omit the Gloria in Excelsis, it was sung by a choir of angels above the altar; while the organ accompanied them without being played by any perceptible hands. The harmony of this chant was so exquisite that those who heard it thought they heard the angels. The gates were opened, the gates of the Duomo. After the plague in Pisa in 1356, the life of this saint was painted in the Campo Santo by Simone Memmi and Antonio Veneziano. These frescoes are most important in the history of art, and consist of eight scenes from the life of St. Ronieri: 1. His conversion; 2. His embarkation for Palestine; 3. He assumes the hermit's dress; 4. He has many temptations and visions in the desert; 5. He returns to Pisa; 6. He exposes the fraud of the innkeeper; 7. His death and funeral obsequies; 8. His miracles after death. —Mrs. Clement, Hand-book of Legendary and Mythological Art, a. v.

Ranken, Carl Ferdinand, doctor of theology and philology, was born at Hallstadt in Austria. Ranken was educated at the Gymnasium in Potsdam, where he took his degree in 1822. In 1824 he went to the University of Berlin, where he was influenced by the German and French schools of thought. He was later appointed to the chair of History at the Royal Reald-school, the Royal Elizabeth School, etc. He died March 29, 1876. Ranken was not only an able philologist and pedagogue, but also an excellent Christian, and took an active part in the inner mission and the work of the Bible Society. He wrote, Piau and Rnou des Johanneischen Evangelusen (Berne, 1854) — De Libris Historiae Nori Testamenti (ibid. 1855) — Clemente von Alexandri u. Origines als Interpreten der heiligen Schrift (ibid. 1861) — Das Kaiserspiel der Hebräer (ibid. 1863), etc. As a contributor to Piper's Evangelical Year-book, he wrote on the life of Andrew Baxtor, Charles Lutley Saxon Elders (viii, 139), Timothy (i, 70), Titus (i, 68); on Symphorianus (xix, 60), Perpetua and Felicitas (ix, 56), Saturninus (xx, 63), Aretas (xiii, 129), Eustatus (xvii, 96), Olaf Petersen (xix, 170), and contributed the German translation of Alonzo De' Alva's De la Vida de la Virgen to Piper's monograph on that hymn (xix, 28, 81). See Schneider, Theol. Jahrbuch (1877), p. 227; Literarischer Handvorscher (1876), p. 255. (B. P.)

Ranken, Friedrich Heinrich, doctor of theology and Ober-Conventiakalrat, brother of Carl Ferdinand, was born at Wiche in 1797. Having completed his studies, he labored in various parishes, was appointed to the chair of Theology at the University of Nuremburg, and then as dean at Thurnau. In 1840 he was appointed ordinary professor of dogmatics at the Erlangen University. In 1841 he was made counsellor of consistory at Bayreuth, and shortly afterwards he was appointed Ober-Conventiakalrat. Some years ago he retired from his different offices, and died Sept. 2, 1876. Of his writings we mention, Untersuchungen über den Pentateuch (Erlangen, 1834-40, 2 vols.): — Predigtet — Gebete über Worte der heil. Schrift (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1867): — The Institution of the Lord's Supper (ibid. xi, 81); — In Piper's Evangelische Year-book (viii, 106). See Fürst, Bibl. Judi. iii, 129; Zuchold, Bibliotheca Theologica, ii, 129; Winer, Handbuch der theolog. Literatur, i, 78; ii, 108, 327, 330, 732; Schneider, Theol. Jahrbuch (1877), p. 227; Literarischer Handvorscher (1876), p. 255; Hauck, Theol. Jahrbericht (1867), p. 382. (B. P.)

Ranken, David, a Scotch divine, was a member of the Episcopalian Church of Scotland at Edinburgh in the first half of the 18th century, and was an author of some repute. He published, Three Discourses (1 Pet. iii, 10, 14 (Edin. 1716, 8vo): — Three Discourses (1 Pet. iii, 14, 16 (1716, 8vo): — Sermon, 1 Pet. iii, 13-16 (Edin. 1715, 8vo): — Sermon, 1729, 8vo]: — Three Discourses (Phi. 17, 27, 28, 1729, 8vo).

Ranken, Thomas, a somewhat noted minister of the early Methodist Episcopal Church — one of Wesley's general assistants — was born in Dunbar, Scotland, 1738. He was religiously trained by his parents, and, at an early age, expressed the desire to become a minister of the Gospel. After the death of his father, he formed bad acquaintances, and gave himself up to worldly amusements. When he was seventeen years of age, Dunbar was visited by troops of dragoons, among whom were a number of devout Christians, who held meetings morning and evening. Young Ranken attended, and was deeply impressed. He afterwards removed to Edinburgh, where he came under the personal influence of Mr. Whitefield, and was decided to devote himself to Christian work. With this purpose in view, he prepared to enter the College at Elgin, under the circumstances, however, occurred which prevented his taking a collegiate course; and, by the advice of a friend, he sailed for America, to engage in a commercial enterprise. Wearying of this life, he was glad to find himself once more in Scotland, living in a more congenial religious atmosphere. Shortly after his return, he met a Methodist minister, who saw the unsettled condition of his mind, and invited Ranken to visit, with
him, the different Methodist societies of the North. He was even prevailed upon to preach, though he consented with great reluctance, and was so dissatisfied with himself that he retired to 19. 20. 21. 22. it no more. While in this state of mind, he listened to the preaching of Wesley, and from that time had the most admiring admiration for him. After a great spiritual conflict, he sought Wesley, and related his experience of the two preceding years. Wesley advised him to persevere in his religious work, and so removed his doubts that he expressed himself willing to be known everywhere "as a poor, despised Methodist preacher."

He was regularly appointed in 1761 to the Northumberland District, and in the following year to the Sheffield Circuit. At the next Conference he was appointed to the Devonshire Circuit. In 1764 he became assistant-preacher in the Cornwall Circuit. In 1765 he was appointed to spend a part of the year in the Newcastle and a part in the Dale Circuit. In 1766 he was stationed upon the Euphrosine Circuit, and, upon request of the people, was returned the second year. In 1768 he was appointed to labor again in the west of Cornwall. In 1769 he was sent to the London and Sussex Circuit, and also travelled with John Wesley on his preaching tours through the kingdom. In 1770 he accompanied Wesley to the west of England, and everywhere their labors met with great success. In 1771 he was once more stationed with his friends in Cornwall. While at the conference held at Leeds, he met captain Webb, lately arrived from America. Wesley had become greatly dissatisfied with the management of the American mission, and, when the question came up before the conference, intimated his desire to send Rankin as general superintendent. The appointment was made; and he, together with George Shadford, sailed for America in 1773. Soon after his arrival, Rankin called a conference, the first ever held in America, July 4, 1773, at Philadelphia. Asbury had been previously appointed and sent over as the general assistant of the societies in America; but as Rankin had travelled several years longer, he took precedence over Asbury when he reached there. Besides, the displeasure of Wesley against the American work had probably led him to select for the place a man who could claim superiority over Asbury. Rankin, therefore, held the place of "general assistant" while here, and presided at the conferences which were convened while he was in America. He was stationed at New York and Philadelphia alternately, and remained in this country until 1778, when he again appears in England. He visited, while here, many of the churches then within the territory of the Pennsylvania Conference, and would probably have remained, had not the Revolutionary struggle made his stay ill-advised. Immediately after his return to England, he was stationed at London, where he lived two years. In 1783 he asked to be made a superannuate; and after this date he lived quietly in the English metropolis until his death, May 17, 1818.

He was buried in City Road, near Wesley. He was a truly pious man, but too stern and uncompromising to succeed as a leader; and he failed in this country to be of any especial service to Asbury, whom he was intended to assist. He never wavered in difficulties and trials, and showed a truly heroic spirit in the hour of need. His irregular education had probably as much to do with his inconsistencies of conduct as his natural propensity to the severe aspects of life. See Stevens, Hist of Methodists, i, 291; and his Hist of the M. E. Ch. (see Index). 1838. 2 vols. (2nd ed. 1839.), i. 77-124; Wakeley, Lost Chapters (see Index). Surrogate, Annals of the Amor. Pilgrim, vii, 25-54.

Ransom (רמיס, pidyon), Exod. xxix, 30; "redemption," Ps. xlix, 8; or רמיס, pidyon, "redemption," Numn. iii, 49, 51; elsewhere הָרָם, הָרָם, נֵדָד, נֵדָד, to act the part of God (q. v.); נְוֵדָד, נְוֵדָד, a price paid to recover a person or thing from one who detains that person or thing in captivity. Hence prisoners of war or slaves are said to be ransomed when they are liberated in exchange for a valuable consideration. (Col. 3, 22.) A captive may be ransomed or exchanged in compensation for the party is his ransome; but the word ransome is more extensively taken in Scripture. A man is said to ransom his life (Exod. xxx, 30); that is, to substitute a sum of money instead of his life as the penalty of certain offences (Exod. xxx, 12; Job xxxvi, 18). The poll-tax of half a shekel for every Hebrew was deemed the ransome, or atonement money, and was declared to be a heave-offering to Jehovah, to propitiate for their lives (Exod. xxx, 12). See also, in the light of the Levitical and trespases-offering might be regarded as communications or ransoms (Lev. iv, 1-5; v, 1-19).

In like manner, our Blessed Lord is said to give himself a ransome (or all (1 TIM. ii, 6; Matt. xx, 23; Mark x, 45)—a substitute for them, bearing sufferings in their stead, undergoing that penalty which would otherwise attach to them (Rom. iii, 21; 7 Cor. i, 30; Eph. i, 7; iv, 30; Heb. ix, 18). See Redemption.

Ranters is (1) one of the many names by which the Presbyterians designated the most advanced of the mystical radicals of the Cromwellian period. They were Antinomian heretics, and were probably related to the Quakers (q. v.), to whom they are often compared. In Rome's Hibernica, the Ranters are described as making an open profession of lewdness and irreligion; as holding that God, angels, devils, heaven, hell, etc., are fictions and fables; that Moses, John the Baptist, and our Lord were impostors; that praying and preaching are useless; that all ministry has come to an end; and that sin is a mere imagination. He says that in their letters the Ranters endeavored to be strangely profane and blasphemous, uttering atheistical imprecations; and he gives a specimen which quite befits his words. He also alleges that they sanctioned and practiced community of women (ed. 1655, p. 287). Much the same account, also, is given a few years later by Pagitt (Herediography [ed. 1662], p. 259, 294). Baxter also writes respecting them: I have myself letters written from Abington, where, among both soldiers and people, this contagion did then prevail, full of horrid oaths and curses, and blasphemy not fit to be repeated by the tongue and pen of man: and this all uttered as the effect of knowledge and a part of their religion, in a fanatic strain, and fathered on the Spirit of God" (Of Ranting, p. 77). The following passage is found in a Life of Bunyan, added to an imitation of his work which is called The Third Part of the Pilgrim's Progress: "About this time" (in Bunyan's early life), "a very large liberty being given as to conscience, there started up a sort of loose, profane wretches, afterwards called Ranters and Sweet Singers, pretending themselves safe from, or being incapable of, sinning; though, indeed, they were the debauchers and profligate wretches living in their bawdy meetings and revels. For, fancying themselves in Adam's state, as he was in Paradise before the fall, they would strip themselves, both men and women, and so catch as catch could; and to it they went, to satter their lust under pretence of increasing and multiplying" (An Account of the Life and Actions of Mr. John Bunyan, etc. [London, 1692], p. 22). (See Wettenstrom, Revolutions-Kirchen Englanda [Leips. 1868], p. 107 sqq.; Blunt, Dict. of Sects, a. v., 2. (2) In recent times—since 1826—the name of "Ranters" has been given to those Primitive Methodists who separated from the main body of Methodists, and were distinguished by their unusual physical denominations.

Raclo de Flax, a French monastic, flourished near the middle of the 12th century. It is difficult to enumerate definitely his works. He is undoubtedly the author of Commentaire sur le Léxicographe (Cologne, 1536, ed.). The authors of the Literary History of
France claim for him a discourse abridged from the
Work of Six Days, which is found in a manuscript in
the King's Library, No. 647; also a Commentary on the
Proverbs, of which they mention a copy at Cambridge
in the library of Pembroke College; and a Commentary on
the Epistles of St. Paul. They add that Raoul de
Flaix, who was ordained on Nahum and the Apocalypse.
These glossaries on Nahum and the Apocalypse exist,
but under the name of Master Raoul (Magistris Ra-
dulti), in a volume of Clairvaux, which is numbered
on page 227 in the library of Troyes. But this is a
mishap, as a number of such glossaries on the Liber
Historiae. A commentary on the Song of Songs,
published in some ancient editions of Gregory the Great,
had been attributed to Raoul de Flaix. Lelong and
Mabillon having proved that this work is by Robert de
Tombelaine, abbot of St. Vign de Bayeux, the authors
of the Liber Historiae have thought it necessary, in con-
sequence, to strike the Canticle of Canticles from the
list of sacred books annotated by our Raoul. But in
that they appear to be mistaken. In fact, the volume
of Clairvaux which is to-day preserved in the library
of the abbey has these glossaries on the Apoca-
lypse and Nahum, glossaries on the Canticles entirely
different from those which have been published under
the name of Gregory and restored to the abbey Robert.
Sanders mentions also, among the works of Raoul de
Flaix, a theological summation—Summarium de sola
Patristica, De laur Cor và Orbis Coráns—
works of which we have no other account.—Hoefer,
Nov. B. Génerale, s. v.

Raoul de St. Trond, a Belgian monastic, was born
at Mouter-sur-Sambre, in the diocese of Liege,
study at Liege, and then entered the Benedictine or-
er at Lix-&-Chapelle. He was there made sacristan,
master of a school, and grand provost. He was a very
devout man; and, dissatisfied with the lax condition
of the monastery at Aix, he left for St. Trond, where,
after two years, he was made prior, and introduced
the reforms of the Cluniacs. In 1108 he was elected
abbot, and took part in the quarrel for the pope which
agitated the Liege diocese and resolved in its division.
He went twice to Rome, where he was warmly received
and had much influence. He died March 6, 1158.
He wrote: Oratio Abbatum Traditionem Ord. Sancti Ben-
decit, a Liber Archiepiscopatus Splicerniae—Di-
scepcionem Puerorum in Monasterio, in Mabillon's Annec-
ta:—Contra Simoniaca, Lib. VII, which is still in MS. See
tella Christiana, iii, 908-960; Ceillier, Hist. des

Raoul de Vaucelle, a French monastic, was born
prior of Engion, in Burgundy, and was admitted in the
first half of the 12th century, first a monk at Clairvaux,
and later as abbot of the new monastery founded at
Vaucelle, in the diocese of Cambray, by St. Bernard.
He was renowned both for his magnificence and
for his charity. In the time of want, he supported
for months as many as five thousand pavers. Charles de
Visch, in his Bibliotheca Cisterciensis, counts him among
the learned writers of his time, and attributes to him
many works; but, according to Pastoret, these works
are lost. He died in 1152.—Hoefer, Nov. B. Générale, s. v.

Rapaport, Salomo Judah Löw, a noted Jewish
scholar, was born at Lemberg, in Austrian Galicia, in
1790. He first attracted attention among his congeni-
alous by notes to a Talmudical work of his father-in-
law, and subsequently rose to the highest rank among
the Hebrew writers of the age by critical-historical
sketches of Sandia Gaon, Rabbi Nathan, Hai Gaon, the
poet Eleazar Kalir, etc., in the Bikkure ha-Itoim (Vienn-
a, 1828-31); by contributions to the Kerem Chened
(Vienna and Prague, 1863-48); and by numerous other
dissertations in Hebrew and German, inserted in vari-
ous other publications. He translated into Hebrew
verse Racine's Esther, entitled דובשת
(Vien-
nan, 1827). He also published, under the title of מ"ש
§", a linguistic and archaeological lexicon, of which
only one part has as yet appeared (Prague, 1852).
Boetticher continued Racinet's work on the Bikkure ha-
Itoim by the cipher מ"ש. Having officiated for some time
as rabbi at Tarnopol, he was elected, in 1840, to fill a
similar office at Prague, where he died, Oct. 16, 1867.
Besides his numerous essays, which are to be found in
the different reviews and periodicals, he published, in
1861, a criticism on Frankel's Darke ha-Mishna, enti-
dled דיבר סדרה סדנה חלק א. In the Litera-
ture History, a commentary on the Song of Songs,
published in some ancient editions of Gregory the Great,
131 sq; Etheridge, Introduction to Hebrew Literature,
K. von der Juden, p. 218 sq.; Dessauer, Gesch. d. Israeliten,
p. 533 sq; Geiger, Jüd. Zeitschrift (1867), p. 241 sq.; de Nud)
(Neuebuesen Schriften (Berlin, 1875), ii, 262; Zunz, Die Mo-
natagute des Kalenderjahres (Eng. transl, by the Rev. B.
Pick, in the Jewish Messenger, N. Y., 1874-75); Cassel,
Leijsden zur jüd. Gesch. u. Literatur (1872), p. 114;
Deltitzch, Zur Gesch. d. jüdischen Poetik, p. 102, 118,
135; Kurzindex, S. L. Rapaport: eine biographische
Skiöze (Pesth, 1868, 1869). (B. P.)

Rafer, William H., a minister of the Methodist
Episcopal Church, was born in Western Pennsylvania,
Sept. 24, 1793. He was first brought to notice by
the service he rendered his country in the second war with
England. In 1819 he was received on trial in the Ohio
Conference, and remained in the effective ranks for about
thirty years. He served the Church in various posi-
tions, and always acceptably. He was honored by be-
ing sent to several general conferences, and had many
admirers and friends. He died while travelling with
bishop Morris to Aurora, Ind., Feb. 11, 1852. Mr. Raper was
a profound theologian, of amiable social qualities,
fearless and earnest.—Minutes of Annual Conf. of M. E.
Ch. 1852, p. 123.

Rapha (Heb. Raphah, רפא, as in 1 Chron. viii, 2),
or Raphah (Heb. Raphah', רפוא, as in 2 Sam. xxii,
16, meaning giant [q. v.], as translated in 1 Chron. xx,
4, 6, 8; 2 Sam. xxii, 16, 18, 20, 22; Sept. Rapach, v. r.
R.papai and Rapah, the name of two men. See also
Raper.

1. The last of the five sons of Benjamin, son of Ja-
cob (1 Chron. viii, 2, "Rapha"). B.C. post 1237.
The name does not occur in the original register of the
family (Gen. xli, 21); but at Num. xiii, 3, Rapha was
the name of the father of the person chosen from Ben-
jamin to spy out the land of Canaan, as having a
name, or something similar, to have belonged to the
tribe. Rapha is apparently but a variation of the
name of Rosh (q. v.). See Jacob.

2. The son of Binea, and father of Elessah, eight
in lineal descent from David's friend Jonathan (1 Chron.
vi, 37, "Raphah"). B.C. post 1000. He is called
Raphaiah in 1 Chron. ix, 43.

Raphaël (Avrappheh = רפאים, "the divine healer")
"one of the seven holy angels which ... go in and out
before the glory of the Holy One" (Tob. xii, 15). Ac-
ccordance to another Jewish tradition, Raphael was one of
the four angels that stood round the throne of God
—Michael, Uriel, Gabriel, Raphael. His place is said
to have been behind the throne, by the standard of
Ephraim (comp. Num. ii, 18); and his name was in-
terpreted as foreshadowing the healing of the schism
of Jeroboam, who arose from that tribe (1 Kings xi, 26;
see Buxtorf, Lex. Rabb. p. 47). In Tobit he appears as
the guide and counsellor of Tobias. By his help, Sara
was delivered from her plague (Tob. vi, 16, 17), and
Tobit from his blindness (xi, 7, 8). In the book of Enoch
he appears as "the angel of the spirits of men" (xx, 3;
comp. Dillmann, ad loc.). His symbolic character in
the apocryphal narrative is clearly indicated when he
is described himself as "Azarias the son of Ananiah" (Tob
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v. 12), the messenger of the Lord's help, springing from the Lord's mercy. See Tobit. The name, in its Heb. form, occurs in 1 Chron. xxvi, 7 as that of a man. See Raphael.

Raphael, Sr. (Lat. Sanctus Raphael; Ital. San Raffaello; Fr., St. Raphael; Germ., Der Heilige Raphael), the same with the above, is considered the guardian angel of humanity. He was sent to warn Adam of the danger of sin, and its unhappy consequences.

"Be strong, live happy, and love! but first of all live, for love is to obey, and his great command. Take heed lest passion swerve Thy judgment to do aught which else free-will would not till it is built, Thine and of all thy beings... The woe or woe in thee is placed. Beware!" (Milton).

He was the herald who bore to the shepherds the good tidings of great joy which shall be to all people. He is especially the protector of the young, the pilgrim, and the traveler. In the apocryphal romance, his watchful care of the young Tobias during his eventful journey is typical of his benignity and loving consideration towards those whom he protects. His countenance is represented as full of benignity. Devotional pictures portray him dressed as a pilgrim, with sandals; his hair and beard and a diadem or a sash, the staff in his hand, and a wallet, or panetierre, hung to his belt. As a guardian spirit, he bears the sword and a small case, or vase, containing the "flabby charm" (Tob. vi. 6) against evil spirits. As guardian angel, he usually leads Tobias. In painting, in the St. Raphael, in the Kunsthistorisches Museum, represents him as the guardian angel of a bishop who appears as a votary below. St. Raphael is commemorated in the Church of Rome on Sept. 12.

Raphael, or Raffaello Santi or Sanzio, called by his countrymen "Il Divino," i.e., the "Divine," is ranked by almost universal opinion as the greatest of painters. He was created by the Academies of the learned and of the nobles of the glories of art and form and color. He was born at Urbino April 6, 1483. In 1497, on the death of his father, Giovanni Santi, who was his first instructor, he was placed under Pietro Perugino (q. v.), the most distinguished painter of the period, who was then engaged on important works in the city of Perugia. The profound feeling, the mystic ecstasy, which characterized the Umbrian school while yet under the leadership of its founder, the Perugian, and before it degenerated into the coarse fatuity at which Michael Angelo sneered, took possession of the soul of Raphael. He soon acquired a wonderful facility of execution. He showed such great talent that Perugino employed him on his own works; and so well did he perform his task that it is difficult now to separate the work of the master from that of the pupil. In 1504 Raphael visited Florence, and improved his style by studying composition and expression in the works of Masaccio, the sweet and perfect modelling of Leonardo da Vinci, and color and effect in those of Fra Bartolommeo. He seems to have lived in Florence till 1508, when he went to Rome, on the invitation of pope Julius II. His celebrated frescos in the Vatican, and numerous important works, were then commenced. Julius died in 1513, but his successor, Leo X, continued Raphael's services, and kept his great powers constantly in exercise. Raphael and Rome are synonymous terms in the history of Italian art of the 16th century. Though Michael Angelo labored at Rome, and the impress of his genius is everywhere in the avenues of Roman art, yet by common consent the Roman school of art owes its origin and life to Raphael. It became the grandest of all the Italian schools of painting, and gave concrete reality to the aspirations and longings of his predecessors by carrying art to a height all but ultimate. The Roman school combined the virility and boldness of Flanders with the delicacy; and the devotional sweetness of Umbria and Siena; in short, all Italian excellences Raphael gathered in his Roman creation; but with the artist who gave it birth the school alone can be identified, and, illustrous as were many of its pupils, his own death marks the fading hour of the Roman school. Of all the Roman painters, it was Raphael alone who in his art works not less to be the measure and frame of all the knowledge, philosophy, and poetry of his time than witnesses to his genius and vouchers for what we call the immortality of his fame. He achieved the labors of a demigod; his successors wrought like mere men. Raphael had scarcely reached his prime when he was struck down by an attack of fever on the anniversary of his birth, in 1520. "The works of Raphael are generally divided into three classes: his first style, when under the influence of Perugino's manner; his second, when he painted in Florence from 1504 to 1508; and his third style, which is distinguished in the works executed by him after he settled in Rome. Each of these styles has its devoted admirers. Those who incline to art employed in the service of religion prefer the first manner, as embodying purity and religious feeling. His last manner, perfected for classical learning and art was strongly excited by the discovery of numerous valuable works of the classic period, is held by many connoisseurs as correctly embodying the highest art; while his middle, or Florentine, style is admired by some as exemplifying his powers freed from the restraint of the rules which they deem the right and easy way to build a Perugino, and untaught by the conventionalism of classic art. In all these different styles he has left works of great excellence. The Coronation of the Virgin, in the gallery of the Vatican, and the Sposalizio, or Marriage of the Virgin, in the Beata Vergine gallery at Milan, which is an improved version of Perugino's Sposalizio, painted in 1495 for the cathedral of Perugia, belong to the first period. The St. Catherine, in the National Gallery, London; the Entombment, in the Barghese Gallery, Rome; La Belle Jardiniere, in the Louvre, belong to his second period. The Sistine Chapel, at Bologna; the Madonna di San Sisto, at Dresden; the Caritosa, at Hampton Court; the Transfiguration, and all the Vatican frescos, except Theology, or the Dispute on the Sacrament, the first he executed on his arrival from Florence, are in his third manner, or that which peculiarly marks the Roman school in its highest development" (Chambers). The two great Madonnas of Raphael are the Madonna della Sedia and the Madonna di San Sisto. The former, which is at the Piti Palace, Florence, is, according to many, the best of all the same painter who have failed to obtain universal popularity. But as a representation of the Roman school of the Holy Family, nothing could be more beautifully expressed. We see only a happy mother bending over the lovely child in the intimacy of her affectionate home. The child is seen from the picture with a strange glance of conscious superiority. The Madonna di San Sisto cannot be described, and no copies of it, photographs or engravings, can convey a correct idea. In this work Raphael reached the perfection of his type, humanity raised to divinity. The grace and beauty of the Virgin seem apart from and above earthly associations. In the solemn, thoughtful, yet childlike expression of the infant Christ there is the foreshadowing of the sufferer, the Saviour, and the Judge. It is singular that this painting, until 1837, when the picture was cleaned, were the innumerable heads of angels surrounding the Virgin discovered. The Transfiguration, which was Raphael's last and also his greatest work, he left unfinished. It seems as if he had labored while already on the way to heaven, and we do not wonder that Vasari, in his ecstasy of joy over this work by human hands, with so much of heavenly skill in it, is led to exclaim, "Whosoever shall desire to see in what manner Christ transformed into the Godhead should be represented, let him come and behold it in this painting." The heavenly and the devotional, the common consent placed at the head of his art, not because he excelled all others in every department of painting, but because no other artist has ever possessed the vari-
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RAPPISTS

Rapha'hu (Heb. 'Rapha', רפָּחִיק) a name given to Judah (Judith 1:1) as that of the son of Gideon and father of Acitho in the ancestry of Judith. It is evidently כַּנַּח = Rapha' (q. v.).

Rapha'hu. He was a German rabbi, born at Stockholm, Sweden, in September, 1798. He was educated at the Jewish college in Copenhagen, and was so precocious that in his thirteenth year he received the Hebrew degree of Chalib Socius (analogous to the B.A. degree of the English university), which entitled him to the honorable designation of Rabbi. In 1812 he went to England, where he remained for six years, devoting himself to the study of the English language. The next six years he spent in travelling and studying in Europe. On his return to England in 1819 he married a Jewish lady and took up his residence in London. In 1832 he gave some lectures on the Biblical poetry of the Hebrews, and in 1834 commenced the publication of the Hebrew Review, the first Jewish publication ever issued in England. When this had reached its seventh volume, ill-health compelled him to relinquish it. In 1840 he acted as secretary of Dr. Solomon Herschel, the chief rabbi of London, and in 1841 he was appointed rabbi preacher of the synagogue at Birmingham, England. He was also the chief instrument in founding the first national school in England for the Jews, of which he acted as headmaster. In 1849, having previously received the degree of Ph.D. from the University of Giessen, he was called to New York as rabbi preacher to the Anglo-German congregation Etem Judah, where he died, June 23, 1866. His main work is his Post-Biblical History of the Jews (N. Y. 1866; 2 vols.), and the translation of Eighteen Treatises of the Mishna, in connection with D. A. de Sola (2d ed. London, 1845). Besides, he translated into English from the works of Maimonides, Albo, and Wesely, which translations are found in the Hebrew Review. (S. M. A.)

Raphael, Georg, a German Lutheran divine of some note, who was born in 1673, and was later the superintendent of Lüneburg. He died in 1740. He was one of the best commentators of that class of exegetists who have attempted to illustrate the Bible from classic authors. His Annotationes in Sacram Scripturam contains historical illustrations of some passages in the Old Testament, and philological explanations in many of the New, chiefly taken from Xenophon, Polybius, Arrian, and Herodotus. He also edited the Greek homilies of Chrysostom, with a Latin translation and notes, annexed to the edition of the Annotations published by Levison (1747, 2 vols. 8vo). See Ortelius, Bibliotheek, Bibl. s. v.; Home, Intro. to the Scriptures.

Rapha'nu (Rapha'nu; Alex. and Josephus, Rapha'nu; Peskitio, Rapphon), a city of Galilee, under the walls of which Judas Macabeus defeated Timotheus (1 Macc. vi, 37 only). It appears to have stood on the eastern side of an important wady, and at no great distance from the modern Shihertah. It may have been identical with Rapha, which is mentioned by Pliny (Nat. Hist. vi, 16) as one of the cities of the Decapolis, but with no specification of its position. Nor is there anything in the narrative of 1 Macc. (ch. ii), or in Josephus (Ant. xii, 8, 3) to enable us to decide whether the torrent in question is the Hieromax, the Zerka, or any other. In Kiepert's map, accompanying Wattenstein's Hauran, etc. (1860), a place named Er-Rafe is marked, on the east of Wady Hrân, one of the branches of the Wady Mandur, and close to the great road leading to Samâneh, which last has some claim to be identified with Acre of the Bible. In our present ignorance of the district this can only be taken as mere conjecture. If Er-Rafe be Rapha, we should expect to find large ruins.

Rapha'nu (Rapho'nu, רפה'נו). See Rapha'hu.

Rap'nu (Rapha'nu, רפה'נו), eldest; Sept. 'Rap'nu) father of Paltib, which latter was sent with Caleb and Joshua as a spy into the promised land; representing the tribe of Benjamin (Num. xiii, 9). B.C. ante 1650.

Rappists, also known as Harmonists, are a Christian people living in community of goods, and in celibate state, at Economy, Pa., in the vicinity of Pittsburgh, and hence also not infrequently called Economites. They owe their origin to George Rapp, a German, who was born at Iptingen, in Württemberg, in October, 1757, of humble parentage, and had enjoyed only a moderate education. Having always been a devout Christian and a close reader of the Bible, he became convinced that the lifeless condition of the churches was ill in accord with the vital character of apostolic Christianity, and in 1787 began to preach among those of like mind with himself. In the little sect he thus formed, he was then living. The clergy resented this interference with their office, and both Rapp and his adherents were visited with all manner of persecution, and denounced as "Separatists", a name which they bore ever after while in Germany, and which they themselves accepted gladly. In the course of six years the Rappists numbered not less than 800 families, scattered over a distance of twenty miles from the home of George Rapp. The consistent manner in which the Separatists bore themselves gave little opportunity for positive accusation, yet they were constantly annoyed with the clergy and congregation, and in 1808 finally determined to end all strife by emigration to a land of freedom. Rapp, accompanied by his son and two other followers, came to this country in advance to select a home for all like-minded with himself. In the course of one year 600 persons came over, and were settled by Rapp in different parts of Pennsylvania and Maryland, where he himself, with several skilful mechanics and ingenious persons, prepared for a family home for the Separatists the land he had purchased in Butler County, Pa., along the Conquesting Creek, Feb. 15, 1803, the future home of Rapp's town with Rapp, and such others as had followed thither, organized themselves formally and solemnly into the "Harmony Society," agreeing then to throw all their possessions into a common fund, to adopt a uniform and simple dress and style of house, to keep thereunto all things in common, and to labor for the common good of the whole body. Later in the spring they were joined by fifty additional families; and thus they finally began with what must have made up all together less than 750 men, women, and children. But these were all accustomed to labor, and with such a leader as Rapp then was—in the prime of life, only forty-eight years old, of robust frame and sound health, with great perseverance, enterprise, and executive ability, and remarkable common-sense—the society got on very successfully. In the first year they erected between forty and fifty log-houses, a church and school-house, a grist-mill, a barn, and some workshops, and cleared 150 acres of land. In the following year they cleared 400 acres more, and built a saw-mill and a tannery, and planted a small vineyard. The distillery was also a part of this year's building—a thing not so very strange in those days of general tendency towards strong drink among the laboring classes—though they themselves indulged only very moderately in any intoxicating liquors. Rapp was the general in all departments. He planned for all, he was the ablest tanner, carpenter, and mason, and the best keeper.

Until 1807 community of goods and the hope of the
approach of the millennial reign alone distinguished the Rappists from other Christians; but in that year an unusual religious awakening led them to determine upon a still closer life with God, and, having become persuaded that it was the duty of the followers of Jesus to conform their lives to the teachings of Christ and his apostles, the Rappists, in the spirit of the apostle Paul, that "He that is unmarried careth for the things that belong to the Lord, how he may please the Lord; but he that is married careth for the things of the world, how he may please his wife," forsook marriage, and since that time celibacy is one of the distinguishing tenets of the Harmonists, and they that have wives do truly live "as though they had none." A member writing on the constancy of the Rappists to the decision of 1807, in 1862, says, "Convinced of the truth and holiness of our purpose, we voluntarily and unanimously adopted celibacy, altogether from religious motives, in order to withdraw our love entirely from the lusts of the flesh, which, with the help of God and much prayer and spiritual warfare, we have succeeded well in doing now for fifty years."

In 1814 the Rappists determined to remove to Indiana, and the unanimity of feeling which prevailed when the council so ordered proved how well organized and how sincere they all were. They settled in the Wabash Valley, on a tract of 27,000 acres, and called the place "New Harmony"—a property which, in 1824, they sold to Robert Owen (q.v.), who settled upon it his New Lanark colony—and bought and removed to the property they still hold at Economy. For some years the society was in a most flourishing condition, and, by frequent accessions from Germany, maintained their ground remarkably until 1831, when an adventurer—Bernhard Muller by right name, who had assumed the title Graf, or count, Maximilian de Leon, and had gathered a following of visionary Germans—joined the Economists, and sowed the seed of discord. In 1835, determined upon a dissolution, and 250 members—about one third—the Economy for Philadelphia, where they settled, to break up in a short time, and finally to furnish a small quota to the Bethel Community in Missouri. Thereafter the Economists no more sought for accession. But they have steadily increased in wealth in spite of all their removals and numerical decadence; and now own, besides their village and estate at Economy, much property in other places, having a large interest in coal-mines and oil-wells, and railroads and manufactories, and controlling at Beaver Falls the coal conveyed by the Union_Stream to the United States.

At present the town of Economy contains about 120 houses, very regularly built, and it is well drained and paved. It has water led from a reservoir in the hills, abundant shade-trees, a church, an assembly hall, a store, and different factories. The house which the society built for their founder is a sort of museum, and serves also as a pleasure resort to all that remain of the Rappists, who, according to Nordhoff, number about 110 persons, most of whom are aged, and none under forty, with some 85 adopted children, and an equal number living there with parents who are hired laborers in the number of 100. The whole population is German, and German is the medium of communication on the street and in the church, as well as in the houses. Most of the men wear for week-day dress blue "roundabouts," like boys' spencers, and pantaloons of the same color and broad-brimmed hats; and are full of quiet dignity and genuine politeness. On Sunday the men wear long coats. The women are dressed quite as oddly as the men, with their short loose gowns, kerchiefs across the shoulders, and caps that run up to the top of a high back-corn. The predominant color is blue. Harmony was founded by Rapp and his associates when they came to this country, and continued from choice by them and their successors.

The agreement, or articles of association, under which the "Harmony Society" was formed in 1805, and which has been signed by all members henceforward, reads as follows:

"Whereas, by the favor of Divine Providence, an association or community has been formed by George Rapp and many others upon the basis of Christian fellowship, the principles whereof, being faithfully derived from the Sacred Scriptures, include the government of the patriarchal ages, unchangeable, which consist of the days of the apostles, and wherein the simple object sought is to approximate, so far as human imperfections may allow, to the ideal of the will of God, we, from the love of those affections and the practice of those virtues which are essential to the happiness of man in time and throughout eternity, and whose essential life is the spirit of love, in order that our effort as a community be clearly understood, and that the rights, privileges, and duties of every individual therein should be regulated as to prevent mistreatment on the one hand, and contention or disagreement on the other;" Thereby it is known to all whom it may concern that we, the undersigned, citizens of the county of Beaver, in the commonwealth of Pennsylvania, do severally and distinctly, each for himself, or, mutatis mutandis, agree and, to and with the said George Rapp and his associates:

"Article 1. We, the undersigned, for ourselves, our heirs, executors, and administrators, do hereby give, grant, and forever convey to the said George Rapp and his associates, and to their heirs and assigns, all our property, real, personal, and mixed, wheresoever situated, testaments, goods and chattels, money or debts due to us, jointly or severally, in possession, in remainder, or in reversion, or vested, or unvested, whatsoever and wherefore, to be exempt from all right of evasion, qualification, or reserve, as a free gift or donation, for the benefit and use of the said association or community, and we will, and do hereby consent and set the same, not only by the said George Rapp and his associates, but by all others who now or hereafter may be under our control.

"Article 2. We do further covenant and agree to and with the said George Rapp and his associates that we will severally submit faithfully to the constitution and by-laws of said community, and will at all times manifest a ready and cheerful obedience towards those who are or may be appointed by the superintendents of the said association, or by any of the apprentices, as superintendents of the said association, and to place the said property at the full disposal of the superintendents of the said community without reserve and prejudice.

"Article 3. If, contrary to our expectation, it should so happen that we could not render the faithful obedience aforesaid, and should be induced from that or any other cause to withdraw from the said association, then in such case we do expressly covenant and agree to and with the said George Rapp and his associates that we will never claim or demand, either for ourselves, our children, or their heirs, or representatives, nor, directly or indirectly, any compensation, wages, or reward whatever for our or their labor or services rendered to the said community, or to any of the said superintendents; but whatever we receive jointly or severally shall or may do, all shall be held and considered as compensation for services voluntary and gratuitous.

"Article 4. In consideration of the premises, the said George Rapp and his associates do, by these presents, adopt the constitution and by-laws jointly and severally, as the special conditions of the said community, whereby each of them obtains the privilege of being present at all religious meetings, and of receiving not only for themselves, but also for their children and families, all such instructions in church and school as may be reasonably required, or, both for their temporal good and for their eternal felicity.

"Article 5. The said George Rapp and his associates further agree to supply the undersigned severally with all the necessities of life, as clothing, meal, drink, lodging, etc., for themselves and their families. And this provision is not a substitute for their days of health and strength, but when any of them shall become sick, infirm, or otherwise unable to work, they shall be allowed as before, together with such medicine, care, attendance, and consolation as their situation may reasonably demand. And if at any time any of them shall become members of the association, the father or mother of a family should die or be otherwise separated from the community, the husband or wife shall not be left orphans or desolate, but shall be provided with rights and means to support life as long as they remain in the association, as well in sickness as in health, and to such extent as their circumstances may require.

"Article 6. And if it should so happen, as above mentioned, that any of the undersigned should violate or their agreement, or that we would or could not, under any circumstances, conform to the laws and regulations of the Church or the community, and for the violation of other cause should be excluded from the said association, then the said George Rapp and his associates agree to refund to him or them the value of all such property as he or they may have brought into the community,
In compliance with the first article of this agreement, the said value to be refunded without interest, in one, two, or three annual installments, as the said George Rapp and his assigns may direct. On account of the said indemnity in the event of their separation, so withdrawing themselves were poor, and brought nothing to the land; and from the time that they do part openly and regularly, they shall receive a donation in money, according to the length of their stay and to their contribution as such, and they may require, in the judgment of the superintendents of the association.

In 1818 a book in which was recorded the amount of property contributed by each member to the general fund and was destroyed. In 1836 a change was made in the formal constitution or agreement above quoted, in the following words:

"1. The sixth article [in regard to refunding] is entirely annulled and made void, as if it had never existed; all others to remain in full force as heretofore. 2. All the property of the society, real, personal, and mixed, in law or equity, and however controlled or acquired, shall be deemed, now and forever, joint and indivisible stock. Each individual is to be considered to have finally and irrevocably parted with all his former contributions, whether in lands, goods, money, or labor; and the same rule shall apply to all future contributions, whether they may be in new stock or any individual withdraw from the society or depart this life, whether he, in the one case, or not the representative of the other, shall be entitled to any demand or account of said contributions, or to claim anything from the society as a matter of right. But it shall be left absolutely in the discretion of the society to decide whether any, and if any, what allowance shall be made to such member or his representative as a donation."

On the death of "Father" Rapp, Aug. 7, 1847, the arrearage due him by the widow, her son, and two trustees and seven elders were put in office to perform all the duties and assume all the authority which their founder had relinquished with his life.

Under this simple constitution the Harmony Society has flourished for sixty-nine years; nor has its life been threatened by disagreements, except in the case of the count de Leon's intrigue. It has suffered three or four lawsuits from members who had left it, but in every case the courts have decided for the society, after elaborate, and in some cases long-continued trials. It has always lived in peace and friendship with its neighbors.

Its real estate and other property was, from the foundation until his death in 1834, held in the name of Frederick (Reichert) Rapp, who was an excellent business man, and conducted all its dealings with the outside world, and had charge of its temporalities generally, as well as of its spiritual business. Upon Frederick Rapp's death the society formally and unanimously imposed upon father Rapp the care of the temporal as well as the spiritual affairs of the little commonwealth, placing in his name the title to all their property. But, as has been seen, this interference with his spiritual functions, and as, besides, he was then growing old, being in 1834 seventy-seven years of age, he appointed as his helpers and subagents two members, R. L. Baker and J. Henri, the latter of whom is still, with Mr. Jonathan Lenz, the head of the society, Mr. Baker having died several years ago.

The theological belief of the Harmony Society naturally crystallized under the preaching and during the life of father Rapp. It has some features of German mysticism, grafted upon a practical application of the Christian dogmatics and theory. At the foundation of all lies a strong determination to make the preparation of their souls or spirits for the future life the pre-eminent business of life, and to obey in the strictest and most literal manner what they believe to be the will of God, as revealed and declared by Jesus Christ. In the following paragraphs is given a brief summary of what may be called their creed:

1. They hold that Adam was created "in the likeness of God"; that he was a dual being, containing within his own person both humanity and divinity, the latter being the deific element in him. In confirmation of this, the text (Gen. 1, 26, 27), "And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness; and let them have dominion;" and the created man, in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them; which they hold to denote that both the Creator and the first created were of this dual nature. They believe that had Adam been content to remain in his original state, he would have increased without the help of a female, bringing forth new beings like himself to replenish the earth.

2. But Adam, being so constituted, withdrew from God separated from his body the female part, and gave it him according to his desire, and therein they believe consisted the fall of man.

3. From this they deduce that the celestial state is more pleasing to God; that in the renewed world man will be restored to that which he did like and Adam and Adam will live.

4. They hold that the coming of Christ and the renovation of the world are near at hand. This nearness of the millennium is a cardinal point of doctrine with them; and father Rapp firmly believed that he would live to see it. He wished that the residence of Christ in the world were to remain in the same language as the one which they held to be the last of the great commandments of Jesus, as the latter had delivered these with their lives. The truth was belief in him that it led some of his followers to loudly fancy that father Rapp would not die in the midst of his coming; and with touching story of the old man that when he felt death upon him, at the age of ninety, he said, "If I did not know that the dear Lord meant I should present you all to him, I should think my last moments come." These were indeed his last words. To be in constant readiness for the reappearance of Christ is one of the aims of the society; nor have its members ever faltered in the faith that this great event is about to come.

5. Jesus they hold to have been born "in the likeness of the Father;" that is to say, a dual being, as Adam before the fall.

6. They hold that Jesus taught and commanded a community of goods, and refer to the examples of the early Christians as Christ's church.

7. They believe in the ultimate redemption and salvation of all mankind; they hold that only such dwellers in the celestial life, and otherwise conform to what they understand to be the commandments of Jesus, will come at last into the bright and glorious companionship of Christ and his companions; that offenders will undergo a probation for purification.

8. They respect and detest what is commonly called "Spiritualism."

-Nordhoff, "Communitistic Societies," p. 81-86.

Raratongan Version. Raratonga, the largest and most important of the Harveys Islands, between 300 and 600 miles west of Tahiti, and discovered by the Rev. John Williams, of the London Missionary Society, in 1823, is inhabited by about 3500 inhabitants. The language of Raratonga is spoken throughout the other six islands of the Harvey group; and although it has a close affinity to the Tahitian and Marquesian idioms, yet a distinct version of the Scriptures was found necessary. The Raratongan version, mainly devoted on Rev. John Williams, and in 1830 the Gospel of St. John and the Epistle to the Galatians were printed. In 1836 an edition of 5000 copies of the New Testament was published in London by the British and Foreign Bible Society. In 1844 a second edition of the Acts was printed, and in 1851 the entire Scriptures were published by the same society, having availed itself of the Raratongan version prepared by Mr. Buzaecott, a missionary at Raratonga. Of the first edition 5000 copies were printed, but in 1854 a subsequent edition of 5000 copies was necessary, which is still in course of circulation. The good effects of reading this version, and the change thereby produced in the state and character of the natives of Raratonga, have been thus described by the martyred Williams: "In 1825 I found them all heathen; in 1834 they were entire Christians. At the former period I found them with idols and marae; these, in 1834, were destroyed. I found them without a written language, and left them reading in their own tongue the wonderful works of God." See "The Bible of Every Land," p. 257 sq. (B. P.)

Rashba (S. רשק), the initials of Rabbi Solomon ben-Abraham Ibo-Sdrat, a native of Barcelona, who was born about 1280, and died in 1349. He was under Nachmaniades (q.v.), and in 1280 he was acknowledged president of the school of Barcelona, and a kind of oracle with the East and the West, with which he maintained an extensive correspondence. He was an acute thinker, an enemy to all equivocation, and an advocate of the open truth. He wrote a large collec-
RASHABAM (ר"ת של רבי סימון בן-זאמה ד"ר), the initials of RASHI. Simon ben Zemach Duran, who belonged to a family which, originally of Provence, was then settled in Spain, and ultimately emigrated to Algiers. In the persecution that took place in 1351, Simon Duran, with a number of his coreligionists, emigrated to Algiers, where, from his profound learning, he obtained the title of The Rabbi of the Great. Here he succeeded Ribash (q. v.), who also had fled from Spain, as the head of all the Jewish congregations, which position he occupied until his death, in 1444. He wrote various works, some so violent against Christianity and Moslems that they have very probably been suppressed or lost. One of the works that have been preserved is ה"㬪, The Lover of the Just, a commentary on Job, with an introduction on the principles upon which it should be expounded; edited by José Malcaho (Venice, 1590), and reprinted in Frankforter's Rabbinic Bible: — ר"ו, Shield of the Fathers, a great theological work, in three parts, treating of different subjects, especially of the fundamental articles of religion; to be found in the Bodleian and in the Oppenheimer collection. The second part is a commentary on the tractate Abodah (Livorno, 1762; Leipzig, 1855), while the third part, which is very severe against Christians and Turks, has been published by his son under the title שליחוה ר"ו, Bow and Shield. He was also famed for his medical abilities, and practiced with great reputation in Aragon. His profound erudition in Rabbinical lore, philosophy, and medicine procured for him the esteem of the learned Israelis of his time. His learned solutions of upwards of 700 points of law are consulted at the present day. See Forst, Bibl. Jud. i, 216 sq.; De Rossi, Dizionario Storico degli Autori Ebrei (Germ. transl.), p. 96; id., Bibliotheca Antiqua-Judaica, p. 109, 111; Lindo, Hist. of the Jews in Spain, p. 194; Finn, Sephardim, p. 387; Basnage, Hist. des Juifs (Taylor's transl.), p. 657; Steinhauser, Jewish Literature, p. 128; and Ethier, Intro. to Hebrew Literature, p. 289; Gritz, Gesch. d. Juden (1876), viii, 101, 154, 170 sq.; Jost, Gesch. d. Juden, u. s. Secten, iii, 67; Zunz, Literaturgesch. d. synagog. Poesie (Bresl. 1865), p. 251; Cassel, Leibnisd. jud. Gesch. u. Literatur (1879); but especially Jaulius, R. Simon ben-Zemach Duran, in Frankel's Monatschrift, 1874, p. 241 sq. (B. F.)

Rashi (ר' שמעון בן-חמד), formed of the initials of Rabbi Solomon Leizakhi, or Isaak ben Isaac, the great Talmudic scholar and commentator, founder of the Germano-French school of Biblical exegesis, and succesor to Rashi, called Jarchi, was born in 1040 at Troyes, in Champagne, and not at Luneul, in Perigianon. He was the grandson of a thorough Talmudist, and thus from his youth imbued an insatiable desire to become master of Rabbinic lore. He was a pupil of R. Isaac ben-Jakar, the greatest pupil of Rabbi Gershon (q. v.). As to the extent of his scholarly institutions, it is a matter of dispute. Basanone terms him one of the most learned of the rabbis, while Jost takes a low estimate of his scientific and literary attainments. However this may be, he was certainly a man of great erudition in the ordinary learning of his people, the Holy Scriptures, and the whole cycle of Talmudic lore. He spent much of his life in wandering from place to place, visiting the different seats of learning in Italy, Greece, Palestine, Egypt, Persia, and Germany, giving lectures and maintaining disputations in the Jewish schools. At Wiesbaden they may still show, as they could a few years ago, the chamber where he taught a class of students, and the stone seat hewn in the wall from which he dispensed his instructions. His famous lectures secured for him the distinction of Rabbi in the ordinary meaning of that term (ד"нятиית, i.e., Interpreter of the Law), which is the name of one of Haman's sons (Esther ix, 7). Under the title שליחוה ר"ל, E. Le wrote a commentary on thirty treaties of the Talmud, printed in the editions.
RASHI

of that work, and the several books separately in many different editions; they are also published with supercommentaries and glossaries: — מִדְרַשִּׁים לֶאֱדוֹנִי יִבְשָׂם, תּוֹעַבָּה יִבְשָׂם, א Kas par excellence, in all the Rashi commentaries. The following are the most important and generally accessible:

1. A Commentary on the Mishnah, condemned from that on the Talmud (Berlin, 1716).— A Commentary on the 100 Chapters of the Bereshith Rabba (Venice, 1566).— A collection of Halachoth, entitled מִדְרַשׁ מִשְׁנָה (Constant, 1802);— penitential hymns, or Selichoth. Besides these, and other works too many to be enumerated, he also wrote on the Old Testament, under the general title of מִדְרַשׁ וַיְסֹרֵךְ, מִדְרַשׁ וַיְסֹרֵךְ, מִדְרַשׁ וַיְסֹרֵךְ, מִדְרַשׁ וַיְסֹרֵךְ, which, for the most part, is found in the Rabbinic Bibles. They have also been published in different portions in numerous editions, with and without the text, especially that on the Pentateuch, a good and critical edition of which has been edited by Dr. A. Berliner (Berlin, 1866). Various parts have also been translated into Latin by different authors, but more extensively by B. J. F. Breithaupt, 1719—1721;—b. J. F. Breithaupt, 1719;— P. J. Prophets, Job, and Psalms, 1719), who also accompanied the translation with a very learned and extensive annotation, besides giving the supercommentaries entitled מִדְרַשׁ לְיִשְׂרָאֵל by Löwe (Prague, 1758), and מִדְרַשׁ לְיִשְׂרָאֵל by Sabatiai Bassi. Rashi, having been long engaged in writing annotations on the Talmud, formed the habit of composing after the manner of that work, in an extreme concise and obscure style, and with the frequent use of its terms and idioms. He condensed as much as possible, and endeavored to give the precise original thought by a natural method of interpretation, by explaining the grammar of the passage, by paraphrasing its meaning, by supplying the wanting members of elliptical forms, and by sometimes rendering a word or expression into the French of that day. At the same time, he did not fail to bring forward the received interpretations of the Talmud and Midrashim, and to point out the support which the Rabbinical Halachoth receive from such passages as he thought available. The rigid brevity of his style, which often leaves the reader in perplexity as to his meaning, has served to call forth a number of supercommentaries on his works by several Jewish authors, which are enumerated in his works. In the Rashi, he combines the traditional exposition contained in the Talmud and Midrashim with a simple and liberal explanation of the text, and does not see any inconsistency in putting side by side with the Halachic and Haggadic interpretation of the Talmud, which are sometimes at variance with tradition. Though unacquainted with the labors of the Spanish grammarians and expositors, he incorporates in his commentaries all the lore contained in the cabbalistic Jewish tradi-


Raskolnikis (that is, Schismatics), the general name used to denote the various sects which have dissented from the Russian Orthodox Church. The first body that left the Russian Church was the sect of the Strigolniks, which arose in the 14th century. Another more remarkable sect appeared in the latter part of the 15th century in the republic of Novgorod, teaching that Judaism was the true religion, and that Christianity was a usurpation because the Messiah was not yet born. The chief promoters of this sect were two priests called Dionysius and Alexius, the protopapas of the cathedral of Novgorod, together with one named Gabriel, and a layman of high rank. These secret Jews conformed outwardly to the Greek Church with so great strictness that they were permitted to be exempted from some saints, and one of them, Zosimus by name, was raised in, 1490, to the dignity of archbishop of Moscow, and thus became head of the Russian Church. By the open profession of adherence to the Establishment Church of the country, the members of this Jewish, or rather Judaizing, sect managed to conceal their principles from public notice; but they were at length dragged to light by Gennadius, bishop of Novgorod, who accused them of having altered their images of the saints; of having planted these images in the places of the real saint; of having cut off their teeth; of having spit upon the cross, blasphemed Christ and the Virgin, and denied a future life. The grand duke ordered a synod to be convened at Moscow on Oct. 17, 1490, to consider these charges; and although several of the members wished to examine the accused by torture, they were obliged to examine themselves with anathematizing and imprisoning them. Those, however, who were sent back to Novgorod were more harshly treated. "Attired," says count Krainski, "in fantastic dresses intended to represent demons, and having their heads covered with high caps of bark, bearing the inscription, 'This is Satan's militia,' they were placed backwards on horses, by order of the bishop, and paraded through the streets of the town, exposed to the insults of the populace. They had after wards their caps burned upon their heads, and were confined in a prison—a barbarous treatment, undoubtedly, but still humane considering the age, and compared to that which the heretics received during that as well as the following century in Western Europe."

The metropolitan Zosimus, finding that the sect to which he secretly belonged was now no longer heretical, resigned his dignity in 1494, and retired into a convent. About the beginning of the 16th century, a number of these Judaizing sectarians fled to Germany and Lithuania, and several others who remained in Russia were burned alive. The sect is said to have existed about this time; but there is still found, even at the present day, a sect of the Raskolnikis which observes sev-
eral of the Mosaic rites, and are called Sabbnitici, or Saturday-men, because they observe the Jewish instead of the Christian Sabbath.

Soon after the Reformation, though Protestant doctrine was of none unknown in Russia, a sect of heretical Raskolnikis arose who began to teach that there were no sacraments, and that the belief in the divinity of Christ, the ordinances of the councils, and the holiness of the saints was erroneous. A council of bishops convened to try the heretics condemned them to be imprisoned for life. Towards the middle of the 17th century various sects arose in consequence of the emigrations introduced into the text of the Scriptures and the Liturgical books by the patriarch Nicon. This reform gave rise to the utmost commotion in the country, and a large body both of priests and laymen violently opposed what they called the Nicomian heresy, alleging that the changes in question did not correct, but corrupt, the sacred books and the true doctrine. The opponents of the amended books were numerous and violent, particularly in the north of Russia, on the shores of the White Sea. By the Established Church they were now called Raskolnikis. They propagated their opinions throughout Siberia and other distant provinces. A great number of them emigrated to Poland and even to Turkey, while the remainder numbered numerous settlements. Among the most fanatical of these was a king of France, who, while in the course of a voluntary suicide, through means of what they called a baptism of fire; and it is believed that instances of this superstition occur even now in Siberia and the northern parts of Russia.

The Raskolnikis are divided into two great branches, the Poporoschi and the Bezpoporoschi, the former having priests, and the latter none. These again are subdivided into a great number of sects, all of which, however, are included under the general name of Raskolnikis. The Poporoschi are split into several parties in consequence of a difference of opinion among them on various points, but particularly on outward ceremonies. They consider themselves as the true Church, and regard it as an imperative duty to retain the uncorrected text of the sacred books. They consider it to be very sinful to shave the beard, to eat hares, or to drive a carriage with one pole. The separation between the Raskolnikis and the Established Church was rendered complete by Peter the Great, who insisted upon all his subjects adopting the civilised customs of the West, and one of which was the shaving of the beard. Peter's memory is in consequence detested by the Raskolnikis; and some of them maintain that he was the real Antichrist, having shown himself to be so by changing the times, transferring the beginning of the year from March 1st to July 1st, abolishing the reckoning of the time from the beginning of the world, and adopting the chronology of the Latin heretics who reckon from the birth of Christ.

The most numerous class of the Raskolnikis are adherents of the old text, who call themselves Storovertizi (those of the old faith), and are officially called Storoberdizi (those of the old rites). There are very numerous sects also included under the general denomination of Bezpoporoschi, but these are without any priests. The most remarkable are the Sptizti, or Unuchiti, the Kherestochi, or Flagellantu; the Malokun, and the Iuchodosti. But the purest of all the sects of Russian dissenters are the Martinita, who arose in the beginning of the present century, and have solemnised themselves by their heathenism and pure morality. See RUSSIAN SECTS; RUSSO-GREEK CHURCH.

Rasponi, Cesare, an Italian cardinal, was born at Ravenna, July 15, 1615, of noble family, and lived at Rome in his youth. He studied under the Jesuits with such success that they made him head of their school at fourteen years of age. Urban VIII gave him, among other presents, an abbey with a rent of 300 crowns. A poem entitled Princps Hiero-politicus, dedicated to the pope, testified to the gratitude of the young beneficiary. He studied Greek; wrote some poetry, both serious and comic, in Italian; and, by the advice of cardinal Barberini, he abandoned his studies of antiquity for canonical law. Admitted to the degree of Doctor, he took possession, in 1636, of a prebendaryship of the Collegiate Church of St. John Lateran. The office of keeper of the records of that chapter gave him the opportunity to collect materials for the history of that church, which he published in 1656. He showed so much zeal and prudence in fulfilling the important duties with which he was intrusted that Innocent X., enemy of the Barberini, loaded him with additional favours. During a voyage which he made to France, he recognised cardinal Barberini with the pope, and was so happy as to put an end to the division which had existed so long between these two families, arresting the marriage of the niece of Innocent X. with Maffeo Barberini. There is a curious manuscript of this voyage in existence. Commencing Nov. 5, 1648, and ending March 19, 1649. Being appointed health officer by Alexander VII, he saved the pontifical domain from the pestilence and famine which ravaged the neighboring countries. In the great quarrel which happened between the Corin- cian guards and the duke de Cruxy, and the murder of the king of France, his action was most beneficial to the interests of the pope. He showed such a spirit of conciliation that, after the treaty of Pass, concluded in 1664, the pope accorded to him the cardinal's hat (1666), and called him to the government of the duchy of Urbino, which he kept in spite of that badly suffering. He died at Rome, Nov. 21, 1675. His tomb is in the Church of St. John Lateran. He left a large part of his wealth to the hospital of the catacombes. We have of his works Historia Italice S. Ioannis Laterani; he also left in manuscript. Memoires sur sa Vie, Descri des des Statuts, etc.—Heuveler. Nouv. Biog. Générale, s. v.

Rasponi, Felice, an Italian nun, was born at Ravenna in 1528 of an illustrious house, which, since the 12th century, had given prelates, captains, senators, and magistrates to several little Italian states. She was but three years old when the death of her father, senator Zocchi, left her to the care of a motherless boy, her brother, with great rigor. In order to divert her mind from the severe treatment she had to endure, she learned the Latin language; studied, in the translations, Aristotle and Plato; and made the works of the holy fathers the object of her constant meditation. She was sent to the convent of Saint Andrea di Ravenna. Her learning and beauty were celebrated by many poets of the time. She was chosen superior of the convent in 1607. She died July 3, 1573. She left a Traite de la Connaissance de Dieu, and a Dialogue sur l'Excellence de l'Etat Monacal. See Heuveler. Nouv. Biog. Générale, s. v.

Rasapos, Children of (ποιο Ποζωνί), Vulg. filii Tharsis, one of the nations whose country was ravaged by Holofemes in his approach to Jutland (Judith ii. 25 only). They are named next to Lud (Lydia), and apparently south thereof. The old Latin version reads Thurus quidem, and Thar, Tharsis, with some reservation, as in the Peshito. Both are in agreement before the present corruption of its text. Wolff (Juss Huc Judith) [1681], p. 95, 96 restores the original Chaldean text of the passage as Thars and Rassos, and compares the latter name with Rhous, a place on the coast, near the mouth of the Rasos (modern Ros). The name is frequent in the region between the Rasos (modern Scopus, and Iakendorf, or Alexandria). If the above restoration of the original text is correct, the interconnection of Meshech and Rassos, as connected with Thar, or Tharsis (see Gen. x. 2), is very remarkable; since if Meshech be the original of Muscorius, Rassos can hardly be less remarkable than that of Rassos—Rassos—Smith. The Vulg. reads Tharsis, which has led some to suppose that the original was ἱππος, and that Tharsus is meant. Friztache proposes to find the place in
RASTALL

John, a learned London printer of the first half of the 16th century, deserves a place here for his controversy with John Frith, which resulted in his becoming a Protestant. He was educated at Oxford, and he died in 1536. Though he printed, edited, and translated as well as composed many books, he is principally known in connection with his Three Dissourses, of which the New Boke of Purgatory (1530, fol.) was answered by Frith; his Apology against John Frith; and The Church of John Rastall. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth. ii, 1734; Wood, Athenae Oxon. i, 100.

Rastenburg, Conversation at. This was a religious conference, held in 1581, to consider the rights of the Anabaptists. On the Lutheran side, the debate was conducted by Polander (q. v.), Speratus (q. v.), and Brismann; on the part of the Anabaptists, Peter Zenker (q. v.), preacher at Dantzic, replied. Duke Albert was present, and finally decided against the Anabaptists, who were banished peremptorily from the country. The Conversation at Rastenburg had been preceded by a synod, held there in 1530, on which occasion Zenker had presented his confession of faith.

Rastignac, Armand Anne Auguste Antonin Sicaire, de Chapt de, a French prelate, nephew of Louis Jacques (q. v.), was born in 1726. He had scarcely reached the degree of D.D. when he was made vicar-general of the archbishop of Arles. In the conference of the clergy in 1755 and 1769, he voted for the refusal of sacraments to the opponents of the bull Unigenitus. Three times he refused the bishopric; and when, in 1773, his uncle, marshal Biron, obtained for him, without his knowledge, the Abbey of Saint-Mesmain, in the diocese of Orleans, he hastened to resign a priory which he held in commendam. He was deputed by the clergy to the States-general in 1789; but in August, 1792, he was imprisoned, and on the 8th of September his nomination was made a question of public interest. His works are: Questions sur la Propriete des biens-fonds Ecclesiastiques en France (Paris, 1789, 8vo) — Accord de la Revolution et de la Raison contre le Dieu (ibid. 1791, 8vo). See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s. v.

Rastignac, Aymeric, de Chapt de, a French prelate, was born about 1315. He was a descendant of an ancient family, originally from Limousin. After filling various important episcopal posts, he became, in 1359, bishop of Volterra, Tuscany. In 1361 he was transferred by Innocent VI to the bishopric of Boulogne, and at the same time he was made governor of that city. In 1364 the emperor Charles IV conferred on him the title of "prince of the empire." While chancellor of the University at Boulogne, he made for it a name which it preserved for a long time. In 1371 George XI transferred him to the bishopric of Limoges, and in 1372 the duke of Anjou made him governor-general of Limousin. He died at Limoges, Nov. 10, 1390. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s. v.

Rastignac, Louis Jacques, de Chapt de, a French prelate, was born at Rastignac in 1684. He was the third son of Francois de Chapt, marquis of Rastignac. In 1714, after having been made prior of the Barbonne, and also grand vicar of Lyon, he received the degree of D.D. In 1720 he was made bishop of Tulle; and in 1725 the king gave him the abbey La Couronne, in the diocese of Angouleme, and, two days afterwards, transferred him to the archbishopric of Tours. Pope Benedict XIII excommunicated him in a short speech in 1725, on account of the zeal which he showed in opposing the Jansenists: but the many dissections which he afterwards had with the Jesuits caused him to favor the Gallican body, and even the Jansenists. He had displayed so much talent in the meetings of the clergy in 1725, 1724, and 1724 that he was chosen to preside over those of 1745, 1747, and 1748; and the speeches which he delivered during the different sessions are monuments of his knowledge and eloquence.

In 1746 he established the foundling hospital, Madeleine, at Tours. By a mandamus, in 1747, he condemned the book of père Fichon, L'Esprit de l'Eglise: and, in order to counteract the pernicious principles in this book, in 1748 and 1749 he wrote three works—one upon repentance, one upon communion, and the third upon Christian justice in relation to the sacraments of penance and the eucharist. So many complaints were made that Cardinal Rohan, by order of the king, instructed four bishops to examine the work. They wrote to M. de Rastignac, asking for explanations, but he refused to make any. He used the greater part of his income in assisting the poor. He died Aug. 2, 1750. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s. v.

Rat. See Mole.

Ratcliffe, William P., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Williamsburg, Va., Feb. 18, 1810. He was admitted to the ministry in the fall of 1834, and was transferred to the Arkansas Conference at its first session, 1836. He labored faithfully for more than thirty years, not only filling circuits, stations, and districts, but also serving as Bible agent. He died in the village of Mount Ida, Montgomery Co., Ark., May 1, 1868. — Min. of Annual Conf., M. E. Ch., South, 1868, p. 274.

Ratel, Louis Jean Baptiste Justin, a French priest, was born at St. Omer, Dec. 14, 1758. He was the son of a hatter, and was placed by his uncle, a dignitary in one of the abbeys of Artois in the Seminary of the Thirty-three at Paris, where he studied theology. Having taken license, he was, while yet very young, appointed to the living of Dunkirk. But, although French, this parish was dependent on the Dutch diocese of Ypres, and each new prelate was an occasion of litigation. The abbot Ratel defended this benefice when the Revolution broke out. Having taken up arms in 1792, he did not wait to be exempted from the service on account of the weakness of his sight; and, during the terror of the period, he took refuge with his family in the village of La Roche-Guyon. He afterwards returned to Paris, and organized and directed the correspondence with the Venetians and the Norman Federation. He aided, also, the famous English admiral Sir William Sidney Smith to escape from the Jacobins. The family arms which attracted attention, particularly that one which related to the coup d'état of 18th Brumaire. Concealed in Boulogne, he there secretly fulfilled the duties of agent of count d'Artois, then succeeded, amid a thousand dangers, in escaping to England, where he was long known under the names of Dubois and Lemoine. His relations with lord Castlereagh and the principal members of the English cabinet enabled him to be of great service to French emigrants. It was also by his mediation that Ticherevo and Moreau were reconciled. Although absent, he was accused of various conspiracies; and he was condemned to death, and a price set on his head. He was long searched for by the imperial police. He did not return to his native city till April, 1814. During the Hundred Days he retired to Ypres, where he fell sick; and, after the return of the Bourbons, he went to live on his place at Maigiral, where he died. Jan. 26, 1816. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s. v.

Rates, Church, money raised annually in the parishes of England for the maintenance or repair of the parish church, etc. Rates are agreed on by the parish in vestry assembled; and they are charged, not on the resident, but on the occupier, both on the landed and on the unenclosed lands; and are summoned by the church-wardens, who, if they neglect to do so, may be proceeded against criminally in the ecclesiastical courts. See CHURCH-WARDENS. Not fewer than eighteen bills have been before Parliament these last twenty years for the modification or settle-
RATHBUN, VALENTINE, an American divine of colo-
nial days, flourished near the opening of the 18th cen-
tury as pastor of a Baptist Church at Pittsfield, Conn.,
and later at Naugatuck, Conn., where he died in 1725.
He was at one time a member of the Shaker commu-
nity, but three months sufficed to satisfy him that his
place was in other folds. He published a tract against
the Shakers, entitled Some Brief Hints of a Religious
Scheme, etc. (Harford, 1781, 12mo, and ofen).
Rathke, WOLFGANG CHRISTOPHER, a German edu-
cator, born as a writer on his patron, was born at
Selitz, April 12, 1683; was educated at Jena; and, after
teaching privately, was, in 1689, made professor of He-
brew at the gymnasium at Bayreuth, in 1697 eclec-
tiasial superintendent of Neustadt, and in this posi-
tion sagaciously opposed all inroads of the Pietists.
He died June 26, 1729. Among his works of interest to us
is De Bibliotheca Patrum (Neust, 1726, fol.).—Hoefer,
Rathenius (Racherus) of Liege, a monastic of med-
ieval times, was born of a noble family, probably in 850.
He was reared in the convent at Leuven, in the dis-
covery of Leuven after his father's death. In 926, when his friend Hilduin, also a monk, went to Ito-
ly to visit his nephew, king Hugo, Rathenius accompa-
nied him. Hilduin was made first bishop of Verona
(931), and shortly after archbishop of Milan; and upon
this promotion, his friend Rathenius was placed in the
vacated see of Verona. In 934, when Arnold of Bav-
aria invaded Italy, Rathenius sided with the invader;
and when Arnold was successfully disposed of, Rathen-
ius was promptly deposed and imprisoned at Pavia.
During his incarceration he wrote his Prologiwi on six
books. By the intercession of powerful friends he
was put into the custody of the bishop of Arno, and
thence escaped, in 939, to Southern France. He was
private tutor for a time, and in 944 returned to Leu-
ven. He was full of ambition, and pined for the opportu-
nity to return to Italy. Finally, made bold by hope of
regaining the king's favor in open confession, he hast-
eted to Hugo's presence, and really secured the for-
feited place. But though restored to the see, he could not
recover the favor of his patronizers, and, after various
years of usefulness, he returned to his dwelling-place of
his youth once more. In 952 Otto the Great call-
ed him into the vicinity of his brother Bruno; and
when he was elevated to the archbishopric of Cologne,
Rathenius was made bishop of Liege. He proved, how-
ever, very soon that the disappointments of life had
told upon his whole character to fit him any longer for
great responsibilities. He failed in all his undertakings, politically and ecclesiastically; and
the discontent in the see so great and widespread
that the emperor felt compelled to dismiss him, and
retire to the little abbey of Alba, a dependence of
Liege. Even here he made himself extremely un-
popular by his overzealous defence of the sacramental
view of Paschiasius Radbertus. In 961, for the third time,
the see of Verona was given to him, but the clergy of the
diocese succeeded in effecting his removal. He was
once more after this a monk at Leuven and abbot at
Alba. He died before he had secured the Abbey of
Leuven, for which he strove finally as if an honor to be
coveted. He died at the house of the count of Namur,
April 25, 974. His writings, which are numerous and
valuable, are collected in one edition by P. and H. Hal-
lerini (Verona, 1765). See Vogel, Rathenius von Ver-
ona (Jena, 1854, 2 vols. 8vo), Lea, Hist. of Celibacy:
Foulkes, Divisions of Christendom, 1, 7; Milman, Hist.
Lat. Christianity, 171, 172. (J. H. W.)
Rathmann, Herrmann, a German theologian of the
Pietistic tendency, was born at Lubeck in 1583;
studied at Leipsic, Rostock, and last at Cologne, where
he became master of the philosophical faculty; and
delivered philosophical lectures at Frankfort-on-the-
Main and Leipsic until 1612, when he became dean of
St. John's Church at Danzic. In 1617 he took a
Ph.D. position at Gottingen; in 1618 he was made pastor of St. Catharine's. He died June 30, 1628. He got into a controversy with his zealous Lutheran colleague, John Corvinus (q. v.), regard-
ing Mysticism and Osiandrianism. Rathmann was a
very devout man, and rejected the mere profession
of faith as sufficient to entitle a person to Christian
fellowship. He also distinguished between the mere
letter of the Holy Word and its inner meaning, regard-
ing the former as a dead, fruitless instrument ('instrumentum passivum, lumen instrumentale historicum'),
which could only take life by the influencing influence
of the Holy Spirit. The Königsberg theologians (Osi-
ander school) accused him of Schweflenkidianism; those
of Jena, of Calvinism; only Rostock accepted his the-
ology as orthodox. See Dorner, Gesch, der deutschen
(J. H. W.)
Rathmunus (Ráthmúnu v. Páthmúnu; Vulg. Rathmi-
us), "the story-writer" (1 Esdr. ii, 16, 17, 25, 30), the
same as "Rehum the chancellor" (Ezra iv, 8, 19, 17, 23).
Ratich, WOLFGANG, a distinguished German edu-
cator, was born in 1571, at Wilstein, in Holstein. A
difficulty in speech compelled him to give up the min-
istry, for which he had intended fitting himself; and he
applied himself to the study of the Hebrew and Arabic
languages and mathematics. He claimed to be the in-
vventor of a new system of instruction, vastly superior
to the prevailing ones, and in 1612 addressed a memo-
rial to the Diet of Frankfort, in which he asserted that
not only every educated young man in Germany was
expected to learn Hebrew, Greek, Latin, German, philosophy, the-
ology, and the arts and sciences, but that uniformity
of language and religion could be introduced into the
whole empire. Several princes were led to interest
themselves in his scheme. Professors Helwig and Jung,
of Giessen, and Granger, Brendel, Walter, and Wolf, of
Jena, were invited to investigate it. They judged it
excellent in theory, and made a favorable report upon it.
Ratich agreed with prince Ludwig of Anhalt-Kö-
then and duke John Ernest of Weimar to instruct
children both in the religious system, and also to
make teachers to give instruction in any language, in
less time and with less labor than by any other method
used in Germany. A printing-office was furnished
him in Köthen, and his books were printed in six lan-
guages. A school was established for him, with one
hundred and thirty-five scholars. But Ratich proved
incompetent to give practical effect to his theories.
He became unpopular, and, being an earnest Lutheran,
fell under the ban of the religious prejudices of a com-
community attached to the Reformed faith. His school
failed in a short time. Prince Ludwig quarreled with
him, and, in 1619, imprisoned him; but he was released
in 1620, after having signed the declaration that " he
had claimed and promised more than he knew or could
bring to pass. His system was now attacked by some
who had been his friends. The countess Sophia von
Schwarzburg-Budsladt, however, recommended him
to the Swedish chancellor, Oxenstierna. At the re-
quest of that statesman, Dr. Brückner, Meyfar, and
Ziegler examined his method; and they again made
a favorable report upon it in 1654. Ratich, without
doubt, had an idea of the conception of a non-
education. He preferred to give instruction in those
branches which could be made useful in life rather than
to pay so much attention to the dead languages. In
his memorial to the Diet at Frankfort, he held that a
child should first learn to read and speak the mother-
tongue correctly, so as to be able to use the German
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Bible. Hebrew and Greek should then be learned as the tongues of the original text of the Bible, after which Latin might be studied. His views were embodied in a number of rules, or principles, the chief of which are: 1. Everything should be presented in its order, a due regard being paid to the course of nature. 2. Only one thing should be presented at a time. 3. Each thing should be often repeated. 4. Everything should be taught at first in the mother-tongue; afterwards other languages may be taught. 5. Everything should be done without compulsion. 6. Nothing should be learned by rule. There should be mutual conformity in all things. 8. First thing by itself, and afterwards the explanation of it; that is to say, a basis of material must be laid in the mind before any rules can be applied to it. Thus, in teaching geometry the teacher should be present, and then he should make an immense amount of labor on the teacher, without seeming to call for a corresponding degree of exertion on the part of the pupil. Comenius, after reading his book, remarked that he "had not ill displayed the faults of the school, but that in practice the defects might be corrected." Ratier's works were written in Latin, and are diffuse, tedious, and somewhat pedantic. He died in 1633. See Biographie Universelle, s. v.

Ratier, Vincent, a French preacher of note, was born in 1634. At sixteen years of age he entered the Order of the Dominicans, and in 1650, he was made superior-general of the order in France. He resigned this position in 1698, and died near the opening of the 18th century, greatly respected on account of his indefatigable zeal. He had preached with great success in the principal cities of France. He wrote, Octave Angélique de Saint-François de Sales (Orleans, 1697, 8vo.);—Oraison Funèbre de Jeanne-Gabrielle Davout des Marrets, Abbé du Mont-Notre-Dame, près Prorina (Orleans, 1699, 4to.).


Ratification is, in the Book of Common Prayer, used to indicate the act of confirming and sanctioning something previously done by another, as in assuming the obligations of baptism at the reception of confirmation.

Rationable. (1.) The science of theology and philosophy (during the scholastic ages) were often one and the same, since from which the doctrines of Aristotle were expounded as the rationales of theological and moral-truth. "There cannot be a body of rules without a rationale, and this rationale constitutes the science. There were poets before there were rules of poetical composition; but before Aristotle, or Horace, or Boileau, or Pope could write their arts of poetry and criticism, they had considered the reasons on which their precepts rested, they had conceived in their own minds a theory of the art. In like manner, there were navigators before there was an art of navigation, and in the art of navigation, there could be the methods of finding the ship's place by observations of the heavenly bodies, the science of astronomy must have explained the system of the world."—Anthony Sparrow, Bishop of Exeter, is the author of a work entitled A Rationale upon the Book of Common Prayer.

(2.) A peculiar form of the bishop's pallium (pectora, koyios), appropriated by the bishops of Rome to themselves from the time in which they began to assume the mitres of pontiffs, or metropolitans of the high-priests of the Old Testament. It was some- times sent by the Roman pontiffs to other bishops as a mark of distinction and favor. It was in the form of a trefoil, quatrefoil, or oblong square, like the piece of stuff worn by the Arian high-priest. It appears in English on bishop Gifford's monument at Worcester in 1501. It was worn, perhaps for the last time on record, at Rheims. The pope has a formal, and cardinals and Italian bishops wear superb brooches to clasp their cope. The Greek παραρθέων, worn by patriarchs and metropolitans over the chasuble, is an oblong plate of gold or silver, jeweled with a diamond.

The word rationale is also the name of a treatise explaining the meaning, and justifying the continuance, of that ceremonial which it was thought fit to retain in the Church of England in the year 1641. The members of the committee to whom this subject was intrusted were warmly attached to the spirit of the Roman ritual, and, of course, made few alterations. The collects in which prayers were offered for the pope, and the offices for Thomas Becket and some other saints, were omitted; but so slight were the changes introduced that in many churches the missal and breviary already in use were retained. The Rationale Dicticorniun officiorum of Durand, bishop of Mende, written in the latter part of the 18th century, gives the "reasons" of the forms and ceremonies of Roman worship. See Coller, Examen, Hist. v. 184; Burnet, Hist. of the Ref. 1. 68; Riddle, Christian Antiqu. (see Index). Rationalism, a term applied to a specific movement in theology which assumed definite shape about the middle of the 18th century, and culminated in the first decades of the 19th. Its chief seat was in Protestant Germany; and the rationalism then prevailing was erecting the human understanding into a supreme judge over the Word of God, and thus, by implication, denying the importance, and even necessity, of any miraculous revelation whatever. But a tendency to rationalism has existed to some degree wherever human thought has made the least advances. Especially are its outbreaks distinctly recognizable at several points along the course of the history of theology; and in several countries it had existed as a clearly defined movement even before its full development in Germany. (In the chief features of this development, we shall follow the account of Dr. Tholuck in Herzog's Reuss-Encylop. xii. 587-584.)

I. English Rationalism.——Sporadic tendencies towards rationalism existed among the Averhoists in the Middle Ages, and among the anti-Trinitarians of the 16th century; but these were largely of a speculative or mystical type. But in English deism the tendency became definitely theological and anti-Biblical. In reaction against the confessional persecutions and intolerance of the 17th century, not a few gifted minds were led to look for a really tenable position only in the elementary form of the tenets of deism, the rationalizations, and even to all religions whatsoever. This led gradually to a denial of the necessity of revelation, and to an exclusive reliance upon the light of nature (lumen naturae). This lumen became thus both the source and the judge of all religious truth. This movement was variously styled naturalism, deism, and occasionally also rationalism. English deism differs, however, in this respect from German—that it proceeded mainly from non-theologians, and was openly hostile to the Bible; whereas (German rationalism sprang from theologians eminently in the church), and it professedly honored the Scriptures as a valuable summary of the highest religious truths. The former, according to Nitzsch (System, § 28), was largely a denial of revelation; the latter was a philosophical exegete. But as the former relied, in the last instance, on the lumen naturae, and the latter on the so-called "sound human understanding," the ultimate result was identical.

II. Rationalism in the Netherlands.——This arose simultaneously with English deism. Here, also, the toleration of different confessions led to latitudinarianism. The tendency was further promoted by a revival of classical humanism. Forerunners of rationalism appeared before the middle of the 17th century. Voetius (Disput. Theol. l. 1) mentions a work (of 1633) which did not hesitate to hold thus: Naturale ratio imdet et norma fidet. The tendency was systematically pre-
pared for by the Cartesian philosophy. Without di-
rectly touching the foundations of faith, it yet silently underlined them by the fundamental maxim, De omni-
bus dubitandum. This maxim, though reverently inten-
ded, yet resulted, in practice, in a thoroughly anti-
Biblical drift. Ducis and Roel hold that human reason
is as infallible as God, its author; and that if it ever
errs, this result from mere lack of attention to its inner
light. The influence of Spinoza was in the same direc-
tion. In his Irenous Theologico-politicus, he had sub-
jected the Bible to a philosophical interpretation which
was fatal to its positive validity. His disciple, L. Meyer, taught unhesitatingly (1666), "Quid-
quid rationi contrarium, ille non est credendum." Also
from the time of Spinoza forward there appears, even
among devout theologians, a tendency to break loose
from orthodox traditions. This is further promoted by
the works of gifted French refugees—Bayle, Le Clerc,
and others.

III. German Rationalism.—This subject falls natu-
really into the following five subdivisions: the period of
preparatory discussion (1600-1700); the period of the
historical-critical movement (1750-1790); the period of the
philosophical-critical movement (1780-1800); the period of the so-
called rationalismus vulgaris (1800-1814); the period of the
philosophical-rationalism (from Kant to Feuerbach).

It was in the latter period that foreign rationalism attracted the attention of German theo-
ologists before the close of the 17th century. The ear-
liest assistant of Herbert of Cherbury and of Spinoza
was Meurerus, in 1667 and 1674. But a German basis
for rationalism had already been laid. In the midst
of the violence against orthodox Baldwin (1583), Calixtus had laid
the foundations for a less rigid tendency. The Thirty
Years' War (1618-1648) had spread immorality among
the masses and indifference among the nobility. The
successing years of material prosperity and of French
luxury made the German upper class undermine the power of the old
orthodoxy. But the Lutheran Church still firmly held its old position till towards the close of the century.

The Reformed Church was the first to be affected. Duisburg became the rallying-point of suspected Car-
tesians from all quarters. Here H. Holstius (1688)
defended the principle of Roel, that reason is the ul-
imate judge in matters of faith, and substituted syllo-
gistic argumentation for the testimonium internum. He
also declared that the theology was the handmaid of
philosophy, instead of the converse. The same views were found later on in the rationalistic circles of Wheaton, in a dissertation (Zerbst, 1727), that reason is the test
d of faith, and that none but fanatics appealed to a testi-
monium spiritus. Similar sentiments soon found place in Lutheran schools, though not in the theo-
cetical faculties. Thomassius, first at Leipzig, then at Halle, was the first to give them much prominence. His main
endeavor of life was the "dissipation of prejudices" from
every field of thought or inquiry, and the criterion of his
efforts was a prudential regard for the "useful"; and as
the only judge of the "useful" was the so-called com-
mum-sense of the educated classes, it is plain that the
rationalistic foundation was already fully laid. But
the name rationalism was as yet almost wholly unknown,
and in outward form the authority of the Scriptures
was still almost universally admitted.

Inside of the German Church of the 17th century,
and down to the middle of the 18th, there prevailed
two parallel streams of life—the subjective devotion of
pietism, and a subjective proclivity to individual cri-
icism—both of them having this in common, that they
opposed the objective validity of formal orthodoxy. On
the part of pietism, this position was not consciously
intended; but in laying such exclusive emphasis on the
Bible as opposed to creeds, and on the witness of the
Spirit as opposed to pious guidance, it actually did so
in fact. Thus the venerable Michael Lang of Altdorf,
allowed himself to live by his name for vital, viz., to dignify the orthodox symbols as sac-Bibles and sac-rect doc-
uments. Spener found the yoke of these symbols in-
supportable in some points; Joachim Lange and others
actually disregarded them on occasion. Hsufering se-
riously objects to the formula that good works spring from
faith. The pious Rambach virtually renounced the
orthodox tenets of inspiration. The form of dogmat-
ics began to undergo a change. Breithaupt (1700) and
Freylinghausen (1738) purposely avoided the traditional
philosophy in their systems of theology. And this
tendency from within the Church was promoted by in-
fluences which came from without—Holland and Italy.
The force of this influence may be judged of by the
opposition it at first met with. Litelental mentions,
between 1680 and 1720, no less than forty-six works
against atheism, twenty-seven against rationalism, and
fifteen against indifferentism. The forms of the oppo-
sition varied all the way from a natural desire for a
clear understanding of the grounds of faith to an ab-
солute indifference, or even a frivolous atheism.
The eminent Leipsic pastor Zeidler (1735) thought to hon-
our the Bible by the utmost contempt of systems of doc-
trine. Out of piety there sprang a number of warm-
hearted mystics, who laid exclusive stress on the "in-
ner spark, the inner word," thus opening the path to every sort of vagary. Under the guidance of this "in-
ner word," Dippel presented, in 1677, a very free criti-
cism of pietism. But Spitta, professor and ex-
teacher complained, in 1725, that even good theologians
were falling into the danger of insisting simply on Chris-
tian love and morals, and forgetting the danger from as-
sults of false teachers. In the same year, an eminent
publicist called for a consolidation of the Lutheran
Reformed confessions, asserting that, after all, peace
and love were the only things essential. Edelmann began,
in 1735, with slight variations from strict orthodox,
and ended, with Spinoza, in denying the personality of
God and the immortality of the soul. The aged Lo-
thes often summed up the condition of the middle to
seven years of faithfulness, the condition of theol-
ogy and of the Church was only growing worse and
worse; and saddler still is the lament of Koch, in 1754,
that the Bible had almost lost all respect on the part
of the cultured classes, and that it was abandoned to the
government as a collection of childish fables.

All the preceding inroads upon orthodox tradition
had been carried out under the demands of the so-called
sound human understanding. It was mostly the work
of non-theologians. But from the beginning of the
18th century, those who professed to serve the interests of rationalism, Leibnitz and Wolf,
throw out thoughts that powerfully contributed to
end which their authors were very far from intending.
Leibnitz's distinction of doctrines into those which can
be rationally proved and those which are above reason
was used to cast positive suspicion upon the whole
of the latter class. Wolff's distinction of theology into
the two parts, natural and revealed, was turned to the
same service. As natural theology could give a reason
for its dicta, and revealed theology could not, it came
to pass that almost the whole stress was laid upon the
former. But this incoherent undermining process was as
yet hardly felt outside of the professional circles. The
pulpit remained almost unaffected. The most eminent
example of the union of the old with the new tenden-
cies was in the case of Matthew Piaf, professor in Tu-
bingen (1716), then in Giessen (1756), who died in 1760.
Holding fast to the chief old landmarks, yet he relaxed
much more from confessional rigidity, and earnestly labored
for the union of the two German churches. The me-
tion of Piaf brings us to the close of this first phase
of German rationalism.

2. The Period of Historical Criticism.—The condition
of theology, and, indeed, of science and art also, about
the middle of the 18th century, was that of a mummy-
like stiffness and a shallow systematization. The vital
contest between the old and the new introduced a
scepticism of Spinozistic origin into pietism and orthodoxy, that lost its vigor and died away.
RATIONALISM

The second generation of Halle pietists had left the stage, J. H. Michaelis in 1788, J. Lange in 1744; G. Francke outlived his age—until 1770. So, also, had departed the last champions of the old orthodoxy—Wernarod in 1749, Cyprian in 1740, the last of all, Wolf, having outlived the vitality of his own system, departed in sadness in 1754. The superficial and pedantic Gottsched still held his mastery in the fine arts. An unproductive, compounding spirit prevailed in science and theology. Most of our preachers," says Eresius, "gave too little attention to the teaching of collected facts, to the suppression of curiosities, stamps, and old coins." There was wanting a fresh wind to fill the weary sails of life. But just now the lacking stimulus was abundantly supplied; it was furnished by the fervor of criticism which broke out first on the field of history, then on that of philosophy.

Although Thomasius and others had already done something in the field of historical criticism, this was only from a superficial, empirical standpoint. It was only when historical criticism assumed a thorough and systematic form that it wrought its full clarifying and revolutionary effects on the whole field of theology. New investigations were now instituted; every nook and corner of antiquity, linguistics, and science of every form was subjected to a searching and sifting such as had never before been paralleled; and the results attained were of a magnitude to revolutionize the whole circle of the religious sciences. It is true the main motive which inspired the critical movement was devoid of deep religious character, and hence many of its boasted results have proved disappointing; but many others are admitted, and accepted by all parties as absolutely unassailable.

Also, on this critical field, English deism had been in the advance, and had contributed no insignificant results. Toland, Collins, Tindal, and Bolingbroke had unsettled the popular faith in the authenticity of the canon, and in the infallibility of the preachers of the age. They propounded, some of them accepted by the fathers, threw doubt upon all the others; that many passages in the Gospels were manifestly spurious; that the time of the settlement of the canon was absolutely unknown; that the genuine sacred books of the Jews had perished in the time of the Exile, etc. Hobbes gave lengthy reasons for disbelieving the Pentateuch; Collins threw discredit upon Daniel; Morgan gave to the views of Toland and Bolingbroke an attractive rhetorical expression, thus disseminating them among the uneducated. Collins assailed the apostles as impostors—men of the movement—to wit, the prophecies—insisting that the predictions of the Old Testament relate, when properly interpreted, to very different things from those to which the New-Testament writers apply them. Only in one of the Prophets did the relation to Christ, not to the religion; and to political events. Moreover, these prophecies of Daniel "were written after the events."

In Germany the full tide of revolutionary criticism takes systematic form in Semler of Halle. By Semler almost the whole circle of orthodox landmarks was thrown into confusion; the Bible-text was assailed; the pertinency of standard proof-texts was denied; the genuineness of Biblical books was contested; the foundation was dashed away from numerous usages and dogmas which had hitherto passed as absolutely unassailable. Although many of the points which Semler made were subsequently further developed and accepted as sound, yet the immediate effect in his case was to doubt into the whole arsenal of orthodoxy.

The general effect was to set in motion an unparalleled tide of literary and polemical兴奋. The Church and of doctrine, were speedily enriched and enlarged. In Halle, Semler found an able and like-spirited pupil in Gruner, at Leipzig labored the cautious but pensive Bieber, and the head of the movement at Göttingen (since 1750); Griesbach, Didlerlein, Eichhorn, at Jena; Henke at Helmstedt; Tüllner, Steinbart, at Frankfort-on-the-Oder. Under the labors of these and kindred critics there was scarcely a single dogma that remained unassailed. But the general inspiration of criticism was not the overturning, but only the clarification, the correct construction, of the Biblical teachings. Even the authority of the Church is held fast by to Semler, though in a peculiar manner. The symbols and forms of the Church are useful in preserving external unity and uniformity. The Church is simply the right of the people to judge of the individual. His position seemed practically to involve a doubt of the possibility of attaining to objective truth; his radical mistake was the assumption that religion can exist without a doctrinal basis. Starting out from the warm atmosphere of Pietism, he gradually descended until he had little more reverence for the oracles of God than for the fables of Ovid. Holding that the inner conviction of our own truth-loving heart is the sole test as to the inspiration of a book, he decided against the claim of Ruth, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, and Canticles; he doubted the genuineness of Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, and Daniel; he held that the Pentateuch is but a collection of legendary fragments. The New Testament is better than the Old, though some of its parts are positively pernicious; the Apocalypse is the fabrication of Gnostic and Essene sects. It was not only one which is useful for the modern Church. There are two elements in the Bible, the transitory and the eternal. It is the prerogative of criticism to sift among the chaff and select out the scattered grains of pure truth. Much of the Bible was written simply for local or party purposes: it was never intended for general use. A principle of which Semler made large use was the celebrated "accommodation theory." He insisted, namely, that Christ and the apostles taught many things by way of mere accommodation to the whims and prejudices of the time; he maintained that these were false views that prevailed, but that they partially accepted them, though planting within them a substratum of absolute truth. To sift out this truth from the encumbrance of rubbish is the privilege of the clear-sighted modern critic. In the field of dogmatics Semler was almost ferocious in his iconoclasm. For the Protestant or even the apostolical fathers he showed the most thorough disrespect. One after another of the central dogmas of orthodoxy fell under the hammer of his criticism, and seemed to be dissipated forever. And what Semler did at Halle, a bold innovator of like-minded men did in other parts of Germany.

Of very considerable influence in this second half of the 18th century were translations of the works of English and Dutch rationalists and deists. Semler himself acknowledged great debt to the works of Clarke and Le Clerc. The biographies of the day are full of references to the wide influence of Toland and Tindal. The same fact is evinced by the scores and scores of clerical attempts at refuting these scribes.

From the lawless subjectivism of Semler the descent was easy to the most absurd and degrading consequences. Two theological writers especially carried out the logical consequences in both their writings and their lives. Edelmann took up the tradition of Thomasius, and constructed his whole system of theology from a superficial utilitarian standpoint. Not what is true, but what is of use to the subject, was his whole inquiry. The result was that he simply reduced Christianity to a feasible and insipid dream. But the climax was reached in Bahrdt. This man used his eminent popular talents to ridicule the Bible, to denounce the church, and to degrade to the very lowest infamy the name of theologian. His popular treatises were read by the ten thousand, and produced great evil. But his career as a whole marked a turning-point in the tide of rationalism. Criticism, when left unguided by any fixed principle of objective truth, was found to be fruitless and to lead only to destruction. It became necessary to look about for some
corner-stone of truth upon which to stay the tottering edifice of theology and religion. The various attempts to discover this constitute—

3. The Period of Philosophical Criticism (1780-1800).

After the decline of the rationalism of Wolff, the vitality of philosophy in Germany stood at the zero point. So long as philosophy was represented by the feeble eclecticism of Mendelssohn, Garve, Sulzer, Meiners, Platner, Reinhard, and Flatt, the criticism of the Semler school could flatter itself with standing upon philosophical grounds for the construction of the old rationalism. The one principle of the so-called "sound human understanding." But when Kant came, both systems were overturned at a blow. Kant showed that our transcendental knowledge reaches no further than our experience, and that our knowledge of supernatural objects is indefensible only as postulates of the practical reason. Philosophy and theology must concede that the proofs for the existence of God avail no further than simply to establish a probability. The subjective morality of utility was overthrown by the principle that no morality is possible save where it is grounded upon a purely objective "ought." It was shown that the whole duty of theology was, by the help of religious ideas, to contribute to the supremacy of the "ought" in human society. But also the philosophy of Kant took on somewhat of the coloring of the old rationalism, and the old rationalists incorporated it as favorable to them. Thus the three Kantian postulates of the practical reason were metamorphosed into mere hypotheses of the theoretical reason. The subjective character of the doctrine of religion was identified with Kant and Kantianism, as the chief foundation in religion" was said to be the very essence of the old subjectivism. But there were two phases to the matter: while one current of rationalistic theology welcomed Kant and vainly hoped to force the new wine into the old bottles, another current mocked at it as mere mysticism, or metaphysics, or rationalistic jargon. Only a few deep-minded men, such as Schmitt, Vogel, and Tiefenbrunck, saw the folly of both of these positions—saw that the new was utterly subversive of the old.

4. The Period of the So-called Rationalismus Vulgaris (1800-1833).—The attitude of the theology dominant at the dawn of the 19th century was thus: The Holy Scriptures rationally interpreted were still revered as the code of a rational religion and morality. But with every advance step in what was called historical exegesis, the discrepancy between the traditional sense of the text and the new constructions endeavored to put upon it became more strikingly apparent. Semler's accommodation theory was made to apply to every narrative and every doctrinal statement of the whole Bible. Every passage in the Scriptures was placed into a new system, so as to be rendered necessary a great deal of clarification before the sense could be reached. The New Testament citations from the Old were thought to be totally misapplied. Jesus was thought by some to have been a veritable fanatic. John the Baptist regarded him as a sinner; but did Jesus think so himself? The myth itself began now to play its rôle. L. Bauer published in 1800 a Hebrew mythology of the Old and New Testaments; the miracles were explained away as mere natural events.

As early as 1794 the aspect of matters was thus summed up by Rien: "The champions of the religion of pure reason have already advanced so far that all the best theologians are going over to them, and all candidates for position hold them in great honor. It has already come to be a settled matter that reason is the currency of the age, and that this coin will not decide against itself is easy to see." A writer in 1792 had said: "The truth of a doctrine rests upon rational grounds. If it can stand the test of reason, if it does not contradict any of the results of science and experience; if it is founded in all rational men, then it is true, and no fanatic can prove the contrary." Krug went so far in 1796 as to deny to Christian truth any more permanent worth than that of the teachings of any other transitory system of philosophy. "Let no one say that God could make none other than a perfect revelation. There is no such perfect revelator as the one you impugn. The attainment of holy men springing up from their souls just as the utterances of other men; hence they necessarily bear the coloring of the environment from which they sprang." Such sentiments were legislatively condemned in some parts of Germany; but not so in Prussia. Here the chief Church council adhered to, on being asked whether any positive confession was any longer to be exacted of candidates for Church membership, replied that, apart from baptism and the eucharist, no other yoke was to be imposed on the contrary, every applicant was to be unhesitatingly received with its simple formula: "I baptize thee upon thy confession of Christ, the founder of a more spiritual and more joyous religion than that of the society [the world] to which thou hast hitherto belonged."

With the changed phase of things at the close of the 18th century, the term "rationalism" came into more frequent use. At first it was chiefly used by opponents. Men like Gehler contrasted rationalism with the fundamental principle of Protestantism, to wit, the normative authority of the Bible, showing the utter inconsistency of the system with the superficial notions of the "sound human understanding." It was never cordially accepted by those to whom it was applied.

As soon as rationalism became clearly conscious of its attitude towards revelation, it felt more fully than ever the need of the breach in its fundamental principles. Also an external stimulus urged it to this step. Hibernus it had peaceably reclined its head on the bower of each successively rising system of philosophy; but since the rise of the speculative systems of Fichte and Schelling, such an alliance was impossible. The hackneyed systems were no longer adequate to meet the superficial reasonings of the "sound human understanding." Also, even rationalism stood aghast at the bottomless abyss of the pantheistic mysticism of Schelling; and numerous works of rationalistic source assailed the new "atheism." But the empirical tendencies of rationalism met with only ridicule and sneers from the new lords of the intellectual world. Fichte, Schelling, and Goethe agreed in stigmatizing the best principles and the whole system of the rationalists as commonplace and vulgar.

At last, however, there appeared a system of philosophy under the wings of which the rationalists felt that they could flee for refuge; this was the faith-philosophy of Jacobi. The radical weakness of the old rationalism was that it gave no scope to the spontaneities of sentiment and religious experience. Fichte and Schelling were dressed in the cold, dry processes of argumentation. It was utterly ungenial, unpoetic; a mere probability was the highest word it could say in behalf of the most central truths. The system of Jacobi remedied this. It supplemented the coldness of mere intellectual speculation by the immediate certainty of feeling; it restored to faith its coeternity with knowledge. Accordingly, all the better representatives of honest rationalism hailed the faith-philosophy of Jacobi, and used it to rescue the sinking bark of the current theology. Notably was this the case with Gehler, who now urged as the deepest proof of the truth of religion a "Nobigungsefühl mit Uraussprüchen der allgemeinen Vernunft"—that is, he held that religious truth commends itself directly to our inner consciousness with all the compelling force of intuition. From this time forward it became common to lay greater stress on the evidence of the heart, the immediate evidence of the practical reason, and to style it the faith of reason (Vernunftglauben). This procedure was partially justified by Kant himself, who claimed to have set limits to reason only in order to give greater play to faith. It was still more justified by the faith-rationalists, such as Boetticher, who derives after the imitation
from a so-called truth-feeling and truth-faith. This is the
philosophic ground upon which are based the definitions
of reason and the understanding as given in the
theology of Bretschneider and Wegscheider; to wit, that
reason is the faculty for generating ideas directly out of
consciousness without the intervention of the discursive
activity, and the understanding the faculty for con-
firming and elucidating these ideas.

Thus rationalism has, since the beginning of the 19th
century, made considerable advances beyond its previous
dry and shallow common-sensicism. It was helped to
this by the philosophy of Fichte, by his doctrine of
faith and insight, placed reason in antagonism to the
understanding; and still more so when this philosophy
was adopted by the gifted and noble-minded De Wett.
For a long while yet—into the third decade—the tone
and fold of rationalism remained largely the same as
those given to it by the abstract, shallow proponies of
Niccolai and of Teller, of Semler, and in some respects
of Gabler. Röh and Paulus follow in the steps of Teller;
Bretschneider and Wegscheider reproduce much of the
loose syncretism of a Semler. The chief scientific weak-
nestness of all is the undiscovered depth of its
understanding of a depth of absolutely fixed ideas and in its
avoidance of decided utterances. He asserts: "In rebus gravissimis
ad religiorem pertinentibus convenire ommes gentes."
Hase raises the question whether any real student of the
history of ideas can consider this as a genuine rationalism.
Wegscheider only defence is to timidly assert a fer ommes. He
reiterates the old demonstrations of the existence of God;
and when Kant's antinomies stare him in the face, he
concedes that, taken singly, these demonstrations are not
conclusive, but thinks that they are so when taken
all together. Hahn declares that deism and naturalistic
rationalism are identical. Wegscheider indignantly
protests, inasmuch as rationalism accepts revelation thus far:
"That God endowed the founder of Christianity with
extraordinary inner gifts, and gave him many outward
to the sense of special marks.

At this point there rises the so-called supernaturalist
school. It includes those who protested against the
absolute autonomy of reason in matters of religion;
and though many of its adherents still clung to views irre-
concilable with due reverence for the Bible, still it formed
the platform upon which a higher and more Biblical
standpoint was subsequently reached. Among these
supernaturalists were men like Storr and Flatt in Wür-
temberg, and Reinhard in Dresden. But by the begin-
nning of the second decade of the century even these
few men of supernaturalism seemed to remain solitary and victorious upon the field
of battle. Yet the dry crumbs of rationalism could not
depict the sad deaths of the German nation; the
stimulus to a deeper insight and a richer faith came from
without. It was from the thunder-strokes of the Leip-
sic and the Waterloo victories that the rejuvenation of
German life went forth. This rejuvenation brought in
its train a restoration of life, first in the German Church
and then in German theology. Inside of theology the
rationalistic movement continued until 1825. Among its
early associations was the so-called Council of Tübingen,
but outside of the schools many signs indicated that its
reign was over. The new policy of the Prussian govern-
ment discomfited it; the religious and patriotic
enthusiasm occasioned by the tercentenary of the Refor-
mation (1817) was uncongenial to it, the theses of
Harms and the disputation of Leipzic (which had the
courage to summon the rationalistic clergy to resign
their clerical positions) were of the same purport. In
1830 the new Kirchenzeitung of Hengstenberg went so
far even as to call for the expulsion of rationalistic pro-
fessors from its universities. As a matter of course, it was
but a small band who opposed rationalism. But they
had the courage of faith and the vitality of truth on
their side, and their influence was very deeply felt.

Just at this time the decisive influence of Schleier-
macher came to the help of the opponents of rational-
ism. With all its rationalistic methods, the system of
this great theologian was hostile to rationalism as a
whole. It promoted a positive faith in a positive Chris-
tianity: it was powerfully influential in implanting a
reverence for positive religion in the higher and learned
classes of German life; it regarded religion as one of the
essential necessities of understanding the human nature
of the Christian Church an organization essential to the nurture of
religion. The period was now past when faith and culture
were regarded as unconnected to each other. In effecting
this change in public sentiment, Fichte and Schelling
were the chief agents, and the rationalistic mob to the potent
influence of Schleiermacher. The very last scientific ef-
fort of rationalism was made on the appearance of Hase's
Hutterus Redivivus. In this book Hase transports him-
self into the sphere of ancient Protestant orthodoxy, and
attempts such a presentation of it as shall harmonize
with the rich fruits of modern culture. The school of
Rohr assailed (1833) this book with desperate earnest-
ness; but the very choice of its weapons betrayed the
forbore hope of the case. The reply which Hase made
to these assaults may be regarded as having given the
rationalistic world the death-blow to which it was in its
definition of fixed ideas and in its avoidance of
decided utterances. He asserts: "In rebus gravissimis
ad religiorem pertinentibus convenire ommes gentes."
Hase raises the question whether any real student of the
history of ideas can consider this as a genuine rationalism.
Wegscheider only defence is to timidly assert a fer ommes. He
reiterates the old demonstrations of the existence of God;
and when Kant's antinomies stare him in the face, he
concedes that, taken singly, these demonstrations are not
conclusive, but thinks that they are so when taken
all together. Hahn declares that deism and naturalistic
rationalism are identical. Wegscheider indignantly
protests, inasmuch as rationalism accepts revelation thus far:
"That God endowed the founder of Christianity with
extraordinary inner gifts, and gave him many outward
to the sense of special marks.

At this point there rises the so-called supernaturalist
school. It includes those who protested against the
absolute autonomy of reason in matters of religion;
and though many of its adherents still clung to views irre-
concilable with due reverence for the Bible, still it formed
the platform upon which a higher and more Biblical
standpoint was subsequently reached. Among these
supernaturalists were men like Storr and Flatt in Wür-
temberg, and Reinhard in Dresden. But by the begin-
nning of the second decade of the century even these
few men of supernaturalism seemed to remain solitary and victorious upon the field
of battle. Yet the dry crumbs of rationalism could not
depict the sad deaths of the German nation; the
stimulus to a deeper insight and a richer faith came from
without. It was from the thunder-strokes of the Leip-
sic and the Waterloo victories that the rejuvenation of
German life went forth. This rejuvenation brought in
its train a restoration of life, first in the German Church
and then in German theology. Inside of theology the
rationalistic movement continued until 1825. Among its
early associations was the so-called Council of Tübingen,
but outside of the schools many signs indicated that its
reign was over. The new policy of the Prussian govern-
ment discomfited it; the religious and patriotic
enthusiasm occasioned by the tercentenary of the Refor-
mation (1817) was uncongenial to it, the theses of
Harms and the disputation of Leipzic (which had the
courage to summon the rationalistic clergy to resign
their clerical positions) were of the same purport. In
1830 the new Kirchenzeitung of Hengstenberg went so
far even as to call for the expulsion of rationalistic pro-
fessors from its universities. As a matter of course, it was
but a small band who opposed rationalism. But they
had the courage of faith and the vitality of truth on
their side, and their influence was very deeply felt.

Just at this time the decisive influence of Schleier-
macher came to the help of the opponents of rational-
hagen. Lutche, Umbret, Sider, Hagenbach, Gieseler, Bleek, Tholuck, Rothe, and their disciples. In the hands of these men Christian theology has been raised to the dignity of the noblest of sciences; and supreme reverence for Christ and the Bible have been shown to consist in the profoundest learning and the greatest speculative ability.

But the scattered echoes of German rationalism were long in entirely dying away. Faint imitations of the movement went out over all the other Protestant nations. It invaded modern Holland and England and France and America. But in these countries it was but a foreign importation, and it has shown no vital power of original production. And even in Germany there are individual representatives of the real system. But these are without popular power or scientific significance. They are simply echoes from a buried past.

IV. Literature.—On the general subject of rationalism, consult Staudlin, Gesch. des Rationalismus und Supranaturalsmus (1828); Saintes, Hist. du Rationalisme (1841); Hagenbach, Gesch. des 18ten und 19ten Jahrhunderts (1856); Hungenberg, Der deutsche Protessantismus (1850); Außermi, Die göttliche Erkenntniss (Baal, 1861-64); Bieyschlag, Uber das „Leben Jesu“ von Renan (Biele, 1861); Bockhamann, Uber den Ernst und Theologie (Stuttgart, 1822); Brochschneider, Uber die Grundprincipien der evang. Theologie (1862); La Saussaye, Commentaire sur les Lettres de M. Corrè, Feuerbach und seine Stellung zur Religion und Philosophie (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1851); Engelhardt, Schenkel und Strauss (Erlangen, 1864); Feldmann, Der Wahre Christus und sein rechtes Symbol (Altona, 1865); Van Prinner, Le Parti Anti-révolutionnaire et Contre-jésus-Christ dans l’Eglise Reformée des Pays-Bas (Amsterdam, 1860); Haffner, Die deutsche Aufklärung (Mainz, 1861); Held, Jesus der Christ (Zurich, 1865); Henhofter, Der Kampf der Unglaubigen (Heidelberg, 1866); Hauck, Die Rationalismus in der ersten Hälfte des 19ten Jahrhunderts (Leipsic, 1864); De Groot, Die Grösser Theologen (Gotha, 1863); Hutter, Uber die Rechte der Vernaunten und des Glaubens (Innsbruck, 1863); Kahn, Der innere Gang des deutschen Protessantismus seit der Mitte des vorigen Jahrhunderts (Leipsic, 1864); Niclas, Die Gotthol Jesu (Regensburg, 1864); Noack, Die Freimaurer in der Religion (Bern, 1851); Riggenbach, Der heutige Rationalismus (Baele, 1862); Rückert, Der Rationalismus (Leipsic, 1865); Schott, Briefe über Religion (Jena, 1862);Schwartz, Zur Gesch. der heutigen Theologie (Leipsic, 1866); Tholuck, Gesch. des Rationalismus (Berlin, 1863); Artz, Les Deux Théologies Nosuelles (Paris, 1862); Colani, Ma Position (ibid. 1866); Fazet, Lettres à un Rationaliste (ibid. 1861); Franchi, Le Rationalisme (Brussels, 1838); Laps, Le Traditionsisme et le Rationalisme (Lisbon, 1865); Remusat, Philosophie Religieuse (Paris, 1861); Farrar, Critical Hist. of Free Thought (London, 1863); Drapper, Intellectual Development of Europe (N. Y. 1863); Hedge, Reason in Religion (Host., 1863); Jell, Supremacy of Scripture (London, 1861); Emanuel, Limits of Religious Thought (ibid. 1839); Pusey, Historical Essays (London, 1851); Hug, Anglican Theology (ibid. 1859); Schaff, Germany, in Theology (Philadelphia, 1857); Hurst, Hist. of Rationalism (N. Y. 1865); Wutke, Christian Ethics (N. Y. 1873); vol. 1; Lecky, Rationalism in Europe (ibid. 1866); Schaff, Creeds of Christendom (ibid. 1877), vol. 1 (J. F. L. Atkin, 1877); La Cité Républicaine (1857); Geschicht, und Politik, 1877; vol. 4; Meinck, Die Abendlandischen Kirchen (1877).

Ratisbon, a city of Germany, is noted in ecclesiastical history as the seat of several important Church councils (Concilia Ratisponenses). The first of these was held in 792. In this council the errors of Felix, bishop of Urgell, who maintained that Christ is only the adoptive Son of God, were condemned. He was afterwards sent to Rome to pope Adrian, before whom he confessed and abjured his heresy in the church of St. Peter; he maintained, with Eulipandi, that Christ, as to his human nature, was the Son of God by adoption only. See Lass, Conc. vii, 1010. See also Feiltamn.

A second council was held in 796. Gregarious com-
theologians even in the Church of Rome who maintain the position assumed by Ratramnus as defensible. Against Hincmar of Rheims Ratramnus defended Godschaleus in the dispute over the *trina deitas*; but this apart, Paulinus a taut book is his *Libre de De, quod Christus ex Virgine natus est*, in which it is not questioned that Mary, *utero clauso*, conceived, but rather the opinion which sprang up at about that time, that the conception had been *incerto tramite*. Ratramnus gained most renown among his contemporaries by his work on *Homo Christi*, which he, together with the arguments of Photius in 867, and defended the Oriental Church and her dogmas. In the Migne edition, these works are in the *Patrologie*, cxxi, 1-946 and 1155-1156. See *Mabillon, Beneditinum Assamum*, vol. ii and iii; *Hist. Littéraire de la France*, v, 322-331; Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschrift für Theol*, 1858, p. 544 sq.; *Baur, Dogmengesch*, vol. ii; *Gieseler, Eccles. Hist.*; *Soames, Hist. of the Reformation*, iii, 118 sq.

**Ratte, Guttard de**, a French prelate, was born at Montpellier in 1592. He was a master clerk in the Parliament of Toulouse. When imprisoned with the president, Duranti, he showed such opposition to the government that his house and library were pillaged, and he was condemned by Parliament to be executed. Henry IV interceded Ratte by giving him the abbey of St. Blaise, and a monastery of 12,000 francs for his fidelity to the king, he afterwards received the abbey of Val-Richer, in the diocese of Bayeux, and that of St-Chinian, in the diocese of Saint-Vincent. He was made vicar-general at Montpellier and archdeacon of Valence, and in 1596 bishop of Montpel-lier. On his way to Toulouse he was attacked by three large dogs, and mortally wounded. He died July 7, 1602. See Hoefer, *Now. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

**Rattles** (Fr. *crêcelle, tarturrelle; Lat. *crotalum*). Prior to the introduction of bells (q. v.), rattles of wood or of iron were struck or shaken by the hand to summon the people to worship. The Celtic *cloc*, which preceded the use of bells, was a board covered with knocker. The Greeks used the *δαυσιστροφ* (sacred iron), a mallet and plate of iron, and the *δαυς* (sacred wood), two clappers, as a summons to prayer. The latter are mentioned by John Climacus as used for rapping the doors of the cell-dwells in the monasteries of Palestine, in the 6th century, as a night signal and waking-hammer. At University and New colleges, Oxford, fellows are summoned to a meeting in common room by the blow of a hammer at the stai-foot. By the rule of Pachomius, a trumpet was used. In many churches the clappers are called *matraxa*; in Italy, *serangola*; and in some parts of France, *soumendra*, which sound for service between the Mass on Maundy-Thursday and the *Gloria in Excelsis*, sung on Easter eve in the Mass after None, when the bells are disused, in memory of the Lord's silence in the tomb, and the speechless timidity of the apostles—a custom dating from the 8th century. At Caen the ceremonial gives the signal for counting with tablets. Neogorgus says that boys carried rattles in the procession of Good Friday.

**Rattray, Thomas, D.D.**, an English prelate, flourished in the first half of the 18th century. He was educated at Oxford University, took holy orders shortly after graduation, and, after filling various ecclesiastical preferments, became in 1727 bishop of Dunkeld, and in 1733 bishop of Sodor and Man. He died in 1745. *Edin., 1728*:—*The Ancient Liturgy of the Church of Jerusalem* (Lond. 1744, 4to);—*Some Particular Instructions concerning the Christian Covenants* (ibid. 1748).

**Ratz[u]nberger, Matthias**, a physician at the court of the elector Joachim in the Reformation period. He is one of the most pointed movements that he deserves a place here. He was born at Wangen, in Wurttemberg, in 1501, and was educated at the University of Wittenberg, where he was the constant companion of Luther; and when, by the decision of the court of the elector Joachim, where he was court physician, he was obliged to aban- don a most lucrative position and practice, he was, by the intercession of his dear school friend, made body physician of the court of Mansfeld, and held this position until, in 1538, the elector John Frederick of Saxony made him his court doctor. He was also the house physician of the great Duchess Christiana of Cleve, and thus, by recon- ciliation of Hincmar of Rheims, he opposed the encyclical of Photius in 867, and defended the Oriental Church and her dogmas. In the Migne edition, these works are in the *Patrologie*, cxxi, 1-946 and 1155-1156. See *Mabillon, Beneditinum Assamum*, vol. ii and iii; *Hist. Littéraire de la France*, v, 322-331; Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschrift für Theol*, 1858, p. 544 sq.; *Baur, Dogmengesch*, vol. ii; *Gieseler, Eccles. Hist.*; *Soames, Hist. of the Reformation*, iii, 118 sq.

**Rau, a name common to many literati, of whom we mention the following:**

1. **Christian**, was born Jan. 25, 1618, at Berlin, studied at Wittenberg, and was made magister in 1536. He then went to Königsberg, Leipsic, Rostock, Hamburg, and Upsala, where he offered a pastorate, which he declined. In 1638 he visited England, and in 1639 set out for the Orient, and resided a short time at Smyrna, where he learned Turkish, Persian, Italian, Spanish, and Modern Greek. In Constantinople he made a valuable collection of old books, and in 1642 was made professor of Oriental languages at Oxford. In 1644 he was called to Utrecht; in 1645 he lectured at Amsterdam, in 1650 at Upsala, in 1669 at Kiel, and finally settled at Frankfurt-on-the-Oder in 1671, where he died, June 21, 1677. His best work is *Concordantiarum Hebr. et Chaldeae Interpretationes* (Berlin and Frankfort, 1667). A number of other works are enumerated in Jöcher's *Gelehrten-Lexikon*, iii, 126. See *Furst, Bibl. Jud.* iii, 198; *Winer, Handbuch der theolog. Literatur*, p. 121, 721; Steinheinscher, *Bibliographisches Handbuch*, p. 114.

2. **Herbert**, a rationalist and preacher of the so-called German-Catholic Congregation, was born at Frankfurt-on-the-Main in 1813, where he also died, Sept. 26, 1876. He wrote, *Allgemeine Geschichte der christl. Kirche von ihrem Entstehen bis auf die Gegenwart* (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1846);—*Neue Stunden der An- dacht* (4th ed. Leips. 1863, 8 vols.);—*Sermons*, etc., published at different times. See *Literarischer Handzeihter*, 1867, p. 561; *Zuchold*, *Bibl. Theol., ii, 1082.

3. **Joachim Justus**, doctor and professor of theology, was born Apr. 17, 1718, at Berlin, studied at Göttingen; and in 1736 was called to Königsberg as professor of theology and Oriental languages, where he died, Aug. 19, 1749. He wrote, *Die erste Geschichte der Philosophia Ludantia* (Jena, 1753);—*Kurze und gründliche Anfänge der hebr. und der andre Sprachen* (Frankfort, 1777);—*D. Chrysostomus*, *et al.* (Köln, 1789; published by G. D. Kypke, ibid. 1749, etc.). See *Jöcher, Gelehrten-Lexikon*, s. v.: *Furst,
RAUCOURT


5. JÖHANN WILHelm, doctor and professor of theology, was born at Rentweinsdorf, in Franconia, March 9, 1745. In 1776 he was rector at Göttingen; in 1778 was made rector and professor of theology at Dortmund, and in 1779 ordi- nary professor of theology at Erlangen, where he died, July 1, 1807. He wrote, Nomina ad Question. an Orationis Montis Apostolor. Inclusor. Nostra dicta in Christ. (Erlangen, 1771);—Ueber die wahre Anzahl der Bergpension betreffend (ibid. 1805);—Freimütige Untersuchungen über die Typologie (ibid. 1784);—De Jo. Bap. in Rom Christ. Studia (ibid. 1786–86);—Materialien zu Konzilvorträgen (ibid. 1797–1800). See Fürst, Bibl. Jud. iii, 184; Winer, Handbuch der theologischen Literatur, i, 246, 247, 390, 556, 557, 559; ii, 122, 722. (B. P.)

Rauch, Christian Daniel, one of the most dis-tinguished German sculptors, and noted for his work in the latter years of his life in sacred art, was born at Arolse, the capital of the principality of Saldeck, in 1777. He began the study of sculpture as a boy, but the death of his father in 1797 obliged him to accept the humble but profitable position of valet to Frederick William II, king of Prussia. Under Frederick William III, he conceived a great liking for young Rauch, facilities for designing and modelling statues were afforded him, and he was even recommended as a pupil in the Academy of the Fine Arts. A statue of Endymion and a bust of queen Louisa of Prussia, executed at this time, convinced the king of Rauch's abilities; and although his request for dismissal had been repeatedly refused, he was now granted his request, and given a small pension in order to be enabled to proceed to Rome for further improvement. He spent six years in that city, working at his profession, and enjoyed the friendship of Thorwaldsen, Canova, and of William Hamilton, at that time Prussian minister there. Among his works at this time were base-reliefs of Hippolytus and Phedra, a Mars and Venus wounded by Dionys, a colossal bust of the king of Prussia, a bust of the painter Raphael Mengs, etc. In 1811 he was called by the king of Prussia to Berlin, to execute a monumental statue of queen Louisa. This great work obtained for Rauch a European repu- tation. It is in the mausoleum of the queen in the garden of Charlottenburg. Not quite satisfied with this triumph, he commenced the statue of the queen, which he finished eleven years afterwards, and which is allowed to be a masterpiece of sculpture. It is placed in the palace of Sans-Souci, near Potsdam. Rauch, af- ter this, lived principally at Berlin, but occasionally visited Rome, Carrara, and Munich. He labored indefatigably in his profession, and by 1824 had executed seventy busts in marble, of which twenty were of colossal size. He died at Dresden, while on a visit there, Dec. 3, 1857. His greatest secular work is the magnificent monument of Frederick the Great, which adorns Berli. His greatest work in sacred art is his famous Moses Group, in the entry of the Friedensruhe (Church of Peace) at Potsdam. It was begun in 1843 and finished in 1855, and is really his last great work. Noteworthy are also his group of the first two Polish kings—

RAUCOURT, LOUIS MARIE, a French prelate, was born in 1743. He entered the Benedictine Order, and studied theology in many of its monasteries. In 1768 he was made abbot of one of the Cistercian monasteries of France, in 1773 prior, and in 1783 abbot. He died in 1825, having preached the Resurrection, and greatly increased the library. Being expelled during the Revolution, he fled to--
Rauhe Haus (Germ. for Rough House), this, a great juvenile reform institution at the little hamlet of Hern, three miles from the German port of Hamburg, owes its origin to John Henry Wichern, the founder also of the German Home Mission Work. See INNER MISSION. The peculiar name which it bears (Rough House) is not due to any peculiar feature of the institution, as one might suppose, but rather to an awkward translation of the German poise into the classical language. The house in which the institution was first located was built some hundred and fifty years ago by a certain Mr. Hugi, a gentleman of wealth and culture, and in every sense quite contrary in character to the name given him in classical German. People of Hamburg's suburbs always knew the place by the name of the "Ruge House," and so the institution was called Rauhe Haus when it first opened on Nov. 1, 1883, by Wichern, with the assistance of his mother, he being then but a young man of twenty-five, and as yet not even in social relations with the opposite sex. For years previous to this event Wichern had conceived a plan for the amelioration of the condition of the lower classes. While at the university his mystical tendencies were noted. He frequently gave himself up to practices of great personal self-denial, and he formed an association of young men for self-improvement and religious edification. There was a constant longing for entire and unconditional consecration to God's service in this band, who all recognised the great fact that Christianity is only a truth to those who experience it. An acquaintance with Dr. Julius, then well known as a philanthropist, who had visited England and America in the interests of prison reform, only quickened Wichern in his purposes, and when, on his return from the university to Hamburg, he was placed in charge of a Sabbath-school in the religiously neglected suburbs of St. George, Wichern conceived a plan that should enable him to begin the task for which he felt himself called of God. Though poor himself, his father having died while he was yet scarcely out of the years of infancy, and his mother having depended upon him for years, he yet set about to realize his purpose. All the difficulties that arose in his way only acted as fresh incentives to exertion. His enthusiasm knew no restraints nor barriers. Finally he succeeded in interesting the syndic Seieving, a man of warm heart and fine pocketbook. A house upon his estate which was occupied by a gardener was vacated for Wichern as a place in which to try his schemes by actual experiment. It was a small space for so vast an undertaking, but Wichern was quite content to let his enterprise have a small beginning. Full of faith, and encouraged by what was already gained, he made immediate arrangements for the occupancy of the Rauhe Haüs (see illustration), small and poor as it was, and however uninviting its little windows, and thatched roof, and low ceilings appeared. With the help of a few interested friends, such repairs as were absolutely necessary were made, he entering the premises himself as an inmate. The day of opening was marked by the admission of three boys; in a short time the number increased to twelve, and thus humbly began, backed by the roof of straw, on the Seieving estate, a movement for the neglected youth of Germany whose influence is seen and felt not only in that country, but all over the Continent and far beyond it, and whose results can never be estimated by mortal man. A careful examination shows that, so far as the children of the Rauhe Haus alone are concerned, the more moderate estimate gives eighty per cent. of them as saved from what would inevitably have been a life of vice or crime. Describing this most Christian charity, Elishu Burritt says:

"These boys had been treated or regarded as a species of human vermi, baffling the powers of the authorities to suppress. They had slept under carts, in doorways, herding with swine and cattle by night, when begging or thieving hours were past. Such were the boys that found themselves looking at each other in wonder and surprise the first evening they gathered around the hearth-stone of that cottage-home. There was no illusion about this sudden transformation in their experience. In their midst was that bands, benevolent man, with his kind eyes and voice, looking and speaking to them as a father to his children. And there with his mother, with the law of kindness on her lips, in her looks, in every act and word; and he called her mother, and They call her mother; and the first evening in their commencement life they showed, felt, the mother of their love and veneration; and they, rogues, forswenken, hopeless castaways, conceived in sin and shaped in sinfulness, became the children of the chief of the city and its haunts, with its bright fire by night and its white beds under the moonlight; and its glee and its fun, and its Sing-Bible and its songs, and its great Bible and its little Psalm-books, was to be their home. The great chestnut-tree that threw out its arms over it, and all the little trees that played about the little banks, and bushes of that acre, were their own. . . . The feeling of home came warming into their hearts like the emotions of a new existence. The father opened the house door, and we entered our house, our trees, our cabbages, turnips, potatoes, pigns, and greese and ducks, which we will grow for our comfort."

The boys at once set to work. At the end of the first week they had made a year's progress in this new life and its hopes and expectations. The faith that they could do something, be something, and own something grew daily within them. "So eager did they become," says the first report of the institution, "to accomplish the undertaking that they frequently worked by lantern-light in the evening, rooting up bushes and trees, in spite of snow or rain."

As the number of pupils increased, and there seemed danger that the physical needs of the family would seriously affect its domestic character, Mr. Wichern divided the company into households, containing from twenty to fifteen each—the children themselves, as each new house was required, performing a large part of the work. The first colony, "under the care," as the report says, "of an earnest young disciple of the law of love, who had come from a distance to discipline his heart and life to the régime of kindness, and who had lived in their midst as an elder brother," commenced their separate family life with affecting ceremonies. On a bright Sabbath morning, and in the presence of several hundred friends, the new cottage was dedicated "to the Good Shepherd, through whose love and help twenty-seven boys had already been gathered into a sheltering fold."

With the assistance of many and ressources and resources, and unpretending character were built in a semicircle around the Rough House. Girls were admitted, and separate cottages were constructed for them; and a new building was erected which afforded a more commodious residence for the superintendent, a chapel, kitchen, and other apartments for the general use of the little community, which grew to be quite a village. In 1851 Mr. Burritt found a considerable cottage-village, with workshops, dwelling-houses, a little chapel, a wash- and drying-house, a
RAUHE HAUS

printing-office, bake-house, and other buildings. There were in all about seventy boys and twenty-five girls, constituting four families of boys and two of girls. Each family-house was under the charge of a superintendent (Oberlehrer), who was assisted by two brothers, or more, who they are called—the superintendent being ordinarily a candidate for the ministry. The brothers are young men of the best character, who undergo a training of three or four years, after which they devote themselves to the care of similar institutions now rising all over Germany, quickened into life by this blessed experiment; or they become city missionaries, carrying the Gospel personally to the neglected and wretched. From thirty to forty brothers are inmates of this institution at one time, receiving no remuneration but their living, superintending the industry and aiding in conducting the moral discipline of the establishment. In its daily life this singular village is separated into three important divisions: domestic, educational, and industrial. Each family is to some extent an independent community. The members eat and sleep in their own dwelling, and the children belonging to each look up to their own particular father or mother as home-born children to a parent. Each household has thus its individual character, its peculiar interest and history, and each belongs to the possession of its own, such as the Beechens, the Dove's-nest, and the like. The bond of union is the loving father at the head of the whole institution; closely drawn by the morning and evening gatherings for prayer in the chapel or mother-house, and the celebration in common of the many festivals of the Church. The superintendents of the several houses meet the chief weekly to render their reports, and to discuss all questions of discipline. In their turn, each separate family visits him once a week in his study; and the record of each member, whether good or bad, is fully considered and passed upon—any good and being admitted at the close of the interview, to private conference with him, a privilege that is often improved. The children were told at the beginning that labor is the price of living, and that they must earn their own bread if they would enjoy it. Mr. Wichern did not point them to ease and affluence, but to an honorable poverty, which they were taught was not in itself an evil. In illustration of this, the dress, food, and furniture of the cottages are of the simplest character. The secular education given is of the most rudimental description, reaching about the middle of the primary schools; three quarters of the weekly recitations being devoted to the study of the Bible Catechism, Church history, and to music. The principal labor, farming, is carefully taught in all its branches; in addition, instruction is given in sewing, book binding, and other trades. The boys remain at the Rough House about four years, and the girls five. They are then apprenticed to service, chiefly in the city of Hamburg, whenever the work of redemption is sufficiently confirmed to admit of their exposure again to temptation. But it must not be inferred from the duration of their term of reform that the Rough House holds its inmates by force. As they come voluntarily, so they stay until dismissed by their own choice. The simple means relied upon for the accomplishment of this great reform work are prayer, the Bible, singing, affectionate conversation, severe punishment when unavoidable, and constant, steady employment in useful labor. "In a peculiar manner," says Dr. Peirce, "Wichern relied upon the Word of God. He made the whole Bible the familiar companion and food of the pupil. The whole Scripture was made to appeal to their minds, in an impressive series of readings, like a mine of priceless metal—reaching a climax in the Evangel of the New Testament. The thought that, miserable, wicked, despised as they were, Christ, the Son of God, loved them—loved them enough to suffer and die for them, and still loved them, even to feel their hearts, and gave them both hope and a strong incentive to reformation."

RAUMER

As the Raue Haus is now constituted, it is partly a refuge for morally neglected children, partly a boarding-school for the moral and intellectual education of those children of the higher classes whose vicious or unmanageable character puts them for training by such competent hands as the Raue Haus superintendents; lastly, a training-school for those who wish to become teachers or officials in houses of correction, hospitals, etc., in promotion of the objects of the Home Missionary Society of the Evangelical Church in the United States. Its trained men are employed in positions of trust, such as prison directors, stewards of estates, and superintendents of charitable houses. It was founded in 1845, and is a kind of conventual house. Entrance into this institution is limited to the age of twenty to thirty. Besides religious belief and good character, freedom from military duties, bodily and mental health, some scholastic acquirements, and a knowledge of some craft or of agriculture are required. The boarding-school was established in 1851, and at the same time a seminary was founded, in which twelve brethren of the Raue Haus are especially prepared for school-work. A printing-office, a bookbinder's shop, and bookbinding, form part of the institution also. The last named has its principal depot at Hamburg, and from it trade with the whole American Continent. The press has brought out numerous publications, and all these enjoy a very large sale. A monthly periodical called Fleische Blätter, devoted to the Inner Mission, is printed, edited, and circulated by the Raue Haus. It may be added also that during the recent German wars the inmates furnished the principal organizers of what was like our "Sanitary Commission" in the war with the South. Dr. Wichern is still living as we write (1878), but he has retired from all active connection with the Raue Haus. See Amer. Education, Monthly, Jan., 1888, art. ii.; Lee, Rev. J. J., 1874, p. 129; Repository, Dec. 1878, art. iii.; Hurst's Hagerbach, Church Hist. of the 18th and 19th Centuries (see Index).

Raulin, Hippolyte, a devoted Minim, was born about 1560, at Kethel. For many years he preached with great success, and was considered one of the most eloquent men of his day. In the capacity of provincial of his order he governed the province of Lyons; afterwards that of Lorraine. He wrote, Pasquier Orthodoxe, Mystérieux, et Prophétique sur l'Antiquité, Dignité, Noblesse, et Splendor des Fleurs de Lys (Paris, 1687), and other works. See Biog. Générale, s. v.

Raulin, Jean, a French preacher, was born at Toul in 1443. After finishing his studies, he received the degree of D.D. Before this time he had composed a commentary upon the Logic of Aristotle. In 1481 he was made president of the college at Navarre, and so acquitted himself that he was greatly esteemed. De sireing to live a more seduced life, he entered the Abbey of Cluny in 1497, and by his exemplary life led many others to follow his example. Under the direction of cardinal Amboise, he greatly aided in reforming the Order of St. Benedict. Raulin enjoyed the same reputation as Cardinal Millay and Menota. His sermons were plain, methodical, and replete with citations made from sacred writings and scholars. He wrote, Epistola (Paris, 1520): — Doctrinale de Triplici Morte, Naturale, Cœpe, et Gelennum (ibid., 1520). His Sermones in Latini were published in Paris in 1642. He died February 5, 1514. See Brehier, Hist. des Pères, etc., s. v.

Raumer, Frederic von, the accomplished German historian, was born at Wodziitz, in Anhalt-Dessau, in 1781. In 1811 he was appointed professor of history at Breslau, and in 1819 he was called to Berlin. In 1859 he was released from the duty of lecturing, but he still continued till near his death, June 18, 1873. He was one of those to whom the New Testament was the key of all the living German professors. He is the author of the well-known History of the Hohenstaufen Dynasty (1822-
RAUMER, Karl Georg von, doctor of philosophy and theology, brother of the well-known historian Frederic (q. v.), was born April 7, 1738, at Wurtzlst, in Anhalt. He was educated in the Gymnasium in Berlin, he went to Göttingen for the study of languages, history, and poetry. From Göttingen he went to Halle in 1800, where he attended the lectures of Wolf and Becker, and where he also made the acquaintance of Steffens, who introduced him in 1805 to the famous geologist Werner at Freiberg. In 1808 we see Raumer at Paris, in 1810 at Berlin; in 1811 he is professor and member of council for mining at Breslau. The Franco-Prussian war, in which he acted as adjutant to general Greisener, being over, he was called to Leipzig in 1815 and in 1816 he was called to a professorship in Halle and remained till 1823, being obliged to leave the place in consequence of distrust aroused against him. He then acted as tutor in the Dittmar Educational Institution at Nürnberg, when, in 1827, he was called as professor to Erlangen, which position he held for nearly thirty years. Rau, active and active interest in all matters promoting the kingdom of God. He is best known as the author of: "Papstjahre (Leipsic, 1835, and often since):—Der Zug der Israeliten aus Aegypten nach Canaan (ibid. 1837);—Beitriige zur bibliol. Geschichte der Pp. (3d ed. Stuttgart, 1857, 1861, 4 vols.); and:—as the editor of Augustine's Confessiones, with notes (ibid. 1856, and often). See First, Bib. Judaica, iii, 134; Zuchold, Biblioth. theol, ii, 1033; Literarischer Hand- wiss, 1857, p. 300; Winer, Theol. Handbuch, i, 722; Thomasius, Rede am Grabe des Herrn Karl v. Raumer (Erlangen, 1865); Raumer, Leben von ihm selbst (Stuttgart, 1867); Hauck, Theol. Jahresbericht, 1865, p. 734 sq.; 1865, p. 861 sq. (B. P.)

RAUMER, Rudolph von, professor of languages and son of Karl Georg von Raumer, was born April 14, 1815, at Breslau. He prepared himself at the Gymnasium in Erlangen, Nürnberg, and in 1836 entered the University of Erlangen, continuing, however, his studies at Göttingen and Munich. In 1840 he commenced lecturing at Erlangen, in 1852 was made professor in ordinary, and died there Aug. 30, 1876. He wrote: Die Einwirkung des Christenthums auf die altdeutsche Sprache (Stuttgart, 1845), which he concludes with the remarkable words: "the destiny of our (the German) people will always be connected with Christianity":—"Ein Wort der Verständigung über die Schrift: die Erscheinung der christentums, etc." (ibid. 1845);—Geschichte der germanischen Philologie, vorwiegend in Deutschland (ibid. 1870). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol., ii, 1023; Literarischer Handwiss, 1875, p. 300; 1876, p. 532; Schneider, Theol. Jahrbuch, 1878, p. 226 sq. (B. P.)

RAUSG, Lucas, one of the earlier Lutheran ministers in this country, was born in 1725 in the city of Hermannstadt, in Transylvania. He was the son of Lucas Rau, an eminent German divine, under whose careful training he enjoyed the best opportunities for mental and moral culture. Designed for the Christian ministry, his talents were early and prominently discovered at the universities of Leipzig and Jena. He immigrated to the United States in 1750, and at once identified himself with its interests. He commenced his labors in Philadelphia, and, as there were few organized Lutheran churches at the time and the members were scattered, his work was very much of an itinerant character. In 1754 he removed to York, Pa., where he continued to reside until his death, which occurred July 11, 1788. Mr. Raus enjoyed the reputation of being an accomplished scholar, particularly in the department of the Latin, Greek, and Oriental languages. He conversed with great fluency in several modern languages. His descendants are still numbered among the citizens of the United States so long labor. See Luth. Observer, April 19, 1876.

RAUSCHER, Joseph Otmar, one of the most prominent ecclesiastical princes of Austria and of the 19th century, was born Oct. 6, 1797, at Vienna, being the son of an imperial officer. He first intended to study law, which he did for three years, but afterwards bestowed himself to the study of theology, and, almost twenty years of age, he was ordained priest Aug. 27, 1823. For two years he labored as vicar at Hitteldorf, not far from Vienna, but he was soon called to Salzburg as professor of canon law and Church history. Here he commenced the elaboration of a comprehensive Church histroy, of which the first two volumes, reaching down to Justinian (Salzburg, 1824—29), promised so well for the young author that he undoubtedly would have become one of the brightest stars among the Roman Catholic historians were he left in his position; but in 1829 he was appointed in the capacity of imperial librarian at Vienna, and from that time on he was invested with different offices, to which also belonged the instruction of the present Austrian emperor and his brothers. In 1849 the metropolitan archbishop of Salzburg, prince von Schwartzburg, his former pupil and now his friend, appointed Raucher to the bishopric of Seckau. For four years he discharged his episcopal duties, amid great difficulties, in the most zealous and happy manner, when, in 1853, the emperor appointed him to the archiepiscopal see. In his new position the emperor intrusted to him a mission which connected his name with the Church history of Austria, viz. the negotiation of a concordat between Austria and the Apostolic See, which, unhappily for Austria, was signed Aug. 18, 1855. For this deed Raucher was made cardinal, Dec. 17 of the same year. For twenty years Raucher moulded the ecclesiastical as well as political affairs of Austria; for his position made him not only the intimate counsellor of the emperor, but also a prominent member of the House of Peers. It would be too long to enumerate his numerous special contributions to letters, which are all distinguished both by the depth of thought as well as by their rhetorical and noble language. He also took a prominent part in the last Vatican Council, and died Nov. 24, 1875. See Literarischer Handwiss, 1875, p. 470; Kurz, Lehrbuch der Kirchen- geschichte (Stuttgart, 1874), ii, p. 244 sqq. (B. P.)

RAUTENSTRACHT, FRANZ STEPHAN, a German theologian of the Romish Church, was born at Platten, Bo...
hemia, in 1734, became a Benedictine monk at Brau-
nan, and was there teacher of philosophy, theology, and
canon law. In 1773 he was made prelatus of the con-
vent and director of the theological faculty at Prague,
and in the following year was called to Vienna to assist
in the Ministry of Education. He died at Erlik, Hun-
gary, in 1806. He was a more than ordinary man, and
as a Romanist enjoyed the confidence of all liberal-
mined men. He was a favorite at the court of the
scholarly emperor, and was the intimate friend of Hunt-
heim (q. v.), whose liberal ideas he favored; but on
these very accounts he had much to suffer from the en-
mity of the Jesuits. He prepared the scheme for the
course of instruction for the theological faculty in the
Austrian universities, and published several minor works.
On the occasion of the visit of pope Pius VI in Vienna,
he wrote Patriot. Betrauchungen, etc.; but he is best
known by his Synoptik Juris Ecclesiasticii (Vienna,
1776). See Sabriick, Kirchenrecht, seit der Reforma-
tion, vii, 144 sq.—Herzog, Real-Encyclop. s. v.

Ravana (from the causal of the Sanscrit rv, ery, alarm; hence literally he who causes alarm) is the
name of the Rākṣasās (q. v.) who, at the time of Raṅga, ruled over Lankā or Ceylon, and, having carried
off Sīva, the wife of Raṅga, to his residence, was utti-
merically conquered and slain by the latter. Ravana is
described as having been a giant with ten faces, and, in
consequence of aesthetics and devotion, as having ob-
tained from Sīva a promise which bestowed upon him
unlimited power, even over the gods. As the promise
of Sīva could not be revoked, Vishnu evaded its efficacy
in becoming incarnate as Raṅga, and hence killed the
demon-giant.—Chambers’s Encyclop. s. v. See VisMūc.

Ravelin, Pierre, a French Protestant theologian,
was born about 1690. He was a descendant of the cel-
berated Jean Mercier. He was pastor of a church at
Souzet. His works are, Bibliothèque Sacrc, sur les Thè-
ories sacrées, des 3e, 4e, 5e, et 6e Sermo, en l’Anné-
e (Genève, 1658, 1660, 2 vols.);—Adéditions Nova ad Bibliothecam Sac-
crām (ibid. 1685).

Raven (C. corone, ‘orē; Sept. and New Test. τῶν κοινῶν, Vulg. corone), the well-known bird of that name which
is mentioned in various passages in the Bible. There
is no doubt that the Heb. ‘orē is correctly translated,
the old versions agreeing on the point, and the etymol-
yogy, from a root (C. corone) signifying “to be black,” favor-
ing this rendering. A raven was sent out by Noah
from the ark to see whether the waters were abated (Gen. viii, 7). This bird was not allowed as food by
the Mosaic law (Lev. xi, 15); the word ‘orē is doubt-
less used in a generic sense, and includes other species
of the genus Corvus, such as the crow (C. corone),
and the hossed crow (C. cornix). Ravens were the means,
under the divine command, of supporting the prophet
Elijah at the brook Cherith (1 Kings xvii, 6, 6). They
are expressly mentioned as instances of God’s protecting
love and goodness (Job xxxviii, 41; Luke xii, 24; Ps.
exilv, 9). They are enumerated with the owl, the bit-
tre, etc., as marking the desolation of Edom (Isa. xxxiv,
11). “The locks of the beloved” are compared to the
gloomy blackness of the raven’s plumage (Cant. v, 11).
The raven’s carnivorous habits, and especially his read-
iness to attack the eye, are alluded to in Prov. xxx,
17. See Ostr. The Sept. and Vulg. differ materially from
the Hebrew and our A. V. in Gen. viii, 7; for whereas
in the Hebrew we read “that the raven went forth to
and fro [from the ark] until the waters were dried up,”
in the two old versions named above, together with the
Nestor, the raven is represented as “returning, until
the waters were dried from off the earth.” On this sub-
ject the reader may refer to Houbigant (Not. Crit. i,
12), Bochart (Hieroz. ii, 801), Rosenmüller (Schol. in 1
T.), Kalisch (Genesea), and Patrick (Commentary),
who shows the manifest incorrectness of the Sept. in
representing the raven as keeping away from the ark
while the waters lasted, but as returning to it when
they were dried up. The expression “to and fro” clearly
proves that the raven must have returned to the ark at
intervals. The bird would doubtless have found food in
the floating carcasses of the deluge, but would require
a more solid resting-ground than they could afford. See
Dukan. The subject of Elijah’s sustenance at Cherith
by means of ravens has given occasion to much fanciful
speculation. It has been attempted to show that the
‘orēbin (“ravens”) were the people of Orba, a small
town near Cherith; this theory has been well answered
by Reland (Pudeli, ii, 913). Others have found in the
ravens merely merchants; while Michaelis has attempt-
to show that Elijah merely plundered the ravens’
ests of hares and other game! Keil (Comment. on 1
Kings xxiv) makes the following, just observation: “The
text knows nothing of bird-catching and nest-robbing,
but acknowledges the Lord and Creator of the creatures,
who commanded the ravens to provide his servant with
bread and water.” It has also been well replied that an
animal unfit for food or sacrifice did not necessarily den
what it touched. “An ass was as unclean as a raven;
yet no one was polluted by riding on an ass, or by eat-
ing that which an ass had carried.” An objection more
to the point would be that the flesh which ravens would
bring would leave the prophet no opportunity of being
satisfied that it was such as he could legally receive;
either that it was the flesh of a clean beast, or, if so,
that it had not died with the blood unstrained. But to
this, too, the answer is obvious: if Jehovah could so
restrain and overrule the instincts of these voracious
birds as to make them minister to his servant, he could
also take care that they should select nothing but what
was fit, and he could give Elijah confidence that it was
so. Some, however, understand 2 rula to be there meant.
See Elijah.

The raven belongs to the order Curaeae, family
Corvidea. The raven is so generally confounded with
the carrion crow that even in the works of naturalists
the figure of the latter has sometimes been substituted
for that of the former, and the manners of both have
been mixed up together. They are, it is true, very
similar, belonging to the same Linnean genus, Corvus,
and having the same intensely black color; but the
raven is the larger, weighing about three pounds; has
proportionately a smaller head, and a bill fuller and
stouter at the point. Its black color is more iridescent
(hence the comparison to the bridegroom’s locks, Cant.
v, 11), with gleams of purple passing into green, while
that of the crow is more steel-blue; the raven is also
the gifted with greater sagacity; may be tended to articu-
late words; is naturally observant and solitary; lives
in pairs; has a most acute scent; and flies to a great
height. Unlike the crow, which is gregarious in its
habits, the raven will not even suffer its young, from
the moment they can shift for themselves, to remain
within its brunt; and, therefore, though a bird fond
in nearly all countries, it is nowhere abundant (Bo-
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chart. Hieron, ii. 796 sq.; Kimchi on Psa. xiv. 7.) Whether the raven of Palestine is the common species, or the Coreuus montanus of Temminck, is not quite determined; for there is of the ravens, or greater form of crows, a smaller group including two or three others, all similar in manners, and unlike the carrion crows (Corvus corone, L.) which are grageorous and seemingly identical in both焚烧 and in the time of year that ravens will descend without fear among a flight of crows, take possession of the carrion that may have attracted them, and keep the crows at a distance till they themselves are gorged. (Comp. Horace, Ep. i. 16, 48; Aristophanes, Fr. 929.) The habits of this whole genus is typified by the name *вор* render it unclean in the Hebrew law; and the malignant, ominous expression of the raven, together with the color of its plumage, powers of voice, and solitary habits, are the causes of that universal and often superstitious attention with which mankind have ever regarded it.

In the mythological history of the Gentiles, we find the appellation of Ravens bestowed upon an ecclesiastical order of priesthood. In Egypt, it seems, the temples of Ammon were served by such—perhaps those priests that occur in their catacomb paintings are ravens, and dressed in black. More than one temple in Greece had similar ravens. It was the usual symbol of slaughter among the Scandinavians; and a raven banner belonged to the Danes, and also to the Saxons; one occurs among the emblems of the Norsemen in the Bayeux tapestry; and it was formerly a custom in the Benedictine abbeys on the Continent to maintain a very large cage of a couple of ravens, where several are recorded to have lived above fifty years. The Raven of the Sea, that ominous bird in Northern mythology, is properly the corvus or corvus corone of the Copts. Jewish and Arabic writers tell strange stories of this bird and its cruelty to young; hence, say some, the Lord's express care for the young raven after they had been driven out of the nests by the parent birds; but this belief in the raven's want of affection to its young is entirely without foundation. To the fact of the raven being a common bird in Palestine, and to its habit of flying restlessly about in constant search for food to satisfy its voracious appetite, may, perhaps, be traced the reason for its being selected by our Lord and the inspired writers as the especial object of God's providing care. There is something weird and shrewd in the expression of the raven's countenance; a union of cunning and malignity, which may have contributed to give it among widely separated nations, and in remote centuries, the name of the emissary of evil. Its black hue—the hue of night and of mourning—its reclusive, solitary suspicion, and its harsh croak have no doubt increased its uncanny reputation. Certain is it that the "infausta corvus" has long been feared and hated as the messenger of evil and the prognosticator of death, while the Romans dedicated it to Apollo as the god of divination. An anonymous writer familiar with the habits of the bird has ingeniously suggested an explanation of its divining power.

"The smell of death is so grateful to them that they use it with a loud croak of satisfaction instantly on perceiving it. In passing over sheep, if a tainted smell is perceptible, they cry vehemently. From this propensity the raven to announce his satisfaction in the smell of death has probably arisen the common notion that he is aware of its approach among the human race, and foretells it by his croakings. I have no doubt the idea is founded in truth, although I think the coming event is not communicated to the raven by any immediate or supernatural means, but that in its animal or human habitation from which a sickly or cadaverous smell may escape, it is perfectly natural for him to announce his perception of it by his cries." (Zoologist, p. 217.) The shepherd had a better reason for calling the raven a bird of ill omen. A more vigilant or more cruel enemy to the flock can hardly exist, and it frequently makes its ferocious assaults on the yet living victim. See Wood, Brit. Animals, p. 439 sq.; Tristram, Nat. Hist. of the Bible, p. 198 sq.

RAVENNA, an important city of Central Italy, forty-three miles east-southeast from Bologna, and four and a half miles from the Adriatic, with a population of nearly 60,000 people, was once the capital of the empire (from A.D. 401), and is not only a very ancient city, whose history is of great interest to Christianity on account of its early relation to the Church, but more particularly on account of the different ecclesiastical councils which have been held there, and the disputes which the metropolitan claims of Ravenna maintained in early mediaval days with the bishopric of Rome, especially in the 7th century, Under Constans (666), in the 8th against pope Hadrian, and in the 9th, when in 861 the strife was finally put at rest at a synod in Rome. Aside from the council of bishops in 419, called by Honorius to decide upon the choice of popes between Boniface and Eulalius, the following councils of Ravenna (Concilia Ravennata) are noteworthy:

(L.) Held July 22, 877, by pope John VIII, at the head of forty-nine bishops (Holstenius and Labbe say the number of bishops was 130). This council was held to remedy the disorders of the Church. Nineteen chapters remain to us, relating to the discipline and privileges of the Church; also a letter confirming the possession of a monastery to the bishop of Antun.

Chap. 1. Enjoys the metropolitan to send to Rome for the pallium within three months after his consecration, and forbids him to exercise any of the functions of his office until that be done.

2. Enjoys all bishops elect shall be consecrated by their metropolitans within three months after election, under pain of excommunication.

3. Forbids metropolitan to make use of the pallium except on great festivals and during massa.

5, 6, 7, and 8. Excommunicate and anathematize those who rob the Church, injure ecclesiastics, and commit various other crimes.

9. Declares those persons to be themselves excommunicati who voluntarily communicate with the excommunicati.

10. Excommunicates those who absolve themselves from their juridical church on three Sundays successively.

19. Forbids Judges and royal commissioneers to hold courts and to lodge in churches.

-Labbe, Concil. ix. 299.

(II.) Held in 896 (or 904, according to Labbe) by John IX, in the matter of Formosus and Stephen; the emperor Lambert being present and seventy-four bishops. Ten regulations were approved.

1. Enacts the new ecclesiastical canons of the fathers, and all that is contained in the capitularies of Charlemagne, Louis le Debonnaire, Lothaire, and Louis II.

2. Confirms the privileges granted to the Church of Rome by the emperors.

4. Approves all that had been done in the Council of Rome, A.D. 896, in the matter of Formosus.

5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10. Relate to the political circumstances of the Roman see.

-Labbe, Concil. ix. 507.

(III.) Held in April, 967. In this council the emperor, Otho I, yielded to the pope, John XIII, the city and territory of Ravenna. Heroldus, archbishop of Salzburg, was deposed and excommunicated; the act of deposition being subscribed on April 25 by the emperor and fifty-seven bishops, including the pope. Lastly, Magdeburg was erected into an archbishopric: this, however, was not completed until the following year.

-Labbe, Concil. ix. 674.

(IV.) Held May 1, 967, by Gerbert, archbishop of Ravenna, and eight suffragans. Three canons remain of which

1. Condemns an infamous custom which existed in the cathedral of Ravenna of selling the holy eucharist and chrism.

-Labbe, Concil. ix. 766.

(V.) Held April 30, 1014, by the new archbishop, Arnold, to remedy the abuses caused by the long vacancy of eleven years, and the intrusion of Adalbert, who had
unlawfully conferred holy orders and dedicated certain churches. It was determined that those upon whom orders had been thus conferred should remain suspended until the matter could be minutely considered; and that the consecrations of churches and oratories made by Adalbert were null and void.—Llabèe, Concil. ix, 853. 

(F.) Held by the cardinals of St. Anastasia, in 1126. Here the patriarchs of Aquileia and Venice, or Grade, were deposed, having been convicted of favoring schismatics.—Pagi; Llabèe, Concil. x, 936.

(VII.) Held in 1296, July 8, by Bonifacius the archbishop, who presided, assisted by eight bishops, his suffragans; no canons were published.

3. Exhorts the clergy to almsgiving, and grants indulgences to those who feed and clothe the poor.

4. Relates to the dress of the clergy; and forbids them to carry arms without the bishop's permission.

5. Orders that the usual daily distributions shall be made only to those canons who attend the holy office.

Llabèe, Concil. xi, 1238.

(VIII.) Held in 1310 by Rainaldus the archbishop, in the matter of the Templars. Present, eight bishops of the province, three inquisitors, two preaching friars, and one Minorite: seven Templars were brought before them, who constantly affirmed their innocence. On the following day it was determined that they were not confessors from a fear of torture only should be considered innocent; nevertheless, there were five who went through the canonical ordeal.—Llabèe, Concil. xi, 1333.

IX.) Held in 1311 by Rainaldus the archbishop, five bishops and thirteen professors attending. Thirty-two canons were published.

6. Orders mass to be said daily for the souls of the other bishops in behalf of a bishop deceased.

7. Orders, yearly, on July 29, a solemn service shall be said for the deceased bishops; and that on that day twelve poor persons shall be fed.

8. Orders that all things be done on behalf of patrons and benefactors of churches.

9. Orders that the sacraments be administered fasting. 

10. Orders that alms be given to the poor every Sunday, after the gospel and oratory, of the festivals and fast-days of the coming week.

11. Orders that the form of baptism shall be publicly said in church three times a year.

12. Orders that the canon "omnibus unigenitis sexis" shall be published at Advent and Lent. That medical men shall not visit a patient a second time if he have not called in the priest. 

13. Forbids to give a benefice to any one who cannot read or chant.

14. Orders annual synods.

15. Orders that Jews shall wear a distinguishing badge.

16. Orders that canons be punished for striking, maltreating, and driving the clergy from their churches.

—Llabèe, Concil. xi, 1569.

(X.) Held in 1314 by the same archbishop, assisted by six bishops and four deputies. Twenty canons were published.

17. Forbids to ordain to the priesthood persons under twenty-five years of age; also to ordain a deacon under twenty, and a sub-deacon under sixteen years.

18. Orders that the church bells shall be rung when a bishop presides, that the people may come out to receive his blessing upon their knees; also regulates the form to be observed by the chapter of a cathedral upon the bishop's visit.

19. Orders, under pain of excommunication, that no monks, or other persons, can claim exemption from episcopal visitation upon plea of prescriptive right, or any other plea.

20. Enacts that the clergy shall be soberly dressed; that they shall carry carms, nor dress in colored clothes; that they shall wear a close cassock, observe the tresses, and keep their hair cut short, etc.

21. Forbids men to enter the monastic houses of females.

22. Orders curates to teach their people the form of baptism once a year.

23. Orders fasting and almsgiving on the three days before the visit of provincial councilors.

24. Revokes the permission given to monks to preach indulgences.


For the Council of Ravenna held in 1317, see Bologna.

Ravenscroft, John Starkz, D.D., an Episcopal minister in America, afterwards bishop of North Carolina, was born near Blandford, Prince George County, Va., in 1772. He entered William and Mary College in 1789, but with little profit; and, on his return from Scotland soon after, settled in Lunenburg County. In 1810 his mind was changed, and he joined the "Republican Methodists," and became a lay elder in their Church. He was subsequently ordained in the Protestant Episcopal Church, became assistant minister at Richmond, and was elected bishop the same year. In 1820 he retired to Williamsburg, and was from ill-health, and on his return to North Carolina, died March 5, 1850. He published several Sermons and Charges:—also, The Doctrine of the Church Vindicated, etc. —Revealed Religion Defended against the No-Comment Principle. Sixty-one Sermons and a Memoir (2 vols. 8vo) were also published after his death. See Sprague, Annales of the Amer. Pulpit, v, 617.

Ravenscroft, Stephen, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born of pious and respectable parents at Staffordshire, England, March 6, 1803, was converted very young, and licensed to preach in his eighteenth year by the Wesleyans. In 1838 he entered the ministry of the English Congregational Church. He was a strong opponent of the connection of the church with the government, as a minister of republican institutions, and as loyal a citizen as ever breathed the free air of America. In 1839 he was admitted into the Indiana Conference, and appointed to Booneville. His subsequent appointments were Mount Vernon, New Lebanon, Carlisle, Spencer, Blanchfield, and Little Egypt. In 1840 he was called away from his charge his health failed, and he was located at his own request. He moved with his family to Point Commerce, and supplied Linton and New Albany circuits. He afterwards travelled as a Bible agent in Clark and Floyd counties until his health became so poor that he had to give up the work entirely. He then moved to Rockport, Ind., where, as a supply, he ended his nine years' service as a local preacher. In 1859 he was re-admitted into conference and placed on the superannuated list, which relation he sustained until his death. In 1869 he moved to Worthington, Ind., and in 1879 to Petersburgh, Ind., where he was appointed postmaster, and where he died, Oct. 20, 1871. See Minutes of Conf. 1872, p. 79.

Ravenscroft, Thomas, an eminent English musical composer, deserves a place here for his devotion to sacred subjects. He was born in 1592, received his musical education in St. Paul's choirmaster, and had the degree of bachelor of music conferred on him when only fifteen years of age. In 1611 appeared his Melismata, Musical Phanais, a collection of twenty-three part-songs, some of them of great beauty; and three years later he brought out another collection of part-songs under the title of Brief Discourses, with an essay on the old musical modes. Turning his attention to psalmody, he published in 1621 a collection of psalm-tunes for four voices, entitled The Whole Book of Psalms, composed into Four Parts by Soundy Authors, to which Tunes have been annexed, usually sung in England, Scotland, Wales, Germany, Italy, France, and the Netherlands. This was the first publication of its kind, and all similar works of later date have been largely indebted to it. Among the contributors to this collection were Tallis, Morley, Dowland, and all the greatest masters of the day; the name of John Milton, the father of the poet, appears as the composer of York and Norwich tunes; while St. David's, Canterbury, Bangor, and many others which have since become popular, are by Ravenscroft himself. Each of the psalm-tunes has a distinctive title assigned to it. Two collections of secular songs similar to the Melismata, and entitled Pammelia and Deutervocala, have been assigned to Ravenscroft; but it is probable that only a few of these songs were composed by him, while he may have revised and edited the whole. A selection from the Melismata, Brief Discourses, Pav-
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melia, and Deuteronomia was printed by the Roxburghe Club in 1823. He died about 1840.—Chambers. See also Eng. Ch. Register, vol. i; Amer. Quar. Ch. Rec. Jan. 1871, p. 526.

RAVESTYN, Josse (in Latin Tilletanus), a Belgian theologian, was born about 1506 at Tielt, Flanders. He was educated at Louvain, and taught theology there. He was sent by Charles V to the Council of Trent (1551), then to the Colloquy of Worms (1557), and disputes were had at these ecclesiastical councils by his knowledge and moderation. In 1559 he replaced Ruard Tapper in the charge of the monks who had the care of the hospital of Louvain. He had twice been elected rector of the university of that city, and held divers benefices. He was a zealous defender of the Church, and much opposed to the errors of the Calvinists, whom he regarded as his most ardent adversary. He died at Louvain Feb. 7, 1571. His principal writings are: Confessionis edita a Ministris Antverpiae Confessiti (Louvain, 1557, 8vo); the Confession of the pastors had already been refuted by William of Linda.—Apologia Catholica Confessitionis, etc. (ibid. 1568, 8vo); directed against the Centuries de Magdeburg, of which Matthew Flach Francowitz was the principal author.—De assumeda apol. de Ecclesii Triumfentia de Sacramentis (ibid. 1568-70, 2 vols. 12mo). He left several works in manuscript.—Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, s. v.

Ravignan, GUSTAVUS FRANCIS XAVIER DELACROIX de, one of the most celebrated of Roman Catholic preachers of our times, and also a distinguished member of the Jesuit Order, was born at Bayonne Dec. 2, 1723. He studied in the Lycee Bonaparte at Paris, and was by his parents intended for the legal profession, which he also entered by obtaining his degree and being named auditor of the Cour Royale at Paris. In 1741 he received an appointment in the Tribunal of the Seine. The prospect thus opened for him, however, lost its attraction after a change of views in religion had made him serious about the future, and in 1782 he formed the resolution of relinquishing his career at the bar, and entering the Church. Having spent some time in the College of St. Sulpice, he soon passed into the novitiate of the Jesuits at Montmore, and thence to Dole and St. Acheul for his theological studies, at the termination of which he was himself appointed a professor. The religious fervor of his soul found expression in many of the material forms which prevail so generally among the Romanists of our country. Thus, for example, he wore for a long time, as a mark of penance, a leather girdle stuck full of needles, around his waist, on the bare body. On the expulsion of the Jesuits from France in 1800, father Ravignan withdrew to Freiburg, in Switzerland, where he continued to teach in the schools of his own order; but after some time, when he was supposed to have gained sufficient notoriety by the afflicting discipline of his body, he was transferred to the more congenial duty of preaching, first in several of the Swiss Parishes, and afterwards in Savoy, at Chambery, at St. Maurice, and other places. In 1803, in 1853, he appeared in the pulpit of the cathedral of Amiens. In the following year he was chosen to preach the Leuten sermons at the church of St. Thomas d'Aquin in Paris; and finally, in 1857, was selected to replace Lamennais at Notre Dame de Paris in the duty of conducting the special "conferences" for men which had been opened in that church. For ten years father Ravignan occupied this pulpit with a success which has rarely been equalled, and his Conferences are regarded as models of orœsætical eloquence. In 1842 he undertook, in addition, to preach each evening during the entire Lent; and it is to the excessive fatigue thus induced, as well as to the many trials imposed, that the premature break-down of his strength is ascribed. To the labors of the pulpit he added those also of the press. He published an Apology of his order in 1844; and in 1846 a more extended work with the same view, Clement XIII et Clement XIV (2 vols. 8vo), which was intended as a reply to the Life of Clement XIV by the Oratorian father Theiner. These, with some occasional Sermons and Conferences, constitute the sum of the publications issued during his life. In 1855 he was invited by the emperor Napoleon III to preach in the Lent at the Tuileries. He died Feb. 26, 1858, in the convent of his order at Paris. None of the Jesuit preachers of our times have so zealously labored among the Protestants as father Ravignan, but, alas! too frequently he employed measures in no way adding honor to the already overcast name of the Jesuitical order. His Memoirs have been published by his brethren, and a collected edition of his works and remains has been for some time in progress. The Memoir has been translated into English, under the title of The Life of Father Ravignan, by father De Ponlevoy (Dublin, 1862; N. Y. 1863).

Rawle is, in ecclesiastical language, the name of a cloak worn by women mourners. See MOURNING.

Rawlett, JOHN, an English theologian, was born about 1642, and was a lecturer in divinity at Newcastle-upon-Tyne at the time of his death, in 1686. He published, Explication of the Creed, the Ten Commandments, and the Lord's Prayer (Lond. 1672, 8vo; 1706, 8vo);—Dialogue between Two Protestants (1691, 8vo) and The Dissenter Monitor, in Welsh (Oxon. 1689, 8vo);—Treatise of Sacramental Coemmentation (5th ed. Lond. 1692, 8vo).

Rawley, WILLIAM, an Anglican divine of some note, was born about 1648, and was educated at St. John's College, Cambridge, of which he was made fellow in 1667. He frequently took part in the polemics of the late 18th century. In 1719 became rector of Bowthorpe, Norfolk; in 1716, vicar of Hunstanton, Norfolk. He was chaplain and amanuensis to Lord Bacon, and subsequently chaplain to Charles II and Charles II. He wrote prefaces and dedications to some Bacon's works, and translated several of them into Latin. In 1698, after Bacon's death, he published them in folio form; and in 1657 he published, under the title of Resuscitatio, several other of Bacon's tracts, with a memoir of the author prefixed. In 1661 he republished the Resuscitatio, with additions. He died in 1667.

Rawlin, Richard, an English Independent divine, was born in 1687, and flourished as pastor of an Independent congregation in Fetter Lane, London. He died in 1757. He published, Christ the Righteousness of His People, seen Discourses on Justification by Faith in Him (1741, 8vo; 1722, 1797, 12mo).

Rawlings, CHARLES, a Wesleyan preacher of some note, was born at Cheltenham, in 1784. He was destined for mercantile life, but finally, brought under the influence of the Wesleyans, he was converted and taken into the Church. In 1836 he entered the ministry, and for twenty-nine years filled some of the best circuits in the connection. He last held the appointment of superintendent of the Swansea (English) Circuit. He died July 14, 1865. See Cambria Daily Leader (of that date).

Rawlinson, George, an English divine, noted also as a scientist, was born in 1819, and was educated at King's College and Emmanuel College, Cambridge. In 1844 he was made fellow of St. Mark's, and in 1849, of St. Mary's, in the University of London. In 1856 he was appointed professor of applied sciences at Elphinstone College, Bombay, where he remained until his death in September following. He published in 1857, at Bombay, a work on dynamics. His Elementary Descriptive Geometry, edited by Elgood, was published at Cambridge and London (1861, 8vo). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s. v.

Rawlinson, John, D.D., an English divine, noted also as an educator, flourished in the first half of the 17th century. He was at one time principal of St. Edmund's Hall. He published, Three Sermons (Lond. 1699; 11;
Raymond of Magnolione, a French medieval prelate, flourished near the opening of the 12th century. It is supposed that he was of the family of the nobles of Montpellier. He was bishop from 1128, but not without opposition. The count of Toulouse, finding the choice of Raymond contrary to his views, for revenge, tried to destroy the church of Magnolone; but the constancy of Raymond triumphed over this opposition, and forced the same Bernard to make public confession of his error. Raymond, with many of the acts mentioned or published by the Italia Christina and L'Historie de Languedoc of M. Vaissete. He died in November, 1159.—Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, s. v.

Raymond of Penafort (Saint), a Spanish Dominican, was born in 1175 at the château of Penafort in Catalonia, and belonged to one of the noble families of Spain allied to the royal house of Aragon. He was educated at Barcelona, and made such progress that at the age of twenty he taught the liberal arts at that place. He went to perfect himself at the University of Bologna, where he received the title of doctor in civil and canonical law. Attracted by his munificence, which was still rising, Béanger, bishop of Barcelona, on his returning to his church from Rome, went to see him at Bologna, and succeeded in persuading him to return with him to Spain. He did not, however, content himself with the mere discharge of his duties of canoni- cate and his archdeaconry in the Barcelona cathedral, but was very much occupied with all manner of good works. He finally felt persuaded to take the Dominican habit, April 1, 1222. His example was followed by several physicians, and sole pastor on church at removal of his father to Enfield. He occupied this position for ten years, and then became pastor of the Broadmead Chapel in Bristol, and at the same time president of the Baptist Institute in that place. Here he continued until his death, May 23, 1825. Brown University conferred the degree of D.D. on Dr. Rayland in 1772. His sermons, etc., were collected, published, and in two volumes. The funeral ser- mon of Dr. Rayland by Robert Hall presents a most charming portrait of this excellent man. (J. C. S.)

Raymond, Sr. (Spanish, San Raymond), a Roman Catholic prelate who flourished in Spain in the first half of the 13th century, is frequently called by his sur- name Navarre, as if he owed to that country the title he afterwards took of the body of his mother after her death by the Cesaréan operation. He was thus born at Portel, in Catalonia, in 1204, and was of a gentleman's family of small fortune. His early life was spent in the moun- tain fastnesses of his native country; but when he had attained to the years of a maturer youth, he set out for the court, and there attracted attention. The dismis- sion of his royal associates disgusted him, and he sought the retirement of the cloister. He joined the Order of Mercy, which aimed at the redemption of captives from the Moors. He was admitted by the founder finding St. Peter Nolasco (q. v.). While in Algiers he was taken up by the authorities, and punished with excori- ating tortures of the body; but he bore all meekly, and even continued his work after his release. The story goes that, when informed of the sentence of death of one of his companions, he put his hands to his hair, and his lips were bored through with a red-hot iron and fastened with a padlock. He was released after eight months' imprisonment, and taken back to Spain by friends of his, and under direction of the pope of Rome, who shortly after made him a cardinal. He was also made the general of his order, and as such was invited to visit Rome. On his way thither he fell sick at Cordova, only six miles from Barcelona, and died Aug. 81, 1240. Both pope Gregory IX and king James of Aragon assisted at his funeral. Pope Alexander VII inserted Raymond's name in the Martyrology in 1657. See Butler, Lives of the Saints, viii, 567 sq.
he wished even to raise him to the metropolitan see of Tarragona, but Raymond preferred the solitude of Barcelona to all the advantages which his friends had hoped for him. Nominated general of his order in 1236, he gave up his charge two years later, and contributed much by his zeal and zeal to the establishment of the Order of Mercy. Peter Nolasccus was one of his converts, and so were many other distinguished characters of that period. Indeed, his influence is said to have been so great that the expulsion of the Moors from Spain is principally credited to his agency. Raymond was also the spiritual director of the king of Aragon, and he persuaded his royal master James to favor the establishment of the Inquisition in his kingdom and in Languedoc, and the popes permitted him to provide for the offices of this tribunal. Pope Clement VIII canonized him in 1691. We have of his works a collection of Decretals, which forms the fifth volume of the canon law. This collection is in five books, and the author has joined several decrees of the councils to the constitutions of the popes—a Summa on.devotion and marriage, which he dedicated a theology of his aborigine of this work, and divers other works which have not been printed, and which do not merit it. Raymond de Penafort died at Barcelona Jan. 6, 1753. He is commemorated Jan. 23.—Hoefler, Nativ. Bipg. Geneal. s. v. See Butler, Life of the Saints, 2d ed.; sq.; Mrs. Jameson, History of Myths and this (I., 168,); in the Academy of Decretals, (1769), which contains the 4th and 5th centuries, he was solicited to fill it. But he was far from being pleased, and even prepared to return to Lyons. He did not again revisit Savoy until 1639, and then only to his unhappiness. He had, during his seclusion at Chambery, contracted a close friendship with father Pierre Monod, his companion; and when he heard of his detention in the fortress of Montmellon, he tried in every way to have it brought to an end. Richelieu took offence at this ardent affection, which was natural between friends, and not being willing to permit relations between Raymond and a priest in residence, he solicited and obtained from the court of Savoy the arrest of the unfortunate Jesuit. At the end of three months he was released, and sought refuge at Carpentras, which then belonged to the Papal States. But the aversion of his enemies would not leave him long undisturbed. By order of the cardinal-legate Antonio Barberini, he was conducted to Avignon, and locked in a chamber of the pontifical palace. With difficulty released, he left for Rome, with the manuscript of Heteroelus Spiritualibus, which he had prepared, suspended, submitted it for examination to father Alem ague, and obtained the authority to publish. In 1645 he returned to Rome in company with cardinal Fed erigo Sforza, and was presented to the pope and the Sacred College as one of the most ardent champions of the papal rights. He afterwards made two journeys to the Eternal City, the first time in 1647, and there occupied for some time a theological chair; the second time in 1651, when he assisted at the general assembly of his order. He afterwards obtained permission to establish himself at Lyons, and there passed the rest of his life in teaching and composing his works. He died Oct. 31, 1668. Father Raymond had all the qualities of a good friar: he was sober, pious, and very charitable; but by his pen he did not spare his adversaries, and showed himself severe and irascible. He wrote a great many works, which, though extravagant in style, curious, and trivial, were nearly all received with favor. Tiraboschi was unable to forbear comparing them to "one of those vast magazines full of merchandise of all kinds, good and bad, ancient and modern, useful and useless, in which one could find in any taste and patience, everything which suited him." The writings of père Raymond worth mentioning here are, Theologiae Naturalis (Lyons, 1622, 1637, 4to);—Splendor Veritatis Moralis (ibid. 1627, 8vo; under the name of Stephani Emonenii)—Morali Disciplina (ibid. 1629, 8vo).—Indiciiis Sanctorum Ludoveni (ibid. 1629, 12mo).—
Calcismus, Vestarum Religio (Paris, 1630, 12mo; under the name of Riviére) — De Commune pro Moribus (Lyons, 1630, 8vo); he pretends that the sacraments have been perverted so that those who receive them are censured by the Church of Rome: — De Martyrio per Pestem (ibid., 1630, 8vo); in the index of this book he tried to show that those who exposed themselves voluntarily to the plague in assisting those who had it were the real martyrs: — Nova Libertatis Explicatio (Paris, 1630, 8vo); against the papal bull, In deo Gratiae. — Meta- morphosis Latronum in Apostolos Apostolique in Latro- nem (Lyons, 1634, 2 vols. 8vo); followed by several other treatises: — De Orti Infantium contra Natura, per Sectionem Canarium (ibid., 1637, 8vo); a singularly curious book; — Hippocratis de Religione Negotiorum (Francisca [Chambery], 1642, 8vo); a satirical work, translated into French (Chambery, 1645, 8vo) by Tri- pier, teacher of the natural children of the duke of Savoy; and Amsterdam (1761, 12mo) — Depicta Mariani (Grenoble, 1643, 4to); — Mala Bonorum Ecclesiasticorum (Avignon, 1645, 8vo); a dissertation written upon the dead body of a woman which was found in 1642 at Carpentras without any signs of decomposition, although it had been buried for a long time; Raynaud pretended that the body was still alive, and died under natural causes, not to the artifices of the devil, but to God himself; but adds, he as this last supposition is far from being demonstrated, it will be well to find what God himself has decreed on this subject: — Interrocalta Spiritus (Paris, 1646, 8vo; Lyons, 1644, 4to); a collection of the extraordinary practices which superstition and ignorance have introduced into religion: — Vite Martia Humanarum Terminarum (Orange, 1646, 8vo); he had not then reason to doubt, following the author, that God has fixed the term of life for the good and the wicked; but ordinarily the length of the life of men and their death depend upon natural causes: — Triunus Patriarcharum (Lyons, 1617, 8vo); notices upon Sime- on Stylites, Francis de Paulo, and Ignatius de Loyola: — Eregione de Maia ac Bonis Libris, deque Justitia et Injusta coronund Congregatione (ibid., 1640, 4to); this work, full of research, is an answer to an attack on his De Mortuio per Pestem: — Theologia Patrum (Antwerp, 1652, fol.); — De Sobria Alerius Seruæ Speculationis per Sacros et Religiosas Homines (Lyons, 1653, 8vo): — De Fide et Erudienda Capitula Terminarum, tamquam Prospectam (Lyons, 1655, 4to); — Evneuchi, Nati, Forti, Mystici, ex Sacer et Humanæ Literaturae Illustrati; Puerorum Emunserius ab Musicam quo loco Habendi (Dijon, 1655, 4to); under the name of Jean Heibert, he treated, in a subtle manner, the subject of euthanasia; but he had forgotten the most essential point, whether they were able to marry; this question was very fully treated in his work Traicitur Evneæus (1707, 4to) — Hercules Commodus (Aix, 1655, 8vo); under the name Honor- atia Lebost; it is a virulent satire against Jean de Lavo- nei — Trivs Fortium Darit (Lyons, 1657, 4to); re- marks upon Robert d'Arbrisel, St. Bernard, and Cesar of Bas — Missa Evangelica ad S. James, Jupitanam et Oraz Corpus (Antw. [Lyons], 1659, 8vo); under the name of Laurens Quintin: — O Paracruceorum (Lyons, 1651, 4to); — Husa P. Gallicus (ibid. 1662, 8vo); — De Inimicitia Auctorum Cacorum ac Insensatorum (ibid., 1662, 8vo); see Dupin, Bibliothèque des Auteurs Eccles.; Nic- ron, Mémoires, vol. xxxi. His Life, written by him- self, is preserved in the Jesuit Library at Lyons. See also Se Sé Si. Script. Soc. Jn. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, s. v.

Rascis (Pozīg, Vulg. Rasinos), "one of the elders of Jerusalem," who killed himself under peculiarly terrible circumstances, that he might not fall "into the hands of the wicked" (2 Mac. xiv. 37-46). In dying he is reported to have expressed himself in a remarkably typical confession (ver. 46)—a belief elsewhere characteristic of the Maccabean conflict. This act of suicide, which was

wholly alien to the spirit of the Jewish law and people (John viii. 22; comp. Ewald, Alterth., p. 198; Groius, De Jure Belli, II, xix, 5), it has been the subject of considerable discussion. It was quoted by the Donatists as the same fact in Scripture which supported their fanatical contempt of life (Augustine, Ep. 104, 6). Augustine denies the fitness of the model, and condemns the deed as that of a man "non eligens mortis sapientia, sed ferendae humiliatis impatience" (Augustine, l. c. ; comp. Zeller, Grund, i. 6-32, 60). Later times, in fact, with which the writer of 2 Mac. views the conduct of Rasis—a fact which Augustine vainly denies—was urged rightly by Protestant writers as an argument against the inspiration of the book. Indeed the whole narrative breathes the spirit of pagan heroism, or of the later zealots (comp. Josephus, War, iii, 7; iv, 1, 10), and the deaths of Samson and Saul offer no satisfactory parallel (comp. Grimm, ad loc.)

Razor is the rendering in the A. V. of the following words: 1. πολύζων, morkāh (Sept. πολυζων; Vulg. nunculato), ferrum: from πολύζων, "scrape," or "swipe." Genesis connects it with the root πολύ, "to tear" (The- saur., p. 819). This word occurs in Judg. xiii. 5, xvi. 17; 1 Sam. i. 11. 2. τάφθρα, t'ar (Sept. posathepa; Vulg. glandis: from πολύζων, to long bone), a more general term (Numb. vi. 5; Psal. iii. 2; Isai. vii. 20; Ezek. v, 1) for a sharp knife, which is mentioned in Jer. xxiv. 1 ("sheath," 1 Sam. xvii. 51, et al.; although many regard this as a different word of the same form). The barb is designated by ζωον, gollab (Sept. konzeph; Vulg. tonsor, 2 Sam. xx. 8). Besides other usages, the prac- tice of shaving the head after the completion of a row must have created among the Jews a necessity for the special trade of a barber (Numb. vi. 9, 18; iv. 7, 17; Judg. xiii. 5; Isai. vii. 20; Ezek. v, 1; Acts xviii. 18). The instruments of his work were probably, as in modern times, the razor, the basin, the mirror, and perhaps, also, the scissors, such as are described by Lo- cian ([Ador. Jud., i. 295, ed. Amst.; see 2 Sam. xix. 26). The process of Oriental shaving, and especially of the head, is minutely described by Chardin (Fig. iv. 144). It may be remarked that, like the Levites, the Egyptian priests were accustomed to shave their whole bodies (Herod. ii. 38, 37). The Psalmist com- pares the tongue of Dog to a sharp razor (Ps. lii. 2) starting aside from what should be its true operation to a cruel purpose and effect. In the denuncia- tion of the woes that were to be brought upon Judah in the time of Ahaz by the instrumentality of the Assy- rians, we have an extraordinary iteration of the same day shall the Lord shave with a razor that is hired, namely, by them beyond the river, by the king of As- syria, the head, and the hair of the feet; and it shall also consume the beard" (Isa. vii. 20). It seems likely that there is here an implication of contempt as well as suffering, as the office of a barber ambulant has seldom been esteemed of any dignity either in the East or West. To shave with the hired razor the head, the feet, and the beard is an expression highly parabolical, to denote the utter devastation of the country from one end to the other, as the plundering of the vanguard from the highest to the lowest by the Assyrians, whom God em- ployed as his instrument to punish the rebellious Jews. See Barber.

Raz, John, D.D., a Presbyterian divine, was born in the village of Tully, Ireland, in 1772. He emigrated to the United States in 1799, and, after remaining at Philadelphia for some time, "I left that place, 1804, and travelled mostly alone through the wilderness, red, gloomy, and desolate, until, after many days, I arrived west of the Alleghany Mountains, stopping at the house of Mr. Porter, a Presbyterian minister." He now le- beraled and straddled a horse all day, before he could secure a literate course of education, teaching school and studying alternately, until he graduated with honor
at Jefferson College, when it was only a small school kept in a log-cabin near Canonsburg, Pa. He studied theology under the direction of Dr. John McMillan, who was licensed by the Ohio Presbytery in June, 1803, and, after itinerating awhile in the wilderness of Eastern Ohio among some Indian camps, he was united, in 1804, to supply the newly organized church of Beechsprings, and pastored Crabapple, over which he was ordained and installed pastor in 1805. The country was settled rapidly, and his charges grew as fast, so that it soon became necessary to have the relation between these two churches dissolved, which he might labor all his time. He moved to the Beechsprings. "So untiring and devoted was this servant of Christ that, besides constantly ministering to his own large congregation, he found time to be instrumental in raising up some six or seven separate societies that went out as colonies from the mother church, and are now self-sustaining and prominent congregations." He died, after a ministry of fifty-two years, Feb. 12, 1855.

Dr. Nca was pastor of the Church at Beechsprings forty-five years, and the history of the Presbyterian Church in Eastern Ohio is closely connected with his biography. He was theudent and persevering student, clear in the arrangement of his subject, original in his thinking, and independent in thought and expression. See Wilson, Pred. Hist. Almanac, 1867, p. 198. (J. L. S.)

Read, Francis H., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Harrison County, Va., Nov. 25, 1812, was converted in his youth, joined the Church in 1834, and was in the time of the formation of the New Testament. To the holy minister, entered the travelling connection within the bounds of the Pittsburgh Conference, Pa. When the West Virginia Conference was formed, he became united with it, and there laborated until 1856, when he was located. He removed to Illinois, and shortly after entered the Rock River Conference, and was appointed to the Newark Circuit. After two years of active work in the Field in 1858 he again took a location, and removed to Iowa. In 1859 he was admitted into the Iowa Conference, and afterwards, by the formation and division of territory, he fell first into the Western Iowa, and then into the Des Moines Conference. His appointments in these conferences were Hopeville Circuit, Oneida, Clarion, Ottawa Circuit, Corning, and the Atlantic District. In this field truly "he died as his post." His death occurred at a Residence near Fort Calhoun, Iowa, Aug. 1, 1871. See Minutes of the Annual Conferences, 1871, p. 218, 219.

Read, Henry Clay, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Stanford, Lincoln County, Ky., Jan. 30, 1826. He graduated at Centre College, Danville, Ky., in 1849, and at the theological seminary at Princeton, N. J., in 1850; was licensed by Transylvania Presbytery June 27, 1850, and began his labors at Lagrange, LaGrange, and Ballardville, Ky. In 1851 he moved to Glasgow, Ky., and was ordained over that Church April 2, 1852. In 1858 he moved to Columbia, Ky., and engaged as Joint principal of the high-school in that place, during which period he preached half of his time to the Church there, and the churches of Edmonton and Munfordsville. In 1859 he took full charge of the Church and school, but discontinued the school in 1862. He was a commissioner to the General Assembly of the Presbytery Church which met in Peoria, Ill., in 1860. He died Oct. 17, 1862, at the age of thirty-six years. He was the son of Robert Read, an exemplary Christian, a man of sound judgment, and a good preacher. See Wilson, Pred. Hist. Almanac, 1864, p. 191. (J. L. S.)

Read, Thomas Buchanan, an American artist of some renown, deserves a place here for his distinction in works on sacred subjects. He was born in Chester County, Pa., March 12, 1826. With a yearly stipend he attended the studio of a sculptor in Cincinnati, intending to devote himself to sculpture for life; but painting soon proved the more attractive to him, and he practiced sculpture only as an amateur. In 1841 he went to New York, then to Boston, and settled in Philadelphia in 1846. He visited Europe first in 1856, and since which time he has lived in Florence and Rome, passing some intervals in Cincinnati. His pictures and his poems have the same characteristics, as might be expected. They are full of aerial grace and delicacy; an exquisite refinement and an ideal charm mingle in all. And yet he sometimes wrote with the spirit we find in Sheridan's Ride, and passed as seen in Sheridan and his Horse. Among his most charming pictures is his Star of Bethlehem. He died in Europe, where he had resided for over five years, while on his way home, May 11, 1872.

Reader, one of the five inferior orders of the Church of the Reformation. The reader is of great antiquity in the Church, dating as far back as the first century. It is, however, abundantly evident that it was not a distinct order, the reader (in the Latin Church at least) never having been admitted to his office by imposition of hands. According to the Council of Carthage, the Bible was put into the hands of the apostles, in presence of the people, with these words: "Take this book, and be thou a reader of the Word of God, which office thou shalt faithfully and profitably perform. Thou shalt have part with those who minister in the Word of God." And since this office of the Reformers was admitted in churches and chapels for which no clergyman could be procured, to the end that divine service in such places might not be altogether neglected. The office, or rather the name, is still continued in the Church of England. The following is the pledge to which, at the time of the Reformation, the readers were obliged to subscribe:

"In præstis, I shall not preach or interpret, but only read that which is appointed by public authority. I shall not minister in the extreme unction or other public rites of the Church, but bury the dead, and purge women after their childbirth. I shall keep the register-book according to the injunctions. I shall receive the alms in church, and especially in the church at common prayer. I shall move men to quit the sabbath, and not give the word of offence. I shall bring in to my ordinary testimony of my behavior from the honest of the parish where I dwell, within one half year next following. I shall give place, upon convenient warning, so thought by the ordinary, if any learned minister shall be placed there at the suit of the patron of the parish. I shall claim no more than the fruits sequestered of such cure where I shall serve but as it shall be thought meet to the wisdom of the ordinary. I shall daily, at the least, read one chapter of the Old Testament, and one other of the New, with good advisement, in the absence of the ordinary, and with regard to the room of the house, and the noise or other inconsiderate abstinence, I shall not read but in poorer parishes, desultot of incumbents, except in the time of divine service, or for other extraordinary resolutions to be allowed by the ordinary. I shall not openly meddle with any artificer's occupations, as covetously to seek a gain thereby, having in ecclesiastical offices the sum of twenty nobles, or above, by the year.

In Scotland also, at the Reformation, readers were appointed to read the Scriptures and the common prayers—that is, the forms of the Church of Geneva. They were not allowed to preach or administer the sacraments. The readers were tempted now and then to overstep these limits, and were as often forbidden by the General Assembly, till, in 1581, the office was formally abolished. The First Book of Discipline says: "To the clergy where no ministers can be had presbytery must be appointed the most apt men that distinctively can read the common prayers and the Scriptures, to exercise both themselves and the Church, till they grow to greater perfection: and in process of time he that is but a reader may attain to a farther degree, and, by consent of the Church and his minister, be appointed to minister the sacraments; but not before that he be able somewhat to persuade by wholesome doctrine, beside his reading, and be admitted to the ministry, as before is said. . . Nothing have we spoken of the stipend of readers, because if it have been of a less degree than that neither they nor judges may be called nor judged true ministers, and yet regard must be had to their labors; but so that they may be espoused for what they do, both in virtue, and not grudged to the publick. They are appointed for their reading in the below estate. This reader, if he do not read a book or more, or less, as parishioners and readers can agree, is sufficient: provided that he teach the children of the parish, which he must doe, besides the reading of the com-
rone, prayers, and books of the Old and New Testament. If from reading he begin to exhort and explain the Scriptures, then ought his stent to be augmented, till finally he comes near the end of the book. If he be found unable after two years, then must he be removed from that office, and possibly direc-ted to another, that another may be proved as long; for this alway is to be avoided, that none who is judged unable to come at any time to some one of his houses, may through the silence of the Kirk, be perpetually sus-tained upon the charge of the reader. Further, it must be avoided that no child, nor person of weak understanding, be within the (two-)two years of age—be admitted to the office of a reader.

The name occurs, however, in Church records long after that period, for in many places the office was tacitly permitted. Some successor sometimes bore it; and ex-treme persons—persons who read the Scriptures and added a few words of remark—were found in various towns. See PRECEPTOR.

Reading, Oriental Mode Of (Heb. מַעַן, to call aloud; ἀναγινώσκω). Mr. Jowett remarks, in his Christian Researches in Syria, etc., that "when persons are reading privately in a book, they usually go on reading aloud with a kind of singing voice, moving their heads and bodies in time, and making a monotonous cadence at regular intervals, thus giving emphasis, although not such an emphasis as would please an English ear. Very often they seem to read without perceiving the sense, and to proceed with themselves without turning one leaf of the book, as it were, through the mechanical art of reading in any way." This practice may enable us to "understand how it was that Philip should hear at what passage in Isaiah the Ethiopian eunuch was reading before he was invited to come up and sit with him in the chariot (Acts viii. 29, 31)." The eunuch, though probably reading to himself, and not particularly designing to be heard by his attendants, would read loud enough to be understood by a person at some distance. See Book.

Reading, Councils Of (Concilia Redimovana). The first of these was held in July, 1279, by archbishop Peckham of Canterbury, assisted by his suffragans. The twelve following constitutions were published:

1. Renews the twenty-ninth constitution of Othobon against pluralities, and directs bishops to cause a register to be kept of all incumbents in their dioceses, with all particulars relating to them and their living.

2. Relates to commentaries, and declares such as are hostile to the Christian religion, or contradicted in the Council of Lyons, 1274, to be in vain. The constitution concerning baptism at Easter and Pentecost, and that concerning consecrables at the four principal rubrics of the Mass, being first prefixed.

3. Orders that children born within eight days of Pentecost and Easter shall be received into the Church at the time, if they be found living at the time; but that children born at other times shall be baptized at once, for fear of sudden death.

4. Orders the eighth constitution of Othobon (1265) against consecriatry priests to be read openly in the four principal rural chapters, and declares that such reading shall be taken as a monition. If the dean or his deputy neglect this, he is directed to fast every Friday on bread and water.

5. Orders the church: orders that what remains of the old chancel shall be burned when the new is consecrated; declares that priests shall be bound to fetch the chancel for their churches every year from their bishops before they dare to use any other than the new chancel, under the heaviest penalties.

6. Orders that the consecrated host be kept in a fair pyx, within a tabernacle; that a fresh host be consecrated every Lord's day; that it be carried to the sick by a priest in surplice and stole, a lantern being carried before and a bell sounding; that the people may "under a humble admission wherebyever the King of Glory is carried under the cover of bread." The consecrated host is kept in a fair pyx, within a tabernacle; that a fresh host be consecrated every Lord's day; that it be carried to the sick by a priest in surplice and stole, a lantern being carried before and a bell sounding; that the people may "under a humble admissi- tion wherebyever the King of Glory is carried under the cover of bread." The consecrated host is kept in a fair pyx, within a tabernacle; that a fresh host be consecrated every Lord's day; that it be carried to the sick by a priest in surplice and stole, a lantern being carried before and a bell sounding; that the people may "under a humble admission wherebyever the King of Glory is carried under the cover of bread." The consecrated host is kept in a fair pyx, within a tabernacle; that a fresh host be consecrated every Lord's day; that it be carried to the sick by a priest in surplice and stole, a lantern being carried before and a bell sounding; that the people may "under a humble admission wherebyever the King of Glory is carried under the cover of bread." The consecrated host is kept in a fair pyx, within a tabernacle; that a fresh host be consecrated every Lord's day; that it be carried to the sick by a priest in surplice and stole, a lantern being carried before and a bell sounding; that the people may "under a humble admissi-
sent there; also, that he did publicly and openly, on the day and year aforesaid, in the time and place aforesaid, read a declaration containing the following words, viz. 1. A B, declare that I will conform to the liturgy of the United Church of England and Ireland, and the Acts and Articles of that church, in all points, and particularly in praying according to the form prescribed in and by the book intituled the Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, according to the Use of the Church of England, with the Psalter or Psalms of David, printed as they are set out in the Psalter or Psalms of David, in the Form and Manner of Making, Ordaining, and Consecrating Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. And that immediately after reading the aforesaid service, the said A B did openly and publicly, before the congregation there assembled, declare his abjuration of all things wherein content and consent to all things therein contained and prescribed, in these words, viz. 1. A, B, do declare our unfeigned assent and consent to all things contained and prescribed in and by the book intituled the Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, according to the Use of the Church of England, with the Psalter or Psalms of David, printed as they are set out in the Psalter or Psalms of David, in the Form and Manner of Making, Ordaining, and Consecrating Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. And these things we promise to testify openly and constantly, and should be daily called upon so to do. In witness whereof we have hereunto set our hands, the day and year first above written."

Reading, John, an English theologian, was born in 1588, in the county of Buckingham. He was curate at Dover, and afterwards chaplain of Charles I, but he manifested so much zeal in defending the cause of the king that in 1642 he was cast into prison, where he remained for several months. Archbishops Laud and having conferred upon him, during his detention at the Tower, the parish of Chatham and a prebend at Canterbury, the king would not allow him to take possession of either of these benefices; and he even had a new imprisonment to undergo. When in 1660 Charles II was restored at Dover, it was Reading who was first congratulated, upon his return, on the renown of the city. We have several religious works written by Reading, among others, A Guide to the Holy City (Oxford, 1651, 4to);—An Antidote to Aneompias (1654, 4to); also several sermons. Reading died Oct. 26, 1667, at Chatham, Kent. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s. v.

Reading, William, an Anglican divine, flourished in the early opening of last century as keeper of the Library of Sion College, London. He prepared an edition of the early ecclesiastical historians (Eusebius, etc.) in Greek and Latin, with notes (Cantab. 1720, 4to; 1714, 4to). He published, also, Sermons preached out of the first lessons of the Sunday in the Year, with an Appendix of Six Sermons (4 vols. 8vo—1, ii, 1728; iii, iv, 1730; 1755, 4 vols. 8vo); very rare; condemned by D'Oyle and Maret in their Commentary on the Bible:—Sermons (1711, 8vo)—Tracts (London, 1759, 8vo).

Readings, Various. See Various Readings.

Rea's (1 Chron. v. 5). See Reaiah.

Rea's (Hebr. ראה', רָאָה', seen of Jehovah), the name of three Hebrews.

1. (Sept. Pādā v r. 'Pa'id') A "son" of Shobal son of Judah (1 Chron. iv. 2). B.C. post 1568. He is apparently designated by the epithet Haroch (חָרֹךְ), ka-Rōkh, the seer; Sept. 'Apa'n, Vulg. qui vidit ebat; evidently a mere corruption of Reaiah. See Shobal.

2. (Sept. Pygš) The son of Micah and father of Reaiah (see above). The view that the "Reaiah" seen long before the invasion of Tidgath-Pileser (1 Chron. v, 5, A. V. "Reaiah"). B.C. ante f20.

3. (Sept. 'Pa'id v. "Pa'id, etc.") One of the Nethi-
cannot be proved by Holy Writ, but it is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthrown by the nature of a sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions." Instead of this—he is a corporeal presence by the change of the elements into the natural body and blood of Christ—she goes on to assert that "the body of Christ is given, taken, and applied only after a heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten is in the supper is faith" (Article XXVIII). See Waterland, Works, vol. vi; Willet, Sym. Pop.; Wheatley, Common Prayer; Hooker, Of Polity; North Brit. Rev. Jan. 1876, p. 272. See TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

Realino, Bernardino, an Italian Jesuit scholar, was born Dec. 15, 1530, at Carpi. Son of a gentleman in the service of Luigi di Govazza, he received an excellent education at Modena, and graduated at Bologna. He studied jurisprudence, and made himself known by a commentary upon the Nuptials of Theod and Pelagis of Catullus (Bologna, 1551, 4to), when one of his parish began an unjust lawsuit to take away part of his fortune. The affair lasted a long time, and was finally left to the verdict of an arbitrator, who hastened to decide against Realino without even hearing him. About the time of the encounter at Carpi, this arbitrator disappeared, and his letter which contained the very strong words in great wrath Realino gave him a sword-cut in the face. Condemned for this bold action, the young man fled to Bologna. Made doctor of law in 1558, he obtained in the same year the office of magistrate of Felizzano, a borough of Milan; after this he became attorney of Alessandria, and, the marquis of Peschiera gave him control of the vast domains which he possessed in the kingdom of Naples. At the age of thirty-four he gave weary of the world, arranged his affairs, and entered, at Naples, the Society of Jesus (1564). He there distinguished himself by his simplicity and austerity, and a charity which, he was always consistent. Having received, in 1574, the order to lay the foundation of a college at Lecce, he did it just before his death. An inquiry was started to establish his rights to canonization, but the court of Rome refused the application. Realino composed quite a number of small books, mentioned by Sotewil; his notes upon ancient authors have been inserted in vol. ii of the Thesaurus Criticus of Gruter. — Hoefer, Nova. Blog. Général, s. v.

Realism is a distinct and readily apprehended doctrine in the higher ranges of metaphysics, characterized by the scheme of speculation with which it may be associated. A Realist is one who maintains this doctrine. Realism asserts that General Terms, or Ideas, as they are called by Plato, such as Man, Horse, Plant, have a substantive, or real, existence independent of their actual and individual manifestations. This dogma early encountered opposition, which became so violent in the 12th and ensuing centuries as to distract philosophy, and to excite controversies that disturbed creeds and kingdoms, and that still survive, though in disguised forms and with greatly diminished virulence. The controversy was frequently pressed to blows and slaughter. Excommunication often attended the less popular side. Tracts, pamphlets, and formidable volumes were sustained or resisted with carnel andican guarnary weapons. Communities were divided by the bitter logomachy into hostile factions. The Church swarmed with dissensions. Universities were arrayed against each other, or were torn by intestine dissensions. Cities were opposed to cities; states to states; one religious order to another; and the conflict between the temporal and spiritual sovereignty was exacerbated and widened by the metaphysical strife. Brutes, and multitudes less cognizant than he of the influence of metaphysical conclusions on the condition and conduct of governments and societies, have superciliously sneered at these envemoned and long-enduring contentions, as merely the blind sophistries of men bewildered by vain abstractions or futile fantasies. But a philosophical problem which has remained unsolved for thousands of years, which engrossed and embattled the most acute intellects for centuries, and which has not yet ceased to produce perplexity and division; which enlisted the zeal alike of the scholar and the people, the priest and the prince, was recognized by the few who dare to discern the intellectual forces and associations by which the progress of the world is moulded. Sir William Hamilton, indeed, doubts the continued existence of any Realistic doctrine, and regards it as "a curious only in a historical point of view; but this opinion appears to result from inattention to the transformations which speculative tenets undergo, and to the vitality of old doctrines through the instrumentality of new disguises. There is a true metempsychosis of metaphysical questions: "Nece manet ut fuerit, nec formas servat eadem, Sed tamen ipsa eadem est: animam sic semper eadem Rese, sed in varia doceo migrare figurae." Sir William Hamilton's scant notices of Realism and Nominalism are ingenious, subtle, delicate, but they want compass, completeness, and depth.

Twin doctrines Realism was Nominalism (q. v.), its direct opposite, which strenuously denies the reality of General Terms, and maintains that they are names only, logical entities, convenient artifacts of expression (nomina mea, voces meae, factae voces, articulato ait, "en re et per se non sunt," f. Springing, s. v.). Springing, as the nominalist views do, from the weakness of the human mind, which is unable to comprehend the primordial origin of being, and which is inevitably inclined to consider its imperfect knowledge complete and conclusive, the opposition between the two schemes of speculative speculation, accompanied its development, and acquired predominance in the ages characterized by dialectical earnestness and verbal precision. The contradictory tenets were upheld by rival sects of Hindu philosophers; they produced a wide severance of opinion in the brightest age of Greek philosophy; they remained irreconcilable, though at times indistinct, in the schools of Alexandria: they burst out into clamorous fury in the Middle Ages, when the loftiest intellects were employed in laying the foundations of systematic theology and of orthodox expression.

Between the extreme and contradictory schemes of Realism and Nominalism was interposed, chiefly by the keen perspicacity of Abelard, but in accordance with the probable views of Aristotle, a doctrine of compromise which has been designated Conceptualism (q. v.). Theo. and Others, General Notions, or Versus, have a real existence in individuals, but no real or substantial being without them. It recognises their positive existence in the mind, which derives them by abstraction and generalization from particulars, and employs them as the signs or names of the classes of concrete realities to which they are applicable. The Realist doctrine is that, before Socrates, Plato, and Phaedo, or any other individual men existed, Men, as an abstract idea, had an essential and immutable reality, and that Socrates, Plato, and Phaedo, can be regarded as men solely in consequence of possessing this ideal manhood—σώμαν ὑπάρχον. The Nominalist, on the other hand, alleged that humanity existed only in Socrates, Plato, Phaedo, and other individuals; that the term was only an intellectual device for indicating the common properties characteristic of Socrates, Plato, and Phaedo; and that the general name Men, and thus embracing them in one class. The Conceptualist agreed with the Nominalist in refusing an absolute existence to the general term Men, and in assigning to it a real existence only in conjunction with Socrates, Plato, and Phaedo, and he endeavored to satisfy the demands of the Realist by admitting that the conception Men, attained by abstraction and generalization from individuals, had an actual existence, and was an intelligible reality in the mind apprehending it. Thus Abelard was antagonist at once to Will-
ism of Champsaur and to Boecellinus. Employing the quaint but precise language of the schoolmen, the Realists held universale esse ante rem; the Nominalists, universale esse post rem; the Conceptualists of various types, universale esse in re. To the last should be added the Pragmatists. These distinctions may appear shadowy and impalpable, but metaphysics deals amid such "airy shapes," and these have had a marked influence and serious consequences in politics, law, morals, philosophy, and religion: "inclusas animas, supernumque ad lumen iustae." Nominalism has simply met with due consideration. See Nominalism. The present notice will consequently be confined to Realism, except so far as Nominalism and Conceptualism may be inextricably entwined with it.

I. Origin of Realism.—It would be misplaced industry and, inconsistent with the brevity required here, to investigate the Realist doctrines which were entertained and developed in the philosophy of the Hindus. But the medieval dogma is so intimately connected with the tenor of Greek speculation that a reference to its roots is necessary, lest the modem day should be debarred from the light of the past. The controversy between Realism and Nominalism did not become predominant in speculation till the close of the 11th century, but the antagonism was distinctly declared from the times of Plato and Aristotle. The systematic metaphysics which were the bedfellow of the great teacher and his greater pupil in their explanation of the intelligible universe (mundus intelligibilis) were plainly manifest to the successors of those great heresiers. The doctrine of Plato and the earnest opposition of Aristotle may be best appreciated by the careful consideration of the multitudinous passages in the text of Aristotle referred to in the index of Lonitz (Aristotelis Opera [ed. Acad. Berolin.], vol. iv) under the head of "Plato, 2." Evidence not merely of the continued antagonism of the Academic and Peripatetic schools, but also of the recognition of the gravity and the consequences of this antagonism, are abundant in the subsequent ages. It may suffice to refer to Florius (Ennead, III, i, 1; V, v, 1; IX, iii, 10), to a passage in Porphyry which will soon require to be cited, and to Hesychius Milesium (F. 7, ii, 58, Fraum. Histor. Græc. iv, 173), who has stated clearly and precisely the Platonist thesis ("Esti et eis eandem in iustam dici eis et inius et homines et diem tria cias," etc.) and the principles of the theory in general. He speaks of "Universe," or "general universally," and to abstract notions generally, remained an indeterminate disputatio in the Hellenic world, and was not raised to supreme importance till it passed, in the medieval period, from transcendental ontology to dialectics and theolology. The germ of the grand debate is found in one of the associates of the Neo-Platonic schools, but it scarcely vegetated till the scholastic period. Porphyry had said, in his introduction to the Categories of Aristotle (Schol. Aristot. sp. Aristot. Opera [ed. Acad. Berolin.]), "I, 1), that he abstained from determining the nature of the recondite inquiries, and aim only at a concise presentation of the simpler topics. "For," he proceeds, "I will decline to speak of the essential character of genera and species, or to inquire whether they are substantially corporeal or incorporeal, and whether they are separable or existent only in perception, since this is a most profound investigation, and requires other and deeper examination."

The Greek of Porphyry was almost entirely unknown to medieval speculators, but the Latin paraphrase of Boethius was familiar to them and constituted, as it were, a text-book of elementary logic. Thus the question of the nature of "Universae" was distinctly raised, and the opposite views which were entertained on the subject divided reasoners into hostile camps, and led to those passionate controversies which have been already alluded to. It was only gradually, however, that the opposition became clear and well marked, and connected itself closely with the gravest interests that have occupied the minds of men. In the first half of the 9th century, Rabanus Maurus, commenting on the text of Porphyry just quoted, but using the version of Boethius, recognises the conflict of opinion (Commen. in pra. Cense, i, 272; etc.) and is supposed to have formulated the Nominalistic side (Caraman, Hist. des Rév. de la Philosophie, i, 249). It would probably be more correct to conclude that he sought a ground of conciliation between the two extremes. The difficult problem was, however, brought forward into distinct contemplation. If there was any tendency in Rabanus Maurus to what was afterwards known as Nominalism, the reaction showed itself promptly. In the next generation, the philosophy of Johannes Scotus Erigena, which was founded on an imperfect acquaintance with the Neo-Platonic teachings, ran into decided Pantheism, in accordance with the results of those teachings, as developed by Plotinus. Regarding God as the source whence all things proceed, by which all things are sustained, and to which all things return—representing creation as the self-evolution of the first principle—the Pantheist, in his vision, he rendered God all things and all things God. The basis of his whole scheme was involved in the Platonistic theory of ideas [see PLATONIC PHILOSOPHY], and in the Realist tenet universale ante rem. Not merely as the foundation of the systems of these remarkable philosophers, but as an essential part of the metaphysical dogma to be unfolded by its acolytes into its ultimate logical consequences, which reveal the extravagances and the hazards of the position. It is the inevitable tendency of such revelation to arouse antagonism, and to suggest security in the opposite extreme. By such oscillation between contradictory tenets, the human intellect is kept from stagnation, and research and meditation are constantly stimulated. The Pantheism of Scotus Erigena annihilated individual existence and individual responsibility; and it obliterated the boundaries between the realms of divine and human action. The refutation of his errors was sought in the examination and denial of his premises, as well as in the repudiation of his conclusions. His views had been founded on the supposititious writings of Dionysius the Areopagite, which were steeped in Neo-Platonism (q.v.). Their antidote was expected from the school of Aristotle, whose logical opinions were gradually disseminated throughout Western Europe, through Saracen and Jewish channels, and which had been partially known through Boethius during nearly all medieval times. But the latter part of the 9th, the whole of the 10th, and most of the 11th century were eminently unfavorable to diligent study and tranquil speculation. It was the period of Arab ravage and encroachment in the Eastern Empire; the period of the ruthless depredations of the Danes and Northmen in the Western; the period when the reigning dynasties of France and England were changed; when Italy was distracted by invasions and by wars between contending emperors; and when the fierce strife between the adherents of the Gregorian and Antipope became peculiarly acrimonious. As the result of these wide-spread disturbances, discord and anarchy, lawlessness and rapine, general wretchedness and insecurity prevailed. Two centuries thus elapsed before the great question of Universae distinctly emerged out of the earlier discordances of opinion. Towards their conclu-
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alone, a purely theological question had arisen, which recalled eager inquiry into the nature of Universals. This was the denial of transubstantiation by Berengarius on grounds which implied Nominalism. About the same time, the doctrine of Nominalism was explicitly attacked and defended at the Council of Constance. He has been usually regarded as the founder of the sect, but may have been preceded by his master, Johannes Surdus (John the Deaf), of whom very little is known. Roscellinus held that "genera and species are not realities, but only words denoting abstractions;" that "there are no such things as universals, but only individuals." Realism is thus directly contradicted. These speculations pointed towards dangerous heresies in theology. Roscellinus, denying all but individual existences, assaulted the unity of persons in the Trinity, and thus maintained Tritheism. The Church was at once aroused. Numerous confutations were propounded, the most celebrated of which was the tractate of Anselm, archbishop of Canterbury, De Fide Trinactivas. Anselm holds the Realist doctrine of Universals, and is occasionally betrayed into extravagance. His politics is, in fact, rational or metaphysical. He attacks perilous errors in religious belief, and assails speculative opinions only incidentally. Rémusat, while considering him a decided Realist, deems that his prominence in the controversy began only after Nominalism had been exaggerated (Résumat, St. Anselme, pt. ii, ch. iii, p. 494). Efforts were made to reconcile the conflict between the discordant doctrines, but they only rendered the issue and the antagonism more pronounced. William de Champeaux (De Cambellius) held that "the Universal or genus is something real; the individuals composing the genus have no diversity of essence, but only of accidental elements." This is the first precise avowal of Realism in medieval philosophy. With William de Champeaux, the essence of things is ascribed to the genus, rather than reduced to accidental accidentals. With Roscellinus, the individuals alone exist, and they constitute the essence of things. With Champeaux, the essence of things is in the genera to which they belong, so far as they are individuals they are only accidents (Caraman, Hist. des Rés. de la Phil. vol. ii, ch. ii, p. 48). Thenceforward the great controversy proceeds with increasing ardor, and furnishes the battle-field for the rival schools and rival schoolmen of the Middle Ages. The further consideration of these speculations belongs, however, to a more intimate discussion of the question, related to the development of scholasticism. See SCHOLASTICISM.

II. Nature of Realism.—The general character of Realism has been exhibited sufficiently to render its origin and evolution intelligible. A fuller explanation is needed to enable us to understand the importance which it assumed in mediæval speculation. Cicero has said that "there is nothing so absurd as not to have been maintained by some of the philosophers." It is easier to ridicule than to appreciate the reveries of philosophy. The aberrations of metaphysics and the paradoxes of dialectic are only the zealots and inadequate expression of far-reaching truths imperfectly apprehended. We certainly should not complain of either the excesses or the blindness of the schoolmen, in an age which is inclined to accept propoalism as a sufficient explanation of all life, and evolution as a complete exposition of creation, or a substitute for it. Yet, even in these cases, much is charged upon the hierophants which they do not accept as part of their doctrines. Realism was the mediæval and dialectical reproduction of the Platonic idea of the sensible world and its general tenets such as Memes, Horae, Tree, Flower, etc., were not merely logical devices, creatures of abstraction, ingenuities of language, but were realities, separable (κατάρα) from the being of individual men, horses, trees, flowers, etc. In Plato and the Platonic school these ideas were supposed to have a real, primordial, changeless, and eternal existence in the Divine Mind, as the archetypes of all things that are made. It demands no extraordinary range of intellect to point out the presumption of attempting to determine the contents of the Divine Mind and the modes of its procedure in ordering the creation. It is the unaided effort to reconstruct the practical incongruities of representing Socrates as a transitory accident; having no real existence except so far as he partakes of the one, universal, ideal Man, who is immortal, incorporeal, immaterial, and unchangeable; communicated and communicable to all men, past, present, and future; composed in each, yet abundant for all, and independent of each and of all. These objections blink or evade the subtleties of the problem. These sneers do not reach the difficulty with which the greatest philosophers have struggled, and struggled in vain. No doubt our knowledge of genera and species is attained (so far as the human mind is capable of ascertaining the process of attaining knowledge) by abstraction from individual things observed, and by combination of their accoutant characteristics. No doubt the abstract terms, so arrived at, are the instruments of linguistic and logical classification, which we employ unsuspiciously in reasoning and conversation. But is this all? Is this a complete solution of the enigma? Is it not a mere screen which conceals the real enigma from us? There is a general, not an individual, resemblance in all these. They are alike in the conception of the Creator — nihil simili simoni quam homo. They are alike in consequence of their participation in a common humanity. Our knowledge of this humanity may be—must be—derived by generalization from the common characteristics of all men. But, again, it should be asked, Is this all? Does our knowledge proceed or follow this possession of a common humanity? Does it do anything more than recognise its presence? How does the common humanity come into existence? How does it continue in existence? How is it to be interpreted? Is there not an inner or internal design in the purposes of the Creator? Is everything spasmodical, momentary creation, with observance of antecedent forms? Whence, then, such observance, and the maintenance of uniformity, and all the characteristics of preordination? How does it occur that the earth proceeds over to "bring forth the living creature after his kind, cattle and creeping thing, and beast of the earth after his kind," if the several kinds and genera and species are mere abstractions, pure figments of the generalizing faculty? Did this unvarying observance of the type as a whole come about without of Realism, or by the accidental collision of atoms in all the infinite variety of their hypothetical contacts, and by survival of the fittest, through self-adaptation to their shifting surroundings? No permanent forms, transmitted from generation to generation, from age to age, could thus be maintained. The unmutilated repudiatio of Realism leads straight to the acceptance of the creed of Leucrætius and Darwin and Herbert Spencer.

Nam certe neque consilio Primordiae rerum Ordinis seque sequentem regem sagacis locum venit: Nec quoque saepe darent motus pepergere producto; Sed quata multimultae molles, multae, mutatae, per Omne Ex humana excutitur percipere plagis. Omne genuus motus, et cosce experimendo, Taudium deuinent in tabulis dispositis. Qualibus hae rebus consexit summæ creata; Et multis eiam magnos servata per annos. Ut semel in memos conjcta et membro sensus.

The answer of the Epicurean herd will not solve the riddles proposed. Realism offered a very different solution, which, however inadequate and unsatisfactory it may be deemed, did not affect to treat the questions as shallow or trite. The gods, such as Memes, Horae, Tree, Flower, etc., were not merely logical devices, creatures of abstraction, ingenuities of language, but were realities, separable (κατάρα) from the being of individual men, horses, trees, flowers, etc. In Plato and the Platonic school these ideas were supposed to have a real, primordial, changeless, and eternal existence in the Divine Mind, as the archetypes of all things that are made. It demands no extraordinary range of intellect to point out the presumption of attempting to determine the contents of the Divine Mind and the modes of its procedure in ordering the creation. It is the unaided effort to reconstruct the practical incongruities of representing Socrates as a transitory accident; having no real existence except so far as he partakes of the one, universal, ideal Man, who is immortal, incorporeal, immaterial, and unchangeable; communicated and communicable to all men, past, present, and future; composed in each, yet abundant for all, and independent of each and of all. These objections blink or evade the subtleties of the problem. These sneers do not reach the difficulty with which the greatest philosophers have struggled, and struggled in vain. No doubt our knowledge of genera and species is attained (so far as the human mind is capable of ascertaining the process of attaining knowledge) by abstraction from individual things observed, and by combination of their accoutant characteristics. No doubt the abstract terms, so arrived at, are the instruments of linguistic and logical classification, which we employ unsuspiciously in reasoning and conversation. But is this all? Is this a complete solution of the enigma? Is it not a mere screen which conceals the real enigma from us? There is a general, not an individual, resemblance in all these. They are alike in the conception of the Creator — nihil simili simoni quam homo. They are alike in consequence of their participation in a common humanity. Our knowledge of this humanity may be—must be—derived by generalization from the common characteristics of all men. But, again, it should be asked, Is this all? Does our knowledge proceed or follow this possession of a common humanity? Does it do anything more than recognise its presence? How does the common humanity come into existence? How does it continue in existence? How is it to be interpreted? Is there not an inner or internal design in the purposes of the Creator? Is everything spasmodical, momentary creation, with observance of antecedent forms? Whence, then, such observance, and the maintenance of uniformity, and all the characteristics of preordination? How does it occur that the earth proceeds over to "bring forth the living creature after his kind, cattle and creeping thing, and beast of the earth after his kind," if the several kinds and genera and species are mere abstractions, pure figments of the generalizing faculty? Did this unvarying observance of the type as a whole come about without of Realism, or by the accidental collision of atoms in all the infinite variety of their hypothetical contacts, and by survival of the fittest, through self-adaptation to their shifting surroundings? No permanent forms, transmitted from generation to generation, from age to age, could thus be maintained. The unmutilated repudiatio of Realism leads straight to the acceptance of the creed of Leucrætius and Darwin and Herbert Spencer.
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at least, of the error of Realism—for neither its whole truth nor its whole error can be distinctly grasped and periscopically expressed—consisted in presenting these important conclusions in an exaggerated form, so that they contradicted the partial truth equally involved in Nominalism: that individuals have a real as well as an actual existence, and that the generic and specific terms which are habitually employed, and are indispensable in language, are modes of classifying our perceptions and conceptions, and are used altogether independently of any ulterior suggestions which may be implicated in them.

The Nominalist denied a metaphysical truth because it was not embraced within the sphere of his logical requirements. The Realist assailed the logical truth because it failed to embrace an ontological explanation, and appeared to be at variance with it.

Bitter contradictions and acrimonious hostilities necessarily resulted from the antagonism, in consequence of the inevitable association of the conflicting doctrines with adverse parties and interests in theology, in Church and in State.

III. Literature.—The historians of philosophy, who embrace the philosophy of the Middle Ages, necessarily pay much attention to Realism and Nominalism. More special sources of information are, Caraman, Histoires,
the reason is that they may lose none of their straw, which is generally very short, and necessary for the sustenance of their cattle, no hay being here made. I mention this," he adds, "because it seems to give light to that expression of the Psalms (cxxxix, 6), "which withereth before it be plucked up," where there seems to be a metaphor of respect to the "straw" of the mind. This unhappy doubtless is the correct meaning of the expression; and the real allusion is lost sight of by the rendering in the A. V., "before it groweth up." It grows, but withers before the plucking-time comes—an emblem of the present decay and fruitlessness of the wicked. See Agriculture.

Reason denotes that function of our intelligence which has reference to the attainment of a particular class of truths. We know a great many things by immediate or actual experience. Our senses tell us that we are thirsty, that we hear a sound, that we are affected by light. These facts are truths of sense or of immediate knowledge, and do not involve the reason. Reason comes into play when we know a thing not immediately, but by some indirect process; as when, from seeing a river unusually swollen, we believe that there have been heavy rains at its sources. Here the mind is not only that the river is high. It is by certain transitions of thought, or by the employment of our thinking powers, that we come to know the other circumstance—that in a remote part of the country there have been heavy rains.

In ascertaining these truths of reason or of inference, as they are called, there are various steps or operations described under different names. Thus we have (1) Deduction, or Syllogism; (2) Induction; and (3) Generalization of notions, of which Abstraction and Definition are various phases. These are well represented by the four fundamental principles of the science. The nature of the functions or faculty denominated Reason, or the Reasoning Faculty, can be explained by showing how it results from the fundamental powers of the intelligence.

There is another and peculiar significance attached to the word reason, growing out of the philosophy of Kant (q. v.), which maintains a distinction between reason and understanding, the latter being that faculty called by the Greeks νοῦς, and by Hamilton called the "Regulative Faculty." See Fleming and Krauth, Vocab. of Philosophy, s. v.

Reason, Use of, in Religion. The sublime, incomprehensible nature of some of the Christian doctrines has commonly belied the understanding of many pious men as to make them think it presumptuous to apply reason in any way to the revelations of God; and the many instances in which the simplicity of truth has been corrupted by an alliance with philosophy confirm them in the belief that it is safer, as well as more respectable, to resign their minds to devout impressions than to exercise their understandings in any speculations upon sacred subjects. Enthusiasts and fanatics of all different names and sects agree in decreeing the use of reason, because it is the very essence of fanaticism to substitute the inventions of the human understanding for the Word of God. In this respect, the extravagant fancies of a disordered imagination, and to consider these fancies as the immediate illumination of the Spirit of God. Insidious writers in the deistical controversy have pretended to adopt those sentiments of humility and reverence which are inapplicable from true Christians, and even that total subjection of reason to faith which characterizes enthusiasts. A pamphlet was published about the middle of the last century that made a noise in its day, although it is now forgotten. It was not Professed Reason, but Foundation on Argument, which, while to a careless reader it may seem to magnify the Gospel, does in reality tend to undermine our faith by separating it from a rational base; and Mr. Hume, in the spirit of this pamphlet, concludes his Essay on Miracles with calling those dangerous friends or disguised enemies to the Christian religion who have undertaken to defend it by the principles of human reason. "Our most holy religion," he says, with a distinctness very unbecoming his respectable talents, "it founded on faith, not on reason;" and "mere reason is insufficient to convince us of its veracity." The Church of Rome, in order to subject the minds of its votaries to the authority of the Church, has, in matters of religion. She has revived an ancient position, that things may be true in theology which are false in philosophy; and she has, in some instances, made the merit of faith to consist in the absurdity of that which was believed.

The extravagance of these positions has produced, since the Reformation, an opposite extreme. While those who deny the truth of revelation consider reason as in all respects a sufficient guide, the Socinians, who admit that a revelation has been made, employ reason as the supreme judge of its doctrines, and boldly strike out of their creed every article that is not altogether conformable to those notions which may be derived from the exercise of reason. These controversies concerning the use of reason in matters of religion are disputes, not about reason, but about the nature of Christianity. But a few plain observations are sufficient to ascertain where the truth lies in this subject.

The first use of reason in matters of religion is to examine the evidences of revelation; for, the more entire the submission which we consider as taken, the more certain it is that, if it is revealed, we have the more need to be satisfied that any system which professes to be a divine revelation does really come from God. See Faith and Reason.

After the exercise of reason has established in our minds a firm belief that Christianity is of divine origin, the second use of reason is to learn what are the truths revealed. As these truths are not in our days communicated to any by immediate inspiration, the knowledge of them is to be acquired only from books transmitted to us with satisfying evidence that they were written by men seventeen hundred years ago in a remote country and foreign language, under the direction of the Spirit of God. In order to attain the meaning of these books, we must study the language in which they were written; and we must study, also, the manners of the times and the state of the countries in which the writers lived, because there are circumstances to which an original author is often alluding, and by which his phraseology is generally affected; we must lay together different passages in which the same word or phrase occurs, because without this labor we cannot obtain in its purest and most unadulterated condition the distinctive style and manner which characterize different writers; because a right apprehension of their meaning often depends upon attention to this difference. All this presupposes the application of grammar, history, geography, chronology, and criticism in matters of religion; that is, it supposes that the reason of man had been previously exercised in pursuing these different branches of knowledge, and that our success in attaining the true sense of Scripture depends upon the diligence with which we assail ourselves of the progress that has been made in them. It is to be noted, also, that the reason of every Christian is not capable of making this application. But this is no argument against the use of reason, of which we are now speaking; for they who use translations and commentaries rely only upon the reason of others instead of exercising their own. The several helps which have been applied in every age by some persons for the benefit of others; and the progress in sacred criticism which distinguishes the present times is nothing else than the continued application, in elucidating the Scripture, of reason not founded on Argument, or on Scriptural knowledge, and very much improved in this kind of exercise by the employment which the ancient classics have given it since the revival of letters.

After the two uses of reason that have been illustrated, a third comes to be mentioned, which may be considered as compounded of both. Reason is emi-
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The use in repelling the attacks of the adversaries of Christianity. When men of erudition, of philosophical acuteness, and of accomplished taste, direct their talents against the religion of their time, it is best to rely on an unskilful defender. He cannot unravel their sophistry; he does not see the amount and the effect of the concessions which he makes to them; he is bewildered by their quotations; and he is often led, by their artifices, upon dangerous ground. In all ages of the Church there has been weak and not very decided opposition; and the only triumphs of the enemies of our religion have arisen from their being able to expose the defects of those methods of defending the truth which some of its advocates had unwarily chosen. A mind trained to accurate and philosophical views of the nature and the amount of evidence, enriched with historical knowledge, accustomed to throw out of a subject all that is minute and irrelevant, to collect what is of importance within a short compass, and to form the comprehension of a whole, is the mind qualified to contend with the learning, the wit, and the sophistry of infidelity. Many such minds have appeared in this honorable controversy during the course of this and the last century; and the success has corresponded to the completeness of the furniture with which they engaged in the combat. The Church has defended itself with a clear and masterly exposition from various misrepresentations; the arguments for its divine original have been placed in their true light; and the attempts to confound the miracles and prophecies upon which Christianity rests its claim with the same time of truth and been effectually repelled. Christianity has in this way received the most important advantages from the attacks of its enemies; and it is not improbable that its doctrines would never have been so thoroughly cleared from all the corruptions and subtilties which had attached to them in the progress of ages, nor the evidences of its truths have been so accurately understood, nor its peculiar character been so perfectly discriminated, had not the zeal and abilities which have been employed against it called forth in its defence some of the most distinguished masters of reason. They brought into the service of Christianity the same weapons which had been drawn for her destruction, and, wielding them with confidence and skill in a good cause, became the successful champions of the truth. See Rationalism.

The fourth use of reason consists in judging of the truth of religious proposals. Everything which is revealed by God comes to his creatures from so high an authority that it may be rested in with perfect assurance as true. Nothing can be received by us as true which is contrary to the dictates of reason, because it is impossible for us to reconcile the truth of a proposition with the falsehood of a proposition. But many things are true which we do not fully comprehend; and many propositions, which appear incredible when they are first enunciated, are found, upon examination, such as our understandings can readily admit. These principles embrace the whole of the subject, and they mark out the steps by which reason is to proceed in judging of the truths of religion. We first examine the evidences of revelation. If these satisfy our understandings, we are certain that there can be no contradiction between the doctrines of this true religion and the dictates of right reason. If any such contradiction appear, there must be some mistake. By not making a proper use of our reason in the interpretation of the Gospel, we suppose that it contains doctrines which it does not teach; or we give the name of right reason to the judicious, who, by improper reductions and more enlarged knowledge will dissipate; or we consider a proposition as implying a contradiction, when, in truth, it is only imperfectly understood. Here, as in every other case, mistakes are to be corrected by measuring back our steps. We must examine each and every passage of a doctrine, as it appears to contain the doctrine; we must compare them with one another; we must endeavor to derive light from the general phraseology of Scripture and the analog of faith; and we shall generally be able, in this way, to separate the doctrine from all those adventitious circumstances which give it the appearance of absurdity. If a doctrine which, upon the close examination, appears unquestionably to be taught in Scripture, still does not approve itself to our understanding, we must consider carefully what it is that prevents us from receiving it. There may be preconceived notions hastily taken up which are inconsistent with the doctrine; or the pride of understanding that does not readily submit to the views which it communicates; or reason may need to be reminded that we must expect to find in religion many things which we are not able to comprehend. One of the most important offices of reason is to recognize its own limits. She never can be moved, by any authority, to receive as true what she perceives to be absurd. But if she has formed a just estimate of human knowledge, she will not shelter her presumption in rejecting the truths of revelation under the pretense of contradictions that do not really exist; she will readily admit that there may be in a subject some points which she knows, and others of which she is ignorant; she will not allow her ignorance of the latter to shake the evidence of the former, but will yield a firm assent to the opinions of the understanding that which she cannot deny what is beyond her comprehension. Thus, availing herself of all the light which she now has, she will wait in humble hope for the time when a larger measure shall be imparted.

Reay, Stephen, an Anglican divine, was born at Montrose, New Brunswick, in 1782, was educated at St. Alban's Hall, Oxford, and was Laudian professor of Arabic from 1840 till his death. He published, Observations on the Defence of the Church Missionary Society against the Objections of the Advocate of Bath, by Pileus Quadratus (1818, 8vo);—Narratio de Josepho et Sacro Codice (1822);—Textus Hebraicus (Lond. 1822, 1840, 12mo).

Reay, William, an English divine of the Establishment, flourished near the middle of the 18th century. He was curate and lecturer of Wordsworth in 1755. He died in 1756. He published Sermons, with Preface by T. Church, D.D., prebend of St. Paul's (Lond. 1755, 8vo).

Re'ba (Heb. id. 72, four; Sept. Ποβή in Numb., 'Pōbī in Josh.; Vulg. Rode), one of the five kings of the Midianites slain by the children of Israel in their avenging expedition when Balaam fell (Numb. xxxii, 8; Josh. xiii, 21). B.C. 1556.

Rebaptism. The ancient Church, if it did not openly declare that the repetition of baptism, certainly refused to rebaptize, and supported its position by assigning, not one, but many reasons. It especially maintained that there is no example of rebaptization in Scripture; and as baptism succeeds to circumcision, which was the entrance and seal of the old covenant, and could not be repeated, so baptism, being the sign and seal of admission to the new covenant, the breaches of this covenant are not to be repaired by repeated baptisms. There were in the early Church some heretics who rebaptized, such as the Marcionites; but the Catholic Church disapproved of the practice. In one of Cyprian's epistles there is a question referred to Stephen, bishop of Rome, whether it was necessary to rebaptize heretics who sought admission to the Catholic Church; or whether it should be deemed sufficient, proceeding upon the same principle, to receive them with the simple ceremony of imposition of hands and ecclesiastical benediction. The Roman bishop acceded to the latter opinion. The African bishops, on the other hand, declared the baptism of heretics to be necessary, and would not recognize their confirmation at the hands of a Catholic bishop as being sufficient for their reception into the Church. They demanded another baptism, to be followed by the usual
It has been conjectured that she died during his sojourn in Padan-aram; for her name appears to have left Isaac's dwelling and gone back to Padan-aram before that period (comp. xxiv, 59, and xxxv, 6), and Rebekah is not placed there. The mention is made by Genesis xxvii, 7 (q.v.). See Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctrines, ii, 364 sq.; Hoffling, Lehrer von der Taufe (Erlangen, 1846). Also see ANABAPTISTS; BAPTISM.

Rebe'coa (Phibne's), the Grecised form (Rom. ix, 10) of the name Rebec'ah (q. v.).

Rebekah (Heb. Ribcah, 'rib'kä), a name, i.e. en- scarer; Sept., New Test., and Josephus, 'Phibne's', the daughter of Bethuel (Gen. xxii, 23) and sister of Laban, married to Isaac, who stood in the relation of a first cousin to her father and to Lot. She is first presented to us in the account of the mission of Eliezer to Padan-aram (ch. xxiv), in which his interview with Rebekah, her consent and marriage, are related. B.C. 2023. The elder branch of the family remained at Haran when Abimelech, the king of the Philistines, was driven out to the land of Canaan, and it is there that we first meet with Laban, as taking the leading part in the betrothal of his sister Rebekah to her cousin Isaac (xxiv, 10, 29-60; xxvii, 43; xxix, 4). Bethuel, her father, plays so insignificant a part in the whole transaction, being in fact only mentioned once, and that after his son (xxiv, 50), that various conjectures have been formed to explain it. Josephus asserts that Bethuel was dead, and that Laban was the head of the house and his sister's natural guardian (Ant. i, 16, 2), in which case "Bethuel" must have crept into the text inadvertently, or be supposed, with some (Adam Clarke, ad loc.), to be the name of another brother of Rebekah. Le Clerc (in Pent.) mentions the conjecture that Bethuel was absent at first, but returned in time to give his consent to the marriage. The mode adopted by Prof. Blunt ('Unedged Coinscences', p. 35) to explain what he terms "the consistent insinuation of Bethuel," viz. that he was incapacitated from taking the management of his family by age or imbecility, is most ingenious; but the prominence of Laban may be sufficiently explained by the circumstances of the country, which we see now (see Nibuh, quoted by Rosenmiller, ad loc.), gave the brothers the main share in the arrangement of their sister's marriage and the defence of her honor (comp. Gen. xxxiv, 13; Judg. xxxii, 22; 2 Sam. xili, 20-23). See BETHUEL.

The whole chapter has been pointed out as uniting most of the circumstances of a pattern marriage—the sanction of parents, the guidance of God, the domestic occupation of Rebekah, her beauty, courteous kindness, willing consent and modesty, and success in retaining her husband's love. For nineteen years she was childless; then, after the prayers of Isaac and her journey to inquire of the Lord, Esau and Jacob were born; and, while the younger was more particularly the companion and favorite of his mother (Gen. xxvi, 19-28), the elder became a grief of mind to her (xxvi, 35). When Isaac was driven by a famine into the lawless country of the Philistines, Rebekah's beauty became, as was apprehended, a source of danger to her husband. But Abimelech was restrained by a sense of justice such as the conduct of his predecessor (ch. xx) in the case of Sarah would not lead Isaac to expect. It was probably a considered time of betrothal when Rebekah suggested the deceit that was practiced by Jacob on his blind father. She directed and aided him in carrying it out, foresaw the probable consequence of Esau's anger, and prevented it by moving Isaac to send Jacob away to Padan-aram (ch. xxvi, 21 sq.), which he owned (21 sq.), (xili, 12). B.C. 1927. The Targum Pseudo-Jon. states (Gen. xxxv, 8) that the news of her death was brought to Jacob at Allan-bachuth.
lishing corrected editions of the Holy Scriptures, though they seldom gave an account of the materials they used. The history of the printed text is important as showing the manner in which in our present copies of the Hebrew Bible were edited, and the sources available for obtaining the exact words of the original. In order to do this we must follow the different editions, we must know the text which they contain; we must know the different degrees of relationship in which the editions stand to each other; in a word, we must have the genealogy of the present editions.

After the history of the printed text, we must mention, first, the editions of different parts of the Old Testament, which formed the basis of later editions. The first part of the Hebrew Scriptures which was published is—

(I.) Marcianus, i.e. Bar Kanabon (1490, 4to, and in folio, sine loco).

This very rare edition is printed on 140 folio pages, each page containing forty lines, but without division of verses, in majuscular and minuscule letters. Only the first four psalms have the superscriptio of Marcianus, which are not found in later editions. At the end two epitaphs are printed, one in rime, the other in prose. See on this edition, F. Rosi, Art. 60, in Borri, Bibliotheca Typographica, p. 14; and in De Hebræis Typographis, 1736, 2 vols., and in Hei-

The text is much better than any previous edition, and it is divided into five books, as can be seen from the super-scriptions to Ps. xii, xlix, ci, and civ. As to the commentary, it is very valuable, because it contains all the post-biblical commentaries of Marcianus, which are not found in later editions. At the end two epitaphs are printed, one in rime, the other in prose. See on this edition, F. Rosi, Art. 60, in Borri, Bibliotheca Typo-

(II.) Shabbetai, i.e. Bar Kosevah, comm. cum Paraphrasis Chaldaica et Commentario Rabbi Solomon Charchi (Bononiis, 1601, 4to). This copy is printed on 318 parchment leaves. Above and below the Hebrew text is a commentary, and within the text, the Hebrew text is printed on the side of the Hebrew text. The text is printed with great care, and we must assume that all the various passages which are found in the Pentateuch printed at Scolio in 1488, and which is a reprint of our edition, are nothing but slavages of the printer and cor-

At the end of the book, there is a list of the books printed at Scolio in 1488, and which is a reprint of our edition, are nothing but slavages of the printer and cor-

(III.) Schöner, i.e. Bar Kosevah, comm. cum Paraphrasis Chaldaica et Commentario Rabbi Solomon Charchi (Bononiis, 1601, 4to). This copy is printed on 318 parchment leaves. Above and below the Hebrew text is a commentary, and within the text, the Hebrew text is printed on the side of the Hebrew text. The text is printed with great care, and we must assume that all the various passages which are found in the Pentateuch printed at Scolio in 1488, and which is a reprint of our edition, are nothing but slavages of the printer and cor-

At the end of the book, there is a list of the books printed at Scolio in 1488, and which is a reprint of our edition, are nothing but slavages of the printer and cor-

(IV.) Theatra Prae-terius Posterioriae cum Comm. Kim-
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dependently, etc.; and Samuel Ockley, in his Introduction, ad Lingua Orient. cap. ii. p. 84, says: "Hinc Roberti Stuphanus edicto palmaria quidem characteris illustratur. Sed in aliqua parte mendosus scatur, quod liber palmarum antiquius postulatur fudurum." III. The third main recension was the Bombergian text of 1522. A newer recension of the text, which has more influence than any on the text of later times, was Bombergus' own, printed at Venice, 1532. It was revised and corrected by Jacob ben-Chashim (Venice, 1535–36, 4 vols. fol.). See Bacherius. This edition was followed by—
4. A. G. C. d'A. d'Arba's edition, published at Venice, 1568, 16 mo; an edition in 4to, 1586: c. R. Rabini (Venice, 4 vols. fol.) (see Barzinaus). This edition was followed by—
6. Croce's, printed at Wittenberg in 1598 and 1602.
8. Brugadin's editions, published at Venice, viz.: a. an edition in 4to and 16 mos (1613–15), & a Rabbinic Bible (in 4to, 1626) (see Barzinaus). This edition was followed by—
9. The Paris, 1619, 4to. See Poretschka; Bacherius.
10. The London, or Walton's Polyglot. See Polyglott Bible.
11. Plantin's Hebrew-Latin Editions (Antwerp, 1571, 1589). In the first edition, in Gen. 3, 15, where the Vulg. has "ipsa contenter caput," with reference to the Virgin Mary, we read גית instead of נינס, with a little circle above to indicate a different reading in the passage (גית). But this corruption was not made by Aris Montanus, the Latin translator.
V. Hutter's Text. Several older editions contributed to Hutter's Bible:
1. Biblia Sacra Polyglotta (incomplete); only the Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, and Ruth (Nuremberg, 1569). Hutter's Hebrew Bible was reprinted in Niese's edition (Ludwig Batsatorus, Straits, 1569, large 4vo, 1696, and 1697 with new title-pages).
2. Biblia Sacra Hebraeae: ad Optimum Edita Romana, etc. (Oxford, 1586). This edition—of good reputation for its accuracy, but about the same beauty and distinctness of type—deserves special attention as constituting our present fassus recipient. The text was chiefly formed on that of Athanas: no MS. was used for it, but it has a collection of various readings from printed editions at the end. The Masoretes readings are given in the margin. In spite of all the excellences which this edition has above others, there are still a great many mistakes to be found therein, as Brons has shown in Richard's Bibliotheca, xi, 23 sq. The following editions are either printed from or based on Van der Brouck's text.
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Van der Hooght's text is found in all English editions of the Hebrew Bible published by Ducange or Bagster, and is also made the basis of—

19. The Hexaplaton (see Polyglott Bible) (Loud. 1876), vol. 1, p. 186. (v. n. 128.
18. Hahn's Edition, published at Leipzig in 1831, 1829, 1838, and 1863; the last is superior to the former, as can be seen from the preface. Hahn's text has also been published in the edition prepared by Bickell (1847, and often). There is also a small edition of Hahn's Bible (in the size), with a preface by Rosenmüller, in small bibles and pocket bibles, which was published in 1868.

Thiele's Editions (ibid. 1846; 4th ed. 1857). This edition may be regarded as one of the best Hebrew Bibles according to Van der Hooght's recension. Wright, in his 1875 edition of the Geneva in Hebrew (Loud. 1879), has followed Thiele's text.

XII. Optima Editions, or Biblias Hebraicas cum Optima Interpretatione, etc. Studio et Opera D. H. Opitii (Kilnott, 1760-4). O'pik compared for this edition of the Codex Turesk. Three different editions, which are enumerated in the preface. This text was reprinted in—

1. Zullichii Biblia cum Profrate Michaeli (1741, 410). Optika compared for this edition of these codices and fourteen printed editions, which are enumerated in the preface. This text was reprinted in—

2. Kilnottianum Cornishiae cum Priscog. Michaeli (1741, 410). Optika compared for this edition of these codices and fourteen printed editions, which are enumerated in the preface. This text was reprinted in—
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thought suggested itself to Bengel that the mass of materials might be definitely classified in conformity with such a view. The same idea afterwards occurred to Semler. Bengel classified all the documents from which various readings are collected into two nations or families—the Asiatic and the African. To the former belonged the Codex Alexandrinus as the chief; to the latter the Greek-Latin codices. And first that eminent critic does not seem to have had a very distinct apprehension of the subject; and therefore he speaks in general terms of it in his edition of the Greek Testament published in 1734; but in the posthumous edition of the Apparatus Criticus (1763, edited by Burkoius) he is more explicit. Semler was the first to use the term recension of a particular class of MSS. In his Hermeneutische Vorbereitung (1765). This critic, however, though acquainted with Westen's labors on the text of the New Testament, had nothing more than a dim notion of the subject. He followed Bengel without clearly understanding or enlarging his views. Griesbach was the first scholar who treated the topic with consummate learning and skill, elaborating it so highly that it became a prominent subject in the criticism of the New Testament. But he had the benefit of Westen's abundant treatises and of the researches already made into MSS. quotations by ancient writers, and versions of the Greek Testament bearing an affinity to one another in characteristic readings, became a classical word in his hands, and has continued so. The appellation is not happily chosen; or, rather the term or process would have been more appropriate; but recension suggests the idea of revision, which is inapprroplicable. If it be remembered, however, that the word denotes nothing more than a certain class of critical documents characterized by distinctive peculiarities in common, it matters little what designation is employed.

The sentiments of Griesbach, like those of Bengel, developed and enlarged with time. Hence we must not look for exactly the same theory in his different publications. In his Disseratio Critica de Codicibus Quatuor Evangeliorum Origine (pars prima, published in 1771), he says that there are, perhaps, three or four recensions into which all the codices of the New Testament might be divided (Opuscula Academica, edited by Gabler, i. 239). In the preface to his first edition of the Greek Testament (1777), he states that at the beginning of the 3d century there were two recensions of the gospel, the Alexandrian and the Western. In the prolegomena to the first volume of his second edition of the Greek Testament, the matured sentiments of this able critic are best set forth. There he illustrates the Alexandrian, the Western, and the Constantinopolitan. The first two are the more ancient, belonging to the time in which the two collections of the New Testament, the εικοναγλωσσα and ἀναγλωσσα, were made. The Alexandrian was an actual recension arising at the time when the two portions in question were put together; the Western was simply the accidental result of carelessness and arbitrary procedure on the part of transcribers and others in the MSS. current before the ἀναγλωσσα, or epitiles, were collected. The Constantinopolitan arose from the intermingling of the other two, and, like the Western, is no proper recension, but was rather the result of a condition of the documents brought about by the negligence and caprice of copyists or meddling critics. The Alexandrian is presented by the MSS. C, L, 38, 102, 106, and B in the last chapters of the four gospels; by the Perpinian, Ethiopic, Armenian, and Philoxenian versions; and the quotations of Clements Alexanderinus, Origen, Eusebius, Athanasius, Cyril of Alexandria, and Isidore of Pelusium. The Western accords with the Graeco-Latin codices, with the Alex-Moscow Latin version, and with B in the gospel of Matthew; also with 1, 13, 69, 118, 124, 131, 157; with the Thebaic and Jerusalem-Syriac versions, and the quotations of Ireneus in Latin, Cyprian, Tertullian, Ambrose, and Augustine. The third or Constantinopolitan is shown in A, E, F, G, H, S, of the gospels, the Moscow codices of the Pauline epistles, the Epistle of Barnabas, and the Pauline epistles of such fathers as lived during the 4th, 5th, and 6th centuries in Greece, Asia Minor, and the neighboring provinces. The text in Chrysostom is described by Griesbach as a mixed one; and of P, Q, and T he says that they are sometimes like the Alexandrian, sometimes like the Western. The Alexandrian recension sought to avoid and change whatever might be offensive to Greek ears; but the Western preserved the harsher genuine readings when opposed to the genius of the Greek language; Hebratizing ones; readings involving solemnism or puerility they retained; they sought sometimes to illustrate words and phrases rather than the sense; the Western endeavored to render the sense clearer and less involved by means of explanations, circumlocations, additions gathered from every side, as well as by transpositions of words and sentences. It also shews the readings which are more full and verbose, as well as supplements taken from parallel passages, sometimes omitting what might render the sense obscure or seem repugnant to the context or parallel passages, in all which respects the Alexandrian is purer. The Alexandrian, a grammatician, the Western an interpreter of an interpreter. In all these points Griesbach asserts that the Constantinopolitan commonly agrees with the Alexandrian; but with this difference, that it is still more studious of Greek propriety, admits more genuine than the Alexandrian, and preserves Western readings, which differ from the Alexandrian, or else readings compounded of Alexandrian and Western. No recension is exhibited by any codex in its original purity (Prolegomena in Novum Testamentum [3d ed. by Schulte], vol. i, p. lxx sq.).

Michaelis thinks that there have existed four principal editions: 1. The Western, used in countries where the Latin language was spoken. 2. The Alexandrian or Egyptian, with which the quotations of Origen coincide and the Copitc version. 3. The Edessene edition, embracing the MSS. from which the old Syriac was made. 4. The Byzantine, in general use at Constantinople after that city became the capital of the Eastern empire. This last is subdivided into the ancient and the modern (Introduction to the New Testament, translated by Marsh, ii, 173 sq. at 2d ed.).

Assuredly this classification is no improvement upon Griesbach's.

Somewhat different from Griesbach's system is that of the Hug, which was first proposed in his Eisleitung in das neue Testament (1808). 1. The συναγλωσσα, i.e. the collections made in the 3d century, and consisting of a concordance of all the 23 legible MSS. in the 2d century, found in D, 1, 13, 69, 124, of the gospels; in D, E, F, G, of Paul's epistles; in D, E, of the Acts; and in the old Latin and Thebais versions. The Peisito belongs to this class of text, though it differs in some respects from D. 2. About the middle of the 8th century, Hesychius, an Egyptian bishop, made a recension of the συναγλωσσα. To this belong B, C, L, of the gospels; A, B, C, 40, 30, 367, in the Acts; A, B, C, 40, 367, in the Catholic epistles; A, B, C, 46, 367, 17, of the Pauline epistles, and A, C, of the Apocalypse. It appears in the citations of Athanasius, Marcus and Macarius the monks, Cyril of Alexandria, and Cosmas Indicopleustes. This recension had ecclesiastical authority in Egypt and Alexandria. 3. About the same time, Lucian, a presbyter of Antioch, in Syria, revised the συναγλωσσα as it then existed in the Peisito, comparing different MSS. current in Syria. In this way he produced a text which did not wholly harmonize with the Hesychian because he was less studious of elegant Latinity. It appears in E, F, G, H, S, of the gospels, in the Alex-Moscow Latin version, and in B, c, d, m, k, (Mattathai), of the Acts; in g, (Mattathai), f, k, l, m, c, d, of the Pauline and Catholic epistles; in r, k, p, l, o, of the Moscow MSS. of the Apocalypse; in the Gob-
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ie and Slavonic versions, and the quotations of Theophylact, though his text is no longer pure. A fourth
reception Hugo attributes to Origen during his residence at Tyre. To it belong A, K, M, 42, 106, 114, 116, and
10 of Matthei in the gospels, the Philoxenian Syriac, the quotations of Theodoret and Chrysostom. From
the fifth century onward, however, Hugo agrees substantially with the Western reception of
Griesbach. It is more comprehensive, as including the Peshito, with the quotations of Clement and Origen.
The Hesychian reception of Hugo coincides with the
Alexandrian of Griesbach.

Eichhorn's system is substantially that of Hugo, with
one important exception. He assumed an unrevised
form of the text in Asia, and, with some differences, in
Africa also. This unrevised text may be traced in its
two forms as early as the 2nd century. Lucian revised
the first, Hesychius the second. Hence, to use a
formula, the text of the third century, there was a threefold phase of
the text—the African or Alexandrian, the Asiatic or Con-
stantinopolitan, and a mixture of both. Eichhorn
denied that Origen made a new reception (Eindung in
der Origenischen Text) as Hugo proposed.

In 1815 Nulan published an Inquiry into the Integrity of
the Greek Vulgate, in which he propounded a peculiar
theory of receptions. He divided all the documents into
three classes—the Palestinian, equivalent to Gries-
bach's Alexandrian; the Egyptian, identical with Gries-
bach's Byzantine; the third, containing the forms
of the text are represented, as he assumed, by the Codex
Vaticanus and Jerome's Vulgate, with the Codices
Vercellensis and Brixianus of the Latin version.
The last two contained a more ancient text than that rep-
gresented by the version of Jerome. The Palestinian
reception, which he attributes to Eusebius of Caesarea,
is greatly censured as having been executed by this
father with arbitrariness and dishonesty, since he tam-
pered with passages because of their opposition to his
Abbasite opinions. At the end of the 5th century this
reception was introduced into Alexandria by Euthymius,
and was circulated there.

Scholz made two classes or families—the Alexan-
drian or Occidental, and Constantinopolitan or Oriental.
Griesbach's Western class is contained in the former.
He referred to the Alexandrian several of the ancient
MSS., and a few later ones—the Mystemphic, Thebaisic,
Ethiopic, and Latin versions, and the ecclesiastical writ-
ers belonging to Western Europe, with those of Africa.
To the Constantinopolitan he referred the MSS. belong-
ing to the Asiatic or Oriental text object. It is opposed to the
Egyptian, especially Constantinople, with the Philoxenian, Syriac,
Geotic, Georgian, and Slavonic versions, besides the
fathers of these regions. To the latter he gave a decided
preference, because of their alleged mutual agreement,
and also because they were supposed to be written with
great care after the most ancient exemplars; whereas
the Alexandrian documents were arbitrarily altered by
obvious grammarians. Indeed, he traces the Constan-
tinopolitan to the autography of the original writers.

Ruck in agrees with Scholz in classifying all doc-
uments numbered by the Constantinopolitan and the Ori-
ental; the former exhibited in A, B, C, D, E, F, G, in
the epistles, the latter containing the curative MSS.
The former he subdivides into two families—the Alex-
ian (A, B, C) and the Latin codices (D, E, F, G). He
finds in it the result of arbitrary correction, ignorance,
and carelessness.

Tischendorf's view, given in the preludium to the
seventh edition of his Greek Testament, is that there
are two pairs of classes—the Alexandrian and Latin,
the Asiatic and Byzantine. The oldest form of the
text, he says, was denied that Origen's use of the con-
ception, is presented in A, B, C, D, L, P, Q, T, X, Z,
\( \Delta \), perhaps also R, in the gospels. A later form, bear-
ing more of an Asiatic complexion, is in E, F, G, H, K,
M, O, S, U, V, W, \( \Gamma \), \( \Delta \). For the Acts and Catholic epistles
the oldest text is given in A, B, C; for Acts probably
D and I also. For the Pauline epistles the oldest text
is represented by A, B, C, H, I, D, F, G, the first five be-
ing Alexandrian, the last two Latin; D standing
between the two classes. A and C in the Apocalypse
have a more ancient text than B.

Lachmann disregarded all systems of receptions, and
proceeded to give his own text. From among the ancient
and modern texts he selected such as he considered to a
definite time—the text which commonly prevailed in the 8th and 4th centuries, drawn from Orient-
al MSS.—with the aid of Occidental ones in cases where
the former disagree among themselves. In his large
dition he follows the Western text, and, as far as the
original itself, as he would have given it. For
this reason his edition contains readings which, in his own
opinion, could not have been original. His object was
therefore somewhat different from that of most editors.
But he set an example of rigid adherence to the task
proposed, and he was able to give the text in a true form
of text from ancient documents of the time, evincing
the talents and skill of a master. Since his time it has
been the fashion among inferior critics and imitators to
attach undue weight to antiquity. Unical MSS. and
their readings have been too implicitly followed by
some.

Tischendorf more recently adopted the same views
as those of Lachmann, holding that the most ancient
text alone should be edited, though it may not always
be what the sacred writers wrote. This principle be-
ing laid at the basis of his eighth edition, lately com-
pleted, made a considerable difference between it and the
seventh. The internal goodness of readings, the
context, and sound judgment are thus excluded, and
this at the expense of something more valuable; for
more outward and ancient testimony can never elicit
what ought to be an editor's chief object—the presenta-
tion of a text as near as can be procured.
The oldest text of the best MSS. and versions
is valuable only so far as it assists in attaining that
object. It is opposed to the Alexandrian, especially
from \( \gamma \) (\( \gamma \) \( \gamma \) \( \gamma \)) in John 1, 18
has been given in the text of a recent edition. The
same excessive veneration for antiquity has led to the
addition of \( \gamma \) (\( \gamma \) \( \gamma \) \( \gamma \)) in (John 1, 8) in mod-
ern times. Lachmann is exceeded by smaller followers,
not in his own exact line, but in his method.

To Griesbach all must allow distinguished merit.
He was a consummate critic, ingenious, acute, candid,
tolerant, and learned. His system was elaborated with
great ability. It exhibits the marks of a sagacious
mind, and is supported by a mass of evidence, the
combined attacks weakened its basis. In Germany,
Eichhorn, Berthold, Hugo, Schulz, Gabler, and Schott
made various objections to it. In consequence of Hugo's
acute remarks, the venerable scholar himself modified
his views. He did not, however, give up all three re-
censions, but still maintained that the Alexandrian and
Western were distinct. He admitted that the Syriac,
which Hugo had put with \( \gamma \) (\( \gamma \) \( \gamma \) \( \gamma \)) was nearer to that than to the
Alexandrian class; but he hesitated to put it with the
Western because it differed so much. He taught that
Origen used, if at all, the Alexandrian, which existed before his time, was
that which he employed. He conceded, however, that
Origen had a Western copy of Mark besides an Alex-
andrian one; that in his commentary on Matthew,
though the readings are chiefly Alexandrian, there is
RECESSIONS

most copious in his praises of Origen, speaks strongly against the critical studies of the Alexandrian father in the New-Test. text. We believe, therefore, that the recession system of Hug is sustained by historical data. Succeeding critics have refused to adopt it. Griesbach himself was attacked by his contemporaries, and was also assailed by Schott, Rinck, Gabler, and others. Mr. Norton, too, opposed it.

Nolan's system is fundamentally wrong. There is no evidence that the Codex Brixianus contains the Latin version in its oldest form, and therefore the assumed connection of it with the Byzantine text fails to show that the latter is the most ancient and best representative of the original Greek. The Codex Brixianus, on the contrary, is itself a revision of the old Latin text. Nolan thinks that the Codex Vercellensis has a text corrected by Eusebius of Vercelli after that which he brought from Egypt on his return from exile. But this form of the text circulated in the West before Eusebius, and the Palestinian recession, which he supposed to have been introduced into Alexandria by Euthalius, was there before; that the system was ingeniously elaborated by the critic is historically erroneous. It introduces arbitrary and baseless conjectures into the department of criticism, ignores facts, and deals in unjust accusations against ancient writers, such as Eusebius of Cesarea, who worked as a historian in the service of the Byzantine text. All attempts to maintain the most recent in opposition to the most ancient text must necessarily fail. Thoroughly erroneous as Nolan's theory is, it was eagerly welcomed by some advocates of the received text in England. Mr. Horne could say of it, even in the ninth edition of his Introduction to the Criti-
cal Study and Knowledge of the Scriptures, "The integrity of the Greek Vulgate he has confessedly established by a series of proofs and connected arguments the most decisive that can be reasonably desired or expected."

With respect to the codex which is collated with Bengel's, it may be preferable to Griesbach's so far as it allows but two classes of documents; it is certainly simpler. His estimate, however, of the value of families is erroneous. He failed to prove that the particular form of the text current in Asia Minor and Greece during the first three centuries was the same as that presented by the Constantinopolitan MSS. of a much later date. He did not show that the Byzantine family was derived from the autographs of the original writers in a very pure state, and he was obliged to admit that the text which he had collated with those of Constantine and Constance was collated with the Alexandrian, a circumstance which would naturally give rise to a mingling of readings belonging to both. Eusebius states that he made out fifty copies of the New Text, for the use of the church; the Constatines of Constantine; and as we know that he gave a decided preference to Alexandrian copies, it cannot be doubted that he followed those sanctioned by Origen's authority. Constantinopolitan codices differ in their characteristic readings from the Alexandrian, but the preference belongs to the latter, and not to the former. Junior should be placed above older documents? Antiquity may be overbalanced by other considerations, and certainly the Constantinopolitan MSS. are neither faultless nor pure. But the Byzantine and later MSS. are more corrupt. Numbers must not be considered decisive of right readings in opposition to antiquity, yet numbers had an undue influence on Scholal's mind. Rinck has refuted his supposed proofs of the superiority of Constantinopolitan MSS., and Tischendorf has more elaborately done the same in the preface to his first edition of the Greek Testament. In fact, the names of the Codex Brixianus are not better than the names of those who undertook to revise the Καισαριανός. It is true that Jerome appeared as editor of Origen undertook to revise the Καισαριανός. It is true that Jerome appeared as editor of the New Test. selected with care, and probably corrected them in various places, but he did not undertake in his old age the laborious task of making a peculiar revision. The silence of ancient writers, especially of Eusebius, who is

great number of such as are Western, and which therefore appear in D, 13, 28, 69, 124, 131, 157, the old Italic, Vulgate, and Syriac. Thus Origen had various copies at hand, as he himself repeatedly asserts. Gries-
bach also conceded that Clemens Alexandrinus had various copies at his disposal in the form of his own texts. Hence his citations often agree with the Καισαριανός and D. Thus Origen and Clement cease, in some measure, to be standart representatives of the Alexandrian recession. The concessions of Griesbach, resulting from many acute observations made by Hug and others, amounted to this, that the nearness of MSS. and recensions to one another was greater than he had before assumed; that his two ancient recensions had more points of contact with one another in existing documents than he had clearly perceived. The line between his Alexandrian and Western classes became less perceptible. This, in-
deed, was the weak point of the system, as no proper division can be drawn between the two. In the applica-
tion of his system he professed to follow the consent of the Alexandrian and Western recensions, unless the internal marks of truth in a reading were so strong as to outweigh this argument. But he departed from his principle in several instances, as in 1 Cor. iii. 4; Gal. iv. 14: Phil. iii. 8; 1 Thess. ii. 7; Heb. iv. 2.

In the year 1814 Dr. Laurence published objections to the system, many of which are unfounded. Some of his observations are pertinent and fair; more are irrelevant. He does not show much appreciation of the comparative value of MSS. and texts, and reasons in a sort of mechanical method against Griesbach. It is evident that he was somewhat prejudiced against the Alexandrian recession. Observations like the following show an animus against the German critic: "Too much dazzled, perhaps, by the splendor of intricate and perplexing research, he overlooked what lay immediately before him. When he threw his critical bowl among the hares of his predecessors, he too hastily attempted to set up his own without having first totally demolished theirs, forgetting that the very nerve of his criticism was a principle of hostility to every standard text" (Remarks upon the Systematic Classification of MSS. adopted by Griesbach, p. 57). The pamphlet of the Oxford scholar is now almost forgotten, yet it produced considerable effect at the time of its appearance, when the reprinting of Griesbach's Greek Testament in England was associated with the active dissemination of Unitarian tenets, and the accomplished German himself not only with learning but with similar views. In America, Mr. Norton subsequently animadverted upon the same system with considerable acuteness and plausibility. It is evident, however, that he did not fully understand all Griesbach's sentiments; he had not studied the peculiar readings of MSS. or quotations of the fathers, and the characteristics of ancient versions, yet he has urged some objections forcibly and conclusively against the adoption of the system.

Hug's theory of recensions, so far as it differs from Griesbach's, is without foundation. It makes Origen use the Καισαριανός, whereas his usual text agrees strongly with the Alexandrian. The Hezychian recession was employed at least a hundred years previously by Clemen-
t of Alexandria, and that Hesychius was really the author of a recession is historically baseless; he may have corrected, in some places, a few copies which he used. The recession attributed to Lucian is also desti-
tute of historical proof. The basis of this is supposed to have been the Καισαριανός as it existed in Syria. Again, it is very improbable that Origen undertook to revise the Καισαριανός. It is true that Jerome ap-
ppeared as editor of the New Test. selected with care, and probably corrected them in various places, but he did not undertake in his old age the laborious task of making a peculiar revision. The silence of ancient writers, especially of Eusebius, who is
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more families of documents; others, with less acuteness or ingenuity, will rest satisfied with classes more strongly marked by the number of materials they involve, as the breadth of territory over which they were supposed to circulate. There is no possibility of arriving at precision. The collating of readings has obliterated many peculiarities in the progress of time, though enough has been left to form the basis of a rough classification.

It is more difficult to classify the ancient versions, such as the Peshito-Syriac, because their texts have suffered frequent interpolations and changes. In the quotations of the fathers we must make allowance for the memorior citation without expectation of exactness of the attache to the letter. Griesbach, however, denies that Origen quoted from memory—and none has investigated the citations of the Alexandrian father with equal labor—but the state of his commentaries is far from being what we could wish, and the original is often lost or corrupted.

The term recension is sometimes applied to the Old Test. as well as to the New Test. There the materials hitherto collated all belong to one recension, viz. the Masoretic. Sometimes, however, the specializations of the critics to which we have referred have had one advantage, viz. that they have made the characteristic readings of MSS. better understood, and enabled us to group together certain documents presenting the same form of text. Thus in the gospels, A, B, C, D, L, F, Q, T, X Z present an older form of the text than E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, F. Among the former, A, B, Z have a text more ancient and correct than that of others.

Matthew repudiated the whole system of recensions as useless and absurd. We question whether he was warranted by learning, penetration, or judgment to use the contemptuous language which he applied. His industry in collating MSS. and editing their text was praiseworthy, but he had not the genius to construct a good text out of the materials within his reach. He overestimated his Moscow codices, and looked on Griesbach's merits with envious eye; hence his diatribe on recensions shows more ardent zeal than discretion.

What sentence can show the spirit of the man better than this?—Griesbach has been hammering, filing, and polishing for thirty years at this masterpiece of uncriticism, unbelief, and irreligion. It is said by Semler's recension-manufactory ("Ueber die gegenwartigen Recensionen, welche der Herr Abt Bengel, der Herr Doctor Semler, und der Herr Professor Mathäus in dem Texte des N. T. wollen entdeckt haben", p. 28).

Prof. Lee employed language equally strong with Mattathias's, but not so scurrilous, though of the same tendency: "Ingegnio illae familiarum fabrisc, ut mihi videtur, in unum tantummodo finem feliciter extruxit sunt; ut rem in speciam baud valde obscuram, tenebris Egyptianis obscuriorum reddant; Editoresco eois qui se omnino rem acut et diligiae pertun, supra mortalia labendi statum, necio quantum, everebe" (Prolegomena in Biblia Polyglotta Lundensine Minoriz, p. 89).

Neither is sufficiently eminent to be called wise. Bengel has been hammering, filing, and polishing from which masters in criticism like Griesbach would refrain. Hear the veteran scholar, in his last publication, speaking of Hug: "Dubitationis ignitus causas exponere mihi liceat, sed paucis et modeste, nec eo animo, sum tum voce docetum quem permagni me facere ingenu proferre, decertem, sed ut tum aliquis harum rerum peritos, tum in primis iisum excitam et humanissimi invitem ad novum instituendum cause, que in universa re critica Novi Testamenti maximi momenti est, examen, quo ea, siullo modo fieri id possit, ad liquidum tandem, etiamsi propter nonnulla in Novi Testamenti Recensionibus, particula ii, p. 42.

The preceding observations will help to account for the varying schemes of different critics. Some may look for greater exactness and nicety than others, hence they will make


corrections it underwent in different places at different times, the methods in which it was copied, the principles, if any, that preceded it, the exactness of the materials, both ancient and modern—"every thing is too meagre to build up a secure structure. The subject must therefore remain in obscurity. Its nature is such as to give rise to endless speculation without affording much real knowledge; it is vague, indefinite, shadowy, awakening curiosity without satisfying it. Yet we are not disposed to reject the entire system of classification as visionary. It is highly useful to arrange the materials. The existence of certain characteristic readings may be clearly traced in various manuscripts of the text, and other faults, on the speeial causes, it is true that in several cases it is very difficult to distinguish the family to which a particular reading belongs, because its characteristics may be divided between two classes, or they may be so mixed that it is almost impossible to detect the family with which it should be united; the evidences of its relationship may be so obscure as to render the determination of its appropriate recension a subtle problem. It is also unquestionable that no one MS, version or father exhibits a recension in a pure state, but that each form of text has been modified by the specializations of the critics to which we have referred. In one MSS. we have the Speculator or Masoretic. Sometimes, however, the specializations of the critics to which we have referred have had one advantage, viz. that they have made the characteristic readings of MSS. better understood, and enabled us to group together certain documents presenting the same form of text. Thus in the gospels, A, B, C, D, L, F, Q, T, X, Z present an older form of the text than E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, F. Among the former, A, B, Z have a text more ancient and correct than that of others.
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Rechabite

Receveur, François Joseph Xavier, a French priest and historian, was born at Longeville (Doubs) April 30, 1766. His family had received his orders when he was sent to Paris (Oct., 1824) to fill a senator in the cabinet of the minister of ecclesiastical affairs and of public instruction. From June, 1828, to June, 1829, he was head of the bureau of secretariat to the same minister. Afterwards appointed a teacher in the theological faculty of Paris (May 1, 1861), he became the precursor of more important works. He was a member of the Academy of Moral and Political Sciences (1841, 1841), and dean of the faculty Dec. 6, 1850. He had not long been relieved from these last duties when he died in his native country, May 7, 1854. The various positions which he filled permitted him to devote his labors to several important works. We have: Études Philosopliques sur le Fondement de la Cer titude (Paris, 1821, 12mo) ;—A de la Foi avec la Raison, ou Exposition des Principes sur lesquels repose la Foi Catholique (ibid, 1830-33, 12mo) ;—Essai sur la Nécessité de l'Amé, sur l'Origine des Idees et le Fondement de la Cer titude (ibid, 1834, 8vo) ;—Tractatus Theologicus de Justitiis et Contradictis (ibid, 1835, 12mo) —Introduction à la Théologie (Besançon, 1839, 8vo) ;—Histoire de l'Église depuis son Établissement jusqu'au Pontificat de Grégoire X (Paris, 1840-47, 8 vols, 8vo). As an editor, abbé Rece veur has given a new life to Théologique Doctrinale et Morale de Bailly (1830), and another of the Théologique Morale de Liguori, to which he has added some notes (1833). Collector for the Nouvelle Bibliographie Générale, he died a short time after having contributed the articles Saint-Cyrus and Saint-Cyrilla, in the Dictionary of the Church. One of his chief subjects was the Rechabite (Heb. Rechab, נָּצָּה כ, a rider; Sept. Παγάς, the name of three men. 1. The first named of the two "sons of Rimmon the Beerothite," "captains of bands," who murdered Ish booth in his bed in order to gain favor with David, but were put to death by him, with expressions of abhorrence for their crime (2 Sam. v, 5-12). B.C. 1046. Josephus calls him Thomas (Ant. ii, 2, 1). The other's name was Banab (q. v.). 2. The "father" of Jehonadab (or Jonadab, Jer. xxxvi, 20), who was Jehu's companion in destroying the worshippers of Baal (2 Kings x, 15-22). See Jonas da B.C. ante 882. He was the ancestor of the Rechabites (q. v.). 3. The father of Malchiah, which latter was ruler of part of Beth-haccerem, and is named as repairing the dung-gate in the fortifications of Jerusalem under Nehe miah (Neh. iii, 14). B.C. ante 446. Rechab'ite [properly Rechab'ite]. (Heb. always is the plural, and with the art. ha-Rekobim, ינָצָּה כ, a pastoral from Rechab; Sept. Panaííers, Panaííers, etc.), a tribe who appear only in one memorable scene of Scripture (Jer. xxxiv, 2-18). Their history before and after it lies in some obscurity. We are left to search out and combine some scattered notices, and to get from them what light we can. 1. In 1 Chron. ii, 55 the house of Rechab is identified with a section of the Kenites who came into Canaan with the Israelites and retained their nomadic habits, and the name of Nehemiah is mentioned as the patriarch of the whole tribe. See HEMM. N.H.), 4, 14. B.C. ante 446. The house of Rechab belonged to a branch of the Kenites settled from the first at Jabez, in Judah. See JEHONADAB. The fact, however, that Jehonadab took an active part in the revolution which placed Jehu on the throne seems to indicate that he and his tribe belonged to Israel rather than to Judah, and the late date of 1 Chron., taken together with other facts (infra), makes it more probable that this passage refers to the locality occupied by the Rechabites after their return from the captivity. In confirmation of this view, it may be noticed that the "shearing-house" of 2 Kings x, 14 was probably the known rendezvous of the nomad tribe of the Kenites with their flocks of sheep. See SHEARING- HOUSE. Of Rechab himself nothing is known. He may have been the father, he may have been the remoter ancestor of Jehonadab, or he may have been an individual who made it probable enough that it was an epitaph passing into a proper
name. It may have pointed, as in the robber-chieft of 2 Sam. iv, 2, to a conspicuous form of the wild Bedouin life; and Jehonadab, the son of the Rider, may have been, in part at least, for that reason, the companion and friend of the fierce captain of Israel who drives as with the fury of madness (2 Kings ix, 20). Another conjecture as to the meaning of the name is ingeniously enough to merit a disinterment from the forgotten learning of the 16th century. Boulcuc (De Eccles. ante Leg. iii, 10) infers from 2 Kings ii, 12: xiii, 14, that the two great prophets Elijah and Elisha were known, each of them in his time, as the chariot (227) Rekeb) of Israel, i.e. its strength and protection. He infers from this the special disciples of the prophets, who followed them as their graduates, were known as the "sons of the chariot," Bene-Rekeb; and that afterwards, when the original meaning had been lost sight of, this was taken as a patronymic, and referred to an unknown Rechab. At present, of course, the different vowel-points of the two words are sufficiently distinctive; but the strange reading of the Sept. in Judg. i, 19 (for 'Psial' daréicara, which the A. V. has "because they had chariots of iron") shows that one word might easily enough be taken for the other. Apart from the evidence of the name and the obvious probability of the fact, we have an apparent (quantum eundem) of John of Jerusalem that Jehonadab was a disciple of Elisha (De Instit. Monach. c. 25).

II. The personal history of Jehonadab has been dealt with under that name. Here we have to notice the new character which he impressed on the tribe of which he was the head. As his name, his descent, and the part which he played indicate, he and his people had all along been worshippers of Jehovah, circumcised, and so within the covenant of Abraham, though not reckoned as belonging to Israel, and probably therefore not considered the same as the Nazarites bound by the basic law and ritual. The worship of Baal introduced by Jezebel and Ahab was accordingly not less offensive to them than to the Israelites. The luxury and license of Phoenician cities threatened the destruction of the simplicity of their nomatic life (Amos ii, 7; vi, 5-6). A protest was needed against both evils, and, as in the case of Elijah, and of the Nazarites of Amos ii, 11, it took the form of asceticism. There was to be a more rigid adherence than ever to the old Arab life. What had been a traditional habit was enforced by a solemn command from Heaven. Jehonadab is that most Approved of idolatry, which no one dared to transgress. They were to drink no wine, nor build house, nor sow seed, nor plant vineyard, nor have any. All their days they were to dwell in tents, as remembering that they were strangers in the land (Jer. xxxv, 5, 7). This was to be the condition of their retaining a distinct tribal existence. For two centuries and a half they adhered faithfully to this rule; but we have no record of any part taken by them in the history of the period. We may think of them as presenting the same picture which other tribes, united in their faith, sacrifices, and religious austerity, have presented in later periods.

The Nabataeans, of whom Diiodorus Siculus speaks (xix, 94) as neither sowing seed, nor planting fruit-tree, nor using nor building house, and enforcing these transmitted customs under pain of death, give us one striking instance. The fact that the Nabataeans habitually drank "wild honey" (μελί αυλαίον) mixed with water (Diiod. Sic. xix, 94), and that the Bedouin as habitually still make locusts an article of food (Burchardt, Bedouins, p. 270), shows very strongly that the Baptist's life was familiar to the Bedouin as well as to the Nazarite. Another is found in the prohibition of wine by Mohammed (Sale, Koran, Pr. trim. Diss. § 5). A yet more interesting parallel is found in the rapid growth of the sect of the Wahabis during the last and present century. Aby-ul-Husayn, as the sect takes its name, still preserves the old type of character in all its completeness. Anxious to protect his countrymen from the revolting vices of the Turks, as Jehonadab had been to protect the Kenítes from the like vices of the Phoenicians, the Bedouin reformer felt the necessity of returning to the old austerity of Arab life. What wine had been given to the earlier preachers of the gospel was not the outward sign and incentive of a fatal corruption, opium and tobacco were to the later prophet, and, as such, were rigidly proscribed. The rapidity with which the Wahabíe became a formidable party, the Puritans of Islam, presents a striking analogy to the strong political influence of Jehonadab in 2 Kings x, 15, 23 (comp. Burchardt, Bedouins and Wahabis, p. 283, etc.).

III. The invasion of Judah by Nebuchadnezzar in B.C. 607 drove the Rechabites from their tents. Possibly some of the previous periods of danger may have led to their settling within the limits of Judah. Some inferences may be safely drawn from the facts of Jer. xxxv. The names of the Rechabites show that they continued to be worshippers of Jehovah. They are already known to the prophet. One of them (ver. 3) bears the same name. Their rigid Nazariteh life gained for them admission into the house of the Lord, into one of the chambers assigned to priests and Levites, within its precincts. They were received by the sons or followers of a "man of God," a prophet or devotee, of sanctity (ver. 4); they were not tempted, and are proof against the temptation, and their steadfastness is turned into a reproof for the unfaithfulness of Judah and Jerusalem. See Jer. xxiv. The history of this trial ends with a special blessing, the full import of which has, for the most part, not been adequately apprehended: "Jehonadab, the son of Rechab, shall not want a man to stand before me forever" (ver. 19). Whether we look on this as the utterance of a true prophet, or as a vaticinium ex eventibus, we should hardly expect at this precise point to lose sight altogether of those of whom it was spoken, even if the words pointed only to the perpetuation of the name and tribe. They have, however, possibly been the extent of the new blessing. The Rechabites were solidly adopted into the families of Israel, and were recognised as incorporated into the tribe of Levi. Their purity, their faithfulness, their consecrated life, gained for them, as it gained for other Nazarites, that honor. See Psal. 69, 9. In Lam. iv, 7 we may perhaps trace a reference to the Rechabites, who had been the most conspicuous examples of the Nazariteh life in the prophet's time, and most the object of his admiration.

It may be worth while to refer to a few authorities agreeing in the general interpretation here given, though differing as to details. Vatabulus (Crit. Sac. ad loc.) mentions a Jewish tradition (R. Judah, as cited by Kimchi; comp. Scaliger, Elench. Tribufes. Serr. p. 26) that the daughters of the Rechabites married Levites, and that they thus were maintained by the Temple, while Clarus (ibid) conjectures that the Rechabites themselves were chosen to sit in the great council. Sanctius and Calmet suppose them to have ministered in the same way as the Nehirim (Calmet, Diss. sur les Rech. chap. 1726). Scaliger identifies them with the Essenes; Scaliger (loc. cit.) with the Chasidim, in
whose name the priests offered special daily sacrifices, and who, in this way, were "standing before the Lord" continually.

IV. It remains for us to see whether there are any traces of the name of Rechabite in the Sept.-version (טבש, ouest 755) of the name, which, however, is evidence merely of a tradition in the 5th century B.C. indicating that the "sons of Jonadab" shared the captivity of Israel, and took their place among the Levitical psalmists who gave expression to the sorrows of the people. The psalm itself belongs to David's time. See Ps. 79:1. 2. There is the significant mention of a son of Rechab in Neh. iii. 14 as co-operating with the priests, Levites, and princes in the restoration of the wall of Jerusalem. 3. The mention of the house of Rechab in 1 Chron. ii, 55, though not without difficulty, points, there can be little doubt, to the same connection. The Rechabites have become scribes (ךר, suraphim). They give themselves to a calling which, at the time of the return, from Babylon, if not chiefly, if not exclusively, in the hands of Levites. The other names (Tirathites, Shimeathe- lites, and Suchathites in the A.V.) seem to add nothing to our knowledge. The Vulg. rendering, however (evidence of a traditional Jewish interpretation in the time of Jerome), gives a translation based on etymology, more or less accurate, of the proper names, which strikingly confirms the view now taken: "Cognominous quaeque scribarum habitantium in Jabe", canones atque resonantes, et in tabernacularis commorantes." Thus interpreted, the passage points to a resumption of the outward form of their old life and its union with their new functions. The etymology on which this version rests, is so confused, very doubtful. Scaliger (Elench. Tishkar. Serrur. e. 29) rejects them with scorn. Pelican and Calmet, on the other hand, defend the Vulg. rendering, and Gill (ad loc.) does not dispute it. Most modern interpreters follow the A.V. in taking the words as proper names. It deserves notice also that while in 1 Chron. ii, 54, 55 the Rechabites and Netophathites are mentioned in close connection, the "sons of the singers" in Neh. xii, 28 appear as coming in large numbers from the villages of the same Netophathites. The close juncture of the Rechabites with the descendants of David of 1 Chron. iii, 1 shows also how in honorable an esteem they were held at the time when this book was compiled.

4. The account of the martyrdom of James the Just given in Acts xii, 22, does not, in any case, mention the name of the Rechabites once more before us, and in a very strange connection. While the scribes and Pharisees were stoning him, "one of the priests of the sons of Rechab, who are mentioned by Jeremiah the prophet," cried out, protesting against the crime. Stanley "Sermons and Essays on the Apostolic Age," p. 333, struck with the seeming anomaly of a priest, "not only not of Levitical, but not even of Jewish descent," supposes the name to have been used loosely as denoting the abstemious life of James and other Nazarites, and points to the fact that Epiphanius (Hier. lxxxviii, 14) ascribes to Simeon, the brother of James, the words which Hegesippus puts into the mouth of the Rechabite, as a proof that it denoted merely the Nazarite form of life. Calmet (loc. cit.) supposes the man to have been one of the Rechabite Netophathites. Eusebius, who is in ignorance for a priest. The view which has been here taken presents, it is believed, a more satisfactory solution. It was hardly possible that a writer like Hegesippus, living at a time when the details of the Temple services were fixed in the memories of as should have thus spoken of the Rechabim unless there had been a body of men to whose name was commonly applied. He uses it as a man would do to whom it was familiar, without being struck by any apparent or real anomaly. The Targum of Jonathan on Jer. xxxvi, 19, indicates, as has been noticed, the same fact. We may accept Hegesippus therefore as an authority witness to the existence of the Rechabites as a recognised body up to the destruction of Jerusalem, sharing in the ritual of the Temple, partly descended from the old "sons of Jonadab," partly recruited by the incorporation into their ranks of men devoting themselves as did Jehoiada and Simeon, to the consecrated life. The form of austere holiness presented in the life of Jonadab, and the blessing pronounced on his descendants, found their highest representatives in the two brothers of the Lord. 5. Some later notices are not without interest. Benjamin of Tudela, in the 12th century (ed. Asher, 1840, i, 112-114), mentions that near El Jubar (=Pun- bitheba) he found Jews who were named Rechabites. They tilled the ground, kept flocks and herds, abstained from wine and flesh, and gave tithes to teachers who devoted themselves to studying the law and weeping for Jerusalem. They were 100,000 in number, and were governed by a prince, Salomon han-Nasi, who traced his genealogy up to the house of David, and ruled over the city of Tiberias. A later traveler, Dr. Wolff, gives a yet stranger and more detailed report. The Jews of Jerusalem and Yemen told him that he would find the Rechabites of Jer. xxxvi living near Mecca (Journ., 1829, ii, 334). When he came near Senaa he came in contact with a tribe, the Beni- Kharib, who identified themselves with the sons of Jonadab. With one of them, Mosa, Wolff conversed, and he recounts the dialogue as follows: "I asked him, 'Whose descend- ants are you?' Mosa answered, 'Come, and I will show you,' and read from an Arabic Bible the words of Jer. xxxvi, 5-11. He then went on, 'Come, and you will find us 60,000 in number. See the words of the prophet have been fulfilled: Jonadab the son of Rechab shall not want a man to stand before me forever'" (ibid. p. 335). In a later journal (ibid. 1835, p. 389) he mentions a second interview with Mosa, describes them as keeping strictly to the old rules, calls them now by the name of the Beni-Abrad, and says that the Beni-Abrad of the tribe of Dan live with them. A paper On Recent Notices of the Rechabites, by Sigmond Pierotti, was read at the Cambridge meeting of the British Association (October, 1862). He met with a tribe calling themselves Rechabites and the descendants of Jonadab from the south-east from it. They had a Hebrew Bible, and said their prayers at the tomb of a Jewish rabbi. They told him precisely the same stories as had been told to Wolff thirty years before. The details, however, whether by the Beni-Abrad (E. iii, 22) or the Beni-Abbad, are more than a Rechabites. They are described as living in caverns and low houses, not in tents—and this in Arabia, where Bedouin habits would cease to be singular; nor are any of the Rechabite rules observable in them except that of refraining from wine—an absten- tiveness which ceases to be remarkable in Arabia, where no one drinks wine, and where, among the strongholds of Islam, it could probably not be obtained without dan- ger and difficulty. There were large numbers of Tal- mudical Jews in Arabia in the time of Mohammed, and these supposed Rechabites are probably descended from a body of them. See Wittius, Dissert. de Rechabites, in Miscell. Sacra, ii, 176 sqq.; Carpusov, Apparat. p. 148; Calmet, Dissert. sur les Rechabites, in Commentarius Lit- eral. vi, 18-21. For the modern temperance organiza- tion by this name, see Two Rechabites.

RECHAB. JEAN GIFFER DE (whose religious name was Jean de Sainte-Marie), a French Dominican, was born at Quillezau, Aug. 25, 1601. He took the habit of a monk, and taught Greek and Hebrew at Paris, then at Bordeaux, and then (1630) as a missionary in Greece. He travelled in the Greek monas- tories, and visited the island of Scio and Constanti- nople. Returning to Paris about the end of 1631, he became in 1637 prior of the convent of the Domin-
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cians at Rouen, and devoted himself with success to preaching. Being sent to Bordeaux in 1640, he collected numerous materials for the history of his order; and when, in 1656, the monks of St. Dominique founded several houses in France, he was charged with the erection of divers novitiates. He died April 9, 1660. We have of his works, Les Vies Exercices Solitaires et Prolongées de la Vie Spirituelle et Religieuse (Rouen, 1638-40; 4 vols. 12mo); Vie de Saint-Hyacinthe (Paris, 1643; 12mo).—Les Vies de Trois Bienheureux de Bretagne, Yves Miseireau, Éclogue de Remes, Abone de la Roche, Pierre Quintin (ibid., 1648, 12mo);—Vie de Renauld de Saint-Gilles, Doyen de Saint-Agnus d'Orléans (who died in 1293) (ibid., 1648, 12mo).—Vie de Saint-Cyris (ibid., 1648, 12mo).—Vie de la Fondation de tous les Convents des Frères Précheurs de l'Un et de l'Autre France en France et dans les Pays-Bas (ibid., 1647; 4to).—Les Vies et Actes Mémorables des Saintes et Bienheureuses de l'Ordre des Frères Précheurs (1655, 2 vols. 4to).—And a great number of other works printed or in MS., among them Propriétés de Nostradamen expliquées (Paris, 1656, 12mo), published without the name of the author.—Hoefer, Neue Biog. Générale, n. v.

Rechah (Heb. Rekah, רַכָּח, hindermost; Sept. 'Ραχάα, v. r. 'Ραχάα). In 1 Chron. iv, 12, Beth-rapha, Paseah, and Tehinnah, the father, or founder, of Ira-bashah, are said to have been "the men of Rechah." In the Targum of R. Joseph they are called "the men of the Great Sambadir," the Targumist apparently reading הָרָא. Schwarz regards it as the name of a place inhabited by the posteriority of Judah, and identifies it with "a village Roashah, three English miles to the south of Hebron" (Polœst. p. 116).

Rechëch, Johann Wilhelm, the main representative of the Kantian rationalism in the Lutheran Church of the Rhine countries, was born at Lennep, in 1796 he became pastor of the newly organized Lutheran church at Hückeswagen, and in 1796 pastor at Mülheim-on-the-Rhine, where, during the Revolution, he published a translation of Marcus Aurelius's philosophical treatise Tu ciir ècuric (1797), in order to show how a man should become a stoic. After the taking of the Rhine countries by Prussia, he became a member of the consistory of Cologne, which in 1826 was dissolved. In 1860 he retired from the ministry to his country-seat at Wenning, between Cologne and Bonn, being dissatisfied with the political moveiments of his time, and died as an angry philosopher Jan. 9, 1855. He published some hymns, which, though of little value, are, however, found in some of the modernized German hymn-books. He also published a collection of sermons in two volumes, which are enumerated in Zinzendorf's Bibliotheca Theologica, ii, 403 (comp. also Koch, Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenleides, vi, 259). (B. P.)

Rechenberg, Karl Friedrich Wilhelm, a Lutheran minister, was born Feb. 10, 1817, at Barnickow, near Königsberg, in Prussia. From 1835 to 1840 he studied in the seminary of the Berlin Missionary Society, and in 1841 he came to this country to work among his countrymen. His first pastorate was at Saratoga, N. Y., where he labored for about fifteen years. In 1855 he was called to Albany, at which place he remained three years. He then went to Canada, where he labored for about thirteen years in Toronto and for five years at Montreal. Among his converts he was a prominent member, and was the first president of the Canadian synod. He also edited for a long time the paper of his denomination, and was president of the Missionary Board he cared for his countrymen with wond and sacrifice. His bodily infirmities obliged him to retire from his large field of labor, and he accepted the call of a small congregation at Port Chester, N. Y., in 1875, where he died Dec. 13, 1877. (B. P.)

Reclusus (Lat. recluse, also inclusus, "shut up"), a class of monks or nuns who, from a motive of special penance, or with a view to the more strict observance of Christian perfection, remained shut up from all converse, even with members of their own order, in a small cell of a hermitage or other place of strict retirement. This practice, which was a kind of voluntary imprisonment, either from motives of devotion or penance, was not allowed except to persons of tried virtue and by special permission of the abbot; and the recluse, who took an oath never to stir out of his retreat, was, with due solemnity locked up in the presence of the abbot or the bishop, who placed his seal upon the door, not to be removed without the authority of the bishop himself. Everything necessary for support was conveyed through a window. If the recluse were a priest, he was allowed a small oratory with a window which looked into the church, through which he might make his offerings at mass, hear the singing, and answer those who spoke to him; but this window had curtains before it, so that he could not be seen. In later mediæval times the recluse was allowed a small garden near his cell for the planting of a few herbs and for recreation in fresh air. If he fell sick, his door was opened by the authorities for the sake of affording assistance. The celebrated mediæval theologian Rabanus Maurus was a recluse when elected archbishop of Mentz. Nuns also were found to practice the same voluntary seclusion, especially in the Benedictine, Franciscan, and Cistercian orders. A rule specially designed for female recluses was composed by Ælfræd of Rerehit, and is preserved by Holstenius in his Codex Regularum Monasticorum, l, 418 sq. In a wider sense, the name recluse is popularly applied to all cloistered persons, whether men or women—even those who live in community with their brethren. The inmates of the celebrated French retreat for Jansenists—Port-Royal—were also called recluses. See Wetzer and Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon (art. "Inclusi"); Cults, Senses, and Characters of the Middle Ages (Lon., 1879).

Recognitions. See CLEMENTINES.

Recollet (Lat. recolléctus, "gathered together") is the name given to the members of certain reformed bodies of monastic orders, whether of men or women, in
RECONCILIATIO PENITENTIUM

the Roman Catholic Church. Among orders of men, an offshoot of the Augustinian hermits, which, under Louis de Montoya, in 1530, obtained considerable popularity in Spain, was called by this name, and the order still exists at Medina Sidonia, Leon, and Pamplona; but outside of Spain, this order is better known under the title of the Reformed Franciscans, who separated about 1592, and were established in France under Henry IV and Louis XIV, and spread thence into Belgium, their houses in these countries and Germany becoming so numerous that they reckoned no less than ten provinces. In the Province of Lyons, the Reformed Franciscans were used to administer the sacrament. A reform of the Cistercian order of monks in Spain was also called by the same name (Chambres). See Histoire du Clergy Seculier et Regular, ii. 367 sqq.; Weitzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lex. ix. 71.

Reconciliatio Penitentium is the act by which offenders of the Church are restored to ecclesiastical rights and privileges. See Penitents.

Reconciliation (usually some form of ἀφίκειν, to cover sin, καταλαλλάγη is making those friends again who were at variance, or restoring to favor those having fallen under displeasure. Thus the Scriptures describe the disobedient world as having been at enmity with God, but “reconciled” to him by the death of his Son (Rom. v. 11). Reconciliation and “making peace” necessarily suppose a previous state of hostility between God and man, which is reciprocal. This is sometimes called enmity, a term, as it respects God, rather unfortunate, since enmity is almost fixed in our language to signify a malignant and revengeful feeling. Of this the copiousness of the doctrine of the state in which we stood before we came to reconcile ourselves to God and to the control of his law. But this is far from expressing the whole of that relation of man in which, in Scripture, he is said to be at enmity with God, and so to need a reconciliation—the making of peace between God and him. That relation is a legal one, as that of the high priest, in his judicial capacity, and a criminal who has violated his laws and risen up against his authority, and who is therefore treated as an enemy. The word ἐνεχθήσαν is used in this passive sense, both in the Greek writers and in the New Test. So, in Rom. xi. 28, the Jews, rejected and punished for refusing the Gospel, are said by the apostle, “as concerning the Gospel, to be enemies for your sakes”—treated and accounted such; but, as touching the election, they are beloved for the fathers’ sakes.” In the same epistle (v. 10) the term is used precisely in the same sense, and in the same relation. See the reconciliation by Christ: “For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son,” i.e., when we were objects of the divine judicial displeasure, accounted as enemies, and liable to be capitally treated as such. Enmity is the sense of malignity and the sentiment of hatred, is added to this relation in the case of man, but it is no part of the relation itself, it is rather a case of it, as it is one of the actions of a corrupt nature which render man obnoxious to the displeasure of God and the penalty of his holy law, and place him in a condition of an enemy. It is this judicial variance and opposition between God and man which is referred to in the term reconciliation, and in the phrase “making peace,” in the New Test.; and the hostility is therefore, in its own nature, mutual.

But that there is no truth in the notion that reconciliation means no more than our laying aside our enmity to God may also be shown from several express passages. The first is the passage we have above cited: “For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God” (Rom. v. 10). Here the act of reconciliation is ascribed to God, not to us; but if it were otherwise. For if the apostle is speaking of a benefit obtained for us previous to our conversion appears evident from the opposite members of the two sentences—“much more, being justified, we shall be saved from wrath through him”—“much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life.” The apostle argues from the greater to the less. If God were so benign to us before our conversion, what may we not expect from him now we are converted? To reconcile here cannot mean to convert, for the apostle evidently speaks of something greatly remarkable in the act of Christ. But to convert sinners is nothing remarkable, since none but sinners can be ever converted; whereas it was a rare and singular thing for Christ to die for sinners, and to reconcile sinners to God by his death, when there have been but very few who have died for sinners. In the next place, conversion is referred more properly to his glorious life than to his shameful death; but this reconciliation is attributed to his death as contradistinguishing from his glorious life, as is evident from the antithesis contained in the two verses. Besides, it is from the latter benefit that we learn the nature of the former. The latter, which belongs only to the converted, consists of the peace of God and salvation from wrath (Rom. v. 9, 10). This the apostle afterwards calls receiving the reconciliation. And what is it to receive the reconciliation by faith? (Rom. v. 2). To receive conversion is a mode of speaking entirely unknown. If, then, to receive the reconciliation is to receive the remission of sin, and in effect to be delivered from wrath or punishment, to be reconciled must have a corresponding signification.

“God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them” (2 Cor. v. 19). Here the manner of this reconciliation is expressly said to be not our laying aside our enmity, but the non-imputation of our trespasses to us by God; in other words, the pardoning of sin, without his executing the punishment of sin. The promise on God’s part to do this is expressive of his previous reconciliation to the world by the death of Christ; for our actual reconciliation is distinguished from this by what follows, “and hath committed to us the ministry of reconciliation,” by virtue of which, when men were, by the apostles, treaeted and besought to be reconciled to God. The reason, too, of this reconciliation of God to the world, by virtue of which he promises not to impute sin, is grounded by the apostle, in the last verse of the chapter, not upon the laying aside of enmity by men, but upon reconciliation by Christ: “For he hath made him to be sin” (a sin-offering) “for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.” And that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby” (Eph. ii. 16). Here the act of reconciling is attributed to Christ. Man is not spoken of as reconciling himself to God; but Christ is said to reconcile Jews and Gentiles together, and both to God, “by his cross.” Thus, says the apostle, “he is our peace; but in what manner is the peace effected? Not in any instance, by subdued the enmity of man’s heart, but by removing the enmity of the law.” “Having abolished it,” or by, “his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments.” The ceremonial law only is here probably meant; for by its abolition, through its fulfillment in Christ, the enmity between Jews and Gentiles
was taken away. But still it was not only necessary to reconcile Jew and Gentile together, but also to "reconcile both unto God. This he did by the same act; abolishing the enmity between them by being himself all its sacrifices and thus, by the sacrifice of himself, effecting the reconciliation of all to God, "slaying the enmity by his cross," taking away whatever hindered the reconciliation of the guilty to God, which, as we have seen, was not enmity and hatred to God in the human mind only, but that judicial hostility and variance which separated God and man as Judge and criminal. The feeble criticism of Socinus on this passage, in which he has been followed by his adherents to this day, is the reflection cast by Goodwin on this passage the difficulty of reconciling the thing it says, to God, only be governed by the very expression τιμοΰσατο, that he might reconcile; for the interpretation of Socinus, which makes to God stand by itself, or that to reconcile to God is to reconcile them among themselves that they might serve God, is distorted and without example. Nor is the argument valid which is drawn from thence, that in this place Paul properly treats of the peace made between Jews and Gentiles; for neither does it follow from this argument that it was beside his purpose to mention the peace made for each with God. For the two parties with whom he joined and so joined among themselves that they should be primarily and chiefly joined by that bond; for they are not united among themselves, except by and for that bond. Gentiles and Jews, therefore, are made friends among themselves by friendship with God.

Here also, a cautionary remark will be appropriate. The above passages will show how falsely it has been asserted that God is nowhere in Scripture said to be reconciled to us, and that they only declare that we are reconciled to God; but the fact is, that the very phrase of our being reconciled imports the putting away of his wrath from us. Whitby observes, on the words καταλαλάγης καταιχηθής, "that they naturally import the reconciliation of one that is angry or displeased with us, both in profane and Jewish writers." When the Philistines suspected that David would appear the anger of Saul by becoming their adversary, they said, "Wherewith should he reconcile himself to his master? Should it not be with the heads of these men?" Not, surely, how shall he remove his own anger against his master? but how shall he remove his master's anger against him? shall he restore himself to his master's favor? "If thou bring thy gift to the altar and there rememberest that thy brother hath aught against thee, not that thou hast aught against thy brother, first be reconciled to thy brother," i.e. suppose that in the records was in fact an angry import "See that thy brother be reconciled to thee," since that which goes before is, not that he hath done thee an injury, but thou him. Thus, then, for us to be reconciled to God is to avail ourselves of the means by which the anger of God towards us is to be appeased, which the New Testament expressly declares to be meritoriously "the sin-offering" of him "who knew no sin," and instrumentally, as to each individual personally, "faith in his blood." See PROPITIATIONS.

"We know," says Farrar, "that God cannot literally feel anger, or any other passion; nor can he be literally grieved and pained at anything man can do, since (as the 1st article of our [Anglican] Church expresses it) he is without body, parts, or passions; though in Scripture words and eyes and often bodily matters are figuratively attributed to him, as well anger, repentance, and other passions. But all these are easily understood as spoken in reference to their effects on us, which are the same as if the things themselves were literally what they are called. It is well known to astronomers that the heat of the sun, as well as the heat of the vulcan, speak familiarly of the sun's rising and setting without any mistake or perplexity thence arising, because the effect on this earth—the succession of light and darkness—are exactly the same as if the sun did literally move round it daily. In like manner, when the Scriptures speak of God's wrath, fierce anger, etc., against sinners, it may be that he literally feels angry passions, but that the effect on men will be the same as if he did. And, similarly, when 'reconciliation' with God is spoken of, it is to be understood as meaning that the effects of the death of Christ are such as to cause men to be regarded by God with that favor with which he would regard them if literally returned from a state of enmity to a state of reconciliation."

See Nitzsch, Praktische Theologie; Fletcher, Works (see Index); Presbyterium Confessum; Pearson, on the Creed; Goodwin, Knapps, Christian Theology; Reymold [John, On Reconciliation]; Bischel, Historical Library of the Christian Doctrine of Justification and Reconciliation (Edinb. 1872); Pope, Compendium of Christian Theology (Lond. 1873, 12mo), p. 196-200.

Recordare Sanctus Crucis is the beginning of a passion-hymn composed by the "Seraphic Doctor," St. Bonaventura (q. v.). This is his best poem, and consists of fifteen stanzas, the last bearing a strong resemblance to the next to the last of the Stabat Mater Dolorosa. There are two English translations of this hymn—one by Dr. H. Harlbaugh in the Mercersburg Review, 1858, p. 481 ("Make the Cross your Meditation"); another by Dr. J. W. Alexander, of which the first stanza runs thus: "Jesus' holy cross and dying; Oh, remember, ever e'ry dwelling Endless pleasure's pathway here; At the cross be thine meditation. Keep, and still in meditation All unsat per seerere."

It has also been translated into German by Simrock, in his Lauda Zion Salvetorem, p. 209; by Rambach, in his Anthology, t. 9, "An dich, Herr Jesus, Kreuz zu denken," which is now generally found in German hymn-books, by Stadelmann, in Bessler's Auswahl allerschönster Hymnen, p. 118, "Woll des heiligen Kreuzes denken:" by Konigfeld, in his collection of Latin Hymns, t. 101, "An des Herrn Kreuzenzeiden." The English of Alexander is given in Shaw's Christ in Song, p. 105. (B. P.)

Recorder (μακσκηρ, a remembrancer; Sept. ἰματοποιον, ἰματοποιοφός), an officer of high rank in the Jewish council, exercising not simply of an annalist, but of chancellor or president of the privy council (I sa. xxxvi, 3, 22). The title itself may, perhaps, have reference to his office as adviser of the king; at all events, the notices that prove that he was more than an annalist, though the superintendence of the records was doubtless intrusted to him. In David's court the recorder appears among the high officers of his household (2 Sam. viii, 16; xx, 24; 1 Chron. xviii, 15). In Solomon's he is coupled with the three secretaries, and is mentioned last, probably as being their president (1 Kings iv, 9). Under Hezekiah, the recorder, in conjunction with the prefect of the palace and the secretary, represented the king (2 Kings xviii, 18, 37). The patronymic of the recorder at this time, Josiah the son of Asaph, makes it probable that he was a Levite. Under Josiah, the recorder, the secretary, and the governor of the city were intrusted with the superintendence of the repairs of the Temple (2 Chron. xxxiv, 8). These notices are sufficient to prove the high position held by him. The same office is mentioned as existing in the Persian court, both ancient and modern, where it is called scribes arbar; and also in the time of the Roman emperors Arcadius and Honorius, under the name of magister memoriae. In Ezra iv, 15, mention is made of "the book of the records," and in Esth. vi, 1; x, 2, of "the book of records of the chronicles," written by officers of this nature. Many of the royal annals of Egypt and Assyria were sculptured on the obelisks, slabs, and monuments, and are still in fine preservation; and already they have contributed to the illustration of the inspired records. See Scrinia.
Records, a frequent name for the books and papers of a Church, which contain a record or account of the history and temporal business of the parish. In these books are written, from time to time, all such transactions as relate to the election of officers, the purchase and sale, etc. of Church property, the erection of buildings, the engaging of ministers, the support of public worship, and other matters connected with the temporal affairs of the Church. Under the name of "parish records," or "Church records," may also be included the register, containing the minister's account of baptisms, marriages, etc. See Register.

Rectitude (or Uprightness) is the choice and pursuit of those things which the mind, after due inquiry and attention, clearly perceives to be fit and good, and the eschewing of those that are evil. "Rectitude of conduct," says Whately, "is intended to express the term κατάδουσας, which Cicero translates recta affectio; κατάδουμα he translates rectum factum. Now the definition of κατάδουμα was νόμου πράστασις, 'a thing commanded by law' (i.e., by the law of nature, the universal law). Antonius, speaking of the reasoning faculty, how, without looking further, it rests contented in its own energies, adds, 'for which reason are all actions of this species called rectitudes (κατάδουσάς κατά ἄποθήκη, right, right doing); as denoting the strictness of their progression right onwards' (II. Harris, Dialogue on Happiness, p. 73, note). "Goodness in actions," says Hooker (Eccles. Pol. bk. i, § 8), "is like unto straightforwardness; whereby which it is done well we term right, for, as the straight way is most acceptable to him that travelleth, because by it he cometh nearest to his journey's end, so, in action, that which doth lie the evenest between us and the end we desire must needs be the fittest for our use." If a term is to be selected to denote that in action and in disposition of which the moral faculty approves, the most precise and appropriate is rectitude, or rightness. "There are other phrases," says Dr. Reid ( Aristotle, Essay v, ch. vii), "which have been used, which I see no reason for adopting, such as, acting contrary to the relations of things—contrary to the reason of things—to the fitness of things—to the truth of things—to absolute fitness. These phrases have not the authority of common use, which, in matters of language, is great. They seem to have been invented by some authors with a view to explain the nature of vice; but I do not think they answer that end. If intended as definitions they are insufficient; for the sense they convey is not expressive of the most favorable sense they can bear, they extend to every kind of foolish and absurd conduct as well as to that which is vicious." But what is rectitude, or rightness, as the characteristic of an action? According to Price and others, rectitude is a simple and primitive idea, and cannot be explained. "It might as well be asked what is truth, as the characteristic of a proposition? It is a capacity of our rational nature to see and acknowledge truth; but we cannot define what truth is. We call it the conformity of our thoughts with the reality of things." It may be doubted how far this explanation makes the nature of truth more intelligible. In like manner some explain rectitude by saying that it consists in a congruity between an action and the relations of the agent. It is the idea we form of an action, when it is in every way conformable to the relations of the agent and the circumstances in which he is placed. On contemplating such an action we approve of it, and feel that if we were placed in such circumstances and in such relations, we should be under an obligation to perform it. Now the circumstances and relations in which man derives his nature from the state of things in general; and hence it has been said that rectitude is founded in the nature and fitness of things, i.e., an action is right when it is fit or suitable to all the relations and circumstances of the agent, and of this fitness a distinction can be made by the judgment. Conscience or prudence, says the judge, do not constitute the relations; these must arise from the nature of man and the nature of things. But conscience or reason judges and determines as to the conformity of actions to these relations; and these relations arising necessarily from the very nature of things, the conformity with them, which constitutes rectitude, is said to be eternal and immutable (Krauth's Fleming, Vocab. of Philos. n. v.).

Rector (Lat. rector, a ruler), the title of several classes of clerical and collegiate officials, some of which are referred to under their respective heads. 1. As regards clerical rectors, the title, in its most ordinary English use, is applied to the clergyman who holds a settled or independent charge in a parish. This use, however, is a departure from the canonical signification of the title, which meant rather a clergyman who was appointed to govern a parish where the chief parochial jurisdiction was vested in a religious corporation or in some non-resident dignitary. The office of vicar is an outgrowth of the rectorate, on the appropriation of benefices to monasteries and other religious houses of old; and the distinction between rector and vicar, which is therefore to be noticed here, is as follows: The rector has the right to all the ecclesiastical dues in a parish, whereas the vicar is generally an appropriator or impropriator over him, who is entitled to part of the profits, and to whom he is, in effect, only perpetual curate, with an appointment of glebe and generally one third of the tithes. See Vicar.

2. In certain of the monastic orders, the name rector is given to the heads of convents, as it is.

3. Also given to the heads of universities, colleges, seminaries, and similar educational corporate institutions.

Reckon. "A rector or parsonage," says Spelman. "is a spiritual living, composed of land, tithe, and other oblations of the people, separate or dedicated to God in any congregation, for the service of his Church there, and for the maintenance of the governor or minister thereof, to whose charge the same is committed."

Recurrent is, in English law, a person, whether Papist or Protestant, who refuses or neglects to attend at the worship of the Established Church on Sundays and other days appointed for the purpose. The offence may be dated back in its origin to 1534, when king Henry became head of the Church; but, as a legal one, may be held to date from the house in the house in the year 1542, when the two or more classes punishable under the statutes against recusancy: simple "recusants;" "recusants convict," who absent himself by reason of his being Roman Catholic; and "popish recusants convict," who absent themselves before conviction; "popish recusants," who absent themselves because of their being Roman Catholic; and "recusants convict," who absent themselves after conviction. It was against the last two classes that the statutes were mainly directed. In addition to the general penalties of recusancy, the popish recusants, for willfully hearing mass, forfeited 100 marks (£66 13s. 4d.); and for saying mass, 200 marks, or £193 6s. 8d., in addition (in both cases) to a year's imprisonment. They were disabled, unless they renounced popery, from inheriting, purchasing, or otherwise acquiring lands; and they could not keep or teach schools under pain of perpetual imprisonment. Popish recusants convict could not keep a house; could not keep arms in their houses; could not appear within ten miles of London under penalty of £100; could not travel above five miles from home without license; could not bring any action at law or equity; could not have baptism, marriage, or burial performed except by an Anglican minister—all under penalties of forfeiture and imprisonment. Protestant dissenting recusants were relieved from the penalties of recusancy by the Toleration Act of 1689. See Memorable (in the Church).
The Red Sea, the usual designation of the large body of water separating Egypt from Arabia. The following account of it is based upon the Scriptures and other ancient and modern authorities. See Sea.

1. **Names.** The sea known to us as the Red Sea was by the Israelites called the **sea (yāḥōn)** **Exod. xiv. 2, 9, 16, 21, 22; xxv. 1, 4, 6, 10, 19; Josh. xxiv, 6, 7; and many other passages**; and specially by the name of **Sīḥah** (יִשְׁחַה), which was used by the Egyptians (Exod. xix. 12, 13; xxxiv. 19, 22; xxii. 81; Numb. xiv. 25; xxvi. 4; xxxiii. 10, 11; Deut. i. 40; Jer. xii. 4; Josh. ii. 10, iv. 23; xxiv. 6; Judg. xix. 16; 1 Kings ix. 28; Neh. ix. 33; Psa. ciii. 7, 9, 22; cxxxvi. 13, 15; Jer. xlix. 21). It is also perhaps written **Saphhah** (םַפָּח).

2. **The Sept.** (Sept. Ζώβηθ) in Numb. xx. 14, rendered "Red Sea" in the A. V.; and in like manner, in Deut. i. 1, **Safah** (םַפָּה), without "כָּה. The Sept. always renders it **יוֹסָפְדוּת שָׁדָאָנָא** (except in Judg. xi. 16, where **Safah** is preserved). See, too, in the New Test. (Acta vii. 36; Heb. xii. 28). The name of this sea is found in the Apocrypha (1 Macc. iv. 9; Wis. x. 18; xix. 7; and Josephus (Ant. viii. 6, 4). By the classical geographers this appellation, like its Latin equivalent **Mare Rubrum or M. Erthymas**, was extended to all the seas washing the shores of Arabia, as well as the peninsula itself, the Indian Ocean: the Red Sea itself, or Arabian Gulf, was **יוֹסָפְדוּת בָּוכָסָה יָבָנָא** (which, however, is also read **יוֹסָפְדוּת בָּוכָסָה שָׁבָנָא**). The Gulf of Suez was specially the hero-political Gulf, Ηηρωοπολική ψαρίαν, Συρία Ηηρωοπολιτική, or S. Heroopolitis. Dr. Beke (*Sium in Arabia Lond. [1878.]* p. 361 sq.) contends (in keeping with his wild notion that the Mitzram of the Bible was not Egypt, but the peninsula of Arabia) that the Gulf of Akabah, and not that of Suez, was the Yam-Saph of the Hebrews, chiefly on the rash assumption that the former only was known to the Israelites, whereas the itinerary of Moses clearly distinguishes Eziongeber on the one from the crossing at the other (Numb. xxxiii. 8, 10, 55, 26). Among the peoples of the East, the Red Sea has for many centuries and lost its old names: it is now called generally by the Arabs, as it was in mediavial times, **Bahr-el-Kulsum**, "the Sea of El-Kulsum," after the ancient Cyrena, "the sea-beach," the site of which is near, or at, the modern Suez. In the Koran, part of its old name is preserved, though it is now used in the account of the passage of the Red Sea (see also El-Beydawi, *Comment. auf die Koran*, vii, 192, p. 341; xx, 81, p. 602). These Biblical names require a more detailed consideration.

3. **Fām, F.⁸ (Coptic, σωμός; Arabic, گیسم)**, signifies "the sea," or any sea. It is also applied to the Nile (exactly as the Arabic bahr is so applied) in Neh. iii. 8, "Art thou better than populous No, that was situated among the rivers (γεφύρ), [that had] the waters round about it, whose rampart [was] the sea (γαλήνη), and her wall was from the sea (γαλήνη)"? See also Isa. xxii. 5, 19.

4. **Yāḥōn, יַחְוַן;** in the Coptic version, **pialmos makās;** A. V. "Red Sea." The meaning of sīḥah and the reason of its being applied to this sea, have given rise to much learned controversy. Gesenius renders it **rush, reed, sea-seed.** It is mentioned in the Old Test. almost always in connection with the sea of the Exodus. It also occurs in the narrative of the exposure of Moses in the same sense (the 

5. **Sea off.** [and] the brooks (yāḥōn) of defence (or of Egypt?) shall be emptied and dried up: the reeds and flags (ṣāhā) shall wither. The passage will read: and the brooks (yāḥōn), by the mouth of the brooks (yāḥōn), and everything sown by the brooks (yāḥōn) shall wither, be driven away, and be no [more]. The fishers also shall mourn, and all they that cast angle into the brooks (yāḥōn) shall lament, and they that spread nets upon the waters shall languish. Moreover, the depth closed round about, the weeds (ṣāhā) were wrapped about my head." With this single exception, which shows that this product was also found in the Mediterranean, sīḥah is Egyptian, either in the Red Sea or in the yāḥōn, and this yāḥōn in Exod. ii. it was in the land of Goshen.

6. The significations of **yāḥōn, sīḥah** must be gathered from the foregoing passages. In Arabic, the word with this significatio (which commonly is "wool") is found only in one passage in a rare lexicon (the *Makomos MS.*). The author says, "Sīḥ-el-bahr (the sīḥ of the sea) is like the wool of sheep. And the Araba have a proverb, 'I will come to thee, O Virginia, and I will cease to taste the sīḥ;' i.e. never. The Sīḥ el-bahr seems to quite certain, is a sea-seed resembling wool. Such sea-seed is thrown up abundantly on the shores of the Red Sea. Fryer says, s. v. **yāḥōn**, "Ab Ethiopiaus herba quaedam suphko appellabatur, que in profundo Maria Rubri crescit, que rubra est, rubrumque colorem continent, pannis tingendis inservientem, teste Hieronymo de qualitate Maria Rubri" (p. 47, etc.). Diodorus (iii. c. 19), Artemidorus (ap. Strabo, p. 770), and Agatharchides (ed. Muller, p. 136, 137) speak of the weed of the Arabian Gulf. Ehrenberg enumerates *Fucus littoralis* on the shores of this sea, and at Sues *Fucus cirratus, F. trinodis, F. turbinatus, F. papillulosus, F. diaphanus, etc., and the specially red weed *Trichodermium erthymas*. The Coptic version renders sīḥah by shari (see above), supposed to be the hieroglyphic of shaph (sea). The second have the same sound as the sēri of Pliny (see next paragraph), we must conclude that shari is the sea-seed, or sea-seed, was both marine and fluvial. The passage in Jonah proves it to be a marine product, and that it was found in the Red Sea the numerous passages (in which that sea is called the sea of sīḥah leave no doubt.

7. The "Red Sea," **yāḥōn, Sīḥah da‘ōn.** The origin of this appellation has been the source of more speculation even than the obscure sīḥah, for it lies more within the range of general scholarship. The theories advanced to account for it have been often puerile and generally unworthy of acceptance. Their authors may be divided into two schools. The first have ascribed it to some natural phenomenon, such as the singularly red appearance of the mountains of the western coast, looking as if they were covered with Brazil nut or brick-dust (Bruce), or of which the redness was reflected in the waters of the sea (Gosselin, ii. 78-84); the red color of the water sometimes caused by the presence of zoophytes (Salt; Ehrenberg); the red coral of the sea; the red sea-weed; and the red storks that have been seen in great numbers, etc. (Beauvoir, *L'Espece Rodier, Jules, Miscell.* i, 59-117) argues that the epithet red was applied to this and the neighboring seas on account of their tropical heat; as, indeed, was said by Artemidorus (ap. Strabo, xvi. 4, 30), that the sea was called red because of the reflection of the sun. The second have endeavored to find an etymological derivation. Of these the earliest (European) writers propused a derivation from Edom, "red," by the Greeks translated literally. Among them were Fuller (*Miscell. Sacr. iv.* p. 29); be-
The Red Sea and Jebel Atákab, near Suze (From a photograph by the Editor.)

The Red Sea is in most places sand and stones from Suze as far as Jiddah, and thence to the strait it is commonly mud. The deepest sounding in that excellent Admiralty chart is 1054 fathoms, in lat. 22° 30'.

Journeying southwards from Suze, on our left is the peninsula of Sinai; on the right is the desert coast of Egypt, of limestone formation, like the greater part of the Nile valley from Egypt, with others, sea-margin stretching landwards in a great rocky plateau, while more inland a chain of volcanic mountains (beginning about lat. 28° 4' and running south) rear their lofty peaks at intervals above the limestone, generally about fifteen miles distant. Of the most importance is Jebel Ghurib, 6000 feet high; and as the Strait of Jiddah is passed, the peaks of the primitive range attain a height of about 4500 to 6000 feet, until the "Elba" group rises in a huge mass about lat. 22°. Farther inland is the Jebel ed-Dukhkhan, the "porphyry mountain" of Potamian (iv, 5, § 27; M. Claudianus, see Müller, Geogr. Misc. Atlas viii), 6000 feet high, about twenty-seven miles from the coast, where the porphyry quarries formerly supplied Rome, and where are some remains of the time of Trajan (Wilkinson, Modern Egypt and Thebes, ii, 383); and besides these, along this desert southwards are "quarries of various granites, serpentines, breccia verde, slates, and micaeous, talcose, and other schists" (ibid. p. 382). Jebel ez-Zeit, the "mountain of oil," close to the sea, abounds in petroleum (ibid. p. 385). This coast is especially interesting in a Biblical point of view, for here were some of the earliest monasteries of the Eastern Church, and in those secluded and barren mountains lived very early Christian hermits. The convent of St. Anthony (of the Thebais), "Deir Mār Antunyius," and that of St. Paul, "Deir Mār Būlus," are of great renown, and were once important. They are now, like all Eastern monasteries, decayed; but that of St. Anthony gives, from its monks, the patriarch of the Coptic Church, formerly chosen from the Nitrian monasteries (ibid. p. 381). South of the "Elba" chain, the country gradually sinks to a plain, until it rises to the highland of Jiddah, lat. 15°, and thence to the strait extends a chain of low mountains. The greater part of the African coast of the Red Sea is sterile, sandy, and thinly populated; first beyond Suze by Bedouin chiefly of the Mār Tribe; south of the Kusair road are the 'Abbāsī and beyond, the Bishārī, the southern branch of whom are called by Arab writers Bejā, whose customs, language, and ethnology demand a careful investigation, which would undoubtedly be repay by curious results (see El-Makrizi's Khilāt, Deacr. of the Bejā, and Deacr. of the Desert of Eugkab); Quatremère's Ensaies on these subjects, in his Mém. de l'Égypte, ii, 134, 152; and the Generale, end of Man, ed. p. 109); and then, coast-tribes of Abyssinia.

The Gulf of el-`Akbah (i.e. "of the mountain-road") is the termination of the long valley of the Gbbr or
'Arabah that runs northwards to the Dead Sea. It is itself a narrow valley; the sides are lofty and precipitous, and the bottom of it is a river-like sea, running nearly straight for its whole length of about ninety miles. The northerly winds rush down this gorge with uncommon fury, and render its navigation extremely perilous, causing at the same time strong counter-currents; while most of the few anchorages are open to the southerly gales. It has the appearance of a narrow deep ravine, extending nearly a hundred miles in a straight direction, and the circumjacent hills rise in some places two thousand feet perpendicularly from the shore" (Wellsted, ii, 108).

The western shore is less impregnable. This Arabian chain of mountains, the continuation of the southern spur of the Lebanon, skirts the eastern coast, and rise to about 3500 feet; while Jebel Teibet-Alli, near the strait, is 6000 feet. There is no pastureage and little fertility, except near the 'Akabah, where are date-groves and other plantations, etc. In earlier days this last-named place was, it is said, famous for its fertility. The island of Grain, Jezireh Far'ah, once fortified and held by the Crusaders, is near its northern extremity on the Sidonian sea. These, on its dangers and sterile shores, is entirely destitute of buildings.

The Arabian coast outside the Gulf of the 'Akabah is skirted by the range of Arabian mountains, which in some few places approach the sea, but generally leave a belt of coast country, called Tihamah, or the Ghur, like the Lebanon in altitude, sandy and parched plains, thinly inhabited, these characteristics being especially strong in the north (Niebuhr, Descr. p. 305).

The mountains of the Hejaz consist of ridges running parallel towards the interior, and increasing in height as they recede (Wellsted, ii, 242). Burckhardt remarks that the descent on the eastern side of these mountains, like the Lebanon and the whole Syrian range east of the Dead Sea, is much less than that on the western; and that the peaks seen from the east or land side appear mere hills (Arabia, p. 321 sq.). In clear weather they are visible at a distance of forty to seventy miles (Wellsted, ii, 242). The distant ranges have a rugged pointed outline, and are granite; at Wajh, with horizontal veins of quartz; nearer the sea, many of the hills are fossiliferous limestone, while the beach hills are covered with colored sandstone, formed by and containing large quantities of shells and masses of coral (p. 248). Coral also enters largely into the composition of some of the most elevated hills.

The more remarkable mountains are Jebel 'Ein-Umm (or 'Umma') in the north 6090 feet high near the strait; a little farther south, and close to Mo'elia, are mountains rising from 6380 to 7700 feet, of which Wellsted says: "The coast is low, gradually ascending with a moderate elevation to the distance of six or seven miles, where it rises abruptly to hills of great height, those near Mowathah terminating in sharp and singularly shaped peaks. Mr. Irwin [1777] has styled them Bullock's Horns. To me the whole group seemed to bear a great resemblance to representations which I have seen of enormous icebergs" (ii, 176). Reference may also be made to the Gebel Mi'a, a little north of Yembo, a remarkable group, the pyramidal mountains of Agatharchides; and beyond, about twenty-five miles distant, rises Jebel Radwa. Further south Jebel Subah is remarkable for its magnitude and elevation which is greater than any other in the Yemen or Jiddah; and still farther, but about eighty miles distant from the coast, Jebel Ras el-Kurn rises behind the holy city Meckheh. It is of this mountain that Burckhardt writes so enthusiastically (how rarely is he enthusiastic!), contrasting its verdure and cool breezes with the arid heat of the desert, p. 60 etc.

The chain continues the whole length of the sea, terminating in the highlands of the Yemen. The Arabian mountains are generally fertile, agreeably different from the parched plains below and their own bare granite peaks above. The highlands and mountain summits of the Yemen, "Arabia the Happy," the Jebel as distinguished from the desert, are described by Niebuhr, Descr. p. 161, with many towns and villages in their valleys and on their sides. The coast-line itself, or Tihamah, "north of Yembo," is of moderate elevation, varying from fifty to one hundred feet, with no beach. To the southward [to Jiddah] it is more sandy and less elevated; the inlets and harbors of the former tract may be styled coves, in the latter they are lagoons" (Wellsted, ii, 244).

The coral of the Red Sea is remarkably abundant, and beautifully colored and variegated. It is often red, but the more common kind is white; and of hewn blocks of this many of the Arabian towns are built.

The earliest navigation of the Red Sea (passing by the prehistoric Phenicians) is mentioned by Herodotus. "Soscessitis (Rameses II) was the first who, passing the Arabian Gulf in a fleet of long vessels, ascended under his authority the inhabitants of the coast bordering the Erythrean Sea. Proceeding still farther, he came to a sea which, from the great number of its shoals, was not navigable; and after another war against Ethiopia he set up a stela of victory a hundred cubits in height, near the strait of the Arabian Gulf. Three centuries later Solomon's navy was built "in Eziongeber, which is beside Eloth, on the shore of the Red Sea, in the land of Edom" (1 Kings ix, 26). In the description of the Gulf of el-'Akabah, it will be seen that this narrow sea is almost without any salt. Shemshen, the 12th of the Mountain Directory of Dira, near the strait of the Arabian Gulf. Three centuries later Solomon's navy was built "in Eziongeber, which is beside Eloth, on the shore of the Red Sea, in the land of Edom" (1 Kings ix, 26). In the description of the Gulf of el-'Akabah, it will be seen that this narrow sea is almost without any salt. Solomon, who is evidently constructed by Phenician workmen of Hiram, for he "sent in the navy his servants, shipmen that had knowledge of the sea, with the servants of Solomon." This was the navy that sailed to Ophir. We may conclude that it was necessary to transport wood as well as men to build and man these ships on the shores of the Gulf of the 'Akabah, which from their natural formation cannot be supposed to have much altered, and which were, besides, part of the Wilderness of the Wandering; and the Edomites were pastoral Arabs, unlike the sea-faring Himyrites. Jehoshaphat also "made ships of Tarshish to go to Ophir for gold; but they went not, because the ships were broken at Eziongeber" (1 Kings xxii, 48).

The scene of this wreck has been supposed to be ed-Dhabah, where is a reef of rocks like a "giant's backbone" (Eziongeber) (Wellsted, ii, 158), and this may have been the situation of the ships of Jehoshaphat were manned by "his servants," who, from their ignorance of the sea, may have caused the wreck. Pharaoh-necho constructed a number of ships in the Arabian Gulf, and the remains of his works existed in the time of Herodotus (p. 159), who also tells us that these ships were manned by Phenician sailors.

The fashion of the ancient ships of the Red Sea, or of the Phenician ships of Solomon, is unknown. From Flinn we learn that the ships were of papyrus and like the boats of the Nile; and this statement was no doubt correct in some measure. But further than this, the information has been very different from those employed in the Indian trade. More precise and curious is El-Makrtzi's description, written in the first half of the 15th century, of the ships that sailed from Edhhab on the Egyptian coast to Jiddah: "Their 'belies' ('bilin'), Quatremères, Mémoires, ii, 154, calls them 'gelves'), which carry the pilgrims on the coast, have not a nail used in them, but their planks are sewed together with fibre which is taken from the coccanut-tree, and they call them with the flowers of the wood of the date-palm; then they 'pay' them with the oil of the trees and the fat of the kish (Squilla carcariata; Forskål, Descr. Asiat. p. viii, No. 19). . . . The sails of these jelebehs are of mats made of the döm palm" (The Kislat, Desert of Edhhab). The crews of the latter, when
not exceptionally Phenicians, as were Solomon's and Pharaoh-nehoe's, were without doubt generally Arabians—chiefly Egyptians—the Levantine and Egyptian Arabs whose ships carried all the wealth of the East either to the Red Sea or the Persian Gulf. The people of Omân, the south-east province of Arabia, were among the foremost of these navigators (El-Medill's Golden Meadows, 815, and The Accounts of Two Mohammedan Travellers of the 9th Century). It was customary, probably to avoid the dangers and delays of the narrow seas, for the ships engaged in the Indian trade to transship their cargoes at the Strait of Bab el-Mandeb to Egyptian and other vessels of the Red Sea (Agath. § 108, p. 190; anno. Peripl. passim). The Red Sea, indeed, appears to have sailed about the autumnal equinox, and returned in December or the middle of January (Pliny, H. N. vi, c. xxii, § 26; comp. Peripl. passim). Jerome says that the navigation was extremely tedious. At the present day the voyages are periodical and guided by the seamen; but the old skill of the seamen has nearly departed, and they are extremely timid, rarely venturing far from the coast.

The Red Sea, as it possessed for many centuries the most important sea-trade of the East, contained ports of commerce of vast importance, and the highly valuable spices and other new products of the East, and hence alone appear to be mentioned in the Bible. The Heroopolitic Gulf is of the chief interest—it was near to Goshen; it was the scene of the passage of the Red Sea; it was also the seat of the Egyptian trade in this sea and to the south. Heroopolis is to this day the same as the Heracleopolis of modern Egypt, and the Heracleopolis of the Bible is near the head of the gulf. The site of the town of the ancient city has been greatly altered, and the original town has been almost destroyed by the development of the modern town. The town of Hermopolis Magna was built on the ruins of the ancient town, and was in the Middle Ages, and emigrated with all his family to Egypt, then the most highly cultivated land on earth. The most fertile part of the country, they had grown to a population of some two millions of souls. Divine Providence had specially fostered them. But now, for about sixty years, the Egyptian government, under a new and jealous dynasty, had adopted a severe policy towards them, and they were gradually reduced to a condition of servitude. Nevertheless, Jehovah had not forsaken them. Moses had been in process of training all these later years as an instrument for their deliverance, and the time had at length arrived for their emancipation. We need not here review the mighty acts of divine interference by which the Egyptian court were finally compelled to grant the release of the Hebrews. We will come at once to the scenes of their exit from Egypt. The Red Sea was, in this instance, an object of the ancient Hebrews, and the whole of the Red Sea was, in fact, a great gulf, the eastern part of which is called the Gulf of Suez, and the western part of which is called the Gulf of Aqaba.

The commerce of the Red Sea was, in very ancient times, unquestionably great. The earliest records tell of the ships of the Egyptians, the Phenicians, and the Arabs. Although the ports of the Persian Gulf received a part of the Indian traffic, and the Himyaritic maritime power had a good share of the trade of Arabia, the kingdom of Sheba, the trade with Egypt was, we must believe, the most important of the ancient world. That all this traffic found its way to the head of the Heroopolitic Gulf seems proved by the absence of any important Pharaonic remains farther south on the Egyptian coast. But the shoaling of the head of the gulf rendered the navigation, always dangerous, more difficult; it destroyed the former anchorage, and made it necessary to carry merchandise across the desert to the Nile. This change appears to have been one of the main causes of the decay of the commerce of the Red Sea. And, indeed, we have seen that the long-voyaging ships shifted their cargoes to Red-Sea craft at the strait; and Ptolemy Philadelphus, after founding Arsinoe and endeavoring to reopen the old canal of the Red Sea, abandoned the upper route and
with remains of antiquity in its vicinity. The other is probably represented by Tell Ramesis, a quadrangular mound on an arm of the Nile opposite the modern village of Belbeis, located on the Damietta branch of the railway, about seventeen miles south-west of the former place. The canal which conveys the sweet water of the Nile from Cairo to Suez passes through both these villages, parallel with the railway, by way of Ismailia, pursuing very nearly the same line as the ancient one constructed for the same purpose, but choked up and obliterated for many centuries. By this route small craft, during the Roman period and the Middle Ages, used to furnish a communication with the market at Memphis for the citizens of Clyisma, which was situated in the immediate vicinity of Suez, as traces of the name still attest. The Suez Canal, which was opened in 1869 for navigation between the Mediterranean and the Red Sea, has made this neighborhood public to thousands of persons travelling across the isthmus to India and China, as large steamers sail directly through it from European ports to these distant lands. Those who wish to see more of Egypt can disembark at Alexandria, take the cars for Cairo, and thence back by way of Ismailia, intercepting their vessel again at Suez. Thus most of the spots rendered memorable by the exodus of the Israelites have been rapidly seen, at least from a distance, by multitudes of passengers on their way to and from the more distant East. The abrupt contact of modern improvements with these ancient scenes is calculated, perhaps, to dissipate some of the romantic haze which the imagination of Bible-readers usually throws around them, but deepens rather than lessens their interest by the familiarity of approach.

After these preliminaries, we are prepared to follow the Hebrews in their exit from the land of their bondage. On the eve of the Passover, corresponding to our Easter, they had rendezvoused, by divine appointment, at Ramesses. Memphis, the capital, was forty miles distant, and hence Moses' final interview with Pharaoh, when the Israelitish leader uttered the ominous words, "Thou hast spoken well, I will see thy face again no more," must have taken place at some nearer point. The sacred meal was eaten in haste, the destroying angel at midnight smote all the first-born, and by the morning light the Israelitish host were on their march. As it is expressly stated that "God led them not by the way of the land of the Philistines, . . . but by the way of the wilderness of the Red Sea" (not the desert between Cairo and Suez, as Palmer thinks [Sinai from the Monuments, p. 144], but the great desert of et-Tih itself), we are sure that they took the direct south-easterly route towards the head of the Gulf of Suez, doubtless corresponding substantially with the modern pilgrim road. This way would lead them out of the fertile valley of Goshen across a rolling gravelly plain between low hills of shifting sand the whole distance. There was no obstruction to their journey, and they would make rapid progress. They had but little household stuff, for Orientals, especially those of nomadic habit, such as the Israelites inherited from their tent-dwelling forefathers, are not apt to encumber themselves much with furniture. Rain-water would be abundant in the pits and rocks along their path at that time of the year, and they carried with them provisions enough to last several days. Their first day was a long one, and they, no doubt, were anxious to fall as soon as possible into the main Haj road. Their first camp is called Succoth, or "booths" (Exod. xii. 37; xiii. 20; Num. xxxiii, 56), probably a rough khan, like those established in all ages along this thoroughfare. The present Derb el-Bān, a northern branch of the great pilgrim route, leads direct from Belbeis, south-west down the valley by way of Rubeihy and Aweitet, and falls into the main Haj road at the castle of Ajrud, sixty miles from Belbeis. Ajrud has been thought by many to correspond to the next station of the Israelites, "Etham, in the edge of the wilderness" (Exod. xiii. 20; Num. xxxiii, 6). It is a long-established Egyptian outpost.
on the frontier of the desert. The whole air of the sacred narrative gives us the impression that this was a great personal privilege, for it formed the first or immediate point of destination for the Hebrews on their journey. If this be Ethem, it will be necessary to allow thirty miles for each day's journey, which, under the prevailing circumstances, is not extravagant, although an order of twenty miles in caravans is only a very short forty. See ETHAM.

At Etham the Israelites received this divine command: "Turn and encamp before Pihahiroth, between Migdol and the sea, over against Baal-zephon: before it shall ye encamp by the sea" (Exod. xiv, 2). This description has been accurately examined, the text and context are not meant to carry us through the actual crossing-place of the Red Sea by the Israelites. It is substantially repeated in ver. 9, wherein the Egyptians are said to have overtaken the Hebrews "encamping by the sea, beside Pihahiroth, before Baal-zephon." Of the names of these localities no trace at present exists; their identification, therefore, must depend upon a comparison of the circumstances of the narrative, with some slight corroborations from the etymology and historical application of the names. Three or four places have been selected from old writings as rivulets for the honor of this remarkable crossing, and their claims have been somewhat hotly contested at times. We propose calmly and carefully to discuss their respective merits, and to be guided by the explicit terms of the Biblical account, irrespective of any purely theological considerations as to whether the miracle involved may thus be enhanced or lessened. We take them up in their geographical order.

1. On the Mediterranean Shore.—M. Brugsch has recently discovered a new crossing-place for the Israelites on their passage out of Egypt, which, on account both of the fame of the author and his confident announcement, has attracted no little attention (L'Étoile et les Monuments Égyptiens: Discours prononcé à l'occasion du Congrès International d'Oristiatistes à Londres, par Henri Brugsch-Bey, délégué de son Altesse Imael Premier, le Khédive d'Égypte; accompagné d'une carte [Leipsic, J.C. Hinrichs, 1872, 8vo], p. 36). He conceives that they did not cross the Red Sea at all, but a noted morass—the Sibnonian Bog of antiquity, the modern Sebounie, a shallow lake along the Mediterranean coast, on the confines of Egypt towards Palestine. He thinks he has found all the names of the Biblical account in the Egyptian papyri, and that he has succeeded in identifying them with modern localities. Thus On he sets down as equivalent to Anu, a city, according to the text of Holm; Hiercon, a town, and, according to the Crock, a mountain; Pihahiroth or Hahiroth, is, of course, Tell-Bast. Goshen he traces, through the hieroglyphical Phacousa, to the modern Käs or Focas; and in the Sethotic name on the north of this he finds mention of Pitian and Sukkorth, with Pi-rames, or Ramses, in the same neighborhood. Etham he conjectures to be Khatam, noticed as another of those ancient stations in this latter region of Tanis-Rameses; the remaining one adjoining being Migdol, which, of course, must be the Magdolium of classical writers, and the present Tell el-Kebir. Baal-zephon, Baal-Casuia, and Pihahiroth is the entrance upon the narrow sand-beach separating the Mediterranean from the Sibnonian Lake just east of Pelusium. Many of these identifications, which M. Brugsch gives with great brevity, and without the detailed authority, the reader might reasonably object, both on the ground of strained etymological resemblance and inadequate historical data for position. But we prefer to call attention to a few palpable discrepancies with the scriptural narrative, which seem to put this locality utterly out of the question. The inhabitants of the author's country accord. To be sure, the Hebrews, on this theory, simply threaded their way along a narrow beach till they came to a bar which allowed them an easy crossing-place over the marsh, and M. Brugsch candidly admits (p. 82), "The miracle, it is true, then ceases to be a miracle; but let us acknowledge, with all sincerity, that Divine Providence sustains its place and authority." What childlike faith!

In the first place, it certainly was the Red Sea that the Israelites crossed on this occasion. True, the history in Exodus does not explicitly name the body of water, but the immediate context and other passages of Scripture most definitely (Exod. xv, 22; Deut. xi, 4; Josh. iv, 23; xxix, 6; Ps. cvi, 9; cxxxvi, 13, 15, etc.). Josephus distinctly understands it so (Ant. ii, 15, 1), and the New-Test. writers are equally clear (Acts xii, 36; Heb. xi, 29). Even M. Brugsch himself, in his map to call the Sibnonian Sea Fûm Shîf, the Hebrew name exclusively applied to the Arabian Gulf, thus committing a twofold blunder.

In the next place, the route which this theory selects for the Israelites on setting out is one which they avoided. "And it came to pass, when Pharaoh had let the people go, that God led them not through the way of the land of the Philistines, although that was near... but God led the people about through the way of the wilderness of the Red Sea" (Exod. xiii, 17, 18). Moreover, an unbroken course of actual and supposed ruin turn, or rather retrogression, on their way in order to reach the sea (Exod. xiv, 2).

Finally, this view is wholly unsupported by any local tradition, and requires a displacement of the well-worn positions of Marah, Elim, etc. The latter are supposed to be near, not far from Suez, but Brugsch locates at "the place which the Egyptian monuments designate by the name of Alaim or Tentilim; that is to say, 'the city of fishers,' situated near the Gulf of Suez, in a northerly direction." Moses, however, speaks of no "city there, much less so large a one as Heropolis, which M. Brugsch sets down there on his map; but only of some wells and palms.

This view of the Red-Sea crossing M. Brugsch reiterates in his latest work (Gesch. Ägyptens, Leipzig, 1867), but "he has not won a single Egyptologist of note to a theory which demands so many conjectures in geography and such fanciful analogies in philology" (Dr. J. P. Thompson, in the Bibliotheca Sacra, July, 1877, p. 544).

2. At the Salt Lakes.—These are a series of shallow ponds of brackish water, some of them of very considerable extent, stretching as intervals from the head of the Gulf of Suez to the Mediterranean. They are supposed to have formerly constituted a continuous water connection between these two great seas, which has since been broken by a change of level, leaving these isolated basins partly salt from the remnant of sea-water. Notwithstanding the physical theory has been adduced, the most palpable of which is the fact that sea-shells, of the same character with those now thrown up by the Red Sea, may be seen along the shore of these lakes (see Dr. Harman, Egypt and the Holy Land, p. 161). This would seem to indicate a continuity of these bodies of water in earlier times. (See further in Laborde, Commentaire Géographique sur l'Étoile [Paris, 1841, fol.], p. 79 a.)

The great bed of the Salt Lakes extends in a north-easterly direction, and becomes, Mount Sinai separating from the Red Sea by a sand-bank 4000 to 5000 meters long, which is seldom more than one meter higher than the sea. It is forty to fifty lower than the water-level of the sea basin, and from plain indications was once covered with the sea (Du Bois-Aimeé, in the Deser. de l'Egypte, Mod. i, 188 sq., 1st ed.). Before it ascended the slopes of the Nile by means of the well-known canal and thus received fresh water, its waters were bitter (Strabo, xvii, 804). It is a favorite theory that it was originally embraced in the Heropotamian Gulf (Sickel, in the Stud. u. Kritik, 1872, p. 23). According to this scheme that the ancient Heropolis was situated in the inner corner of the Arabian Sea (Strabo, xvi, 767; xvi, 866; Pliny, vi, 33), and that vessels sailed thence (Strabo, xvi, 768); but more probably this city was located far
north of Cypsa, the modern Kolsum, near the present Suez (Proleny, iv, 5, 14, and 54; Itinerar Aust. p. 107, ed. Weiss), namely, somewhere about the modern Abu-Kheisah, or Mufkar (Knobel, Commentar zu Exodus, p. 140 sq.). Its ruins are still visible there (Champlin, Egypt, ii, 88). Its importance gave name to the entire district of Israel and rendered it a strategic spot. Both were likewise more properly designated from Arsinoe, which was situated near the present head of the bay (see Smith, Dict. of Greek and Roman Geography, s. v. "Arsinoe"). This latter seems to have been the official designation of the place which was popularly termed Cypsa (beautifica, thy elkhayia [Keldan, Palatini, p. 472, 556]).

A rise of the intermediate land has been inferred from the stoppage of the ancient canal along this line; but this can readily be accounted for by the drifting-in of sand and the neglect of the banks. On the other hand, no material change of level has taken place in this region in modern times seems to be proved by the fact that the fresh-water canal now actually conveys water from the Nile to Suez, just as it formerly did, for its present route is not a cutting for that purpose.

The brackishness of these lakes merely argues a con
nection at some period with the Mediterranean, and not necessarily with the Red Sea likewise, and the shell and other marine indications are probably traces of this connection only. In fact, the immense lagoon of Lake Micropolis 13°42'15" 25°20'18" (ibid. 461) is a principal or deepest of the Bitter Lakes, and there is nothing but flats and marshes in this direction; whereas southwesterly the Suez Canal required extensive excavations for its continuance to the Gulf of Suez, cutting in some places, not through sand and salt debris merely, but through firm strata of clay and crystalline alabaster. This theory rests upon so problematical a foundation that it has not been much resorted to in this discussion except for the purpose of strengthening the location of the Israeliite crossing at Suez, by way of showing that the water at the latter point was deeper anticiantly than now, and so preserving the greater appearance of a miracle in the case. It is thus incidentally alluded to by Calmet and Robinson, and by several later writers. But for this purpose, if it proves anything, it proves too much; for if at the time of the Exodus the Red Sea extended thus far north, there is no occasion to seek for any other place of crossing, so far as a sufficiency of water is concerned.

Aside from these geological and theological speculations, there is in favor of this crossing-place only the shorter distance from Belbeis, rendering it an easy three days' journey of only fifteen miles per day to any port that might be selected in the vicinity of Ismaïlia. The attempt of Furst (Hebrew Lexicon, p. 786) to identify Baal-Zephon with Heroopolis is mere conjecture; and his remark that Migdol is the Magdol of Herodotus (ii, 159) is founded on a mistake (repeated in Smith's Dict. of Greek and Roman Geography, ii, 246), for Megiddo in Palestine is doubtless there intended. (See Rawlinson, Herod. ii, 267.) The Magdolus of Egypt was probably due to the readiness of the translators (see Autolycus, comment, on p. 14), entirely too remote for the precise indication of locality in the Mosaic narrative.

Against the location of the miracle at the Bitter Lakes are the following facts in the Biblical text: (1) In order to go round the head of the sea (if thus far north) the Israelites would be obliged to start, not by the "way of the wilderness," as the text states, but precisely by that direct "way of the land of the Philistines" which the text expressly says they did not take (Exod. xiii, 17, 18). (2) There would be no change of their course required possible in order to get to this point as the word "turn" (xiv, 2) demands; they were already going on the direct and only route they could well have taken. Indeed, if the region of Lake Timshah were then so low as to be filled from the Red Sea, it is difficult to see how the water from the Mediterranean on the other side could have been kept out, and then there would be a continuous lake from sea to sea, and a miracle would have been necessary, at all hazards, in order to effect the passage anywhere. The Hebrews had no occasion to "turn" at all, for that matter. (3) In that case Pharaoh's observation (ver. 5, 4), "The children of Israel have left us," implies that they had already shut them in," would have been very inapt; at least, its force is not at all clear; for, go which way they might, the material obstacle would be the same, viz. the water merely. (4) There is no local or historical tradition confirmatory of this spot; in short, circumstances on this theory are all so uncertain (and ill-defined that we may safely dismiss it as altogether hypothetical. If we are to determine anything definite concerning the place of the transaction, it must be based upon the known relations of the localities as they now exist.

Rahlfs thinks (Comment. on Exod. ad loc.) that the Israelites turned northwards; but in that case likewise, as Shaw long since observed (Travels, p. 311), they could not in any proper sense have become "entangled in the land" nor "shut in by the wilderness," for they would have been free before they could escape; in fact, they would have been only pursuing a more direct route to Canaan.

3. At Suez.—This location of the event in question has a far greater array of names in its support, among the most notable of whom is Dr. E. Robinson (in the Biblical Repository, 1832, p. 253 sq.) and Dr. Res, ii, 80), who followed in the wake of Niebuhr (Travels in Arabia, translated by Heron [Edinb. 1782], i, 198, 451), and whose views have been substantially reproduced by the latest writers. Important authorities on the same side are Laboree (Commentaire Géographique, p. 77), who cites, as having adopted it with some modification, the earlier writers, Le Clerc, G. Baer, Du Bois Aimée, Salvator, etc., to whom we add the author of Murray's Hand-book for Egypt (ed. 1875), p. 279; Keil, Commentaries on the Holy Bible (Keil and Delitzsch's translation, Edinb., 1866, 3 vols. 8vo), ii, 46 sq. The obvious purport of the arguments adduced in favor of this as the place of the Israelites' passage is, notwithstanding the disclaimer of most of its advocates, to reduce the miracle to its minimum terms, and to find a spot where it is practicable by merely natural forces. This has created a prejudice against it in the minds of most readers, and induced a controversy not always temperate or logical. Let us look at the arguments on both sides from scriptural sources purely.

In favor of this view we may say that—(1) The distance from Belbeis (assuming that to correspond substantially with the site of Rameses) sufficiently agrees with the requirements of a three days' march, being about fifty miles in a straight line. (2) The general direction is about the required one for the Israelites at the outset. (3) The adjoining localities are thought to correspond with those of the Scripture account; thus it is generally agreed that Migdol (the tower) answers to some fortress on Jebel Atakah. (4) There are shoals reaching nearly or quite across the channel at this point, so that an east wind might readily stop it; and it is, moreover, so narrow that the Israelites could easily cross in the few hours presumed to have been occupied in the passage.

Other features of this locality do not well tally with the requirements of the case, and some might absolutely to contradict the Biblical statements. Even the above coincidences—especially the last—when more closely examined, do not prove satisfactory. (1) The direction to "turn" from the regular course hitherto pursued by the fugitives does not admit of an adequate explanation on this view. The word is an emphatic one, not the ordinary יְדֵה, or יְדֵע, to turn aside or weary, but יְדֵע, to return, turn back, viz. actually retrograde. (Ewald, who treats the record in his usually arbitrary and irrelevant manner, is yet too a scholar
not to feel the force of this expression, which he con-
strues by saying that Moses "led the host half-way
back" [Hist. of Israel (translated by Martineau, London,
1869, 5 vols. 8vo), ii, 691]. At least a marked digression
or detour is required to meet the significance of this
term. But Suez is directly on the beaten track of all
ages, and precisely in the line which the Israelites had
already been pursuing. It is true the immemorial Haj
route does not actually come down to the village of Suez
itself, as, of course, it does not cross the head of the gulf
there; it passes a mile or two above, so as to avoid the
water. But this small divergence would be quite incon-
siderable in the direction of a whole day's march; for
the order to "turn," be it observed, was given at Etham
before setting out the third day, not near its close, or in
the vicinity of the sea, where the difference in direction
might have been more perceptible. This last consid-
eration is, therefore, altogether too insignificant to justi-
fy the Hebrew term. (2) None of the places given in
the Biblical account as fixing the spot determine it at
Suez. Even Jebel Atakah, if Migdol, is too far away
to be naturally selected for such a minute specification
of the immediate scene. Any point from Ras Atakah
to the south end of the Bitter Lakes would be "east"
(of or "before") that mountain in this general sense.
As for Pi-hahiroth (whether Hebrew for mouth of the
vines, or, as is more likely, Coptic for the sedge-plot),
it finds no special adaptation to any place in that neigh-
borhood. The attempt to identify it with Ajrud fails
utterly, for the Hebrew and Arabic have no radical
letter in common. Equally unsatisfactory is every effort
to discover Beal-zephon in any prominent landmark
north of Jebel Atakah. (Some writers refer Migdol to Makkala, but this seems to be an error for
the pass Muntzalah, and therefore fails of verbal corres-
dondence.) There is in that direction nothing but a
flat, monotonous tract of sand, with no striking name or
object to fix upon. (8) At Suez the Israelites, so far
from being hemmed in by barriers on either side and
an impassable sea in front, as the Biblical situation evi-
dently was, had nothing to do if they wished to escape
but to act just as every caravan at Suez now does, sim-
ply keep on across the open plain around the head of the
bay—an easy, free, and direct passage of some three
or four miles at farthest. At Suez it was impossible
for them to be either "entangled in the handkerchief
or shut in by the wilderness." The way was clear, so far as nat-
ural obstacles or intricacy
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Map of the Head of the Gulf of Suez.
be water enough left in the bay itself to prevent an enemy from surrounding the passing host on that side, but on the north there would be no such protection. Thus, even on the supposition that the term "wall" is used in ver. 22 in the sense of defence, the explanation clearly fails to meet the language of the text: "The waters were a wall unto them on the right hand and on the left." We desire to insist on this fact, and to us it appears decisive of the whole issue. But the phraseology seems to us to be stronger even than this interpretation. The term "wall" (יָדִּים) is rarely, if ever, used in this metaphorical sense of protection, but invariably (1 Sam. xxx, 16 is, we believe, the only doubtful instance) signifies some physical barrier, whether of stone or other material, placed more or less vertically for the purpose of protection. Its meaning is by no means fulfilled in the supposition of a vague water-line, shelving away at a distance on one side. Surely nothing but a desire to minimize the preternatural element in the discussion could lead to the adoption of so inadequate an interpretation; for the language, it must be remembered, occurs not in a poetical or figurative connection, but in a plain, prosaic history. The poetical version of the transaction (Exod. xv, 8) uses much stronger language: "The floods stood upright as a heap, and the depths were congealed in the heart of the sea." But the phraseology here, although figurative, no doubt correctly represents the facts as seen by an eye-witness. Ps. lxxviii, 13. "He made the waters to stand as a heap," shows the same traditional interpretation, and 1 Cor. x. 2 confirms it, "Baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea"—that is, wet with the spray.

For these reasons, even if we could find no better crossing-place for the Israelites, we should be disposed to reject the one at Suez as not fairly meeting the scriptural requirements in the case.

4. At Ras Atâkah. This place has been preferred as that of the crossing by the great majority of writers and travellers, including Pococke, Joly, Monconys, Shaw, Ovington, Sicard, Bruce, Arundale, Rainbow, Kitto, Olin, Wilson, Durbin, Bartlett, Porter, Bonar, Murphy, etc. It seems to us to meet the demands of the Biblical account more perfectly than any other. This cape is situated about six miles, in a direct line, south of Suez, opposite the southern end of Jebel Atâkah. It is a tongue running out more than a mile into the water beyond the average shore-line, and continued nearly a mile farther by a shoal, over which the water at ordinary low tide is not more than fourteen feet deep. Beyond this again stretches, for nearly a mile and a half in the same direction, a lower shoal, covered nowhere by more than twenty-nine feet of water at low tide. Opposite this point there reaches out, for about two miles from the eastern shore, a similar shoal, only thirty feet under water at its deepest place. The entire width of the sea at this point is about five miles, while the space where it is not over fifteen feet deep is but three and a half miles, and the channel itself not over fifty feet deep, is less than three quarters of a mile wide. The sea immediately above and below this spot, in the channel, is about seventy feet deep. Here, then, is a place where a strong and continued east wind, of the preternatural character implied in the sacred narrative, might open a passage suitable for the occasion, and leave a mass of water fitly comparable to a "wall on either hand." Moreover, the Israelites would,
in that case, emerge on the shore near Ayūn Mīṣa (Wells of Moses), the very name of which, in addition to other local traditions, represents the scene of the event.

A close examination of the text itself confirms this view of the transaction. It says (Exod. xiv, 21), “Jehovah caused the sea to go (נָתָן, made it walk) by a strong east wind all night, ... and the waters were divided (ֶ֖נֶַּלָּֽוּ, were split).” Similar is the language in ver. 16: “Divide it (the sea), and the children of Israel shall go ... through the midst of the sea.” The statement that the wind blew “all night” gives no just countenance to the inference that the Israelites did not begin the passage till near morning, and therefore could have gone but a very short distance in all, or, at least, when the wind lulled and the miracle ceased. For aught that appears, they may have already walked many miles, or even have continued their march some time the next forenoon if necessary in order to cross. True, the text says (ver. 27), “The sea returned at the turning of the morning (נָחַד, at daybreak; comp. Judg. xix, 25, 26) to its usual bed (נָתַ֫לְתָּן, to its perennial flow),” but it does not necessarily follow from this that the Israelitish host had at that time all reached the opposite shore. Indeed, rather the contrary is intimated by the statement, given subsequently to this, that “the children of Israel walked upon dry land in the midst of the sea” (Exod. xiv, 29), as if they continued their march some time after the overthrow of the Egyptians in their rear. Nor is it certain from ver. 20 that both camps remained quiet all the night, although such might be the inference at first sight. The true state of the case appears to have been about this: the Egyptians overtook the Israelites about midnight, just as they were about to encamp (נָתַ֫לְתָּן, in the act of pitching their tents, or preparing to do so) near the shore of the sea (ver. 9), and marched down directly upon them (ver. 10). In their dismay at the prospect of instant destruction, Moses ordered them to press forward immediately (ver. 13, וּלְכַ֫לְלָן, and they shall pull up stakes, that is, break up their preparations for camp). While they were doing this the wind sprang up, which did not lull till daylight. As they were marching to the beach the guardian pillar took its position in their rear (ver. 19), and so followed them all night as a light to their steps (ver. 20). When they had reached the middle of the sea (ver. 21), and the Egyptians were not far behind them (ver. 22), the morning began to dawn (ver. 24), and to prevent the enemy from overtaking the fugitives the march of the Egyptians was miraculously retarded, so that they, in their panic, were about to retreat (ver. 25). This they would hardly have thought of doing had they been nearly across, or had it been but a little way to the opposite shore: indeed, every reference to their destruction shows that they were yet in the middle of the sea. So, too, was Moses apparently at this juncture, when, at his extended rod, the water behind the host—who had gained somewhat by the delay of the enemy—began to fall, and the Egyptians actually turned to flee, but were overtaken in the heart of the sea (ver. 27), while the Israelites continued their march through the channel, still open in front of them (ver. 29), till they reached the shore, which the following waves soon strewed with the corpses of the foe (ver. 30). From this recital of incidents in the exact order of the text, it appears that the march really lasted some part of the night, and we consequently require a considerable width of water for its occurrence.

Ras 'Atākah, too, seems to correspond to the geographical features of the case. The point where the Israelites struck the western coast-line of the Red Sea is (as we have seen above) explicitly defined in three passages of the sacred itinerary, which we translate literally: “Speak to the sons of Israel, and they shall return (נהַלְתָּן) and encamp before (נָתַ֫לְתָּן) Pi-ha-Charith, between Migdol and the sea; before (נָתַ֫לְתָּן) Baal-Tsephôn, opposite it (םַעַלְתָּן) shall ye encamp upon (נָתַ֫לְתָּן) the sea” (Exod. xiv, 9). “... and they [the Egyptians] overtook (נָתַ֫לְתָּן) them [the Israelites] encamping upon the sea; upon (נָתַ֫לְתָּן) Pi-ha-Charith, which is before Baal-Tsephôn (ver. 9). “... and they [the Israelites] removed from Etham, and he [Israel] returned (נהַלְתָּן) upon (נָתַ֫לְתָּן) Pi-ha-Charith, which is before Baal-Tsephôn; and they encamped before Migdol” (Numb. xxxiii, 7). The meaning of Pi-ha-birihot, if it be Hebrew, can only be mouth of the gorge (root תעִ֫בַּה, to bore); or, if Egyptian (as Genienius and Frurst prefer), it is doubtless sedgy spot (Coptic, πι-ακ-ερόσ, "the place of meadows," according to Jablonski). In either etymology it would most probably designate a grassy shore, as at the opening of a valley with a brook into the sea. Such a spot is found in the reedy plain (sometimes called Badesh) at the mouth of a wide valley just south of Jebel 'Atākah. The writer's Egyptian dragoon, who was thoroughly familiar with these localities, called it Wady Ghubbeh ("cane-valley"); Robinson calls it Wady Tawrāt, others Wady Mīṣa, and still other names are assigned to it. Baal-zephôn is doubtless a Hebrew rendering of the name of a place "sacred to Typhon," the Greek form of the Egyptian malignant deity, of whose haunt in this vicinity there are traces in ancient writers (see the Hebrew lexicographers). In that case it was probably a mountain, or at least an eminence, in accordance with the heathen preference for hills as sites of shrines. Migdōl is the common Hebrew word for a tower, and was, therefore, most likely also a commanding position. It occurs, however, as the name of a town in this quarter of Egypt (Jer. xliv, 1; xlv, 14), and may be nothing more than a Hebraized form of the Coptic megidōr, "many hills" (see the authorities in Genienius). In Ezek. xxix, 10; xxx, 6, it recurs in the phrase רַמְלָּן בְּהֵמָּה, which may most
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naturally be rendered from Magdol of Sevenes: in the English Bible, "from the tower of Syene," after the Vulg. a turre Syene; but the rendering of the Sept., אָוֶּת מַגְּדוֹל יֵרְאֶה [once xai] סְבָרִים, suggests that the latter name should be pointed הָרָעָר, to סְבָרִים, thus marking out the natural limits of Egypt from Magdol on the north to Assuan on the south, precisely as today; and this conclusion is generally adopted by modern scholars. First, in his Hebrew Lexicon, gives a curious interpretation of this whole geographical question: "From Magdol a road led to Hæst-sphenon, the later He rolipolis on the Red Sea, and therefore the Red Sea is mentioned with it, Exod. xiv, 2; Num. xxxiii, 7. Most readers, however, will prefer to see in these texts, so carefully worked in almost exact agreement with each other, a precise indication of the very spot where the Israelites crossed; and if the above reason be correct, we ought to find on each side of the crossing-place a conspicuous landmark, probably a mountain. This we exactly have at the valley in question, with Jebel Atākāth ("hill of liberty") on the north, and Jebel Abb Durrānī on the "valley of wandering," which terminates in the wady in question, thus intercepting the Israelites, who could not escape along the narrow, rocky margin of the shore around the point called Rās Atākāth. The writer tried to travel through that rough coast and found it impracticable enough, Small companies, as was the case with Dr. Dürbin, may, indeed, pass slowly along it, but not so great and encumbered a multitude as the Israelites. Besides, it is about a day's march by this route from Rās Atākāth to Suez, and the Egyptians might readily have intercepted the fugitives by sending a detachment around the other side of the mountain.

The particular path by which the Israelites reached Rās Atākāth from Ajrūd has not been agreed upon by the advocates of this point of crossing. Some think they came down Wady et-Tīth from Memphis; but this, as we have seen, is not at all likely. Most others suppose that they came first to Suez, and then along the shore. But if they came that way, why might they not escape by the same? As we have just seen, they could do this; but if they then, as the Israelites presumably did, passed around partly behind and across Jebel Atākāth, this exactly tallies with the command to "turn" back from Etham. From Ajrūd the route would thus be not merely a deflection, but in part an actual retrogression, as the accompanying map shows. A path is laid down on several of the maps of this region between the highest and westernmost summits of Jebel Atākāth, which the fugitives would most naturally take. By this route the distance for the third day's march from Ajrūd to the spring on the shore at the mouth of Wady Ta wārīk would be about thirty-eight miles ("the valley of wandering," in the Av); but the maximum age allowed above for each of the previous day's travels. Thence to the extremity of Rās Atākāth is not quite ten miles, and thence to Ayūn Māsā is scarcely seven miles more. The journey does not seem to us to be an impracticable one under the urgency of the circumstances. It might be materially shortened for each of the succeeding days, especially the last, by locating Etham on the Haj route, somewhat to the west of Ajrūd—a sup position not at all forbidden by any known fact.

Kurtz (History of the Old Covenant [Clarke's transl. Edinb. 1847], 2 vols. small 8vo) observes on the observation on the time that elapsed upon the route from Rameses to the Red Sea, which he argues must have been more than the three days that appear in the narrative (by implication only, however, for there is no express statement to that effect). We condense his statements into the following points: (1) Jewish tradition assigns seven days, and this seems to have been the origin of the Passover week. (2) The term סְבָרִים, "journey," denotes only an encampment, while the successive days of travel are expressed by בָּרָא יָמִים, or "day's journey." (3) In Numb, x, 33, we find stations three days apart, with no locality named between (the same, we may add, is the case in xxxiii, 8, 16). (4) It would have been impossible for the Israelites all to rendezvous at one place and start together, especially as they all kept the Passover in their own homes the preceding night, and were not allowed to leave till morning (Exod. xii, 22). (5) The distance, under any calculation, was too great for a three days' continuous march. (6) The message to Pharaoh of their movements at Etham (xiv, 5) requires at least four days from that point to the Red Sea—two for him to get the information, and two more for his army to be got ready and take over the Israelites. To these arguments we may add the fact that a whole month was consumed (Numb, xxxiii, 5; Exod. xvi, 1) in making the first eight stations (Numb, xxxiii, 10) for an estimated direct march—but ten days of marching. As the remainder of the time could hardly have been all spent in camp—of which, moreover, there is no mention in the account—there arises a suspicion that the most prominent stations only are named, or those where more than one night's halt was made from some noteworthy incident occurred. Of course the fugitives would travel faster, longer, and more continuously, till they were escaped from Egypt, and more leisurely after the event at the Red Sea had relieved them from danger. Be all this as it may, it is in any case clear that they could as easily journey from Ajrūd to the mouth of Wady Ta wārīk in one day as they could from Tell Ramals to Ajrūd in two.

5. Capt. Moreseby (in Aitton's Land of the Messiah, p. 118 sq.) is of the opinion that the Israelites crossed at Rās Tarafneh, south of Mount Abb-Duraj, some sixty miles below Suez, where the sea is twenty miles wide and two hundred and fifty feet deep. This accords with certain traditions of the Arabs of the Desert, who name the warm springs in the rocks opposite after Pharaoh. The induction, however, to this view seems chiefly to be a desire to exaggerate the miracle.

6. The last and most preposterous theory broached is that of Dr. Beke (Sinai in Arabia [Lond. 1873]), who contends that the eastern arm of the Red Sea, i.e. the Gulf of Akabah, and not the Gulf of Suez, is that which formed the end of the Egyptian possessions. The hypothesis is supported by his chimerical idea that Mount Sinai is not the traditional mountain in the peninsula, but Jebel Baghīr, east of 'Akabah. See Sinai.

Among the localities named, the choice really lies between Suez and Rās Atākāth, and of these we decidedly prefer the latter.

Besides the works cited above, and the commentaries on Exodus, the question has been discussed by the following among the more modern writers: Kitto, Pictorial History of the Jews (Lond. 1843, 2 vols. small 4to), i, 187 sq.; Lachbruck, Die ägyptischen Reise (ibid. 1838, 8vo), p. 29 sq.; Raumer, Beiträge zur biblischen Geographie (Leipz. 1843, 8vo), p. 1 sq.; Sharpe, in Bartlett's Forty Days in the Desert (Lond. 2d ed. large 8vo), p. 28 sq.; Wilson, The Lands of the Bible (Edinb. 1847, 2 vols. 8vo), i, 149 sq.; Olin, Travels and Journeys (N. Y. 1843, 2 vols. 12mo), i, 642 sq.; Dürbin, Observations in the East (ibid. 1841, 2 vols. 12mo), i, 120 sq.; Porter, in Murray's Hand-book for Syria (Lond. ed. 1868, 12mo), i, 9 sq.; Palmer, Desert of the Exodus (N. Y. reprint, 1873, 8vo), p. 42 sq.; Bond, The Desert of Sinai (London, 1820, 12mo), 92 sq.; Morris, Tour through Turkey, etc. (Phil. 1842, 2 vols. 12mo), ii, 219 sq.; Strauss, Sinai und Golypho (Berl. 1850, 12mo), p. 147 sq. One of the most recent monographs on the subject—that of Unruh, Der Zug der Israeliten aus Agypten nach Canaan (Langenalz, 1889, 8vo)
Redemption, a frequent rendering of the Heb. נט, which strictly means the nearest kinsman. It is thus applied to Christ, as he is the avenger of man upon his spiritual enemy, and delivers man from death and the power of the grave, which the human avenger could not do. The right of the institution of נט was only in a relative—one of the same blood—and hence our Saviour's assumption of our nature is alluded to and implied under this term. There was also the right of buying back the family inheritance when alienated; and this also applies to Christ, our נט, who has bought back the heavenly inheritance into the human family. Under these views Job joyfully exclaims, "I know that my Redeemer (my נט) liveth," etc. See Goel; Jesus Christ; Mediator.

Redemption, in theology, denotes our recovery from sin and death by the obedience and sacrifice of Christ, who on this account is called the "Redeemer" (Isa. lix, 20; Job xix, 25). "Being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus" (Rom. iii, 24). "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us" (Gal. iii, 13). 

Redemption, according to depend upon the blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot" (1 Pet. i, 18, 19). "And ye are not your own, for ye are bought with a price" (1 Cor. vi, 19, 20).

By redemption those who deny the atonement made by Christ do to understand deliverance merely, regarding only the effect, and studiously putting out of sight the cause from which it flows. But the very terms used in the above-cited passages, "to redeem" and "to be bought with a price," will each be found to refute this notion of a gratuitous deliverance, whether from sin or punishment, or both. "Our English word redemption," says Dr. Gill, "is from the Latin, and signifies buying again; and several words in the Greek language of the New Test. are used in the affair of our redemption which signify the obtaining of something by paying a proper price for it; sometimes the simple verb αγορασκο, to buy, is used; so the redeemed are said to be αγορασκοι, bought back, made free by the blood of Christ. Sometimes the compound verb αγορασκον, to be bought, or to be bought from the earth, and to be bought from among men, and to be bought with a price—that is, with the price of Christ's blood (1 Cor. vi, 20); hence the Church of God is said to be purchased with it (Acts xx, 28.) Sometimes the compound verb αγορασκον, to buy, or to be bought, is used, which signifies to buy again, or out of the hands of another, as the redeemed are bought out of the hands of justice, as in Gal. iii, 13, iv, 5. To redeem literally means 'to buy back;' and σαρκαν, to redeem, and αγορασκον, redemption, are, both in Greek written and in the New Test., used for the act of setting free a captive by paying λατρευω, a ransom or redemption price." Yet, as Grotius has fully shown by reference to the use of the words both in sacred and profane writers, redemption signifies not merely "the liberation of captives," but of man himself; the deliverance of man from the state of sin in which we must be freed; and σαρκαν signifies everything which satisfies another so as to effect this deliverance.

The nature of this redemption or purchased deliverance (for it is not gratuitous liberation, as will present itself) is as follows, and is therefore, as the circumstances of those who are the subjects of it. The subjects in the case before us are sinful men; they are under guilt, under "the curse of the law," the servants of sin, under the power and dominion of the devil, and "taken captive by him at his will," liable to the death of the body and to eternal punishment. To the whole of this case the redemption—the purchased deliverance of man as proclaimed in the Gospel—applies itself. Hence in the above-cited and other passages it is said, "We have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, being delivered from the curse of the law, deliverance from sin, that we should be set free from sin;" deliverance from the power of Satan; from death, by a resurrection; and from future "wrath" by the gift of eternal life. Throughout the whole of this glorious doctrine of our redemption from these tremendous evils there is, however, not in the New Test., a constant reference to the λατρευω, the redemption price, which λατρευω is as constantly declared to be the death of Christ, which he endured in our stead. "The Son of man came to give his life a ransom for many" (Matt. xx, 28). "Who gave himself a ransom for all" (1 Tim. ii, 6). "In whom we have redemption through his blood" (Eph. i, 7). "Ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, but with the precious blood of Christ" (1 Pet. i, 18, 19). That deliverance of man from sin, misery, and all other penal evils of his transgression, which constitutes our redemption by Christ, is not, therefore, a gratuitous deliverance, granted without a consideration, as an act of mere prerogative; the ransom—the redemption price—was exacted and paid; one thing was given for another—the precious blood of Christ. But on the contrary, the price of all the same import are those passages which represent us as having been "bought" or purchased by Christ. Peter speaks of those who "denied the Lord, saying, I am not his disciple," which price is expressly said by John to be the blood of Christ: "Thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God (αγορασκον, hast purchased us) by thy blood" (Rev. v, 9). The ends of redemption are, that the justice of God might be satisfied; his people reconcile and adopt and sanctify, and bring to glory. The properties of it are these: (1) it is agreeable to all the perfections of God; (2) what a creature never could merit, and therefore entirely of free grace; (3) it is special and particular; (4) full and complete; (5) it is eternal as to its blessings. See Edwards, Hist. of redemption.
REDEEMPTORISTS

Redemptorists, Order of, or "The Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer," was established by Alfonso Maria di Liguori (q. v.) in the city of Scala in 1732, and spread first in the kingdom of Naples and in the Papal States. The end of this institute was the association of missionary priests who should minister by special services to the spiritual wants of the abandoned in cities and villages, and in particular parochial duties. After St. Alfonso had founded several houses of his community, pope Benedict XIV solemnly approved of his rule and institute, under the above title, Feb. 25, 1749. The order rapidly found favor in all the churches of Europe, and was officially established through the instrumentality of Clement Maria Hoffbauer. This man, the first German Redemptorist, was born in Moravia Dec. 26, 1751. He became a baker, and exercised his profession for some years in the Premonstrant convent of Bruck. Here he obtained the favor of the abbots, who made him commence his studies. After studying four years very actively, he left the convent in 1776 with a view to turn hermit, and spent two years at the renowned shrine of Mühlfrauen. When the hermitages were abolished, he went to Vienna, where he supported himself by working at his former trade. In company with his friend Peter Emanuel Kunzmann, who eventually joined the Liguorians as a lay-brother, he made several pilgrimages to Rome, and subsequently completed his studies at Vienna. Here he became acquainted with John Thaddaeus Hebel, who was afterwards his most zealous follower and firm friend. The two friends visited Rome, and together entered the convent of the Priests of the Most Holy Redeemer. The rector of the convent designated them some time after to go to Germany to establish the order there, and thus to suppress the Jesuits, whom he expected to be pressed by the revolution of July, 1830. But as there was no prospect of Joseph II allowing their order to be established in Austria, they turned their attention to Poland. Through the mediation of the papal nuncio Saluzzo, they obtained the church of St. Benno at Warsaw and a dwelling-house, and from this their followers subsequently received in Warsaw the name of Bemontites. The priests of the new order, during the first years of their establishment, were in the habit of preaching every Sunday and feast-day in the open air; but as this was subsequently forbidden by the civil authorities, they commenced preaching every Sunday in their church of St. Benno two sermons in Polish, two in German, and one in French. Their activity was rewarded by great success, for in 1796, shortly after they had commenced, the number of their communicants had reached, it is said, 19,000. Natives of Poland, in large numbers, entered the order; and Hoffbauer, during his sojourn in Poland, even opened a seminary for the clergy. In 1799 he went to Mitten, invited to Livonia, and Hoffbauer sent three priests to establish it there. In Warsaw they obtained a second church—that of the Holy Cross. In 1799 the order numbered twenty-five members in that city. As they were at a great distance from Rome, Francis de Paula had, in 1785, given Hoffbauer full power to establish colleges, receive members, give dispensations, etc. In 1797 he was appointed by the pope his vicar-general. In 1801 or 1802 they were invited to Switzerland, and in 1803 some of them were sent there. They settled at first on the estate of the duke of Schwarzenberg at the frontier of Switzerland, and after 1824, in the village of Jestetten, on Mount Taibor. In August 1838, Hoffbauer went towards Poland, and thence to Mount Taibor. While at the latter place he received a request to send a member of his order to the church at Tryberg, in the Black Forest, a place of pilgrimage. Still the two establishments at Mount Taibor and at Cre Tavera were unsuccessful, and were subsequently abandoned. In 1806 Hoffbauer returned to Warsaw; but the very next proceedings were instituted against the society, their papers searched, and finally the community was suppressed by the military authorities. The fathers were imprisoned in the fort of Klustern, where they were retained one month, and then sent back two by two to their native country. Hoffbauer retired to Vienna, where he sought to reunite his order. In 1818 he was appointed confessor and ecclesiastical director of the Ursuline convent of St. Joseph, and the order was restored, but it was not until his death. The church of the convent was soon transformed into a mission church, Hoffbauer's reputation as a confessor became considerable, and he preached, besides, every Sunday in the church of St. Ursula. As he died at Vienna in March 1835, he is chiefly known through the instrumentality of Clement Maria Hoffbauer. The Liguorians now named for the king of Bavaria until driven out of it in March, 1849. In Bavaria the king authorized, March 11, 1841, fifteen to twenty members of the Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer to establish themselves at Alt-Oetting. On the other hand, the government became satisfied in 1848 that the Redemptorists and their doctrines would prove dangerous to Bavaria. They were therefore replaced by the Benedictines. The authorities gave as their reasons for this change that the fathers were instilling fanatical views among the people by means of the confessional, and that their preaching excited the lower classes to disorder. A part of the members of the society removed to America after its dissolution, others went to Austria, and some became secular priests. In France the Redemptorists established themselves first at Vichy, then at Altenberg, in the Saar, from which they were expelled. After they had finished the necessary studies, they were ordained. They went in 1875 to Vienna; but as there was no prospect of Joseph II allowing their order to be established in Austria, they turned their attention to Poland. Through the mediation of the papal nuncio Saluzzo, they obtained the church of St. Benno at Warsaw and a dwelling-house, from this their followers subsequently received in Warsaw the name of Bemontites. The priests of the new order, during the first years of their establishment, were in the habit of preaching every Sunday and feast-day in the open air; but as this was subsequently forbidden by the civil authorities, they commenced preaching every Sunday in their church of St. Benno two sermons in Polish, two in German, and one in French. Their activity was rewarded by great success, for in 1796, shortly after they had commenced, the number of their communicants had reached, it is said, 19,000. Natives of Poland, in large numbers, entered the order; and Hoffbauer, during his sojourn in Poland, even opened a seminary for the clergy. In 1799 he went to Mitten, invited to Livonia, and Hoffbauer sent three priests to establish it there. In Warsaw they obtained a second church—that of the Holy Cross. In 1799 the order numbered twenty-five members in that city. As they were at a
REDENBACHER

Redford, George, D.D., an English Congressional minister, was born in London Sept. 27, 1778, and was educated at Hoxton College and the University of Glasgow. His first settlement as a minister was at Uxbridge, where he remained fourteen years. In 1825 he became pastor of the Congregational church at Worcester. In 1855 he was transferred from his carriage, and suffered a fall. He was then 85 years of age. He retired to Edgebaston, near Birmingham, and his congregation at Worcester allowed him £100 per annum. He died May 20, 1860. He was a man of great industry and talent. Faithful in his pastoral work to a remarkable degree, he gave himself largely to literature. He was for some years editor of the Congregational Magazine, and was a frequent contributor to the Eclectic and to the British Quarterly Review. He published, besides a number of minor writings, the Pastor's Sketch-book (12mo); — Holy Scriptures Verified, the Congregational lecture for 1837 (8vo); — Finis Triumphant (1841, 12mo); — The Great Change, a treatise on conversion (1843, 16mo); — Body and Soul Considered (1847, 8vo); — Life of the Rev. W. J. — Life of the Rev. A. James (1860, 12mo). He was made D.D. by the University of Edinburgh and LL.D. by the University of Glasgow in 1834. — English Congregational Year-Book, 1861.

Redman (Redmayne), John, D.D., an English divine, flourished in the first half of the 16th century. He was a native of Yorkshire, and was probably born in 1499. He was educated at Corpus Christi College, Oxford, and at Paris. He became public teacher at the university, master of King's Hall, first master of Trinity College, archdeacon of Taunton, prebend of Wells and of Westminster, and died in 1551. He was one of the most learned men of his age, according to bishop Burnet, and says that he divided himself between both religions; but on his death-bed he certainly professed to embrace the cardinal doctrines of the Reformers. He published nothing; but after his death appeared, Opus de Justificatione (Antw. 1555, 4to); — Hymnus in qua Precator Justificationem venus fecit Imagine describatur; — The Complaint of Below (1556, 8vo); — Resolutions concerning the Sacrament, etc.

Reece, Richard, a preacher of Methodism in England, who travelled without interruption for a longer period than any other Methodist preacher — no less than fifty-nine years —and thus figured at one time as the oldest living Methodist preacher in the world, was born about the year 1765. In 1823 he visited this country with John Hannah as a delegate of the Wesleyans to the Methodist Episcopal Church; and he spent some time here visiting the societies, from Lynn, Mass., to Winchester, Va., and by his and Hannah's profound interest, attracted the general unity of all Methodists. In 1846 he was obliged to take a supernumerary relation, and he died in 1850. “He was a good, if not a great, preacher,” says Stevens, “and a most amiable man. He is still generally remembered, by both English and American Methodists, for his perfect courtesy and his venerable appearance. His person was tall, his complexion ruddy, his head silvered with age, his voice commanding, his language flowing and pertinent, his piety tranquil, and his wisdom in counsel always reliable. He lived to share in the centenary celebration of Methodism, and by proposing that it should be signalized in England by the contribution of a million dollars for its public charities, excited the suspicion that his usual good judgment had suffered from the effect of age; but the people justified his calculation by giving seventy thousand dollars more, and sending a deputation with an election to the presidency of the Conference.” See Stevens, Hist. of Methodism, ii, 315, 316; iii, 256, 308; West, Sketches of Wesleyan Preachers (N.Y. 1848); Wesleyan Magazine, 1850, p. 652. (J. H. W.)
count we employ the usual Scriptural and scientific authorities on the subject.

1. Usually κανέχ (κανέχ; Sept. καλάμος, καλανσός, καλάμος, πτηνός, ἄγεως, φυσιγ, τριγμήν; Vulg. culmus, culmus, arundo, flanda, statiera), the generic name of a reed of any kind. It occurs in numerous passages of the Old Test., and sometimes denotes the "stalk" of wheat (Gen. xii. 5, 22), or the "branches" of the candlestick (Exod. xxxv and xxxvii); in Job xxxi, 22, κανέχ denotes the bone of the arm between the elbow and the shoulder (as humerus); it was also the name of a measure of length equal to six cubits (Ezek. xii, 8; xl, 5). The word is variously rendered in the A. V. by "stalk," "branch," "bone," "calamus," "reed."

In the New Test. the corresponding Greek word, καλαμος, may signify the "stalk" of plants (Mark xv, 38; Matt. xxvi, 46, that of the hyssop, but this is doubtful), or "a reed" (Matt. xi, 7; xii, 20; Luke vii, 24; Mark xv, 19), or a "measuring-rod" (Rev. vi, 1; xxi, 15, 16), or a "pen" (3 John 13).

Strand (Flor. Palest. p. 28-30) gives the following names of the reed plants of Palestine: Sacccharum officinale, Cyperus papyrus (Papyrus antiquorum), C. ronduae, and C. cocculus, and Arrundo scapitosa; but no doubt the species are numerous. See Bove (Voyage en Palest., Annal. des Science, Nat. 1834, p. 165): "Dans les déserts qui environnent ces montagnes j'ai trouvé plusieurs Sacccharum, Milium arundinaceum et plusieurs Cyperacea." The Arrundo donax, the A. Egyptiacus (7) of Bove (loc. cit., 22), is common on the banks of the Nile, and may perhaps be "the staff of the bruised reed" to which Sennacherib compared the power of Egypt (2 Kings xvii, 21; Ezek. xxix, 6, 7). See also Is. xlii, 3. The thick stem of this reed may have been used as walking-staves by the ancient Orientals; perhaps the measuring-reed was this plant. At present the dry culms of this huge grass are in much demand for fishing-rods, etc. See METHODOLOGY.

Some kind of fragrant reed is occasionally denoted by the word κανέχ (Is. xlii, 24; Ezek. xxvii, 19; Cant. iv, 14), or more fully by κανέχ βιεως (κανέχ βιεως) (see Exod. xxx, 23), or by κανέχ χατ-λόβ (κανέχ χατ-λόβ) (Jer. vi, 20), which the A. V. renders "sweet cane," and "calamus." Whatever may be the substance denoted, it is certain that it was one of foreign importation, "from a far country" (Jer. vi, 20). Some writers (see Sprengel, Com. in Deccor, i, xvii) have sought to identify the κανέχ βιεως with the Acorus calamus, the "sweet sedge," to which the καλάμος of the Psalmists (Is. i, 17), the καλάμος τοῦ ἔθνος of Theophrastus (Hist. Plant. iv, 8, § 4), which, according to this last-named writer and Pliny (H. N. xii, 22), formerly grew about a lake between Lyamus and another mountain of no note," Strabo identifies this with the Lake of Gennesaret (Geop. xvi, p. 735, ed. Kramer). Burchardt was unable to discover any sweet-scented reed or rush near the lake, though he saw many tall reeds there. "High reeds grow along the shore, but I found none of the aromatic reeds and rushes mentioned by Strabo (Geop. xvi, p. 739), but whatever may be the "fragrant reed" intended, it is certain that it did not grow in Syria, otherwise we cannot suppose it should be spoken of as a valuable product from a far country. Dr. Royle refers the καλάμος ἀρωματικός of Dioscorides to a species of Androropogon, which he calls A. eunomus aromatica, a plant of remarkable fragrance, and a native of Central India, where it is used to mix with ointments on account of the delicacy of its odor (see Royle, Illustrations of Himalayan Botany, p. 415, t. 57). It is possible this may be the "reel of fragrance," but it is hardly likely that Dioscorides, who under the term οἰνημος, gives a description of the Androropogon schaenanthus, should speak of a closely allied species under a totally different name. See CANK.

"The beasts of the reeds," in Ps. lxvii, 30, margin, literally from the Hebrew, but rendered in the text of the A. V. "the company of spearmen," probably means the crocodiles. Yet for other interpretations see Rosenmüller ad loc. Gesenius, on Is. xxxvi, 1, understands ἰσθήλες. See Crocodilus.

2. Αροθ (Ἀροθ; Sept. ῥόθος οῦ Χαλαρα Πατήρ) is translated "paper-reed" in Is. xix, 7, the only passage where the plural noun occurs. There is not the slightest authority for this rendering of the A. V., nor is it at all probable, as Celsius (Hierob. ii, 230) has remarked, that the prophet, who speaks of the paper-reed under the name γίννη in the preceding chapter (xviii, 2), should in this one mention the same plant under a totally different name. "Aroth," says Kimchi, is the name to designate pot-herbs and green plants. The Sept. (as above) translates it by "all the green herbage." The word is derived from άρος, "to be bare," or "destitute of trees;" it probably denotes the open grassy land on the banks of the Nile; and seems to be allied to the Arabic arra (lucus opertus, spatiatus). Michaelis (Suppl. No. 1973), Rosenmüller (Schol. in Jes. xix, 7), Gesenius (Theol. a. v.), Maurer (Comment. a. v.), and Simon (197. Heb. a. v.) are all in favor of this, or a similar explanation. Vitringa (Comment. in Isaitum) was of opinion that the Hebrew term denoted the papyrus, and he has published a dissertation on this subject (De αροθ, hoc est de Papyrus Frutice [Lips. 1731, 4to]). See PAPER-REED.

3. In one passage (Jer. lii, 92) οπαί (Ὁπαί; Sept. εἰς-εραγα) Vulg. palus) is rendered "reed" (but elsewhere "pond" or "pool"), and there is thought to designate a stockade or fort enclosed by palisades.

II. Other Hebrew words representing, more or less accurately, various kinds of reedy plants are the following:

1. אָרֹנָה (Arornh), which is mentioned in opposition to the palm-branch (Isa. ix, 13; xix, 15), and is translated "rush" in the A. V., does not rather mean reed. Both were, and are, used for making ropes (Somnini, Trar. ii, 416; Pliny, xix, 9; comp. Job xl, 26). See Gesenius, Kaland, Knobel, and others; also Celsius, Hierobol, i, 465 sq. See Rush.

2. The Hebrew אָרֶך (Ark), originally an Egyptian word (see Jerome, ad Isa. xix, 7; comp. Jablonski,
Opusc. i, 45; ii, 160; Gesen. Theaur. i, 67), occurs in
(Hebr. xi, 2; Job viii, 11; in the first place the A. V.
has meadow, in the second rush.
It seems to mean, not
i, 340 sq.). On the other hand, suppl. τεράς, Exod. ii, 3,
5, growing on the Nile, but distinct from kaneh, may
be the same (Pliny, xiii, 46). See Pla. poëma. NT. Gr. βασιλος, the poppy.Button, pooper-reed (so rendered, according to the old interpreters, by the Sept.; Job loc. cit.; Isa. xxvii, 2; Vulg. Is. xxvii, 2; Syr. Isa. xxvii, xcvv.; Arab. Exod. ii, 3. In the
Talmud this word means rush; comp. Mishna, Erubin, x,
14. The leaves were used for binding wounds), does
not belong to the genus Arundo, and is not a proper
reed (called by Pliny, xxvi, 45, sabin to the reed).
It is the Cyperus pooper of Linnaeus, Class. iii, Monogynia.
This plant, anciently so important, grew abundantly in
the Egyptian swamps (even perhaps in those of the
Nile, Pliny, xiii, 46; comp. v, 8. Hence Ovid, Metaph.
iv, 753; Tit. iii, x, 27, calls this river pooper-reed:
comp. Mart. x, 139), and is mentioned Isa. xxxvi, i; Job viii,
11; Exod. ii, 8; Isa. xxviii, 2. The A. V. has rush in
the first two places, bulrush in the others. It is now
rarely met with in Egypt (according to Minutoli, Abhned. 
Verm. Isakila, Bartolotti, 1801), vol. ii, No. 7, only at Damietta on the coast of Egypt (Pliny, xxvi, 53, says it does
not now grow in Egypt), but in Palestine it is occa-
sionally found at the Jordan (Von Schubert, iii, 259).
It has a three-edged stalk, which below bears hollow,
arrow-formed leaves, covering each other; it grows to
a height of ten feet or more, and has above a flower
cup of reddish leaves, out of which a thick body of
hair-like shoots spring up (comp. Theophr. Plunt. iv,
9). The root is as thick as a man's arm, and is used as
fuel (Dioscor., i, 115); vessels were framed of the stalks
(Exod. ii, 8; Isa. xxviii, 2; Pliny, vi, 24; vii, 57, p. 417; 
Har. Marsh., 182; Latr. Pharm., 186). Be Cittania, 
Monument. Cir. ii, 124; Wilkinson, iii, 185 sq.), which
sailed very fast (Heliod. Athiop. x, 4). Sails, shoes,
ropes, sieves, mattresses, wicks, etc., were made of the
green rint (Pliny, xiii, 22; xxvii, 29; xxviii, 47; Herod.
i, 37; Veget. Veterae, ii, 57; Philo, Op. ii, 492; comp.
Wilkinson, iii, 62, 146), but especially paper, on the
mode of preparing which comp. Pliny, xiii, 53 sq. (see
Kemellini, Monument. Cir. ii, 208 sq.); Becker, Charis-
cides, i, 219 sq.). See phyrna. The plant is now called
bera or ber by the Arabs (so Job viii, 11, in the Ara-
bic). See Papyrus.
III. It will thus be seen that the reeds named in
the Bible may be popularly distinguished as three,
1. The water-reed in pools, marshes, and on the
shores of rivers, as of the Nile (Exod. ii, 3, 5) and of the
Jordan (Isa. xlii, 11; Jer. v, 5). The most common species are Arundo phrygiana and Arundo calamos ourica (comp. Oken, Botany, i, 805)
See Bulrush.
2. The stronger reed, adapted for staves and canes,
and as measuring-sticks (Exek. xi, 8 sq.; Apoc. x, 1,
xxi, 15 sq.; 2 Kings xxi, 21; Isa. xxxvi, 6; Ezek.
xxix, 6; Matt. xxvii, 29; Mishna, Skob. xxvi, 3; Dios.
Laert. Proem. 6), the Arundo demus, whose hard, woody
stem reaches a height of eight feet, and is thicker than a
man's thumb. This, too, is very frequent on the banks
of the Nile (Forsk. Flor. p. 24; comp. Descr. de 
l'Egypt., xix, 74).
3. The writing-reed (Arundo scriptroria) (3 John 13;
see Mishna, Skob. viii, 5). It grows in the marshes
between the Euphrates and Tigrit; at Heilah, in the Per-
soni, the reeds are planted, then dried, and when properly cut and split make tolerable pens.
Formerly the writing-reed grew in Egypt, in Asia
Minor, and even in Italy (Pliny, xvi, 64; Martial, xiv,
36; comp. Beckmann, Gesch. der Erfindungen, ii, 48 sq.;
see on the Hebrew name, Celsius, Hierobol. i, 812 sq.). See Psev.
See, in general, Prop. Alpin (Plant. Aegypt., c. 36, 
p. 58) and Vealing (p. 197) upon it: Rottbll, Desc.
Narc. Plant. (Haft. 1773) i, 82 sq.; Celsius, Hierobol.
ii, 137 sq.; Bodei a Stapel, Com. 428 sq.; Bruce,
Travels, v, 15 sq.; 279, with plate i; Montfaucon, in the
Memorie de l'Acad. des Inscrip. vi, 592 sq.; Oken, Bot-
any, i, 819 sq.
Reed, Alexander, a Baptist missionary, was born in
Chesterfield, Mass., in 1807. He pursued his studies at
the Hamilton Literary and Theological Institution (now 
Madison University), N. Y., and was appointed Aug. 3, 
1835, as a missionary by the American Baptist Mission-
ary Union to labor among the Chinese living in Bang-
kok, Siamese.possessing a knowledge of the language,
he took a floating-house on the Meinann, two miles
above Bangkok, and began his evangelical lab-
ors among the Chinese. While thus occupied, he was
stricken down by disease, and died Aug. 29, 1837. 
(J. G. S.)
Reed, Alexander, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was
born at Washington, Pa., Sept. 26, 1802. He was the
son of the Hon. Robert R. Reed, a child of the con-
venient dedicated to God in baptism, and early instructed
both by precept and example in the ways of religion.
His preparatory education was received in the English
department of Washington College, and he graduated at 
that institution in 1823. He went to Georgia and engaged in
teaching, and while there joined the Church on a profession of religion under the 
ministry of the Rev. Dr. Baker, an esteemed evangelist.
In 1835 he entered the Western Theological Seminary
at Pittsburgh, Pa., and was graduated in 1856. The fol-
lowing year he was ordained and installed pastor of the
Presbyterian Church of Octorara, Pa. Here his labors
were greatly blessed, and the bonds of affection between
him and his people greatly strengthened, until the
year 1844, when they were dissolved to enable him to
accept the pastoral charge of the church in Philadelphia.
This call removed him to a wider sphere, and
brought him to a more responsible position in a great city
at one of the most critical periods of our national
history. His sympathetic nature, ready and effective
oratory, very soon attracted attention, and other duties
than those merely of the pastorate were soon laid upon
him. He was active and influential in the organization of
the "Christian Commission," the spirit and object of
which appealed to his sympathies and patriotic impulses,
and some of his most stirring and powerful addresses were
made in behalf of this great interest. He was not only alive to all the duties connected with his pastorate, but to all the general social and moral interests of the community. He gave to all the boards of the Church his zealous and faithful support, and at one time his personal attention was the object of the Board of Minis-
terial Relief and also the Board of Publication. In the year 1873 Dr. Reed was called to the Westmin-
ster Presbyterian Church, Brooklyn, N. Y., and in ac-
ccepting this call he threw himself with all his accus-
tioned ardor into the labors of his new field. Toward
the end of two years he was obliged, from declining health,
to resign his charge. With the hope of regaining his
health, he spent a year and a half in Europe, but he re-
turned without any perceptible change for the better.
Thinking that the dry and bracing air of Colorado might
prove beneficial, he accepted the pastorate of the church in
Denver City. Though in feeble health, he labored among
those people, and greatly endeared himself to them by
his affectionate nature and eminent pulpit ability.
But his work was evidently done, and he was
called to his reward. The church was in distress, then dried
off, and when properly cut and split make tolerable pens.
Formerly the writing-reed grew in Egypt, in Asia
Minor, and even in Italy (Pliny, xvi, 64; Martial, xiv,
36; comp. Beckmann, Gesch. der Erfindungen, ii, 48 sq.; see on the Hebrew name, Celsius, Hierobol. i, 812 sq.).
prayer. He devoted himself wholly to the work of the ministry because he loved it. All his faculties were already at hand for the best part of his life, so he was engaged. By his strong power of will he seemed to hold the forces which were moving upon life's citadel in check until his brother, Dr. T. B. Reed, who was on his way to visit him in his distant home, might reach him. When he arrived, and he had committed to him the charge of his beloved wife and children, in perfect peace he laid himself down to die. He died at Denver, Colo., Nov. 18, 1878. (W. P. S.)

Reed, Andrew, D.D., an English Independent divine, noted as one of the greatest philanthropists of our time. He, according to his father, a pious man, was a watchmaker in Butcher Row, St. Clement's Danes. Many a time, it is said, Andrew's mother would keep the shop while his father was off on a preaching tour; for he was much given to itinerating in the suburban towns, proclaiming among the benighted "the truth as it is in Jesus," and so interested became he in this glorious work that Mrs. Reed found it needful to provide for the family herself by opening a chinshop, which she kept for twenty years in Chiswell Street. Young Andrew was brought up in the trade of his father, and at eighteen a year, after five years' leave as a watchmaker to go on the same errand as his father. He sent to a school in Islington to get such an education as was needful for an ordinary artisan. Andrew evinced a prelection not only for all study, but especially for the study of Greek and Hebrew. The careful mother, anxious to prevent her son's detention—for she hoped from him support in the business his father had so much neglected—took him finally from school and apprenticed him to a master. The temptation of books was a very harmless one compared with the temptations of another kind that awaited Andrew in his new situation. His master's son was a wild youth, and the young apprentice entered on his diary the following: "By the wicked behavior of my master's son I was made still worse. I went twice or thrice to the secured play-houses." On this account he got his indentures cancelled and returned to the parental roof. Working the usual hours at watchmaking, in his leisure he kept his mother's books, instructed his sister, and taught a little orphan girl, their servant, to read and write—thus early beginning his orphan work. Books and every more books were the choice friends of his leisure hours; and though he worked well at his trade, his good mother in her diary might well write down, "These are things which, if the last be for business, show too much taste for study." She sent him to the same school to study Greek and Hebrew, and sacred to secular pursuits. Andrew Reed's Hebrew and Greek studies led him to theology, and his joy knew no bounds when it was decided in the family counsel that he might go to college. He dismantled his little workshop, sold his tools, and laid out the money in books. He entered Hackney Seminary, a collegiate and theological school of the Independents. It is needless to say that when he was ready to graduate his record was already begun as a preacher. He had many invitations to settle. Among other calls was that of colleague to the celebrated preacher, Matthew Wilks (q. v.), at the Tabernacle. But Reed gave the preference to the church in the New Road, East London, where he remained the pastor for half a century. He resigned the place on Nov. 27, 1861, the anniversary of his birth and of his ordination. He died Feb. 25, 1862, happy to the last and conscious of his Master's love. Rarely, if ever, was such a record closed as this event ended. More than most men—even Christian ministers—Dr. Reed seems to have lived in the presence of some great public purpose, and to have consecrated, or rather sacrificed, all things to its accomplishment. Thus we read in the Memoir published by his sons (Lond. 1863) that at times he was so engrossed that he would not dine with his family for a week. "In the last four years," he writes in his diary, "I have been four hundred times to Earlswood [asylum for idiots]; each time has consumed the best part of the day, so that it has cost me a whole year." Indeed, nothing less than a consecration like this could have accomplished Dr. Reed's work. He must, moreover, have combined the physical strength of a giant with the powerful will of the Christianauthoress. He was one of the most successful and popular preachers of his day—the laudatory pastor of one of the largest churches in the metropolis; and yet he found time to originate not only the Hackney Grammar-school, but five great national benevolent institutions—viz. the London Orphan Asylum, the Infant Orphan Asylum, the Orphan Asylum for the Industrious, the Orphan Asylum for Fatherless Children at Reatham, the Idiot Asylum at Earlswood, with its branch establishment at Colchester, and the Hospital for Incurables. The aggregate cost of their erection was £129,520; they accommodate 2110 objects of charity; and their total receipts under his administration amounted to the respectable sum of £1,043,566 13s. 1d. Emphatically was his a life, with deeds to crown it." Andrew Reed began his work among the seafaring population of London. He befriended the parents, established schools for the children, and formed societies for the poor. Besides these stupendous works of faith and labors of love, he founded a Home for Incurables; and, not forgetting the interests of education while employed in helping the helpless, he was the friend of the Hackney Grammar-school and endowed schools for Sabbath and day schools for the children of the industrial classes. He not only refused all remuneration for his great services, but contributed, besides, a large part of his yearly income in charity. The five asylums that he founded alone received from his hand £4,540. When he opened a chapel he was ready with his £10, £20, and even £50, to encourage its friends to discharge a debt incurred in its erection. He lived in the most simple way, that he might have the more to give to him that needed. His remarkable success in his vast and varied enterprises he owed to his extraordinary business powers, his great sagacity, and his determined will. Few men saw more clearly what was to be done, or knew better how to do it. One record strikingly exhibits the stern kind of discipline that he was wont to exercise upon himself, and the resolute determination with which he carried out his work: "The measure of mercy is the measure of obligation. Of the course I should take at present I see nothing. All is dark, very dark. Work which I had thought to do is now abandoned; now one thing is left. I am too old for it. For discipline I will do it. I have naturally a love for the beneficent labors of the Church; but I am too old for it. I am firm and deformed. The thing I would not do is the thing I am now resolved to do. Alas! poor idiot! while he is the greater sufferer, I am the greater sinner." His benevolence was both a natural enthusiasm and a sacred religious duty, and whatever his warm heart prompted, his clear head conceived and his strong hand executed. A keen discriminator of character, he knew how to bend the wills of others to his purpose. As a speaker, he was endowed with very great power of eloquence. After the fashion of his generation, he was somewhat rhetorical and magniloquent, but there was a mighty power of passion in him. His Sermons and Charges, recently published, contain specimens of a very high order of pulpit eloquence; and few sermons of modern times have produced a greater effect than his missionary sermon at Surrey Chapel. His power in the pulpit was attested by his own crowded chapel, and by the large numbers whom he admitted to his Church fellowship. He was a polemic of no mean power—"a sharp thrashing-instrumamt having teeth;" and perhaps even Russell never went so far as to make a storm of rhetoric than at the British and Foreign School meeting in Exeter Hall, when Dr. Reed claimed him as a leader in opposition to Sir J. Graham's Factory Bill. Dr. Reed's power of work was immense; his recreation
was change of benevolent employment, either the energetically prosecutes of some philanthropic scheme or a campaign of provincial preaching. Amid all his literary and other labors, he did not think of writing his life. One of his sons, perceiving that his venerable father was fast failing, asked him if he ever had arranged any memoir. Dr. Reed replied by writing the following note:

"To my many boy who said he would write my life, and asked for what title:

A. R.

I WAS BORN YESTERDAY;

I SHALL DIE TO-MORROW,

AND I MUST NOT FUND TO DAY

IN TELLING WHAT I HAVE DONE,

BUT IN DOING WHAT I MAY FOR

HIM

WHO HAD NO NAME FOR ME.

I SPRANG FROM THE PEOPLE; I HAVE LIVED FOR THE PEOPLE—

THE MOST FOR THE MOST HAPPY;

AND THE PEOPLE, WHEN THEY KNOW IT, WILL NOT ALLOW ME TO DIE OUT OF LOVING REMEMBERANCE."

What can be added to such a summary? "It is not surprising that the sons of Dr. Andrew Reed should wish to publish the history of his life of goodness and active benevolence—though, in fact, the permanent records of his character and works exist in the many institutions which owe their existence to his activity and devotion."

These are the words of the queen of England in referring to him who was the honored instrument of doing such a vast amount of good that his name undoubtedly ranks among the first philanthropists of the age. Dr. Reed wrote many works in practical theology, principally on practical religion—all of which have a wide and extensive circulation, and of which a list is given in Allibone. Dr. Reed is the author of many hymns among which is the one beginning "There is an hour when I must part." In 1833 he visited this country as a representative of the Congregational Union of Britain, and made many friends here. On his return home, he wrote on his Visit to the American Churches, and the work was republished here (N. Y. 1835, and often). See, besides, the Memoir (Lond. 1863, small 8vo; 3d ed. 1867); London Reader, 1863, ii, 724; London Patriotic, Dec. 17, 1863; Eclectic and Congregational Rev. Jan. 1864; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth., s. c.; Grant, Metropolitan Pulpit, 1843, ii, 265-274; Men of the Times (1862), p. 618.

Reed, Caleb, an American divine, who belonged to the New Jerusalem Church, was born in 1797. He entered the ministry, but was finally made editor of the New Jerusalem Magazine, and continued its management. He died in 1854. His publications were of a secular character.

Reed, Fitch, D.D., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, whose memory is precious in all the communities where he has resided, was born March 28, 1753. His early Christian training was under Calvinistic influences, but, in his nineteenth year, while studying medicine, he was converted under the labors of the Rev. Marvin Richardson, and accepted Armenian doctrines as preferable. In 1815 he was licensed to preach, and was employed upon a circuit by Dr. Nathan Bangs, then presiding elder. In 1817 he was admitted into the New York Conference, and was sent to the extreme eastern point of Long Island. His second appointment was Dunham Circuit, in Canada East, which offered him all the hardships which the severity of a northern winter, a new country, unimproved and sometimes almost inaccessible, a poor people, and ill-constructed log-huts could afford. Of this he himself told, as follows, in a semi-centennial sermon: "I did at first wonder that my lot had fallen just here, and thought that possibly, after all, the bishop had made a mistake; yet the harsh climate, the hard work, and plenty of it, and harder fare were just what my infinite Wisdom saw needed. I praise the Lord to this day for Dunham Circuit, it saved me from an early grave." His next field of labor was in the wilderness lying north of Lake Ontario. To this region he was sent as the first minister of the Gospel, within about twelve months after the first settlement had been made. He established his appointments, organized his circuits, and went about as a circuit rider, carrying the message through the trackless forest by the aid of a compass, and, when twenty-eight years of age, was appointed presiding elder of Susquehanna District. After eight years he was again transferred to New York Conference and stationed at Rhinebeck, and subsequently in New York city, Brooklyn, Poughkeepsie, and other important fields of labor, including New Haven District. In 1848 he was transferred to Oueida Conference, to which he gave fourteen years of effective service, including seven years in the office of presiding elder. In the year 1852 he was compelled by increasing bodily infirmities to retire to the superannuated relation, and thereafter, though his love for the work never abated, he preached only as health and opportunity would permit. He died Oct. 10, 1871, leaving behind the record of a life well spent in the service of his heavenly Master. See Christian Advocate, Dec. 9, 1871.

Reed, John (1), D.D., an American Unitarian divine, was born in Framingham, Mass., Nov. 11, 1721, and was educated at Yale College, class of 1722. He studied for the ministry, and became pastor at Bridgewater, Mass., in 1780. He finally took interest in political affairs, and was a member of Congress from 1784 to 1789. He died Feb. 17, 1831. He published various sermons and theological treatises of passing value. See Sprague, Annales of the Amer. Pulpit, viii, 143.

Reed, John (2), D.D., a clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born at Wickford, R. I., about 1777. He had his thoughts early turned towards the New Jerusalem Church, and went to Union College with a view to greater efficiency in the sacred work. On May 27, 1806, he was made a deacon, and on June 17, 1808, priest. His first pastorate was at St. Luke's Church, Catskill, N. Y. In 1810 he became rector at Christ Church, Poughkeepsie, and there preached for thirty-three years, in his last five of which he was having the aid of an assistant. He died July 6, 1845. A tablet, erected in the church by the vestry, records the high respect and veneration in which he was held by his parish. He was a careful observer, a diligent student, a man of God, and an acceptable preacher. In a whole devoted life Dr. John Brown, of Newburgh, N. Y., at the funeral service, "showed that his [Reed's] best treasure was in heaven." He published a small work in defence of episcopacy, and two or three separate Sermons. See Sprague, Annales of the Amer. Pulpit, v, 505-508; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s. c. (J. H. W.)

Reed, Joseph, a Roman Catholic priest, was born at Waterbury, Conn., about 1845. In 1869 he was ordained at Troy, N. Y., and, after supplying a mission at Birmingham, Conn., and serving as a curate at the cathedral in Providence, R. I., was appointed secretary and chancellor of the diocese of Hartford, Conn. He died in 1877.

Reed, Nelson, a pioneer minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Ann Arundel County, Md., Nov. 27, 1751. Nothing positive is known of his early history. In 1779 his name appears on the minutes of a missionary preacher, as he was called at that time, and thus preached for four years. His appointments were, in 1779 to Fiuavana; in 1780, Amelia; in 1781, Calvert; in 1782, Little York; in 1783, Caroline; in 1784, Dover. From 1786 to 1756 he had the charge of districts in Maryland and Virginia. In 1796 he was stationed at Foll's Point, in Foll's Point district; in 1799, on Baltimore Circuit. In
1800 his name is found among those "who are under a location through illness of body or family concerns," and it disappears now from the minutes until 1803, when we find him again on the Baltimore Circuit. The next year he was placed in charge of the Federal and Annapolis Circuit. In 1807, 1808, 1809, and 1810 he presided over the Baltimore District, which included the time some of the strong men of the itinerancy. In 1811, 1812, 1813, and 1814 he presided over the Georgetown District. In 1815 we find him on the Baltimore District again, where he presided four years. In 1819 he stands connected with the Baltimore Circuit as a supernumerary. In 1820 his name appears on the superannuated list; in this relation he continued till the close of his life. At the time of his death, which occurred Oct. 20, 1840, he was the oldest Methodist preacher in Europe or America. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1840; Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, vii, 68-70.

Reed, Sampson, a Swedishbordian of note as a writer especially, was born at West Bridgewater, Mass., in 1800, and was educated at Harvard College, class of 1818. He became editor of the New Church Magazine and co-editor of the New Jerusalem Magazine, and died in 1875. He published Observations.

Reed, Samuel, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Union County, N.C., Nov. 18, 1816. He entered the ministry in 1838, and was sent to the Peru Circuit as a supply. He was admitted into the Conference, and travelled Auburn Mission in 1839-40. Frankfurt in 1841-42, Vincennes in 1843, Evansville in 1844, Bedford in 1845, North Indiana Conference, Covington in 1846-47. This fall he went to St. Louis and remained one year, returned with impaired health, and was superannuated for five years following. He was again made effective and appointed to New Harmony in 1853, to Petersburg in 1854, to New Albany in 1855, and to Bedford in 1856, where he remained to the close of that conference year, when he was superannuated a second time. He declined in health, but lingered on until Feb. 6, 1869. Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1869, p. 187, 188.

Reel'lah ('Heb. Reel'lah, נֶלֶךְ, τρέχων; fr. Sep. Piel'lah), one of the "children of the province" who returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Ezra ii, 6; Neh. vii, 7) by the synonym Raamiah (q.v.).

Reil'hu (Pielox v.r. Bapolox), one of the Israelites who returned with Zerubbabel from Babylon (1 Esdr. v, 8); inserted in place of the B'elai of the Hebrew lists (Ezra ii, 2; Neh. vii, 7) by confusion for the Reel'lah of Ezra's list.

Rees, Abraham, D.D., a dissenting minister who held a distinguished rank in the literary and scientific world, was the son of a Welch Nonconformist minister, and was born at Montgomery in 1743. Intended for the ministry, he was first placed under Dr. Jenkins, of Carrmarthen, whom he removed to the Hoxton Academy, founded by Mr. Coward, where his progress in his studies was so rapid that in his second year he was appointed mathematical tutor to the institution, and soon after resident tutor, in which capacity he continued upwards of twenty-two years. In 1768 he succeeded Mr. Read as pastor to the Presbyterian congregation of St. Thomas's, Southwark. On the death of Mr. White, in 1768, Rees accepted an invitation to become minister of a congregation in Jewin Street, Cripplegate, where he continued to officiate till the time of his death, June 9, 1825. On the establishment of the dissenting seminary at Hackney in 1786, Dr. Rees, who had, in conjunction with Drs. Savage and Kippis, secured from that at Hoxton two years before, was elected to the situation of resident tutor in the natural sciences. This position he held till the dissolution of the academy, which took place on the death of Dr. Kippis (q.v.). It is, however, in a literary capacity that Dr. Rees is principally and most advantageously known. In 1768 he was applied to by the proprietors of Chamber's Encyclopaedia to superintend a new and enlarged edition of that valuable compilation, which, after nine years' incessant labor, he brought to a conclusion in four folio volumes. The success of this work stimulated the proprietors to still further exertions. A new undertaking, similar in its nature, but much more comprehensive in its plan, and printed in quarto size, was projected and carried on by him; and he had at length the satisfaction to see the new Cyclopaedia now generally known by his name, advance from the publication of the first volume in 1802 to its completion in forty-five volumes with undiminished reputation. His other works, besides those of a secular character, are, Practical Sermons (1809-12, 2 vols.); The Principles of the Protestant Disestablished and Deistsicated—besides a variety of occasional discourses. See Jones, Christian Biography, p. 357; Annual Biography, 1825; London Gentleman's Magazine, 1825.

Reese, E. Yates, D.D., a minister of the Methodist Protestant Church, but especially noted as a writer, was born about the year 1820. He early entered the ministry, and, after filling many positions of prominence in the pastorate, became editor of the Methodist Protestant newspaper at Baltimore, and was in this position till 1849, in a fit of mental and physical languishment, he committed suicide. The Lutheran of Philadelphia thus commented at the time: "Dr. Reese was one of the noisiest and most genial of men. His paper was among the very best of the denominational organs in our country; and so much more than a denominational organ, immeasurably more than a sectarian one. He drew around him many amiable writers, not only of his own Church, but of other churches, but no pen among them all was so versatile, so happy, as his own. He was a poet and an orator, who consecrated every gift to the service of the Saviour of men. His consecration had a wonderful charm. His delicacy of feeling, his fine tact, his generosity and large catholicity of feeling, made him very dear to all that knew him." Such testimony from another denomination is surely rare; and is reprinted within the walls of the Messenger of the German Reformed Church, and thus given still further approval than the bounds of one outside denomination.

Reese, Levi R., a minister of the Methodist Protestant Church, was born in Harford County, Md., Feb. 6, 1806, enjoyed a general preparatory education, and was sent to school for a while after he was seventeen. When about twenty years of age he joined the Methodist Episcopal Church, but shortly after the agitation opened which resulted in the formation of the Methodist Protestant Church, he was, it is said, the first preacher appointed by the new body. The first three years of his ministerial life were spent at Philadelphia and New York. In 1833 he was appointed by the Maryland Annual Conference to labor in Alexandria, Va., and there succeeded so well that he was successively given "every important position in the church, and the official position of the body with which he was connected." He was for two years president of the church, and repeatedly a candidate for the vice-presidency. In 1837 and 1838 he was chaplain to the United States Congress. He died in Philadelphia Sept. 21, 1865. He was highly esteemed as a man and a preacher, and the whole church is made up all through Maryland. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, vii, 751-754.

Reese, Thomas, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born in 1742, was educated at the College of New Jersey, class of 1768, and became the pastor of the Presbyterian Church at Salem, S. C., and subsequently

---
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**Reeve, Thomas, D.D.** An Anglican divine of the 17th century, flourished as a preacher of Waltham Abbey. He was appointed Bishop of Salisbury (1682, 4to) and was active in the persecution of the nonconformists. He published *Sermons* (1647, 4to) and *Public Devotions* (1651, 12mo) and *The God's Plea for Nincher, or London's Preserver for Mercy,* delivered in certain sermons, etc. (1651, fol.).

**Reeves, William** (1668-1647), a man of more than ordinary learning, was born in 1668, and was educated at King's College, Cambridge, of which he was made a fellow. He took holy orders, and was in 1692 chaplain to the rector of Cranford, Middlesex, and in 1711 vicar of St. Mary, Reading. He died in 1692. He published, *Sermons* (1704, 4to) and *The Apologies of Justin Martyr, Tertullian, and Minucius Felix in Defence of the Christian Religion,* with the *Commemoration of Vincentius Lirinensis concerning the Primitive Rule of Faith* (transl. and a preliminary discourse upon each author, Lond. 1709-10, 2 vols. 8vo), in which he answered the value of work upon the same subject (Orme). See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth.*

**Refectory,** the dining-hall of a monastery, college, etc. The internal arrangements and fittings were very similar to those of the ordinary domestic halls, except that it was usually provided with a raised desk or pulpit, from which on some occasions one of the inmates of the establishment read to the others during meal-time. There are remains of old English refectories at Chester and Worcester now used as a schoolhouse, at Cambridge and Durham as a library, and at Beaulieu as a church. Portions of the beautiful arcaded walls of one remain at Peterborough. It was usually, as at Lanercost and Rievaulx, raised upon cellarium, which at Cluny contained the bath-rooms; and in Benedictine friars' and regular canons' houses it lay parallel to the minster, in order that the noise and fumes of dinner might not reach the sanctuary; but in most Cistercian houses, as Beaulieu, Bland, Ford, Netley, Tintern, Rievaulx, Furness, and Kirkham, Maulbronn, Clairvaux, Baisieux, Savigny, and Benso, it stood at right angles to the cloister, as it did in the Dominican convents of Toulouse and Paris. A few foreign monastic refectories were of two aisles, as Tours, Alcobaca, the Benedictines', and St. Martin des Champs at Paris. At St. Alban's an abbey, on his resignation, went to reside in a chancel which he had fitted up as a refectory. The usual dinner-hour was three P.M. The small bell rang and the monks came out from the parlor and washed at the lavatory, and then entered the hall, two and two, taking their appointed places at the side-tables. At the high-table on the dais the superior sat, in the centre of the large dinner table, over a cross, a pillar, or the boone, or the Last Supper, having the squilla-ball on his right hand, which he ran at the beginning and end of dinner. Usually the number of each mess varied between three and ten persons. Each monk drew down his cowl and ate in silence. While the bedchambers or servers of the week laid the dais, the reader of the week began the lection from Holy Writ or the lives of saints in the wall pulpit. During dinner all the gates were closed, and no visitors were admitted. After dinner the broken fragments were sent down to the almsery for the poor and sick, and the brethren either took the meridian sleep, talked in the calefactorium, read, or walked, but in some houses remained in procession in the cloister, divided into several small groups, and prayed a while bareheaded among the graves of the brotherhood. At Durham the frater-house was used only on great occasions. It was fitted with benches and mats. The ordinary fare was pulse, fruit, vegetables, bread, eggs, cheese, wine, or ale; and the evening meal, the sestinal, consisted of bread and wine, and was followed by prayer in church before bedtime. The dinner-hour at length became put back to noon, and the supper was continued at the old time, about five P. M. At the entrance of the hall there was a large ambo for the mazers, cups, and plate. The Chaucerian distributed the unseemly hosts in hall. The Last Supper of Leonardo da Vinci, painted for the Dominicans of Milan, represents the high table of a refectory of the order. French or Latin only were allowed to be spoken in hall at canoe, and in 1347 meat was not served on Wednesdays and Saturdays during Advent, or from Septem- gisima to Easter-day. The hall of a guest-house was lined with beds at Cluny and Farfa, for men on one side and for women on the other, while movable tables down the centre were laid out at meat-time.

**Refine,** the art of refining, as referred to in Scripture, was of two different kinds, according as it was applied to liquids or to metals; and the processes, in themselves quite diverse, are expressed by different words. In respect to liquids the primary idea was that of *strain*nsg or filtering — the primary discourse was *F?F?* (Isa. xxv, 6); but in respect to metals it was that of *melting,* and thereby separating the ore from the metal. And for this the word was *?W? , tur?rph.* But the first word also in the course of time came to be used of gold or other metals, to denote their refined or pure state (1 Chr. xxviii, 18; xxix, 4; Job xxviii, 1; Ps. xii, 6; Mal. iii. 3). In figurative allusions, however, to the idea of refining, while both words might have been employed, we find almost exclusive use made of that which points to the more searching process of purification by fire (Isa. i, 25; xi, 19; xlviii, 10; Zech. xiii, 9; Mal. iii. 2, 3). Hence the term "refiner" or smelter (*?W? , *?W? , *?W? , metorrph,* Mal. iii. 2, 3) denotes a worker in metals, specially of gold and silver (Prov. xxx, 4), a founder (Judg. xvii, 4), a goldsmith (Isa. xii, 7). That the ancients acquired, in comparatively remote times, some knowledge and skill in this art, as in the working of metals generally, admits of no doubt. See METAL. The Egyptians carried the working of metals to an extraordinary degree of perfection, as their various articles of jewelry preserved in museums evince; and there is no doubt that the Hebrews derived their knowledge of these arts from this source—though there is evidence that the art of working in copper and iron was known before the flood (Gen. iv, 22). The Egyptian monuments also give various representations on the subject, and in particular exhibit older persons blowing at the furnace, while others of metal on it, in order to raise it to a melting heat. See HELLOWS. The creation of a heat sufficiently intense for the purpose was the chief element in the process of refining, although, probably, borax and other substances were applied to facilitate and perfect the results. The refiner's art was especially essential to the working of the precious metals. It consisted in the separation of the dross from the pure ore, which was effected by reducing the metal to a fluid state by the application of heat, and by the aid of solvents, such as alkali ("A. V. "purely," Isa. iii, 25) or lead (Jer. vi, 29), which, amalgamating with the dross, permitted the extraction
of the unsulphurated metal. The Hebrews evidently understood the process of melting the metals, not only to make them fluid for the purpose of casting, but also for separating from them the impurities present in them or adhering to them. The metal, being dipped in water, would form a silver lead ore with which it was combined (Ezek. xxxii, 18-22; xxxiv, 11). The instruments required by the refiner were a crucible of furnace (ם"א) and a bellows or blowpipe (ל"ת). The workman sat at his work (Mal. iii, 3; "He shall sit as a refiner"); he was thus better enabled to watch the process, and keep the metal run off at the proper moment. See MINT. The notices of refining are chiefly of a figurative character, and describe moral purification as the result of chastisement (Isa. i, 25; Zech. xii, 9; Mal. iii, 2, 3). The failure of the means to effect the result is graphically depicted in Jer. vi, 29: "The bellows blow with the fire (become quite hot from exposure to the heat); the lead (used as a solvent) is expended (ץ"כ ל"ת [khet]); the refiner melts in vain, for the refuse will not be separated." The refiner appears, from the passage whence this is quoted, to have combined with his proper business of assaying metals: "I have set thee for an assayer" (ת"ד י. "a tower," ver. 27). See FISSION.

Reformation LEGEM ECCLESIASTICÆREM, a code of Church law, first projected by Cranmer at the commencement of his primacy, and accomplished, after various interruptions and collision (1551), by a body consisting of bishops, divines, canonists, and secular doctors of the law. It was ready to be submitted to King Edward, but his sudden death prevented the royal confirmation, and so the project came to an end. The work, consequently, is neither solid nor of any authority; but it is of valuable record, as throwing a clear light on the views of the Reformers. It not only reveals their plans with respect to canonical jurisprudence, but their opinions on Christian doctrine.

Reformation, this is the name commonly given to the religious and ecclesiastical movement of the 16th century which resulted in the overthrow of the then all-powerful authority of the Roman popes in a large portion of the Christian world, and in the construction of a number of new religious organizations. The name itself is highly significant, and points to the importance of the new departure in the history of Christianity which then began. It has come into quite general use even among Roman Catholic writers, although the theologians of that Church have attempted to substitute for it other terms, like the "so-called Reformation," and the "separation of the Church." We have already had occasion in numerous articles of this Cyclopædia to refer to detached portions of the Reformation. The Church history of no important country of Europe could be complete without a mention of its reformatory movements, whether they were successful or unsuccessful, and the great names of the greatest fathers of the Reformation consist chiefly of an account of their labors in behalf of the reconstruction of the Church upon a new basis. The present article treats of the great turning-point in the history of Christianity as a whole.

1. Forerunners of the Reformation. Like most of the great events of mankind, the Reformation has had its preparatory history, in which attempts of a similar nature were made for the same purpose, meeting with no or but partial success, but yet smoothing the way for the marvelous changes which were achieved by the victorious reformation of the 16th century. All the Reformed churches which have sprung from the movements of the 16th century are agreed in regarding the undue power which the bishops of Rome at an early time began to arrogate to themselves, and the centralization of which the consequence was forced upon the Christian Church, as of the main deviations from the doctrines of the Bible and the practice and the life of the apostolic age. In a wider sense of the word, all the efforts, therefore, which have been made to repress and abolish the arrogant and encroaching power of the Roman popes, and to bring back the Church to its purity in the time of her founder and his first disciples, might be called preparatory and forerunning movements of the great Reformation. These movements have been manifold and widely different in their origin, progress, and ramifications, and each of them has to be individually judged by its own character and history. Indeed, throughout the Middle Ages, even when the power of the papacy was most despotic and absolute, a reformatory tendency was pervading the Church, often confining itself to secrecy and occult labors, but frequently bursting the bonds of the Church, proclaiming its reformatory principles in public and defying the rule of man and hierarchy. Some of these outbreaks ran smoothly on in the channels of a purely evangelical belief; others became impregnated with fanatical, sometimes even anti-Christian, elements, and threatened with a common overthrow both the State and the Church. Among the more prominent reformatory movements in the earlier part of the Middle Ages were those of the Albigenses, the Cathari, and the Waldenses, to all of which (and many others) this Cyclopædia devotes special articles.

In the latter part of the Middle Ages, the deviation of the ruling Church from Scripture and primitive Christianity became more and more glaring, and the corruption among all classes of the clergy, from the highest to the lowest, more and more general. The call for a "reform in the head and members" spread rapidly, and even great nations began to look upon the reformation of the Church as a national cause. It has been justly remarked that the meaning given to the term "reformation in the head and members" was by no means uniform, and that "every one understood it to mean primarily that he was most desired—the removal of what seemed to him most oppressive and unchristian." All malcontents, however, appeared to agree in regarding the administration of the Christian Church by the papal court as utterly depraved, and as subservient of true Christianity.

The efforts made for putting an end to papal misrule and achieving a reformation of the Church were chiefly of two kinds. The one class found the seat of the degeneration not so much in a departure from the doctrine of the papacy, but in the disregard of the popes of greater power than belonged to them by divine and Church right. These men strongly believed in the continuity of the visible Church; they rejected the right of separation and accension, and looked upon the ecumenical councils of the Church as the only medium through which the needs of the Church should be adjusted and acted upon. This school had for a long time a centre in the most famous literary institution of the Church—the University of Paris. Its chief representatives were Peter d'Ailly, the chancellor, his pupil Gerson, and Nicolas de Clichy, rector of that university. The hearty support of many of the foremost princes of the age, including several emperors, was secured, and at the three great councils of Pisa, Constance, and Basle the majority of the assembled bishops and theologians expressed their concurrence in these views, and earnestly endeavored to effect a radical reformation on this basis. The joyous hopes which had been raised in the Church by these reformatory efforts were, however, sorely disappointed when the pope succeeded in dissolving the Council of Basle.

Much more thorough than this class of reformers were a second, which not only turned against papal innovations in the government of the Church, but also by a study of the Scriptures were led to look upon the entire doctrinal system of the Church, as it had gradually developed under the misguidance of the popes, as an apostacy from the Christianity of the Bible. The Church believed that her reformation in its head and members, the Church needed a reformation in its spirit and doctrines. The foremost representatives of this
school were Wycliffe in England, and Huss in Bohemia. To Wycliffe the papacy appeared as anti-Christianity, and the papal power, in his opinion, was not derived from God, but from the emperor. He rejected altogether the existing hierarchical constitution of the Church, and advocated the substitution for it of the presbyterian constitution. He believed it to be in existence in the apostolic age. To the traditions of the Church he absolutely denied an authoritative character, and declared the whole Scripture to be the only source and rule of religious knowledge. Huss derived his views of Church reform largely from Wycliffe, and in 1410 was excommunicated from the Church as a Wycliffite. One of the central doctrines of the reformation of the 16th century rose, however, in his system to greater prominence, and he also resembled his great followers more than Wycliffe by arousing the masses of the people in behalf of reform. Neither Wycliffe nor Huss succeeded in carrying through a reformation. When the English government, which had protected Wycliffe during his lifetime from personal injury, began a bloody persecution against his followers, most of whom were found in the humble walks of life, the more reformatory movement in England came to a sudden standstill. The reformatory ideas of Huss appeared for a time to gain complete control of an entire country, and thus to establish a stronghold of evangelical Christianity in the centre of Europe. But internal dissensions and the appearance of Hussism in the German empire in 1434 the prospects of the Hussite movement, which dwindled down into a small sect called the Bohemian and Moravian Brethren. Numerically too weak to exercise a missionaries influence upon the remainder of Christian Europe, this religious denomination will yet always be counted among the ripest and most delicious fruits of the reformatory tendencies of the Middle Ages.

Nothing shows better the vast difference between the two classes of reformers who have been characterized in the above lines than the fact that Loomon, the most gifted representative of the first named, was the leading spirit at the Council of Constance which sentenced Huss to be burned at the stake. Besides these two broad currents of reformatory movements which are visible in the Church history of the latter part of the Middle Ages, there were a large number of theological writers who bravely contended for bringing the corrupt Church of their times back to the purity of Jewish Christianity, and who more or less discussed all the great reformatory questions which agitated the world in the 16th century. Among the most celebrated of these reformers were John Carthusian, a monk of Mechin, John Wessel (Gansfort), called by his friends Ludi Mondi, and John (Ruenrath) of Wesel. Though many of these writers made undisguised assaults upon the received doctrines of the Church, their views, if not directly addressed to the people, were frequently tolerated as learned opinions of the school. One of the most gifted reformatory preachers of the Middle Ages appeared towards the close of the 15th century in Italy. With a rare eloquence and boldness he attacked the immoral life prevailing in both Church and State, and demanded a radical reform of both. Though few reformatory preachers have ever succeeded better than Savonarola in swaying the emotions of large masses of the people, he did not lay the foundation of any reformatory organization; and when he was burned at the gibelet, there was no one to continue the work of his life.

2. At the close of the 15th century, the Church had succeeded in repressing all the reformatory movements of the Middle Ages, at least so far as to prevent, mostly by the power of the German emperor, the consolidation and extension of any of these movements into a powerful ecclesiastical organization, like that of the Eastern Church. But her triumph, after all, was more apparent than real. Her authority had been thoroughly undermined, and remained shaken in every country of Europe. The threats of the Church might extort reluctant recantations from a number of intimidated reformers; but her very successes of this kind had the effect of spreading the latent discontent with a religious organization which so palpably cared more for power than for the purity of Christian doctrine and Christian life. Other powerful agencies were needed to aid in this process, already begun in the 16th century, in the organization and extension of the reformation in the Church. The most influential among them was the school of the Humanists, who used the revival of classical studies for promoting a general literary culture, which not only fully emancipated itself from the guardianship of the Church, but frequently assumed an antithetical position to it with regard to Christianity. Especially in Italy, humanism became an enthusiastic worshipper of pagan antiquity, and it became quite common that high dignitaries of the Church were in the circles of their friends and acquaintances known as ardent atheists. Even pope Leo X was credited with the remark—and, whether true or not true, it was regarded as credible by his contemporaries—"It is generally known how much we and ours have profited by the fable of Christ." While in Italy many of the leading humanists entertained the highest degree of Christian belief, though they had no objection to retaining their pagan habits which were often of the highest rank, in the Church, the chief patrons of the classical studies in the Teutonic countries were mostly men of earnest Christian convictions, who cultivated them with a view to strengthening the cause of the Christian faith. Thus the interest in ancient literature, especially the community of the Brothers of the Common Life who founded a number of excellent schools, in which the highest attainments in the revived classical studies, and an education in the principles of earnest, puritan Christianity, were aimed at. Though the community as a whole never entered into an opposition attitude with regard to the Church, but rather, like its greatest member, Thomas à Kempis, limited itself to teaching, preaching, and practicing that which in the system of the ruling Church appeared to be unobjectionable to earnest and pious Christians, its teachers and pupils generally favored the idea of a Church reformation, and in the 16th century many of them became enthusiastic co-workers in the reformatory labors of Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin.

The labors of such men could not fail to kindle in Germany still more the desire for a reformation, and to strengthen the expectation that in resuming the work of reformation on a grand scale the German nation would take the lead. As early as 1457, chancellor Mayer of Zeil wrote to Jan Zizka, one of the famous Hussite leaders: "The German nation, once the queen of the world, but now a tributary handmaid of the Roman Church, begins to arouse herself out of a dream, and is resolved to throw off the yoke." This spirit of preparing for the overthrow of the papal yoke and the purification of Christianity at the proper time was jointly nurtured by hundreds of learned and pious men in the latter part of the 16th and the beginning of the 16th century; and when at length the right leader appeared at the fulness of time, he found hundreds of thousands ready to fall at once into line as combatants in the grand army of reform.

II. Luther's Reformation in Germany.—While the forerunners of the Reformation diffused in the Church the yearning for a radical purification of Christianity, and while the humanists were educating a race much better fitted for the standard-bearer of reformation than were the reformers of preceding centuries, a number of other great events co-operated for bringing the medieval history of mankind to a close, and for ushering in a new era. Maritime discoveries of unparalleled magnitude, the consolidation of wealth and wealth and led to a rapid growth of commerce, to an increase of manufactures, and a greater and more general diffusion of wealth. The invention of the art of printing diffused knowledge among the masses of the people to an extent which former generations would have regarded...
ed as impossible. Feudalism and medieval chivalry collapsed before the rise of the wealthier and more informed bourgeoisie, settling down in the North and, by the other hand, the consolidation of powerful states under centralized governments, on the other. The new forces which obtained a controlling influence upon modern society were not always, and not by necessity, hostile to the ruling Church; but it is still more true that when Church movements they were a considerable aid in raising up more formidable oppositions to the popes and their Church than those which had been put down in the Middle Ages. Soon after the beginning of the 16th century, Germany, then the soil most favorable to religious reform, produced the man who succeeded in carrying through the reforms which the preceding centuries had so often in vain attempted, who dealt to the papacy a heavier blow than it had received since the separation of the Eastern Church, and whose name, forever associated with "The Reformation," stands at the portal of modern history as one of its greatest pillars. No one disputes the eminent position which Martin Luther occupies in history, nor the extraordinary qualities which elevated him to it. The *Manual of Church History*, by Dr. Alzog, which has been an authority for early Latin literature and is very extensively used in the theological schools of the Roman Catholic Church, says of Luther: "If we look upon his aggregated, eventful life, we must count him among the most remarkable men of all centuries, although he grasped his mission in the most rash and blind manner, being in the most unlikely position, and in opposition with the most brilliant feature of his system." A Protestant Church historian (Kurtz) justly calls Luther a religious genius, who was called to his great work by the rarest union of the necessary qualifications and gifts of the intellect, sentiment, character, and will; who was trained and educated by a providential guidance of his life; who, in his own life, had passed through the entire essential course of reformation, had tested in himself its divine power, and then could not but make the holiest and dearest experience of his life serviceable to all the world.

1. The origin of the German Reformation was quite humble and indefinite. Pope Leo X., of whom even Roman Catholic writers must say that "he does not appear to have experienced the blessing and power of the Church," had at first turned to him the "highest affair of life," had arranged for a very extensive sale of indulgences. It was not deemed worth while to assign for such an outrage upon the religious sentiment of pious Christians a more spirited protest than that the proceeds of the sale were intended for a war against the Turks and the erection of St. Peter's church. The real destination of the money, it was quite commonly believed, was to defray the exorbitant expenditures of the pope's court and to serve as a marriage dowry of his sister. Archbishop Albert of Mento, of whose Christian belief as little was known as of that of the pope, authorized the sale in Germany on condition that fifty per cent. of the gross income should flow into his own pocket. A Dominican friar (Tetzl) carried on the trade with an effrontery which outraged the sentiments of thousands of earnest Christians. Among those who were urged by their conscience to rise against this profanation of Christianity was Luther, then a young monk in an Augustinian convenant. When a young student, he had been driven by his anxiety for the salvation of his soul to study with the Augustinians. Long doubts and mental troubles, he had derived from a profound study of the Scriptures, and of the writings of Augustine and Tauler, the consolatory belief that man is to be saved, not by his own works, but by faith in the mercy of God in Christ. When he became a doctor of the Sacred Scriptures, he was deeply impressed with the truth that the human soul is too weak and polluted to be lifted by its own efforts to God, and the occasion of teaching and making known to the world the truths of Christianity. Both as an earnest Christian, who sincerely believed in the Christianity of the Scriptures, and as a conscientious teacher of theology, Luther felt himself impelled to enter an evangelistic protest against the doings of the Church of Rome. In accordance with the decrees of the Council of Rome, he wrote to several neighboring bishops to stop the sale of indulgences, and only when this appeal remained unheeded he determined to act himself. On the eve of All-Saints' Day, Oct. 31, 1517, he affixed to the tower of Wittenberg his celebrated ninety-five propositions, which are generally looked upon as the beginning of Luther's reformation. Both Protestant and Roman Catholic writers are agreed that these theses involved no more than Luther's part in a conscious renunciation of the Roman Catholic faith. Luther himself showed this clearly by his subsequent appeal to the pope; but Dr. Hase justly remarks that Luther certainly must have been aware that he had thrown out a challenge to the most powerful prelates and monks. On the other hand, the opposition to the Pope was in Italy, where the sale of indulgences was very extensively used as an object for public charity, and the emperor was not disposed to interfere, as it would have endangered the chance of the union of Italy under the papal standard. Luther was soon followed by the religious reformers of the Church. We must also recognise his courage, though it frequently degenerated into defiance—his untiring activity, his popular, irresistible eloquence, sparkling wit, and disinhibitedness. He did not lack a profound religious sentiment, which yearned for satisfaction, and which constituted the fundamental character and the most brilliant feature of his system."
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turned from a journey to Rome with a bull which declared Luther a heretic and ordered the burning of his writings. Luther, on the other hand, systematized his views in three works, all of which appeared in 1520: *To his Imperial Majesty and the Christian Nobility of the German Nation: On the Bondage Captivity of the Church in the World and the Freedom of a Christian*. Finally he broke away from the last bridge of retreat by publicly burning (Dec. 10, 1520) the papal bull with the papal canon law. The pope succeeded in prevailing upon the German emperor and the German Diet of Worms (1521) to proceed against Luther; and when the latter firmly refused to recant, and avowed that he could yield nothing but to the Holy Scriptures and reasonable argument, he was placed under the ban of the empire; but so great was the discontent in Germany with Rome that the same assembly that condemned Luther for opposing the faith of his ancestors presented 101 articles of complaint against the Roman see. The ban of the empire involved serious dangers for Luther, for it gave permission to any one to assault his person and seize upon his property; but he was saved from these dangers by the advice of his friends at the university of Warburg, to which disguised horsemen, according to a previous understanding with the elector, but against his own desire, had conducted him. Far from the turmoil of political agitation, he found time not only to issue several powerful polemical essays (against particular confessional points of the Augsburg Confession, against the new calendar of the archbishop of Maynooth), but to refute the rumor that he was dead, but to conceive and partially execute the plan of translating the Bible into the native tongue. During the absence of Luther from Wittenberg, the Reformation under the leadership of men who were more impetuous and practical, but less circumspect and theological, assumed a more aggressive turn against Rome. Several priests renounced celibacy and were married; Karlstadt administered the Lord’s supper in both kinds, and in the German language. To these changes Luther made no objection; but when Karlstadt began to commit open acts of violence in disturbing the public worship of the Roman Church—when enthusiastic prophets appeared from Zwicky, who boasted of immediate divine revelations, rejected infant baptism, and denounced Church, State, and science—he emerged once more from his seclusion, silenced by powerful sermons his adversaries at Wittenberg, and once more placed himself at the helm of the movement. In intimate union with Melanchthon, he resumed the struggle against the papal system of the Church which had ceased to regard itself upon the basis of his reformatory movement. Luther himself gave his chief attention to continuing the translation of the Bible in German, which was completed in 1534, and constitutes in every respect one of the master-productions of the reformers, while Melanchthon, in his celebrated work on theological science (Loci Communes Reform Theologicae), gave to the theological leaders of the new Church a hand-book of doctrine which, as a literary production, ranked with the best works that the Church had hitherto produced. In Rome, Leo X had meanwhile (1521) been succeeded by Adrian VI, the son of a mechanic of Utrecht, who, while strongly attached to the continuity of the external Church and opposed to the separation already produced by Luther, was at the same time sincerely and honestly devoted to the cause of a religious reform. The energy displayed by him and the success obtained were, however, by no means commensurate with the honesty of his convictions. During his short administration (1521-23) he was neither able to arrest the anti-Church policy of Luther nor to smooth the way for the introduction of any reforms within the Church. The latter were hated in Rome no less than the former, and when Adrian died he was succeeded by a humanist, Clement VII, who, like Leo X, was anxious to preserve the splendor and power of the papal court, and showed not the least interest in the purity of the religion.

In Germany, during this interval, the protracted absence of the emperor had prevented the adoption of any stringent measures for the suppression of the Reformation, and allowed the latter to strike deeper roots in the nation. Several local movements against the Reformation were not yet willing to part with the religion of their fathers, and to identify themselves with the movement which they thought represented their beloved ancestors as heretics. They mistrusted Rome, however; persisted in demanding reforms; contented themselves with resolving at several successive diets that the Edict of Worms should be carried out as much as possible, and thus enabled the princes and free cities which were friendly to the Reformation to consolidate it within the boundaries of their states. When the papal legate Campeggio succeeded at the Diet of Ratisbon, in 1524, in bringing about an alliance between Ferdinand of Austria, the dukes of Bavaria, and most of the bishops of Southern Germany for the preservation of the old faith and for carrying out the Edict of Worms, landgrave Philip of Hesse, in the meantime, of a meeting held at Gotha, took the initiatory step for a counter-alliance of the friends of the Reformation. Luther and Melanchthon were at first opposed to the conclusion of any offensive and defensive alliance, on the ground that God’s cause could not be defended by carnal weapons. When, however, the danger became imminent, a defensive alliance between the landgrave and the elector was concluded in 1526 at Torgau, and was soon joined by a number of other princes. As the emperor became involved in a new foreign war in which the pope was on the side of his enemies, the Diet of Spire unanimously agreed upon the decree that until the meeting of a free general council every state should act with regard to the Edict of Worms as it might venture to answer to God and his imperial majesty. This decree gave to the states which were friendly to the Reformation time to reorganize the churches of their territories on the basis of the Reformation. The lead was taken by the elector John the Constant of Saxony. Melanchthon drew up the articles of visitation, in accordance with which, in 1529, a general Church visitation of ecclesiastical and lay councillors took place. Among the results of this visitation were the compilation of two catechisms by Luther for more efficient instruction of the children in the elements of religion, the appointment of superintendents to exercise spiritual supervision, and the introduction of an ecclesiastical organization and disciplinary system of model for the churches in the other German states. Luther, in the meantime (1525), had followed the example of many of his clerical friends and married. As the continuing centre of the entire movement, Luther exerted a powerful influence in many directions as professor and author by an extensive correspondence far beyond the borders of Germany, and by supplying the churches with a great number of excellent Church hymns in the native tongue. By these Church hymns, as well as by his translation of the Bible, Luther at the same time occupied so prominent a position in the religious literature that Germany as a nation appeared to be under the greatest indebtedness to him, and its further progress to be closely linked to the success of the Reformation. A number of theological controversies into which Luther was drawn, and of which the most engaging Henry VIII of England, with Erasmus, with Carlstadt, and Zwinglei were the most important, belong more to the personal history of Luther than to that of the Reformation.
demand, decreed that the Edict of Worms should be carried through in the states which had hitherto acknowledged its authority, but that no innovations should be required in the remaining provinces; that none should be obstructed in celebrating the mass; and that the privileges of every spiritual estate should be respected. Against this reccess, which of course was disastrous to the church, the pope made a further protest against the Reformation impossible, Ecclesiastical Saxony, Hesse, Lüneburg, Anhalt, the margrave of Brandenburg, and fourteen imperial cities entered a protestation, from which they were henceforth called Protestants. They appealed from it to the emperor as the supreme sovereign of Christendom. At the Convention of Schwabach, Luther had drawn up, on the basis of the articles of Marburg, the so-called seventeen Schwabach articles, which the Zwinglian cities were requested to sign as conditional of their admission to the Council; it was the Augsburg Confession, and the convention remained without result. At the next Diet of Augsburg (1530) the emperor intended to put an end to the religious strife. The elector of Saxony therefore requested his theologians to draw up a brief summary of the evangelical faith, and they accordingly presented to him a revision of the Schwabach articles at Torgau (the Torgau articles). The elector was accompanied to Augsburg by Spalatin, Melanchthon, and Jonas. Luther, who was still under the ban of the empire, remained behind at Coburg. The emperor's arrival was delayed, and Melanchthon used the time up to the opening of the diet (June 20) for composing, on the basis of the Torgau articles, the famous Confession of Augsburg (q. v.), the first of the symbolic books of the Lutheran Church, which, after being approved by Luther, was signed by the states. It had been drawn up both in Latin and in German; and although the emperor desired the Latin text to be read, it was at the request of the elector publicly read to the diet in German (June 25). Some of the princes admitted that they had derived from this document a clearer conception of the Reformation than they had had from the Schwabach articles, and desired to sign; but the emperor commissioned the Catholic theologians Faber, Eck, Cochlaeus, and Wimpina to prepare a "confutation" of the Confession, which was read on Aug. 3. The emperor declared that he was determined to stand by the doctrines laid down in the confession; that he expected the same from the princes; that he was the patron of the Church, and not willing to tolerate a schism in Germany. He refused to receive the "Apology of the Augsburg Confession," which had been composed by Melancthon in reply to the "confutation." The state of the empire at Session 22 announced that the confession of the Protestants had been refuted, but that time for consideration would be given to them until April 15 of the next year; until then all should refrain from differing their heresy by writing or preaching; and within six months a general council would be called for the ultimate settlement of the matter. The Edict of Worms was to be carried out, and the imperial court was to proceed against the disobedient. As soon after the close of the diet, a legal process was actually begun against the Protestant states for having espoused the doctrine of the Church, the Protestant powers met at Smalcald, and concluded (1531) a defensive alliance for six years, at the head of which the electors of Saxony and the landgrave of Hesse were placed. Fortunately for the new alliance, the emperor was soon again involved in a war with the Turks, who threatened an invasion of Austria and Germany, and his desire to obtain the aid of the Protestant churches once more disposed him favorably towards toleration. New negotiations resulted in the conclusion of the religious peace of Nuremberg (July 28, 1532), which enjoined upon both parties mutual frienship; but this had no effect on the opposing council. Pope Clement VII so far yielded to the demands of the emperor that he promised in 1538 to convocate a council within the space of a year at Mantua, Bologna, or Piacenza; but he demanded, at the same time, from the Protestants a previous unconditional submission to the decrees of the council. In 1536 the Protestants naturally refused to give, though they were ready to attend the council and plead their cause. The power of the Protestants in the meanwhile was greatly strengthened by the accession of the dukes of Pomerania and Württemberg, and by a union with the cities which favored the Zwinglian Reformation; and which, after a religious colloquy, held at Cassel in 1535, between Melanchthon and Bucer, agreed in May, 1536, upon the Wittenberg Concord, by which the cities unequivocally accepted the Augsburg Confession. When in July, 1536, the pope actually declared war on the Protestant states met again for consultation at Smalkald. They accepted and signed the "Articles of Smalkald" which had been composed by Luther, and which presented the doctrines of the Reformation in much stronger terms than the Confession of 1529; but they remained unanimous in the resolve not to attend an Italian council, at which the pope would appear both as a party and as a judge. The council did not meet, but in 1538 a "holy league" for the suppression of Protestantism was formed at Nuremberg by the archbishops of Mentz and Salzbourg, the dukes of Bavaria, George of Saxony, and Henry of Brunswick. But the next year George died, and was succeeded by his Protestant brother Henry, who found it easy to carry through the Reformation; and a few years later (1542), Henry of Brunswick was driven from his dominions, into which his conquerors likewise introduced the Reformation. The emperor of Brandenburg, Joachim I., a decided enemy of Luther, was likewise (1535) succeeded by a Protestant son. Thus gradually the Reformation gained over to its side nearly all the secular princes of Germany, with the exception of the duchies of Bavaria and the house of Hapsburg, which found it necessary to adhere to the old faith on account of its connection with Spain, Belgium, and Italy. Several new attempts were made to effect a reconciliation of the contending parties. The Reformation Colloquy of Worms was held, and de facto, that the church was finally prevailed upon by the emperor to open (Dec. 18, 1546) the long-promised council at Trent, a city of the German empire. The emperor still adhered to the plan to force the pope into a Catholic reformation of the Church, and the Protestants into submission to the Church. Another council at Ratisbon was to lay down a basis of union to be submitted to the council, but it remained without result. At the same time, the emperor was determined to break the political power of Protestantism by annihilating the Smalkald alliance, and made amends against the Scanians, whose landgrave were declared guilty of high treason, and in the ensuing Smalkaldic war, in which duke Maurice, though himself a Protestant, fought from political motives on the side of the emperor, both princes were defeated and made prisoners. The other members of the
league, with the exception of a few cities, submitted. The emperor was anxious not to give to his expedition the name of a religious war, but the pope accorded a plenary indulgence to all who would aid in the extermination of the heretics. Shortly before the beginning of the siege, the emperor was at Eisleben, where he had been invited to act as umpire between the counts of Mansfeld. In order to prevent the participation of the Protestants in the council, the pope caused the immediate condemnation of some important Protestant doctrines in the first session of that body; and to escape the reformation pressure of the emperor, he transferred the council (March, 1547), on the pretext that in Trent it was threatened by the pestilence, to Bologna, where it soon dissolved. The emperor was greatly dissatisfied, and determined to go on with his own reformatory policy for preserving the religious unity of Christendom. At his request, the conciliatory and noble-minded bishop of Naumburg, Julius von Pflugk, and the court preacher of the elector of Brandenburg, John Agricola, drew up the Augsburg Interim (1548), which was adopted by the diet, and was to serve as the standard according to which all religious questions should be decided. The Interim was intended to be valid for both Protestants and Catholics, but it really remained in force only among the former, to whom it conceded the right of election to the lower clergy, the use of the cup in the sacrament, and some indefinite constructions of particular doctrines of the Catholic Church. The Protestants submitted to the Interim with great reluctance; and even the emperor's ally, Maurice of Saxony, did not risk its unconditional introduction, and at his advice the Leipzic Interim (1548) was drawn up by Melancthon, in which the greater part of the Catholic ritual was declared to be indifferent (indulphorum), and therefore fit to be retained. It also declared that the power of the pope and of the bishops might be acknowledged so long as they agreed with the doctrine of the Church. But even this more Protestant Interim gave no satisfaction, and the fermentation continued until the new pope, Julius III, reconvened the Council of Trent for May 1, 1551. The emperor demanded that the Protestants should attend the council, but Maurice made the attendance dependent upon the condition that Protestants should receive the right of voting, that the former resolutions against the Protestants should be annulled, and that the pope himself should be subject to a general council. Melancthon elaborated the basis for the Reformation of the Church, the Concordia Saxoniae, or Deorpetio Confessamur Augustane. Protestant deputies from Württemberg, Brandenburg, Saxony, and Strassburg appeared at Trent, and Melancthon, accompanied by several theologians of Wittenberg, set out to join them. The situation of the Reformation was radically changed when Maurice concluded a secret alliance against the emperor with a number of Protestant princes and the Catholic king of France, to whom, for his assistance, the three German bishops of Metz, Toul, and Verdun were treacherously betrayed by the allies. Maurice, in a short and decisive war (1552), completely defeated the emperor, who was sick at Innsbruck, and compelled him to agree to the Treaty of Passau (July 30, 1552), which set the Januarie of Hesse at liberty (the elector of Saxony had been liberated previously), opened the imperial council to the adherents of the Reformation, promised a diet for the settlement of the religious differences, and provided a permanent peace for at least all those who sympathized with the Augsburg Confession. The continuance of the war between Germany and France during the last years of the emperor, the Estates of the Diet, Feb., 1555. Both parties in Germany had arrived at the conviction that the hope of terminating the religious controversy by means of religious colloquies or by a general council must be abandoned for the present, and that peace and order in the empire could only be maintained by mutual forbearance. After long orga-

III. Zwingli's and Calvin's Reformation in Switzerland.—Next to Germany, Switzerland became the principal source of the Reformation. But it sent forth two currents which have never fully united, though many connecting canals have been built between them, and both are now usually acknowledged as belonging to one comprehensive system, which is commonly designated as the Reformed Church. One of the movements originated in German, the other in French, Switzerland. At the height of the dispute for the doctrine of the other John Calvin. The thirteen cantons which constituted Switzerland at the beginning of the 16th century were still in nominal connection with the German empire; and the same causes, therefore, which have been referred to in our account of Germany favored the growth of the Reformation in Switzerland. Dissatisfaction with and contempt of Rome were, moreover, promoted in Switzerland by the large number of mercenaries who were employed in the military service of the popes, and who naturally brought with them a knowledge of the utter corruption prevailing in Rome, but by their own unworthy lives helped to bring Rome into disrepute. 1. Ulrich Zwingli, who gave the first impulse to the Reformation in German Switzerland [see ZWINGLI], had received his education at the universities of Vienna and Basle, and in the latter place had joined himself to a circle of enthusiastic admirers of ancient learning and of enlightened religious views who gathered around Erasmus. It was more classical education and scientific study of the Holy Scriptures than, as in the case of Luther, religious experience which made Zwingli an earnest advocate of religious reform, although, like his teacher Erasmus, he continued to hope for a reformation within the Church by the ecclesiastical authorities themselves. Such views were entertained quite generally in Switzerland; and though Zwingli in 1518 raised his voice against the effrontery of a trader in indulgences, the Franciscan monk Bernardin Sanson, he was appointed papal chaplain by the papal legate. His preaching against the corruptions prevailing in the Church had been made known at Augsburg, and he was appointed, in 1519, "Lent priest" in Zurich. The influence proceeding from Luther did not remain without effect upon him, and he began to be looked upon in Zurich as a Lutheran at heart. When he designated the rule of fasting as an ordinance of man, the Council of Zurich, in 1529, took his part against the bishop of Constance.
Zwingli's first reforming work, *Von Erkiesen und Freyheit der Spuyen*, which was published at this time, gave a new lease of life to the movement in Unterwalden, Luzern, Valais, Uri, and Zurich. In Zurich, in the name of the reformation party among the clergy, addressed the Diet of Lucerne and the bishop of Constance in behalf of a free preaching of the Gospel; he also demanded the abolition of priestly celibacy. In accordance with Zwingli's wish, the Council of Zurich charged all the preachers to preach the pure Gospel in the churches, and in 1526 there was held a national conference for an efficient colobarer in his reformation efforts by the appointment of Leo Judae as Lent prior at Zurich. Several events signalized at this time the steady advance of the cause. The council allowed mints to leave their convents, several of the clergy married without hindrance, a German baptismal service was introduced, and the cathedral chapter, at its own request, received new and suitable ordinances. In other cantons, especially in Lucerne, Frisboug, and Zug, a violent opposition was manifested against the Reformation, but in Zurich its success was undoubted. A national conference was held on April 26, upon images and the mass, to which all Swiss bishops and cantons were invited, but only Schaffhausen and St. Gall sent delegates. No champion for images and mass was found at the conference, and the spirit of the Reformation was reinvigorated. The reformation of the canton by diffusing the proper instruction in the country districts, for which purpose Zwingli, the abbot of Cappel, and Conrad Schmidt, commander of the knights of St. John at Kusmacht, were appointed. With the consent of the council, Zwingli published his *On the Mass*, which was no easy task to the people more fully the meaning of the religious Reformation. Soon new reformation measures were adopted by the council. The shrined pictures in the churches were shut up, and every priest was left free to celebrate mass or not as he chose (Dec. 1523). On Whit-Sunday, 1524, the work of removing the images from the churches was begun, and it was completed in thirty days. The abolition of many other usages followed in rapid succession; and the transformation in religious service was completed by the celebration in April 15, 14, and 16, 1525, of the Lord's supper in its original simplicity in the great minster. The publication of Zwingli's *De Vera et Falsa Religione* and the first part of the Zurich translation of the Bible likewise gave a favorable impulse. Be yond the Alp, and even within it in the Morat, and in some cases within the cantons of Uri and Schwyz, the Reformation was begun by the preaching of the prudent Berchtold Halbr; in Basel, Wolfgang Fabricius, Bishop of the Reformation, the Reformation continued to make progress. In the summer of 1526, the Girsons granted religious freedom; and in April, 1527, the Reformed party obtained a majority in the Council of Berne (Dec. 15, 1528), officially introduced the Reformation. Decisive measures for securing the preponderance of the Reformation were taken in 1528 by St. Gall, and in 1529 by Basle and Glarus. As the most zealous of the Catholic cantons, especially Schwyz, Uri, Unterwalden, Luzern, Valais, and Zurich, Zwingli, in the name of the reformation party among the clergy, addressed the Diet of Lucerne and the bishop of Constance in behalf of a free preaching of the Gospel; he also demanded the abolition of priestly celibacy. In accordance with Zwingli's wish, the Council of Zurich charged all the preachers to preach the pure Gospel in the churches, and in 1526 there was held a national conference for an efficient colobarer in his reformation efforts by the appointment of Leo Judae as Lent prior at Zurich. Several events signalized at this time the steady advance of the cause. The council allowed mints to leave their convents, several of the clergy married without hindrance, a German baptismal service was introduced, and the cathedral chapter, at its own request, received new and suitable ordinances. In other cantons, especially in Lucerne, Frisboug, and Zug, a violent opposition was manifested against the Reformation, but in Zurich its success was undoubted. A national conference was held on April 26, upon images and the mass, to which all Swiss bishops and cantons were invited, but only Schaffhausen and St. Gall sent delegates. No champion for images and mass was found at the conference, and the spirit of the Reformation was reinvigorated. The reformation of the canton by diffusing the proper instruction in the country districts, for which purpose Zwingli, the abbot of Cappel, and Conrad Schmidt, commander of the knights of St. John at Kusmacht, were appointed. With the consent of the council, Zwingli published his *On the Mass*, which was no easy task to the people more fully the meaning of the religious Reformation. Soon new reformation measures were adopted by the council. The shrined pictures in the churches were shut up, and every priest was left free to celebrate mass or not as he chose (Dec. 1523). On Whit-Sunday, 1524, the work of removing the images from the churches was begun, and it was completed in thirty days. The abolition of many other usages followed in rapid succession; and the transformation in religious service was completed by the celebration in April 15, 14, and 16, 1525, of the Lord's supper in its original simplicity in the great minster. The publication of Zwingli's *De Vera et Falsa Religione* and the first part of the Zurich translation of the Bible likewise gave a favorable impulse. Beyond the Alp, and even within it in the Morat, and in some cases within the cantons of Uri and Schwyz, the Reformation was begun by the preaching of the prudent Berchtold Halbr; in Basel, Wolfgang Fabricius, Bishop of the Reformation, the Reformation continued to make progress. In the summer of 1526, the Girsons granted religious freedom; and in April, 1527, the Reformed party obtained a majority in the Council of Berne (Dec. 15, 1528), officially introduced the Reformation. Decisive measures for securing the preponderance of the Reformation were taken in 1528 by St. Gall, and in 1529 by Basle and Glarus. As the most zealous of the Catholic cantons, especially Schwyz, Uri, Unterwalden, Luzern, Valais, and Zurich, Zwingli, in the name of the reformation party among the clergy, addressed the Diet of Lucerne and the bishop of Constance in behalf of a free preaching of the Gospel; he also demanded the abolition of priestly celibacy. In accordance with Zwingli's wish, the Council of Zurich charged all the preachers to preach the pure Gospel in the churches, and in 1526 there was held a national conference for an efficient colobarer in his reformation efforts by the appointment of Leo Judae as Lent prior at Zurich.
SECOND HELVETIC CONFESSION

The Second Helvetic Confession, the most important among the symbolic books of the Reformed Church, which was compiled by Bullinger in Zurich, published in 1566, and recognized in all Reformed countries, completed the superiority of Calvin's principles over those of Zwingli.

3. Although the majority of the German Protestant churchmen adhered to the Lutheran Reformation, a German Reformed Church which wore a moderately Calvinistic aspect sprang up in several parts of Germany. In 1560 the elector Frederick III. of the Palatinate embraced the Reformed creed, and organized the Church of his dominions according to Reformed principles. By his authority, Urrais and Olevianus composed the Heidelberg Catechism, which soon came to be regarded not only as the standard symbolic book of the German Reformed Church, but was highly esteemed throughout the Reformed world.

In Anhalt, Calvinism was introduced chiefly from attachment to Melanchthon. Thus in North Germany, introduced the Heidelberg Catechism in consequence of its relation to the house of Orange. The most important accession to the Reformed Church of Germany was that of John Sigismund, elector of Brandenburg, who on Christmas day, 1618, in the presence of the Lord's supper in the heavenly court church of Berlin according to the Calvinistic ritual. Although he tried, as all princes of these times did, to induce the people to follow his example, the overwhelming majority of the country continued to remain Lutheran. Among the free imperial cities, it was especially Bremen which adopted the Reformed creed.

IV. THE ENGLISH REFORMATION—In England the writings of Luther were warmly welcomed by many, especially by those who secretly adhered to the doctrines of Wycliffe. King Henry VIII, who was a great admirer of St. Thomas & Becket, wrote against Luther (1521) the work Declaravit Unum Deum, for which he received from the pope the title Defender Fidelit. He also wrote the emperor of Germany a letter in which he called for the extirpation of the heretics. But Lutheranism found faithful adherents even at the English universities, and an English translation of the Bible (1525) by Frith and Tyndale, members of the university of Cambridge, had a decisive effect. Soon the king fell out with the pope, because the latter refused to annul Henry's marriage with Catharine of Aragon, the niece of Louis X the Great of France (1550). The king then signed a law that his marriage with Catharine, his brother's widow, was open to objections, laid the matter, by advice of Thomas Cranmer, before the Christian universities; and when replies were received declaring the marriage with a brother's wife as null and void, the king separated from Catharine, married Anne Boleyn, and fell under the papal ban.

The English Parliament concluded the connection between England and Rome, and recognized the king as the head of the Church. Henry was desirous of obtaining the influence of the pope over the Church of England, to which, in order to preserve the continuity of its Catholic character, the clergymen were subjected to a visitation in 1555, and totally abolished in 1556; and the Bible was diffused in the mother tongue (1538) as the only source of doctrine; but the statute of 1539 imposed distinct limits upon the Reformation, and, in particular, confirmed subordination, priestly celibacy, masses for the dead, and auricular confession. A considerable number of those who refused to comply with the religious changes introduced into England were executed. A powerful party, headed by Thomas Cranmer, after 1533, Edinburgh and Canterbury, and Thomas Cromwell, after 1534 royal vicar-general for ecclesiastical affairs, exerted a strong influence in behalf of a nearer approach towards the Reformed churches of continental Europe. They met with little success during the reign of Henry, but obtained a majority in the regency which ruled England during the minority of Edward VI. Peter Martyr, Ochino, Bucer, and Fagius were called to England to aid Cranmer in carrying through the Reformation. The basis was laid in the Book of Homilies (1547), the new English liturgy (1549), the Book of Common Prayer (1549). The Articles (1552); but the labors of Cranmer were interrupted by the death of Edward VI (1553). His successor, Mary, the daughter of Henry and Catharine of Aragon, was a devoted partisan of the Church of Rome, during whose reign Cranmer and from three hundred others were burned on account of their religion. A papal nuncio appeared in England, and an obsequious parliament sanctioned the reunion with Rome; but the affections of the people were not regained, and the early death of Mary (1558) put an end to the official restoration of the Papal Church.

Queen Elizabeth, the daughter of Henry and Anne Boleyn, whose birth, in consequence of the papal decision, was regarded by the Roman Catholics as illegitimate, resumed the work of her father, and completed the English Reformation, as distinct both from Calvinism and from the Reformation of Germany and Switzerland. The Book of Common Prayer which had been adopted under Edward was so changed as to be less offensive to Catholics, and by the Act of Uniformity, June, 1559, it was made binding on the whole nation of England, and all English and all Latin Catholices conformed: of 9400 clergy, their benefices were only lost by fourteen bishops, fifteen heads of ecclesiastical corporations, fifty canons, and about eighty priests.

Matthew Parker, the former teacher of the queen, was appointed archbishop of Canterbury. The validity of his ordination, which was not sanctioned by the pope, nor made according to the Roman rite, was once disputed in numerous Catholic writings, but has also found some Catholic defenders, as Le Courayer. The Confession of Faith which had been drawn up under Edward in forty-two articles was reduced to thirty-nine articles, and in this form it was adopted by a convocation of the clergy at London in 1562, and by Parliament made, in 1571, the rule of faith for all the clergy. According to the Thirty-nine Articles, the Scriptures contain everything necessary to salvation; justification is through faith alone, but works acceptable to God are the necessary fruit of this faith; in the Lord's supper there is a communion of the body of Christ, which is spiritually received by faith; and predestination is apprehended only as it is a source of consolation. Supreme power over the Church is in the king, who reserves to himself the right to appoint bishops to the vacant sees. His power is limited by the statutes. Bishops continued to be the highest ecclesiastical officers and the first barons of the realm. Subscription to the articles was made binding only on the clergy; to the laity freedom of conscience was allowed. The adoption of the Thirty-nine Articles completed, in the main, the constitution of the Episcopal Church of England. Some parts of the Church government and the liturgy, especially the retaining of sacerdotal vestments, gave great offense to a number of zealous friends of a radical religious reformation; and owing to the numerous changes, the Church of Mary, and, while excels, has become strongly attached to the principles of strict Calvinism. They demanded a greater purity of the Church (hence their name Puritans), a simple, spiritual form of worship, a strict Church discipline, and a new and simplified form of the Thirty-nine Articles. The Act of Uniformity (1559) threatened all Nonconformists with fines and imprisonment, and their ministers with deposition and banishment. When the provisions of the act began to be enforced, a number of the Nonconformist clergy formed separate congregations in communion with presbyterianism (1561). The Act of Uniformity (1559) threatened all Nonconformists with fines and imprisonment, and their ministers with deposition and banishment. When the provisions of the act began to be enforced, a number of the Nonconformist clergy formed separate congregations in communion with the presbyterian churches (1561). The Act of Uniformity (1559) threatened all Nonconformists with fines and imprisonment, and their ministers with deposition and banishment. When the provisions of the act began to be enforced, a number of the Nonconformist clergy formed separate congregations in communion with the presbyterian churches (1561). The Act of Uniformity (1559) threatened all Nonconformists with fines and imprisonment, and their ministers with deposition and banishment. When the provisions of the act began to be enforced, a number of the Nonconformist clergy formed separate congregations in communion with the presbyterian churches (1561). The Act of Uniformity (1559) threatened all Nonconformists with fines and imprisonment, and their ministers with deposition and banishment. When the provisions of the act began to be enforced, a number of the Nonconformist clergy formed separate congregations in communion with the presbyterian churches (1561). The Act of Uniformity (1559) threatened all Nonconformists with fines and imprisonment, and their ministers with deposition and banishment. When the provisions of the act began to be enforced, a number of the Nonconformist clergy formed separate congregations in communion with the presbyterian churches (1561). The Act of Uniformity (1559) threatened all Nonconformists with fines and imprisonment, and their ministers with deposition and banishment. When the provisions of the act began to be enforced, a number of the Nonconformist clergy formed separate congregations in communion with the presbyterian churches (1561). The Act of Uniformity (1559) threatened all Nonconformists with fines and imprisonment, and their ministers with deposition and banishment. When the provisions of the act began to be enforced, a number of the Nonconformist clergy formed separate congregations in communion with the presbyterian churches (1561). The Act of Uniformity (1559) threatened all Nonconformists with fines and imprisonment, and their ministers with deposition and banishment. When the provisions of the act began to be enforced, a number of the Nonconformist clergy formed separate congregations in communion with the presbyterian churches (1561). The Act of Uniformity (1559) threatened all Nonconformists with fines and imprisonment, and their ministers with deposition and banishment. When the provisions of the act began to be enforced, a number of the Nonconformist clergy formed separate congregations in communion with the presbyterian churches (1561). The Act of Uniformity (1559) threatened all Nonconformists with fines and imprisonment, and their ministers with deposition and banishment. When the provisions of the act began to be enforced, a number of the Nonconformist clergy formed separate congregations in communion with the presbyterian churches (1561). The Act of Uniformity (1559) threatened all Nonconformists with fines and imprisonment, and their ministers with deposition and banishment. When the provisions of the act began to be enforced, a number of the Nonconformist clergy formed separate congregations in communion with the presbyterian churches (1561). The Act of Uniformity (1559) threatened all Nonconformists with fines and imprisonment, and their ministers with deposition and banishment. When the provisions of the act began to be enforced, a number of the Nonconformist clergy formed separate congregations in communion with the presbyterian churches (1561).
ship, or led others to do so, should be imprisoned and
sentenced, and after three months be banished; and again in
1580, they swept away all the religious Catholic and an-
archic Sabbath laws to the Christian Sunday, and when Calvin's
doctrines respecting predestination excited animated
disputes.

A much more uncompromising opposition than that by
the Puritans was made to the Established Church
by Robert Brown, who embraced (from 1580) Calvinism
in its strictest form, denounced the English Church as a
false Church, and demanded that, in accordance with
the apostolic example, every congregation should be an
independent Church. His adherents, who were variety
of opinion, and were called Puritans and Congregationalists, denounced all fellowship with the Church of
England, and met with great success, though Brown
himself returned to the Church of England. In 1588
there were about 20,000 Independents in England: those
who fled to Holland founded a number of churches there,
and from Holland the Pilgrim fathers brought this branch
of the English Reformation over to the New World.

The Stuarts entertained immediate opinions as to
the royal authority in Church and State. James I, the
son of Mary Queen of Scots, remained, in spite of the
government in the Netherlands, bitter and passionately
opposed to Puritanism. The Catholic element in the
Established Church was greatly strengthened, and an attempt was even made to restore episcopacy in
Scotland. A bond of union was, however, given to all
Scottish bishops in 1600 by the declaration that the Bible
was to be translated into English, with which King James's name is honorably connected. Charles I followed in the footsteps of his father, and as the bishops sided with him in his
conflicts with Parliament and his endeavors to enforce
the divine right of kings, the king's overthrow, which
ended in his execution (1649), involved the overthrow
of the supremacy of the Episcopalian Church. The Parlia-
ment summoned an assembly of divines at West-
minster—the Westminster Assembly (1643-49)—and, in
accordance with the proposition of this assembly, introduced a Presbyterian form of government and a
Puritanic form of worship. Soon after the death of
Cromwell, however, the Stuarts were recalled (1660) and
the Episcopalian Church was re-established. The Test Act
(1673) prohibited every one from holding any public
office unless he had acknowledged the king's ecclesi-
astical supremacy and had received the sacrament of
the Lord's supper in an Episcopal church. In conse-
quence of the adherence of James II to the Church of
Rome, there arose one more conflict between the Eng-
lish king and the Episcopal Established Church; but
whom the English Parliament became king, the constitu-
tion of the Church was definitely settled (1689). The
Church of England retained the Episcopal form of govern-
ment, and Ireland was placed under the jurisdiction
of the Church of England. This connection between
the Established Church of England and the Established
Church of Ireland remained until 1870, when the latter
was disestablished and its official connection with the
Church of England severed. The "Church of Ireland"
then takes an independent, self-governing body; whereas the Scottish Episcopal Church, the Church of the
Episcopal Church of the United States agree with the
religious creed of the Church of England, but frame
their Church laws with entire independence.

V. The Presbyterians of Scotland. The first knowl-
edge of the Reformation began in continental Europe
was brought to Scotland by several Scotch students of
the Wittenberg. They tried to circulate Luther's writings,
but found the ground not favorable to a reformation, be-
cause King James V had intimately allied himself with
the clergy for the purpose of curbing the power of the
nobility. Strident voices were raised against the refor-
mation. The first victim was Patrick Hamilton (March 1, 1528), a youth of royal blood, who, while studying in Germany, had imbibed a love of
the Reformation. Two more Reformers were burned
in 1584; in 1589, five in Edinburgh and two in Glasgow.

Nevertheless, the adherents of the Reformation steadily
increased in number, and in 1592, when the second
Sectarian Assembly met, the number of the adherents
of the theological leaders of the Reformation, rallied the
reformatory party anew. Under the guidance of John
Knox they began to advance more firmly, and to de-
velop their ecclesiastical affairs more definitely. As
both Knox and Wishart had been educated at Ossian,
and were firmly addicted to the Reformed Confession,
the reformed type of the Reformation now obtained in
Scotland a decided and lasting ascendancy over the
Lutheran. The Reformed party allied itself with the Eng-
lish government, the Catholics with that of France. The
latter sent to the Exiles in the Low Countries and to Stuart, to France for education, where she was subse-
quently married to king Francis II of France, and im-
ibed an enthusiastic attachment to the Church of Rome.
In 1554 the fanatical dukes of Guise, the brother of
the widowed queen, became king of France. The French influence was strongly used for the repression of
the reformatory party, which, on the other hand, was
benefited by the accession to the English throne of Mary, daughter of Henry VIII. Protection was af-
-fored to the English Protestants who had fled on account of their religion, and freedom of worship was again sec-
cured by the native friends of the Reformation. John
Knox, who in 1546 had had to flee from Scotland, re-
turned in 1558 to strengthen the Reformed faith and to
urge on the nobility and the people to an unceasing contest against the idolatries of Rome. Dissatisfied, how-
ever, with the feeble support which he found, Knox
returned in 1556 to Geneva, in which city he received from the Scotch bishops the sentence to the stake which had been passed against him. The stirring letters which he wrote to Scotland from Geneva led (1557) to the
formation of a defensive league of the Protestant nobil-
ity—the "Congregation of Christ." The accession of
Elizabeth to the English throne was followed in Scot-
land by the adoption of new measures against the Re-
formation, which French troops were ordered to put
through. This led to a virtual separation of the Church of Scotland, and was a breach of the Reformed party.
John Knox once more returned, the Covenant of May
31 was signed, a new alliance with England was con-
cluded, and the widowed queen was declared as regent.
The iconoclastic devastation of Catholic churches and clo-
ters began at Perth and rapidly spread over the king-
dom. A civil war which ensued was concluded by the
- treaty of Edinburgh (1560), which recognised the rights
of the Reformed. The Scotch Parliament, which met
soon after, immediately abolished the papal jurisdiction
over Scotland, and declared the Protestants to be the
entirely Calvinistic Confession (Confessio Scoto-
Holland). In the next year (1561) the Presbyterian Church
government was set in order in the Book of Discipline. These acts of the Parliament were, however, not sanctioned by
the government until 1567, after the overthrow of Mary
Stuart, who, notwithstanding her fanatical zeal in behalf of Rome, had been unable since her return from
France (1561) to arrest the complete victory of the Re-
formed party. While the theology of the Scotch Con-
-ession was strictly Calvinistic, the episcopal ben-
etices were allowed to continue, the majority of the
minority of James VI, and still more James himself, had
a strong personal interest in their preservation. Mel-
ville, the successor of Knox, induced the Assembly of
1578 to adopt a strictly Presbyterian Church constitu-
tion, which admits no Church office except the four recognised by Calvin—of pastor, doctor, elder, and deacon. The sanction of this Church constitution (the Second Book of Discipline) by Parliament and the youthful king was not obtained until 1592. James was, however, perspicacious enough to find a strong adherent of an episcopal form of government. He left no means untried, especially after he had united the crown of England with that of Scotland, to force an episcopal form of government upon the Church of Scotland. Charles I went still further than his father, and gave to the Scotch a liturgy which the Presbyterians denounced as a service to Baal. The union of Scotch Presbyterians with the Puritans and Independents of England led to the overthrow of Charles I. In 1648 a new league and covenant was adopted, and in 1645 Scotland received the Westminster standards. After the execution of Charles I, the Scotch, from opposition to Cromwell, proclaimed Charles II, who signed the covenant, as king. This led, however, to a serious and lasting division among Scotch Presbyterians. Other divisions, from various causes, followed in the course of time, and ever conduced to the time (1729) Scotch Presbyterianism is split up into a large number of divisions. The Presbyterian character of the people has, however, remained unimpaired. Cromwell, who several times defeated the Scotch, did not allow the assembly to meet, but in no other respect interfered with the freedom of the Scotch Church. Charles II relapsed into the Stuart tendency to introduce Episcopalianism; but on the expulsion of the Stuarts in 1669, the Church constitution of 1592, and the Westminster Confession were definitely restored. To the adherents of an Episcopal Church an act of 1712 granted freedom of worship, and in 1792 they received the full enjoyment of civil rights.

VI. The Reformed Church of Holland—Nowhere did the Reformation find a more favorable soil than in the Netherlands, which were closely united with Germany, being both a part of the empire and of the League of the Netherlands. The people were noted for their industry and love of freedom, and were therefore inclined to an earnest opposition to every form of ecclesiastical and civil despotism. Besides, the Brethren of the Common Life, the Beghards, and other religious communities had awakened and fostered an interest in a purer, more scriptural form of Christianity, which, at the beginning of the 16th century, was far from being extinct. Therefore Luther’s writings, although they were condemned by the University of Louvain, were enthusiastically received in the flourishing cities of Dutch and Holland. As the Netherlands were the hereditary land of the emperor Charles V, he made the utmost efforts to suppress the reformed movement and the penal law which was issued at Worms in 1521 was carried out with greater earnestness in the Netherlands than in Germany. In 1529, two Augustinian monks, Henry Vos and John Ech, were executed at Brussels—the first martyrs of the Reformation. Other edicts against the Protestants followed, and with them new executions. The progress of the Reformation was, however, not checked; but, in consequence of the closer connexion of the people with the empire, it took a Reformed rather than a Lutheran type. The rigor of the persecution during the reign of Charles was somewhat mitigated by the mild disposition of the two stadholders, Margaret of Savoy, and Mary, widow queen of Hungary, the latter of whom, a sister of the emperor, was even suspected of a secret sympathy with the Reformation; and in many places the execution of the obnoxious decrees was even prevented by the outspoken personal inclinations of municipal and provincial authorities. An effort made by Charles V (1536) to establish a regular inquisition, after the pattern of the Spanish, was not successful. Philip II did not shrink from measures of the utmost cruelty to enforce submission to the laws and to the Council of Trent; but, instead of submitting, the people rallied for the defence of their religious and civil liberty. A Calvinistic conception of faith (Confessio Belgica) was in 1562 drawn up by Guido de Bres, and in 1566 it was recognized by a synod of Antwerp as a symbolical book of the Reformed churches of the Netherlands. In the latter year a defensive league, the Compromiss, was also concluded by the Protestants, which spread with great rapidity. The name of Genez (Haarlem), by which the last and most decided of the confederates, was received by the people as a title of honor, and served as a rallying-point for a great national movement towards freedom. When the stadholder Margaret of Parma felt unable to curb any longer the rising opposition, the Dutch Protestants undertook to extinguish the Reformation with fire and sword. In the southern provinces he was successful; but seven of the northern provinces formed, in 1579, the Union of Utrecht, and renounced allegiance to the king of Spain. A long and bloody war of independence followed, which terminated in the establishment of the independent Dutch Republic. In the southern provinces, which remained under the crown of Spain, the Reformation was wholly extinguished. The Dutch Republic, though only one of the smaller Protestant states of Europe, soon became the strong fortress of the Reformation by the conspicuous position it occupied in regard to literature and art, to civilization and to maritime conquest. In the inner history of the Reformed churches, the Arminian controversy [see ARMINIANISM] and the Synod of Dort, which settled the polity of the Synod of Dort led for a time, both in Holland and in the Reformed churches of several other countries, to a complete victory of strict Calvinism over a party which demanded more biblical simplicity and less rigid conformity with the system of any theologian, even if it be Calvin; but soon strict Calvinism lost more ground in Holland than in any other country. The Reformation in the Netherlands was mainly a local movement; but the situation of the country was such that influence from abroad was felt in the tragic fate of the North Dutch Church. The Reformed churches of the northern provinces separated from the latter and constituted a Free Reformed Church. The Dutch Reformed Church has planted large and flourishing offshoots in North America and several countries of South Africa, and thus contributed an important share to the ascendency which Protestantism enjoys in these regions. In Belgium, under the cruel rule of the Spaniards, but very few and small Reformed congregations were able to continue their existence. After the expulsion of Charles V, in the 19th century, the reunion of the country with Holland began an era of greater freedom and of progress, which continued after the erection of Belgium into an independent kingdom. Now Belgium has again a National Reformed Church, which is still one of the smallest Reformed national churches of Europe, but is recognized by the State, enjoys a steady progress, and the out-spoken sympathy of many of the foremost statesmen of the country.

VII. The Lutheran Reformation in the Scandinavian Kingdoms.—At the time when Luther began his reformation, Christian II ruled over all the Scandinavian countries—Denmark, Norway, Iceland, and Sweden. He was an unprincipled tyrant, who favored the Reformation in Denmark in order to strip the bishops of their political power, while in Sweden he executed a large number of Protestants under the plea that they were under the papal ban. As early as 1519 he called Martin Reinhard from Wittenberg to Copenhagen into the theological faculty, and in 1521 he issued a decree encouraging the marriage of the priests. When, in 1522, a papal delegate appeared in Denmark, Christian took his revenge on the marriage of the priests. He was, nevertheless, deposed in 1523, and among the grounds of the deposition which the estates brought forward was, that he had infected his wife with the Lutheran heresy, and introduced promoters of this same heresy into the Catholic kingdom.
Iceland had become a part of the Danish kingdom by the Calmar Union of 1397, and the decree of the Danish Diet of 1836, which declared the Evangelical Church as the State religion of Denmark, became also valid for Iceland. For several years the two bishops of the country successfully neutralized the efforts of the Danish government to enforce them. In 1839 Gifur Einnason was banished from his see. In 1842, when Gifur Einnason was in Wittenberg, became bishop of Skálholt, and began the introduction of the Reformation. His successor, Martin Einarsen, worked in the same direction, but was violently opposed by the other bishop, John Aresen, of Holar, who even took him prisoner, and had Gifur’s bones dug up and interred in an un-Christian fashion. But finally bishop Aresen was overpowered, and in 1850 executed as a rebel. This ended all opposition to the Reformation in Iceland. The entire population, as in Denmark and Norway, has ever since belonged to the Lutheran Church.

In Sweden the Reformation was hailed as a useful ally in the struggle for shaking off the yoke of Denmark and re-establishing the national independence. The bishops and higher clergy were the strongest supporters of Danish rule, and when Gustavus Vasa achieved the freedom of Sweden (1523) by the Diet of Strenigis he was looked upon by the bishops as a dangerous enemy. The king, who needed part of the immense wealth of the clergy to relieve the people of their taxes, at first endeavored to gain pope Adrian VI’s co-operation, but the pope’s council was not attained, the predominance of the Lutherans was now fully decided, and the king openly ranged himself on their side. On the death of Frederick I the bishops used the political power which had been left to them for a last attempt to put down the Reformation, but it was of no avail. The new king, Christian III, by energetic and violent measures, soon destroyed the last remnant of the old Church and completed the victory of the Reformation. Immediately after his accession to the throne, he confirmed the freedom of religion. On Aug. 20, 1526, all the bishops were imprisoned. A diet held at Copenhagen decreed that the bishops should thereafter be deprived of all secular power, and that the Church property should be confiscated, and divided among the king, the nobility, and ecclesiastical and charitable institutions. When the imprisoned bishops declared their willingness to renounce their dignities, they were restored to liberty; only Rönov, bishop of Roeskilde, refused, and died in prison. At the invitation of the king, John Bugenhagen came to Denmark, crowned (1537) the king and the queen, consecrated the archbishop, and took a leading part in the framing of a new Church constitution, which was published on Sept. 2, 1537, and sanctioned by the Diet of Odense in 1539. From that time all Denmark has firmly adhered to the Lutheran Church. For many years no other worship was allowed; and, even after the establishment of complete religious liberty in 1849, more than ninety-nine per cent. of the entire population continue to be classed as Lutherans.

On the progress of the Reformation in Norway we are but imperfectly informed. A monk Anthony, who was a missionary who preached the Gospel in Bergen. The majority of the bishops and the clergy appear to have been opposed to the Reformation, which was almost unknown until the reign of Christian III; then the Danish government began to introduce the Reformation. Olaf Egelbrechtsen, archbishop of Drammen, soon abandoned his opposition to the Danish king and fled (1537) with his treasures to the Netherlands, and resistance to the new Church constitution soon ceased. Many of the bishops and clergy, however, left their positions; though a few, such as the clergy at Orelø, preserved for a long time showed a marked preference for Catholicism. But when the people had become settled in their new belief they became strongly attached to the Lutheran Church, with which now fully ninety-nine per cent. of the population are connected.
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tendent of all the clergy of the kingdom, with a number of custodians and religious councillors as overseers of particular provinces. This arrangement was received with general disfavor, and led to a number of conspiracies. At the death of the king (1560) the ecclesiastical condition of the kingdom was quite undecided. The old nobility, under the leadership of Count Eric XIV, removed some more Catholic elements from the new constitution of the Swedish Church, and gave a hospitable asylum to persecuted Protestants of every creed; the orthodox Lutherans suspected him of an inclination toward the Roman Church, which, however, he did not gain any ground in Sweden. Eric's brother and successor, John III, was prevailed upon by his Catholic wife, who was a Polish princess, and by the hope of succeeding to the Polish throne, to attempt the re-establishment of a closer connection with the Church of Rome. The king was willing to recognize the supremacy of the pope, but demanded a number of concessions for the Swedish Church. The archbishop of Upsala was gained for the plan, a strongly Romanizing liturgy was introduced, but the boldness of the Jesuits incensed clergy and people against the counter-reformation, and the king finally took offense at the refusal of the pope to accept his proposition. The death of the Catholic queen and the king's second marriage with a Lutheran princess put an end to the negotiations with Rome, though the king continued to receive the new liturgy. While John was wavering between Catholicism and Protestantism, his younger brother Charles, who was regent of South Ermland, was an unyielding protector of the Reformation, and did not hesitate to incur the anger of his royal brother by offering a place of resort to the Lutheran clergy who had been expelled from the royal dominions for their unwavering character. King John was succeeded (1592) by his son Sigismund, who was already king of Poland and had been brought up a Catholic. Popular opinion by this time had undergone a great change, and the king recognized Sigismund, a guarantee of the Lutheran State Church. An ecclesiastical council at Upsala (1588), which was convened by duke Charles as regent, decreed, even before the arrival of Sigismund, the exclusion of Catholicism from Sweden, and the official authority of the Confession of Augsburg. In 1596 the Diet of Söderköping declared the Lutheran Church as the only tolerated State Church. In 1599 duke Charles was appointed administrator, and in 1604 he was elected king. The new king was somewhat inclined to Calvinism, but he confirmed the resolutions of the Augsburg Confession, which was the constitution of the Lutheran State Church, which since then has retained full control of the kingdom.

VIII. Protestantism in the Austrian States.—In the various states governed by the house of Hapsburg both the Lutheran and the Reformed Reformation spread with great rapidity. Great enthusiasm was awakened by Luther's Reformation in Bohemia, where deep-rooted opposition to Rome still pervaded the masses of the people. Both the Bohemian Brethren and the Calixtines entered into communion with the German Reformer. Though a full union between Luther and the Brethren, who had never returned to the communion with Rome, was not effected, there was a mutual recognition as evangelical Christians; and the Brethren, whose number now increased again rapidly, and who in 1535 banded in their confession of faith to Ferdinand, helped to strengthen the reformationist body in Europe. Among the Calixtines, so large a number adopted the doctrines of Luther that an assembly of the Estates in 1524 declared in favor of a continuation of the reformation begun by Huss in the way just followed in Luther. At the time of the Smalkald war, a majority of the Bohemians were attached to the Reformation; the Estates denied to king Ferdinand the aid of their troops, and united with the elector. When they had finally to submit, the king gave orders that in future only Catholics and Utraquists should be tolerated in the royal domains, and a large number of the Brethren deemed it best to emigrate to Poland and Russia. In the last years of his life Ferdinand showed a greater moderation towards Protestants, and his son Maximilian II was even, by Protestants as well as Catholics, regarded as a secret friend of the Reformation; but he was unable to prevent the persecutions instigated by the Jesuits. In 1575 the Calixtines and Brethren united and presented a common confession of faith, and received from Maximilian an oral pledge of recognition. In 1609 the king was forced to give a more formal promise to the elector of Saxony, that he would grant his equal rights with the Catholics; but practically the persecutions continued. When the Estates of Bohemia refused to recognize Ferdinand as their king, and elected the Protestant elector of the Palatinate, Frederick V, the Thirty Years' War broke out, in the course of which appeared the fatal decree of 1627, that left to the people only the alternative of becoming Catholics or leaving the country. Notwithstanding the rigorous persecution, which lasted for more than a hundred years, several thousand Protestants maintained themselves secretly in the Lower Austrian and Moravian provinces, and the Moravians and Bohemian Protestants numbered sixty per cent. of the Moravians and ninety-five per cent. of the Moravians and Bohemians were connected with the Church of Rome.

In the southern provinces of Austria the Reformation was generally refused to the elector, and the Lutherans read their writings were eagerly read in Vienna as early as 1520. In 1528 more than one third of the nobility of the archduchy of Austria were evangelical. The Estates demanded freedom of religion in 1542 at Innsbruck, in 1548 at Augsburg, and in 1566 at Vienna, and bishop Naunz, of Vienna, intended to resign because the government tolerated the appointment of Lutheran professors at the University of Vienna. Under Maximilian the Estates called the Lutheran theologian David Chytryus to Vienna to compile a Book of Religion and a Church Agenda, and to establish a Lutheran university. Lower Austria was at once almost wholly won over to Protestantism; but the numerous and bitter doctrinal controversies of the Protestants made it easy for the Jesuits to enforce a counter-reformation. Gradually stringent laws demanded here, as in Bohemia, either a return to the Catholic religion or emigration; but how generally the people continued to be secretly attached to Protestantism became apparent when the victorious Hungarians and Transylvanians compelled the government, in 1596, to promise religious toleration. Whole towns were forced to renounce Protestantism, and in 1610 the emperor Matthias had to recognize the equal rights of the churches. The reviving hopes of Protestantism were, however, cruelly destroyed by the Thirty Years' War, which led to the utter extinction of the Protestant congregations. In Austria, and as in all other countries, the Reformers paid a special attention to the promotion of education; and for the ignorant South Slavic tribes in particular, where Primus Truber displayed a remarkable literary and reformationary activity, he was known as the father of Slavic literature. With the suppression of the Reformation, the Slavs relapsed into the utmost ignorance, from which only now an efficient system of State education is gradually extricating them. In thoroughly Protestant Germany the government in 1601 had passed a law condemning the translation of Latin to Slavonic, and declared it illegal to teach Latin in Moravia, Lower Austria, and Carinthia, and in Silesia. The number of Hungarian students at Wittenberg at the time when Luther began his reformation was so great that his reformationary views became at once widely known in Hungary, and found many friends. As early as 1516 several adherents of the Reformation were
burned. The diet of 1529 passed a decree that all Lutherans and their patrons should be seized and burned. But the number of Protestants was already considerable: in Hermannstadt they had in 1523 the upper-hand; a new bloody law passed in 1524 remained ineffective, and the number of Protestants increased during this period. The reformation in Transylvania—issued laws of persecution, they were unable to carry them out. The number of influential preachers rapidly increased. As the first preacher, Thomas Preussner, of Kásmsk (about 1520) is mentioned, among the most distinguished were Matthias Devay (called Lutherus Ungaricus), Leonhard Stöckel, who drew up the Confesio Pentapostolica, which the free cities of Upper Hungary in 1549 presented to the king, and John Hunter, who had studied in Basle and worked in his native city, Kromstadt, as a preacher and at a printing-press. In 1529 Hermannstadt expelled all priests and monks, and Kromstadt soon followed this example. The episcopal see which became vacant after the battle of Mohacs were partly not filled, and partly came into the hands of friends of the Reformation. Several bishops, including that of Kempten, and Andrew Duthith, who had attended the Council of Trent, openly became Protestants; and even the primates of Gran, Nicholas Olah, approved Stöckel's Confession of Faith. The widow of king Louis II, to whom Luther wrote a letter and dedicated his translation of the Psalms, appointed an evangelical court preacher. Neither Ferdinand, who by the peace of 1536 was confirmed in the possession of the throne, nor John of Zapolya, who was to retain during his lifetime the royal title, Transylvania, and a portion of Upper Hungary, regarded the cities of Dunauerring and Transylvania as objects of special care. But it is clear that the Reformation had been strengthened in Transylvania by the efforts of the Protestants. The widow of John, Isabella, who, after John's death, endeavored to retain her husband's possessions, with the aid of the Turks, for her son John Sigismund, favored the Protestants; and in that part of the country which was subject to the Turks the Reformation advanced without any obstruction. Thus the Reformation obtained a decided ascendency in all Hungary and Transylvania. At one time only three families of magnates were Catholic; the archbishop's see of Gran remained vacant for twenty years; the whole Szeben line of the Turks was now set in its place. In the period of Medvecs (1544), adopted the Confessio Augsburg, which for a long time remained a bond of union for all the Protestants of Hungary and Transylvania. Among the Magyars, however, Calvinism finally obtained the ascendancy, and in 1566 all the Hungarian Reformed churches united to the Helvetian Confession. In Transylvania, in 1564, a Lutheran superintendent was appointed for the Saxons, and a Reformed for Magyars and Szeklers. In 1571 religious freedom was also extended to the Unitarians; and from this time Transylvania has always had far more religious freedom recognized by the State (religious recepta). In Hungary the Jesuits succeeded in arresting the further progress of Protestantism, and in instigating new and bloody persecutions. Repeatedly the Protestant princes of Transylvania, aided by the Hungarian Protestants, compelled the kings by force of arms to confirm anew the religious freedom of Protestantism; but each time these promises were immediately broken. In 1534 the majority of the Hungarian Diet had again become Catholic, and from that time persecutions naturally became all the more oppressive. Throughout Hungary the Protestants maintained themselves; they constitute at present only a minority of the population—about twenty-three per cent. in Hungary proper, and twenty-four per cent. in Transylvania.

X. Protestantism in Poland, Prussia, and Lithuania—Towards the close of the Middle Ages the kings of Poland showed a firmer attachment to the Papal See than any other government of Europe. As, however, the powerful nobles were almost independent of the king, those of them who favored a religious reformation were able to give an asylum to many persecuted heretics during the first years of the Reformation. The Hussite movement excited a great deal of sympathy, and a Polish translation of the Bible came into wide circulation. Luther's doctrines were favorably received by a large portion of the Polish nobility, which at that time was distinguished for its scholarship, and especially by the large German commercial cities of Polish Prussia. In the neighboring grand-mastership of Prussia, the domain of the Teutonic Order, the grand master Albert of Brandenburg called himself in 1523 two Lutheran preachers to Königsberg. The two bishops, and soon the grand master himself, confessed the Reformation, and in 1525 Albert took the duchy of Prussia in fief from Poland. The Reformation was soon generally accepted.

The success of the Reformation in Livonia was equally rapid, notwithstanding the determined opposition of the archbishop of Riga. The city of Riga took the lead, and in 1538 joined the League of Smolkaid. Nearly all the population soon followed. The grand master Conrad Kettler followed the example of Brandenburg, and in 1561 assumed the title of duke of Courland and Semigallia, and to the throne of Livonia in 1572. The Reformation in Livonia was liked by the Polish Czars, and in 1572 the Council of Trent confirmed the Reformation in Lithuania. The two bishops, and soon the grand master himself, confessed the Reformation, and in 1525 Albert took the duchy of Prussia in fief from Poland. The Reformation was soon generally accepted.

The success of the Reformation in these two fiefs encouraged its friends in Poland proper. King Sigismund, who died in 1548, was opposed to Protestantism, but unable to arrest its progress. His son, Sigismund Augustus, favored the Reformation, entered into negotiations with Calvin, and granted religious liberty to the cities of Danzig, Thorn, and Glogau, one of the Polish fiefs; that part of Livonia which was situated on the other side of the Dvina was united by a special treaty with Poland on condition that it should be permitted to profess the Confession of Augsburg.
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mation of the Church had, however, organized societies in Rome, Venice, and other cities, and the writings of the German and Swiss Reformers met therefore with a great deal of sympathy in all parts of Italy. One party of Italian reformers, which counted among its members several cardinals, like Contarini and Carafa, was adverse to a separation from the Church, and hoped for an evangelical regeneration of the old Church. Another party came out in favor of a thorough reformation, first in Ferrara (under the protection of the duchess Renata, a French princess), then in Modena and many other cities. A prominent centre of reformatory movements was subsequently in the city of Naples, where the Spanish nobleman Juan Vázquez displayed a remarkable activity, and where two of the greatest preachers of Italy—Bernardino Ochino, the general of the Capuchinos, and the learned Augustinian Peter Martyr Vermigli—were gained for the Reformation. Translations of the principal writings of German and Swiss Reformers, mostly under assumed names, found a wide circulation, and the Italian reformers themselves published a large number of writings, the most celebrated of which is the work entitled On the Benefits of Christ. Under Paul III the evangelical Catholics, like Contarini and his friends, had for a time a leading influence upon the government of the Church; but in 1542 a decided reaction began when the pope, by the advice of cardinal Caraffa, who had for many years been a friend of Contarini, approved an impartia-

l solution for the suppression of Protestantism. Many of the leading friends of the Reformation fled to foreign countries; among them Ochino, Vermigli, Verggero (bishop of Capo d'Istria), and Caraccioli, a nephew of cardinal Caraffa. When Caraffa became pope, under the name of Paul IV, the persecution extended also to the Catholi-
cs of evangelical sentiments, including a number of cardinals and bishops. Under Paul V an Index Libro-
rum Prohibitorum led to the suppression of all literature friendly to Protestantism. In Spain, as in Italy, the Jesuits, who had been divided into two parties, a Jesuit and a Carthusian, with a prevailing inclination to the latter; and Anti-Trinitarian followers of Servetus had likewise become numerous, although they had to keep their opinions secret. The division of the Protestants weakened their power of resistance, and before the end of the century the Inquisition had destroyed all vestiges of Protestant communities. Among the distinc-
guished martyrs of the Reformation were Carcecechi and Palaeus; two Waldensian congregations in Calab-
ria, the first, and perhaps the last, for a time, to give up to a terrible gauntlet. In 1570, however, the king, chiefly through the influence of cardinal Tournon, ceased to manifest any sympathy with the cause of the Reformation. With it the connection of Frenchmen with the Lutheran Reformation seems to have come to an end, until, at a later period, the conquest of German territories gage to France a considerable number of Lutheran congregations.

The friends whom bishop Briçonnet had called to Meaux to assist him in his reformatory work remained mostly, like himself, within the old Church, contending themselves with the articles of doctrine and discipline among Catholics. Leftvire (Faber Stupendialis), after having fled to Strasbourg on account of the charges of heresy brought against him, was recalled by Francis I appointed librarian at Blois, where he translated the Old Testament, and spent the end of his life at the court of Margaret of Navarre. Etoulard Rousset, with whom Leftvire had Strasbourg, became subsequently bishop of Oloron, where he introduced important reforms, but never ceased to be suspected of heresy. Even Margare-

t of Navarre, the zealous patron of all friends of the Reformation, demanded the Reformed, under Frédéronnet, took on the state according to evangelical principles, never regarded it necessary to separate externally from the Catholic Church. Her course was disapproved by Calvin, but her work was continued by her daughter Jeanne d'Al-
bret, the wife of Anne of Bourbon, and in 1569 the Reformation was fully carried through in Bear.
be subdivided into a number of minor sects, and in many of them, at times, the old doctrinal platforms of the founders of the Reformers appeared to have been abandoned, leaving nothing but the name of the Church as a bond of communion with the denomination of the 16th century. The very name, however, has contributed to the maintenance of consciousness of a live connection with the great movement of the 16th century, thus proved elements of great conservative force, and have been largely instrumental in keeping the territory which the three great branches of the Reformation conquered in the 16th century undiminished up to the present day. While it has been the prevailing tendency in the history of the subdivisions to develop independent life-organisms illustrating the vitality of the principles and theories which led to their separate existence, attempts have never been wanting to strengthen the bonds of union connecting them.

Many subdivisions which had been formed in consequence of disagreeing views on particular points of belief or church government had been reunited on the basis of the points common to all, allowing the right to disagree on points of minor importance. In modern times, attempts have even been made to find a permanent bond of union for all the subdivisions of the large groups of the Protestant churches. Thus, all the bishops of the churches in doctrinal conformity with the History of the Church of England, the Episcopal Church, and the Pan-Anglican councils. All the Reformed and Presbyterian churches met in 1877 for the first time in a Pan-presbyterian Council in Edinburgh. The General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church took, in 1876, the first step towards the convocation of an Ecumenical Council of Methodists.

While the large majority of the millions which in the 16th century rose up against and separated from the Church of Rome rallied around three large centres, it was but natural that many in the search of a pure form of Christianity, around the claims of St. German, and several fortresses as a guarantee of the peace; but two years later (1572), St. Bartholomew's Eve was the beginning of the most terrible ordeal through which they passed in their entire history, more than 30,000 of being massacred during one month. King Henry III was driven by the arrogance of the Guises into the ranks of the Huguenots, and was soon assassinated by the Dominican Clement. Then the first Protestant, Henry of Navarre, ascended the French throne. To save the Protestant cause in the Church, he carried out the great principle, he asserted the rights of the Reformation of the 16th century to the best of their understanding, and to worship God according to the dictates of their own conscience. About the middle of the present century (1845), an attempt was made to unite in one association, called the Evangelical Alliance, Christians belonging to all denominations collectively called evangelical, and to represent, on a larger scale than had ever been attempted before, the unity of all these churches in the more important articles of faith, notwithstanding their separation by external organizations. A list of these articles was drawn up, to which it was thought, all Christians wishing to be regarded as evangelical might be expected to assent. In the list of these articles were included the inspiration of the Bible, the Trinity, the utter depravity of human nature, justification by faith alone, the eternal blessedness of the righteous and the eternal punishment of the wicked, the divine institution of the Christian ministry. According to this programme, it could and did become a rallying-point for Lutherans, Reformed, and Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Methodists, Baptists, Moravians, the evangelical or Low-Church party of Anglican churches, and a number of minor denominations. It was objected to by the so-called high and strict Church parties among Anglicans and Lutherans, by Unitarians and Universalists, by the Friends, by the Anti-Trinitarians, and by all the anti-Trinitarian and the Reformed churches. The subdivisions have again
FORMATION.—The parties which withdrew from the Church of Rome in the 16th century and tried to restore a purer form of Christianity took different roads and arrived at different conclusions; yet there was one point on which they all agreed, and which may be declared to be preeminently the central principle of the Reformation—this was the absolute authority of the Holy Scriptures. Every Reformed Church charged the Church of Rome with holding doctrines and usages which the former deemed antisciriptural, and which on that ground it rejected. The three large divisions of the Reformation were all more intent upon eliminating from the creed of Christendom what could be proved to be anti-scriiptural than to undertake the revision of every article of the creed by a scriptural test exclusively. Thus they all retained what the early councils had defined on the essence of the Godhead and the person of Christ. Gradually other parties arose which demanded a greater prominence for the necessity of the scriptural affirmative proof, and that not too great a stress should be laid upon the testimony of the early Church. Hence many doctrines which the great Reformed churches of the 16th century agreed in continuing in their creeds were by other Christian inquirers declared to lack the foundation of a clear scriptural proof, and on that ground either rejected or held as insufficient by which Bibles Christians had a right to disagree. All these parties, however, held fast to the fundamental principle that the Bible was the supreme authority for the believer in Christ. Other sects and parties have made a distinction between the written Word of God and the Word of Christ, and placed the latter above the former; others, again, have found a hidden sense in the Bible besides the literal; yet all these parties concur in recognising the central principle of the Reformation. A total change of the basis of the Reformation was attempted by the Rationalists of the 18th and 19th centuries, who, wanted to have the Bible regarded and interpreted as any other book, recognising what appeared to agree with sound reason, and claiming the right to reject all the remainder. The divergence between this view and the central principle of the Reformation is so apparent and so radical that the long-continued coexistence of both views in many of the European State churches can only be explained from the fact that the churches were enslaved by the State, and treated not as forms of religion, but as a division of the State administration. The introduction of self-government into the churches rapidly leads to this separation towards the complete separation between the Rationalistic and the Biblical conception of Christianity.

Theologians have sometimes called this principle the formal principle of the Reformation, or the principium conditionale, which, distinguished from it the material principle, or principium essendi, which proclaims the justification of the sinner by faith alone. Both are intimately connected. When the Church is no longer viewed as the infallible teacher of the true Christian doctrine, but the inquirer after Christian truth is pointed to the Bible and to Christ himself, the soul's salvation can only be found in a direct relation between Christ and the Christian soul. The doctrine occupies, however, a somewhat different position in the doctrinal systems of different Protestant churches. See JUSTIFICATION.

XIII. The Reformations Place in the History of the Christian Church and in the History of the World.—It is agreed on all sides, and not even denied by the Catholics, that the Reformation is one of the great turning-points in the Christian Church, and that with it begins an entirely new era. The compulsory uniformity of the Church was forever at an end. Church history, henceforth, has not to deal only with one predominant and all-powerful Church, but with a number of rival churches, the number of which has steadily increased. For a time, the leading reformatory churches in close alliance with the governments of the countries in which they prevailed endeavored likewise to enforce conformity with their doctrines and laws; but this course was gradually recognised to be untenable, and religious toleration, and subsequently the freedom of religious confession, has become one of the characteristic features of the Reformation principle in which all agreed up to the present day to brand the principle of religious liberality as a heresy of modern times; but it is a notable fact that nearly all the Catholic countries which nominally continue to adhere to the doctrine of the Churchdieted legislation which their Church declares to be the Christian principle, and have introduced Protestant principles of religious freedom into their legislation.

In universal history, the Reformation is by all historians designated as one of the great movements which mark the transition from the Middle Ages to modern times. The characteristic feature of the countries which adopted the Reformation is the progress towards political freedom, and the separation between Church and State. The Catholic Church in the Middle Ages claimed a far-reaching influence upon civil legislation. It claimed the sole right of legislating on marriage affairs, exempted priests and monks from civil jurisdiction, and accumulated within its hand a very large proportion of the nation's wealth. Though the Reformed State churches pursued different courses in reforming the civil codes, the tendency to make all citizens equal before the law can be traced in all of them. Although the Catholic Church still has a larger membership than all the Reformed churches combined, the power and the commanding influence upon the destinies of mankind are more and more passing into the hands of states which have separated Church and State, and which are separate from Rome. In the New World, the ascendency of the United States and British America, in both of which Protestantism prevails, over the states of Spanish and Portuguese America is not disputed even by Catholics. In Europe, England has become the greatest world-power, and in its wide dominions new great Protestant countries are springing into existence, especially in Australia and South Africa. In Germany, the supreme power has passed from the declining Catholic house of Hapsburg to the Protestant house of Hohenzollerns, and the new Protestant German Empire marks an addition of the greatest importance to the aggregate power of the Protestant world. The combined influence of the three great Teutonic peoples—the United States, Great Britain, and Germany—continues to be cast in a steadily increasing ratio for the defence of that freedom from the disturbance of religious church and state which the Reformation set up. That freedom is now not only fully secured against any possible combination of Catholic states, but the parliaments of most of the latter, as France, Italy, Austria, Portugal, are as eager in the defence of this freedom as the Protestant states. The existence of about 560 years, the Reformation has totally annihilated the influence of Rome upon the laws and the government of the civilized world.

XIV. Literature.—A great many works which are sources for the history of the Reformation have been mentioned in the articles on the Reformers and on particular churches. The following list contains works which more specially treat of the history of the Reformations:

REFORMATION, FESTIVAL OF THE. This is an annual commemoration in Germany of the great event of the 16th century. It is held on Oct. 31, to remind of the opening of the Reformation by the nailing of the ninety-five theses on the church doors at Wittenberg (Oct. 31, 1517). It is first celebrated as a secular feast, and on the following Sabbath as an ecclesiastical commemoration.

REFORMATION RIGHTS (justa reformandi) are the privileges granted to the different princes of the Reformation compact at the Augsburg Interim in 1555 to introduce into their states either the Catholic or Protestant faith, and to maintain it as the faith of the people. The peace of Westphalia, in 1648, brought in modifications, but modern events have made so many changes in the rights of the Reformed Church that it is only in name. At present it is religious liberty which each state concedes to its subjects, and the only question remaining is whether Church and State shall have any interdependence. See State.

Reformed Baptists. See Campbellites.

Reformed Churches, the name usually given to all the churches of the Reformation. In a conventional sense, it is used to designate those Protestant churches in which the Calvinistic doctrines, and still more the Calvinistic polity, prevail, in contradistinction to the Lutheran (q. v.). The influence of Calvin proved more powerful than that of Zwingli, which, however, no doubt considerably modified the views prevalent in many of these churches. The Reformed churches are very generally known on the continent of Europe as the Calvinistic churches, while the name Protestant Church is in some countries almost equivalent to that of Lutheran. One chief distinction of all the Reformed churches is their doctrine of the sacrament of the Lord's supper, characterized by the utter rejection not only of transubstantiation, but of consubstantiation; and it was on this point mainly that the controversy between the Lutherans and the Reformed was long carried. The doctrine of the Lord's Supper is also one of the important reasons for their rejection of the use of images and of many ceremonies which the Lutherans have thought it proper to retain. Among the Reformed churches are those both of England and Scotland (notwithstanding the Episcopalian government of the former and the Presbyterianism of the latter), the Protestant Church of France, that of Holland and the Netherlands, many German churches, the once flourishing Protestant Church of Poland, etc., with those in America and elsewhere which have sprung from them. See Protestantism; Reformation.

Reformed (Dutch) Church in America, one of the oldest and most influential bodies of Christians in this country.

1. Name.—The former title of this denomination indicated its historical relations, "the Reformed Protestant Dutch Church in North America." It is "Reformed" as to Lutheranism; "Protestant," as professing against Rome; "Dutch," as expressing its origin in Holland. In 1687, by an almost unanimous vote of its General Synod, with the concurrence of the great majority of the classes, the name of the Church was restored to its original and original form—the Reformed Church. The history and reasons of this change are fully presented in an elaborate report, which is appended to the minutes of the General Synod of 1867. The word "Dutch" was originally introduced to distinguish the Church from the "English" Church, by which the Episcopalian denomination was generally known, in the State of New York, after the Dutch government had surrendered to the British in 1664. The Hollanders who settled New York and Albany, and intermediate places, came over as members of the "Reformed Church of the Netherlands" and representatives of the Reformed Religion. It was not until thirty years after the cession of the province to the British that the word "Dutch" was incorporated in the style and title of a single Church when William III of England gave a charter to the Netherlands Reformed Congregation in the city of New York as the "Reformed Protestant Dutch Church." In resuming its original title, the Church has lost none of its historical associations, and has only dropped what had long been regarded by many as a hindrance to her advancement.

II. Reformed Church in Holland.—The Reformed Church of the Netherlands was a legitimate outgrowth from the great Reformation of the 16th century. The conflict for civil and religious liberty in the Low Countries was preceded by the labors of those "Reformers before the Reformation," Wessel Gaasewoort and Rudolph Agricola. Both of these illustrious men were nates of Groningen. They were students of the Bible, who, fifty years before Martin Luther, came to a clear knowledge of the great doctrines of the faith with which he shook the world. But it was not until many years after he had taken his positon that he saw the writings of Gaasewoort, and then he felt constrained to make the fact public, lest his enemies should use their agreement of views to his own disadvantage. Gaasewoort was an eminent teacher at Heidelberg, Louvain, Paris, Rome, and at last, as he made a celebrated conversion, it is his native country where he was born and died in 1489. Agricola was professor in the University of Heidelberg, and was noted for his classical and scientific attainments, and especially for his skill in the use of the Greek New Testament. The labors of these great and good men mightly prepared the way for the civil and religious conflict which followed under Charles V and his son Philip II of Spain. Evangelical truth struck its roots deep down into the hearts of the people. Confessors and martyrs for Christ were never wanting for the persecutions of the government and the Inquisition. The people called themselves the "Churches of the Netherlands under the Cross." They worshipped privately for many years, in scattered little assemblies, until they crystallized into a regular ecclesiastical organization. The ban of the empire and the curse of the Roman Church could not deaden the rising spirit of the heroic believers in Christ and liberty. Every new act of tyranny fanned the sacred flame. Popular field-preachers, like Herman Strijker and Jan Arentzen, gathered thousands of people beneath the open sky to listen to their powerful eloquence. The whole country was stirred to its depths. The synods of Beza and Clement Marot, translated from the French, rang out the pious enthusiasm of the multitudes. Babes were brought for baptism, and alms were collected for the poor. At length three pastors were set apart to the ministry of the Church in Amsterdam, deacons and deaconesses were appointed to distribute alms to the needy saints, and churches were organized. In 1563 the Synod of Antwerp was held, which adopted the Beligic Confession, and laid the foundations of that noble Church to which subsequent synods only gave more form and emphasis. The church schools and universities, her pure faith and holy living, her active zeal and martyr spirit, gave the Reformed Church of Holland the leading position among the sister churches of the Continent. Her catholic feeling and religious life reached not only the Reformed churches of other lands. The Waldenses and the Huguenots, the Scotch Covenanters and the English Puritans,
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found a welcome at her altars; and John Robinson and the voyagers of the Mayflower learned in Holland some of the ordinances which they brought with them to Plymouth Rock.

111. History of the Reformed Church in America.—1. Origin.—The Reformed Church in America was founded by emigrants from Holland, who formed the colony of the New Netherland, and by the authorship of the State-Governor, and after the auspices of the Dutch East India Company. Hendrick Hudson arrived in New York harbor Sept. 11, 1609, in the Half Moon, and proceeded as far as Fort Orange (now Albany). Trading-posts were established there and on Manhattan Island (New York) in 1624. The emigrants came for trade, but they did not neglect religion and the public worship of God. They had no ordained minister and no organized Church for several years; but two "kraan-besoeckers," or "zieken-troosters"—literally "comforters of the sick," pious persons who were often commissioned as aids to the ministers of the Gospel in the mother-country—came over with governor Minuit in 1626. These were Jansen Krol and Jan Huyck. They met the people on Sundays in an upper room above a horse-mill, and read the Scriptures and the creeds to them. This was the beginning of public worship in the New Netherland. There is evidence, however, that "a considerable Church was organized in that city as early as 1619," and that "a list of members in full communion of the Church of New York is still extant, dated 1622." (Life of Dr. John Flavel, page 79, note.)

The first minister of the Gospel who came to this country from Holland was the Rev. Jonas Michaelis, a graduate of the University of Leyden, and afterwards a missionary in San Salvador and Guinea. He preached in New Amsterdam from 1628 to 1633, and then returned to Holland. See MICHAELIS. In the spring of the same year his successor, the Rev. Everardus Bogardus, arrived, bringing with him the first schoolmaster, Adam Roelandsen, who organized the parochial school of the Collegiate Reformed Dutch Church. This school is still in existence, without a break in its succession of nearly two hundred and fifty years. It is sustained by the Collegiate Church, and has always been "an instrument of much good to the Church and to the community." A history of it has been published in a small volume by its present principal, Mr. Dunham, in a collection of sermons and addresses of the school, which bears the name of the Rev. Jonas Michaelis. The school is characterized by the early Reformed churches, and it antedates the claim of priority made by the New England Puritans by several years. The upper room in Francis Molemaker's horse-mill was reincorporated into the first schoolhouse, and the school was founded by John Loeve. The Rev. Jonas Michaelis, in 1683, and a plain, frail wooden church building and a parsonage were erected near what is now Old Slip, on the East River. In 1642, at the suggestion of the famous navigator David Petersen de Vries, funds were raised for the erection of a stone edifice within the fort (now the Battery), where the people worshipped until the church was finished in Garden Street in 1699. A church was planted in the colony of Renellensweck (Albany) under the patronage of Killian van Rensselaer, a pearl-merchant from Amsterdam, who founded a colony upon the large tract of land of which he was the first patron. In 1642 he secured the services of the Rev. Johannes Megapolensis, whose call states that "by the state of navigation in the East and West Indies a door is opened through the special providence of God, and in the name of the Gospel of Jesus Christ for the salvation of men, as good fruits have been already witnessed there through God's mercy." He was also the first Protestant missionary to the Indians in this country, preceding the labors of John Eliot near Boston by three or four years. See MEGAPOLENSIS. His successors Dillius and Lydius did the same good work.

2. First Period.—"The Dutch rule in Manhattan lasted fifty years from the establishment of the first trading-

station. The Church had been organized about thirty years. The city of New Amsterdam, at the date of the surrender of 1664, contained only 1500 inhabitants; there were but five Reformed churches in the whole province—New York, Albany, Flushing and Flatlands, Esopus (or Kingston), and Breuckelen (Brooklyn). There were six ministers—the two Megapolenses, Drius, Schell, and Polyhend, and Bishop. They were men of thorough education, and, as far as we can learn, diligent in the ministry. There were also a church at Bergen, which was the first of any denomination in New Jersey, organized in 1660, and one at New Amstel, Del., which subsequently dropped out of the connection. The Hol-

llanders numbered about 10,000 souls. This first period of the Church was necessary one of very small beginnings. The churches were planted in the wilderness. They encountered all the difficulties of new colonies—surrounded by savage tribes, separated by long distances from each other, and dependent entirely upon Holland for their clergy and school-teachers. Civil affairs were sometimes unhappily mixed up with religious interests, and the growth was slow indeed.

3. The second period covers nearly three quarters of a century (1672 to 1757), during which about sixty churches were added to the denomination. Of these fourteen were in New Jersey, about twenty on the banks of the Hudson River, about half as many in the valleys of Schoharie, Orange, and Ulster, and a half-dozen on the west side of the long island, Long Island, and Staten Island. The first church established in New Jersey began their labors, some of them only remaining a short time, among these churches; and at the close of the period there were sixty churches, and seventeen ministers of Hollandish extraction in America. When the English rule began in New York, emigration from Hol-

land almost ceased. Frequent collisions occurred with the British governors of the province. Governor Andros sent a minister of the Church of England [see VAN RYSELJERK, NICHAU] to Albany to take possession of the Dutch church there; and Governor Fletcher, failing to impose the use of the English language by law upon the Hollanders, procured the passage of a bill by the Assembly settling a maintenance for ministers, which was so worded that, while it might apply to dissenters, it practically subserved the Church of England, and made it substantially the Established Church in the colony. New York, Kings, and Westchester. Church-rates were exacted by the government for the support of these episcopalian ministers. The line of separation between the Dutch and English gradually became more distinct. Many of the Hollanders, through fear of these new regulations, turned to New Jersey, and settled principally in Middlesex, Somer-
they would adhere to the Heidelberg Catechism, the Palatinate Confession of Faith, the Canons of the Synod of Dort, and the Rules of Church Government of Dort. The Reformed Church in America was formed by the direction and under the jurisdiction of the Synod of Holland, which charged the Classis of Amsterdam with the supervision of the affairs of the German Church in America, which then extended among the German settlements in Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, the Carolinas, New Jersey, and New York.

This relation subsisted forty-six years, until 1739, when the cedus asserted its independence of the Church in Holland. See German Reformed Church in America. In Schuyler and Columbia counties, and in the valley of the Mohawk, the German and Dutch elements have, to a great degree, united in the Reformed churches.

4. The third period in this history dates from the first effort of the Dutch churches to secure an independent organization—1737 to 1792. Their entire dependence upon the Church in Holland for ministers, their growth in numbers and their distance from the mother country, the necessities of a new country, and the lack of facilities for educating their clergy, the delays, expense, and anxieties occasioned by the necessity of sending their ministers to Holland for theological instruction, and other good reasons growing out of their position and the ecclesiastical restrictions of the Classis of Amsterdam, led to the organization of a cedus, or ecclesiastical association, in New York in 1737. A plan was carefully framed, submitted to the churches, and sent to Holland for approval by the classis. This plan embraced a yearly meeting of clerical and lay delegates for the transaction of ecclesiastical business only, to promote the welfare of the churches, and in entire secession from the Classis of Amsterdam. A committee was appointed to pass upon it, and they passed it before that body gave its sanction. The first meeting of the cedus was held in September, 1747, and the first German cedus in the same month.

The powers of this body were too limited to make it effective. It had no authority to ordain any man to the ministry without special permission, nor to decide finally upon any question. But these restrictions only roused the spirit of independence in the younger ministry, and generated the powerful opposition of the adherents of the policy of the mother Church. In 1753, measures were taken for forming an American Classis, which was organized in 1755. This event caused the withdrawal of the conservatives, who were thereafter known as the "Confessent," the Dutch word for the Latin cedus. From this time until 1771 the conflict between these parties rent the Church asunder. The Classis of Amsterdam, which had hitherto been the only recognized ecclesiastical authority, was divided, and the cedus was formed as a rival body.

5. Causes of Slow Growth.—It has often been a matter of surprise to persons unacquainted with these and other facts that the introduction of Protestantism in this country has been of such slow growth. The reasons are self-evident. The Dutch rule in New Amsterdam lasted only about thirty years; and when it ceased, the population of the city was but 1500. The English Episcopal Church rose almost to the power of a state establishment. "The Presbyterians of Ireland and Scotland, for a hundred and twenty-five years, were practically excluded by the continued use of the Dutch language from the Church assemblies of the Reformed, and they established their own churches not until the latter part of the 17th century before an English word was heard in a Dutch church." The introduction of English preaching by the Rev. Dr. Laidlie, who was called by the Church of New York for this purpose, was the result of a long strife, and the commencement of a longer struggle against the use of this restrictive tongue. The dependence of the American church upon the Church in Holland for more than a hundred and fifty years also produced its natural results.
neither publicly nor privately propose, teach, or defend the same, either by preaching or writing, until they have first revealed such sentiments to the consistory, classis, or synod, that the same may be there examined; being always ready cheerfully to submit to the judgment of the consistory, classis, or synod, under the penalty of refusal, ipso facto suspended from office." Other provisions, however, guard the rights of conscience and of individual judgment against any harsh or unjust treatment.

Ministers are regarded as bound to the service of the sanctuary for life, and are not at liberty to secularize themselves "except for great and important reasons concerning which the classis shall inquire and determine." Supernumerated and disabled ministers may be declared emeriti, and be excused from all further service in the Church during such infirmity. In the case of pastors thus incapacitated and retired, congregations are required to provide a reasonable support, with the approval of the classis.

The parity of the ministry is effectually secured by the following article of the constitution: "All ministers of the Church are equal in rank and authority. All are bishops or overseers in the Church, and equal stewards of the mysteries of God. No superiority shall therefore be ever claimed or acknowledged by one minister over another, nor shall there be any lords over God's heritage in the Reformed churches." art. ii. § 16.

Licensure is required of all ministers of churches with which the Reformed Church holds correspondence are received upon the usual certificates of dismissal from those bodies; unless there be grounds of presumption against their doctrines and morals; and then inquiries are to be proposed to satisfy the classis as to the propriety of proceeding freely in each case. Foreign ministers must present their credentials before the classis prior to invitation by any consistory to preach in its church: and no classis can receive any such minister without strict observance of the rules of the Church provided for these cases. Ministers coming from non-corresponding bodies must always be examined respecting their theological views before they can be received.

2. Teachers of theology, or professors in the theological seminary, are to be appointed only by the General Synod—the one for life, or during good behavior—"and that to such a synod a professor of theology shall always be amenable for his doctrine, mode of teaching, and moral conduct." He is also required to sign a constitutional formula expressing fidelity to the Church and her theological principles, etc. And, to complete the independence and personal responsibility of the professor to the General Synod, it is provided (art. iii. § 4) that "no professor, while in office, shall have the pastoral charge of any congregation, or be a member of any ecclesiastical assembly or judicatory; but, as a minister of the Gospel, may preach and administer, or assist in administering, the sacraments in any congregation, with the consent of the minister or consistory." Six months' notice of intention to resign his office must be sent to the president of the General Synod before it can be accepted or rejected. Most of these provisions regarding teachers of theology are peculiar to the Reformed Church. Their practical effect has been excellent.


VI. Judicatories. These are:

1. The Consistory.

2. The Classis.

3. The Particular Synod.

4. The General Synod.

1. The Consistory is the primary ecclesiastical body, corresponding to the presbytery of the Presbyterian Church. It is composed of the minister, elders, and deacons of a Church. To the elders, with the minister, are committed the chief spiritual functions of the Church, especially in admitting persons to the communion, in maintaining discipline, and in choosing delegates to the classis. To the deacons is confided the care of the poor. "When joined
together in one board, the elders and deacons have an equal voice in whatever relates to the temporalities of the church, and the calling of a minister is by the choice of their own successors, in all which they are considered the general and joint representatives of the people" (art. vi., § 2). In New York and New Jersey the minister, elders, and deacons constituting the consistory are the legal trustees of the corporate rights and property of the particular Synod, chosen from the congregation, and are often composed of two or more ministers and General Bodies. These meet annually. The first synodal assembly was only provisional; it possessed and exercised the right to examine students of theology for license until the year 1800. This function was afterwards devolved upon the classes alone. The particular Synod is a court of appeal in judicial cases which are carried up from the classes. It has power to form new classes, to transfer congregations from one class to another, and has a general supervisory power over its classes. It also confirms the nominations of the classes for delegates to the General Synod. It meets annually, and has met at least 143 times, the last session held in 1879. The Synod is composed of four ministers and four elders from each class.

The four particular synods now existing are those of New York, organized in 1800, composed of nine classes; Albany, organized in 1800, composed of ten classes; Chicago, organized in 1856, composed of seven classes; New Brunswick, organized in 1869, composed of nine classes. At the session of the General Synod held in 1869 the particular synods were reorganized upon the basis of a plan which is intended to increase their previously limited powers, and to bring them into more systematic and effective coöperation. Each class is to have a synod, a provincial and a General Synod assembly—a sort of ecclesiastical bridge over which the Church passed from her dependence upon the mother Church in Holland to her condition of real independence and separate American organization. At first it was a conventional assembly, consisting of the ministers in the class with an elder from each separate Church. It met triennially. In 1800 it was made a delegated body, consisting of eight ministers and eight elders from each of the two particular synods of New York and Albany, which were constituted in that year, only two ministers and two elders being admitted from each class. In 1809 the delegation was increased to three ministers and three elders, who are nominated by each class and confirmed by their respective particular Synods. By the present Constitution, each class having more than fifteen members is entitled to one additional delegate for each additional five members. In 1812 the sessions were made annual. This body meets on the first Wednesday in June, and it continues in session about ten days. It exercises a general supervision over the entire Church. It is the court of last resort in appeals of judicial cases from the lower bodies. It has power to form and change the particular synods. It elects professors of theology and has supreme control of the theological seminaries. The benevolent boards of the Church are its creations. It corresponds with the various ecclesiastical assemblies of other denominations. It has no power to alter or amend the Constitution of the Church, but can only recommend such changes, which must be submitted, through it, to
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... the classes, and can be adopted only by the votes of a majority of these bodies. The General Synod was incorporated in 1818 by an act of the Legislature of the State of New York.

The first consistorial of the whole Church are managed under this charter by the Board of Direction of Corporation, which is elected annually by the General Synod, and consists of a president, three directors, and a treasurer. The personal and real estate and all the synods' property are confined to the custody of this board, which is in charge of the confidence agents of the Church. Their affairs are reported annually to the synod. For more than sixty years it has managed its large trust with the most exemplary diligence, fidelity, and success, and with scarcely the loss of a dollar from all its investments. The board reported in 1878 that the assets in the hands of the treasurer, June 1, amounted to $451,411.69; this was in addition to the large real estate owned by the synod at New Brunswick, N. J., in the buildings and grounds of the theological seminary, and in those of Hope College, at Holland, Mich.

VII. Liturgy.—1. Made of Worship.—All the Reformed churches of the Continent adopted liturgies for the observance of public worship, including the offices for the administration of sacraments, the ordination of ministers, elders, and deacons, and for the infliction of discipline. Even the Scottish Reformer John Knox prepared a liturgy for the Church of Scotland which was used for some time, but which was ultimately swept away by the same anti-ritualistic storm in which Puritans and Presbyterian were driven to the opposite extremes of bold simplicity in public worship. The liturgy of the Reformed Church of Holland—with the omission only of a prayer in the marriage service and an article on the consolatio of the sick—is accurately given in the English translation, which is now in use in the Reformed Church of America. It was first adopted: was in 1668 and substantially as when first adopted in 1658 by the Synod of Wessel. Like all the Reformed liturgies, it is based on that of John Calvin. But its shape was given chiefly by John Alsaco, the popular pastor of the Reformed Church in London, which numbered, under his ministry, over three thousand members, who were refugees from persecution in their native land. This Church still exists. Alsaco also prepared a new liturgy, using his old one and that of Strassburg, a translation of which, from the French, was published by Solomon, Calkins' successor who founded a Church at Glastonbury, England. It was written in Latin, and then, in 1551, translated into Dutch by John Uytenhove, an elder of the Church in London. The liturgy of the Reformed Church in the Netherlands was prepared by Peter Dathem, an eminent minister, who, while living in London, settled with some of his fellow-exiles in the Palatinate at Frankenthal, near Heidelberg. He translated the Heidelberg Catechism into the Holland language, and also the psalms of Beza and Marot from their French originals. He dedicated the volume containing those symbols (psalms, catechism, and liturgy) "'to all the churches and ministers of Jesus Christ sitting and mourning under the tyranny of antichrist. Subsequently, the "Form for Adult Baptism," and the "Consecration of the Sick and Dying," and the "Compendium of the Christian Religion," a condensation of the Heidelberg Catechism—which was in place of another brief catechism—for persons who intended to unite with the Church, were issued. In 1574 the Synod of Dordrecht directed the liturgy to be used in all the churches. For a full account of the Presbyterian and Congregational, see ch. xi; and Prof. Domare's History and Ecclesiastical Characteristics of the Ref. Ch. ch. vii.

The liturgy is officially declared to be a part of the Constitution of the Reformed Church (Minutes of Gen. Synod, 1871, p. 426). The office of baptism and the Lord's supper, for ordination of ministers, elders, and deacons, and those for excommunicating and for readmitting the excommunicated are also declared by the Constitution to be essential, and must be used. The forms of prayer, marriage-service, etc., are not essential, but simply remain as formulas and specimens, which the ministers may not be used by the minister. The prayers were used for a time, but always in connection with extemporary prayer. Since the latter part of the 17th century they have been dropped in public worship in Holland. When English preaching had been established in the Church of New York, three years after Dr. Judie's advent, a translation of this liturgy into English—which is more accurate and faithful than elegant in style—was procured and introduced by the collegiate consistory. The same year also (1677) singing in the English language was commenced in that Church. The volume used was an amended edition of Brady and Tate's version, in which the old music was retained and the rhyme adapted to it. See Psalmod.

Several attempts have been made to revise the liturgy, all of which have failed of final adoption by the classes, to whom, under the constitution, they were referred for final decision.

2. Other Customs (essential and non-essential).—In 1814 the General Synod adopted a report of a committee on this subject which is still the law of the Church. The essential customs which were necessary to be continued in the Church are expressed in the explanatory articles of the constitution; such as singing the psalms and hymns approved of and recommended by the General Synod; preaching from the Heidelberg Catechism; observing the forms in the administration of baptism and the Lord's supper, etc., as contained in the liturgy, etc. "Other customs and usages prevail in the Church which are deemed non-essential, and in many instances are either wholly dispensed with or partially retained in our congregations, according to the taste and judgment of the members. The arrangements observed in the performance of public worship—the number of times of singing psalms and hymns; reading sermons and preaching them from memory or extemporaneously; sprinkling in baptism one or three times; sitting or standing in receiving the Lord's supper; preaching on Ascension-day, Good-Friday, and other days which have long been observed both in Holland and America" (Minutes, 1814, p. 31, 32). In the Constitution adopted in 1832, however, "for the purpose of uniformity, a directory is set forth which to be observed in all the churches." In Holland all the clergy wear the official pulpit dress or gown during their performance of public worship. In this country the custom prevails chiefly in the cities of Philadelphia, New York, Albany, Newark, and Providence. In some of the country and village churches.

VIII. Institutions.—1. Colleges.—Zeal for the training and perpetuation of an educated ministry—which produced the unhappy division of the Church in the last century—soon led to various plans for the establishment of proper schools for that purpose in this country. Few ministers came from Holland; and the time, cost, and dangers, the difficulties and disappointments, incurred in sending youth to be educated in the universities of the mother country were too great to furnish a supply from this source. The number of churches rapidly outgrew the pastors. In 1754, in order to defeat the movements of the centus for independence, a plan was adopted, by a provision which was inserted in the charter of King's (now Columbia) College, in New York, giving the consistory of New York the privilege of electing a professor of theology in that institution. But, fearing that such an arrangement would produce an episcopalian defection, the Rev. Theodore Frelinghuysen, of Albany, projected an academy or seminary, in which the Dutch language should be adopted and the advantages of both the German gymnasium and the university system. In 1759 he sailed for Es-
The Science of Revealed Truth Impeachable, as shown by the Argumentative Failures of Infidelity and Theoretical Geology. All of these lectures have been published under the general title of The Vedder Lectures.

"Hope College," located at the city of Holland, Mich., was chartered in 1856, and grew out of a flourishing academy which was conducted as a civil and parochial school in the infancy of the colony of Hollanders, founded by the Rev. Dr. Albertus C. Van Raalte, on Black River and lake, in that state, in the year 1846-47. This institution embraces a preparatory school, collegiate, scientific, and theological departments, under the ecclesiastical supervision of General Synod. The General Synod retains immediate charge of its council and faculty. It possesses ample college grounds, good buildings, an endowment of funds which are augmenting yearly, a tract of land called "the James Saydam farm of Hope College," after a great benefactor, and many appliances for a liberal training. The course of instruction is thorough, and will be expanded with the demands of the times. The faculty consists of a president and five professors, with subordinate teachers. The whole number of pupils in June, 1878, was 98, of whom 65 were in the preparatory department, and 33 in the internal. The seventeen-year period was celebrated, with appropriate services, at the commencement held in June, 1870. A large endowment has been secured. The course of instruction has been greatly enlarged and the standard of scholarship elevated.

2. Theological Seminaries.—A professor of theology, Dr. John H. Livingstone, was chosen in 1874, and at the same time Dr. Hermanus Meyer was appointed professor of languages, and two years later, also, as lector in the Kirkpatrick Professorship in theology. In 1878-79 were appointed additional professors of didactic theology. Other appointments were subsequently made—Rev. Drs. John Bassett, Jeremiah Romeyn, and John M. Van Harlingen. All of these professors and lectors originally taught their students at their own places of residence. The seminary proper, under Dr. Livingstone, was located in 1796 at Flatbush, L. I., and in 1804 was transferred to New York, where it remained until its final location, in 1810, at New Brunswick, N. J.

These facts substantiate the claim that the Reformed Dutch Church in America was the first of all her Protestant sisters to reduce theological education to a system, the first to demand that it be in charge of a professional instructor, and the first to appoint a theological professor. But for the outbreak of the Revolutionary war, her theological seminary might have been started in the year of American independence, 1776. Dr. Livingstone occupied the professorial chair from 1784 to 1825; and previous to the removal to New Brunswick he and his colleagues sent forth 91 students to the ministry. After the death of Dr. Livingstone the efforts to secure a proper endowment, the professorship was merged in Queen's College by a covenant between the synod and the trustees of that institution. In the year 1825, the seminary had three resident theological professors, and was fully organized. Additional articles of agreement were now entered into with the trustees, by which a theological college was organized, and the name changed from Queen's to Rutgers. Three years later, a Board of Education was established to care for beneficiaries. In 1865 another theological professorship was added, and the covenant between the synod and the trustees of Rutgers College formally annulled. The following year, Hope College was organized in Holland, Mich., and in a twelvemonth more a theological department in the same place. In the year 1856, Mrs. Anna Hertzig, of Philadelphia, donated $5,000 for the establishment of a suitable edifice for the use of the seminary, upon the condition that it should bear the honored name of her deceased husband, "the Peter Hertzig Theological Hall." The building was speedily erected—three stories in height, 126 feet long, and 67 feet wide, with double rooms for reading and study purposes, to accommodate about sixty students; lecture-rooms for the professors, rector's residence, and refectory. It stands in the midst of seven acres of land, which were also donated for the purpose by Messrs. James Neilson, David Bishop, and...
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Charles P. Dayton, and Francis and Wessell Wessell.
The site is commanding. Three professors’ houses have been built upon it, and another one, directly opposite, has been bought and presented to the General Synod by Messrs. James Suydam and Gardiner A. Sage, of New York, at a cost of $18,000. Mrs. Hertzog also left by will, the interest in two trust funds, the income of which is to keep the hall in repair. By the munificence of its friends the building has been thoroughly refitted and furnished in the best manner to make it a pleasant Christian home for the students. In 1874 the James Suydam Hall was opened for use. The large, spacious, commodious, and costly building, containing a chapel, lecture-rooms, museum, and gymnasium, was the gift of the late James Suydam of New York, who laid its cornerstone but did not live to see it completed. Mr. Suydam also endowed the professorship of didactic and polemic theology which bears his name, in the sum of $60,000; and these, with various gifts and legacies to the theological seminary and other specific Church purposes, amount to more than $250,000. This was in addition to other bequests to the American Bible and Tract society, and the seminary and the Bible society were also made his equal residuary legatees. A bronze statue of Mr. Suydam, somewhat larger than life size, the gift of friends, was unveiled on the day of dedication of the hall. The Gardner A. Sage library building is the gift of the generous founder whose name it bears, who superintended its erection and has provided for its maintenance and support. It is perfectly fire-proof, and combines every modern arrangement for heating, ventilation, light, and security from dust and other annoyances. It has room for about 100,000 volumes. The library at present numbers over 80,000 volumes, to which additions have been constantly made by donations, and principally from a fund of $35,763, of which a balance of about $10,000 remains unexpended. The selection of books is confined to a competent committee, under the supervision of the General Synod, in cooperation with the theological professors. The library has a very complete Biblical critical apparatus, including fac-similes of the Sinaitic, Vatican, and other MSS.; the Acta Somtorum (Bollandist), 60 vols.; Migne’s Patrology, 320 vols., embracing all the fathers, Greek and Latin; and many of the best and rarest editions of standard works imported from Europe.

The permanent endowment of the seminary, which is still in progress, now amounts to over $200,000, besides the real property held for its uses. There are four professors, and the number is now in its class, while the hall is filled with other young men of the college and preparatory school who are on their way to the ministry. The course of instruction is thorough, and embraces the usual departments of theological study in similar institutions, with the addition of those subjects which are specially related to the Reformed Church, such as the Confession of Faith, Canons of Dort, Heidelberg Catechism, the ecclesiastical polity, and the constitutional law of the denomination. The whole number of graduates from its establishment in 1816 to 1873 is 609. The faculty of the seminary is vested in the General Synod and meets annually. A standing committee of the synod has the charge of its temporal affairs.

The Theological Seminary in Hope College” had for its first professor Rev. Cornelius E. Cripelli, D.D., who was elected by the General Synod in 1867 to the chair of didactic and polemic theology, and the other professors in Hope College were invited to act as lecturers. In 1869 two additional professors were added. There is a Board of Superintendents, which consists of the Council of Hope College, with duties and prerogatives like those of the seminary at New Brunswick. The endowment of this institution has been begun. In 1878, on account of financial embarrassments, the theological department was suspended and the students went to other institutions. A few young men have gone out from its walls to preach the Gospel, two of them as foreign missionaries.

3. Parisian Schools.—A few of these are aided by the Board of Education. They are almost exclusively confined to the German and Holland Churches.

4. Foreign Missions.—The Reformed Churches, her ministers gave special care to the evangelization of the heathen Indians. During the existence of the United Foreign Missionary Society, she steadily contributed to its funds; and when that organization was dissolved, and its stations transferred to the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, she continued her efforts in connection with it. In 1832 the General Synod appointed its own Board of Foreign Missions, proposing to organize missions of their own Church to be conducted through the medium of its prudential committee. In 1856 the first band of missionaries went out to seek a settlement in Northern India, but subsequently located in the island of Borneo. After working a long while harmoniously in this relation, prompted by a desire to accomplish the utmost that might be gained by an independent American missionary society, and other motives, it was considered desirable to sever the connection existing between their society and that of the American Board. This was accordingly done in 1858. The number of members is twenty-four—one half being laymen, and one third elected annually by the General Synod. A number of missionaries, several times, under the care of the board, have been sent out to China, India, and Japan. Chief among the missionaries of the Church in the foreign field were the Rev. John Scudder, M.D., of the Madras Mission: the Rev. David Abeel, D.D., the first American missionary to China; and the Rev. Dr. Cornelius V. A. Van Dyck, the translator of the Arabic Bible, who, although in the employ of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, yet retains his relation to the Reformed Church, from which he went out as a missionary. The Mission to the Dyaks in Borneo was given up in 1849, some of the missionaries having been transferred to Amoy in China, and the others returned to America.

The China Mission was organized at Amoy in 1844, at the original suggestion of the Rev. David Abeel, D.D., who visited that city in 1842, just after it had been declared one of the five open ports. The first missionaries were Rev. Messers. William J. Pohiman and Elisha Day. Its prosperity has been wonderful. The Mission now (1879) consists of seven churches and seventeen stations, comprised of over 2,000 members, and membership of 598 communicants. Over these in Amoy and adjacent cities are now four missionaries and four assistants, with three native pastors settled over and sustained by two churches in the city of Amoy and the Church of Kang-than and Opi. The Mission is divided into Congregations which are specially related to the Reformed Church, such as the Confession of Faith, Canons of Dort, Heidelberg Catechism, the ecclesiastical polity, and the constitutional law of the denomination. The whole number of graduates from its establishment in 1816 to 1873 is 609. The faculty of the seminary is vested in the General Synod and meets annually. A standing committee of the synod has the charge of its temporal affairs. The Theological Seminary in Hope College” had for its first professor Rev. Cornelius E. Cripelli, D.D., who was elected by the General Synod in 1867 to the chair of didactic and polemic theology, and the other professors in Hope College were invited to act as lecturers. In 1869 two additional professors were added. There is a Board of Superintendents, which consists of the Council of Hope College, with duties and prerogatives like those of the seminary at New Brunswick. The endowment of this institution has been begun. In 1878, on account of financial embarrassments, the theological department was suspended and the students went to other institutions. A few young men have gone out from its walls to preach the Gospel, two of them as foreign missionaries.

The Arcot Mission in India was organized in 1854, being composed of the sons of the celebrated missionary the Rev. John Scudder, M.D., of Madras, with their families. The Classis of Arcot was formed in 1854, with the clerical missionaries and three native elders. According to the report of 1877, the classis is composed of twenty churches, with a membership of 1750 communicants. With them are connected 86 native pastors, 23 assistant pastors, and a number of regular attendants upon the means of grace being 4396. Contributions for religious and benevolent purposes in 1889 amounted to $7556 in gold. There are 8 missionaries and 6 assistants in this important field of labor, with 2 native pastors and 21 catechists, 22 Bible readers, 29 teachers, and 19 color-
teurs. There are 4 seminars for males and females, a preparand school for training native catechists and pastors, and 97 day-schools with 2508 scholars. The missionaries and native helpers make frequent tours into the surrounding country. The statistics of this work for 1889 were, 18,006 sermons preached to 297,979 hearers, and 14,000 books and tracts distributed.

The press is used freely to print the Scriptures, catechisms, and practical, religious, and educational works. The hospital and medical dispensary at Arout has received the highest official praise from lord Napier, the governor general, and is esteemed all the same one of the government. The number of patients treated in 1889 was 63,586, an average of 17 per day. A medical class of young natives is connected with it. The Gospel is daily preached to all comers, and portions of the Scriptures, tracts, and good books are offered to all who can read. A simple and brief story of Christ's love to fallen man is carried away by every patient on the printed ticket given to him on his first application, and which he must show at each subsequent visit.

A missionary held a meeting at the Quebec Convention for prayer for missions held in Feb., 1889, in the South Reformed Church, New York, when one elder offered to give $800 per year to support a missionary in Japan, another made a similar promise, and the Church pledged itself for a third like sum. On May 7, 1889, the Board of Foreign Missions of the Committee of Correspondence—Rev. Samuel R. Brown, M.D. (who has been a missionary in China for several years), Rev. Guido F. Verbeck, and D. Simmons, M.D., with their wives, and Miss Caroline E. Adriance—who reached Nagasaki Nov. 1 of that year. Rev. James H. Ballagh was sent out in 1862, and Rev. Henry Stout in 1868. Dr. Simmons and wife resigned in 1860, and Miss Adriance went to Amoy, where she became an assistant missionary, and died in 1863. She always bore her own expenses as a volunteer missionary. The missionaries engaged chiefly at Yokohama, Nagasaki, and Tokio in teaching the government schools, translating the Word of God, circulating the Scriptures, tracts, and books in Chinese, and instructing inquirers in the way of salvation. Mr. Bal-

lagh began a Japanese religious service in 1866, the average attendance being about twenty persons. The first two native converts, Wakasa, a nobleman, and Ayabe, his younger brother, were baptized by the Rev. G. F. Verbeck, May 20, 1866, the day of Pentecost, at his residence in Yokohama. Wakasa's attention was first drawn to him by a copy of the New Testament in English, which some Japanese picked up out of the water in the bay of Nagasaki, and which was probably lost overboard from an American or English ship. He did not rest until, five or six years after, he procured a Chinese translation of it, which he eagerly read. Thus this "bread cast upon the waters" was found "after many days" in the soul of the first Japanese convert to Christianity. In March, 1872, the first native Christian Church was organized by the Rev. James H. Ballagh at Yokohama with eleven members. In 1874 it had had a Baptist Church, located in Yokohama, in which it worshiped cost about $6000, of which the first thousand was given by the native Christians of Honolulu, Sandwich Islands. It seats about 450 persons. In 1889 there were 2 stations and 19 out-stations, and preaching-places with communicants enrolled to the number of 1800 belonging to this mission. The entire native contributions amounted to $8234.70. The mis-

sion has been very successful in the last three years. The present missionary force of this Church in Japan consists of 9 missionaries and 11 assistant mis-

sionaries, all of whom are catechists or teachers. There is one academy at Yokohama, the Isaac Ferris Seminary, for girls, of whom there were 153 at latest date. A theological class or school of 32 young men is also established, under the instructions of the Rev. James L. Amerman.

Another school for girls is at Nagasaki. The Rev. Dr. G. F. Verbeck has been for many years connected with the Imperial University at Yedo, under the auspices of the government, and he has also been engaged with Mrs. Brown, Hepburn, and others in the work of translation of English works into Japanese and of Japanese works into English. Of the large number of Japanese youth who came to this country for education, a score or more were students at Rutgers College and its gram-
marsch. Several of them have united with Chris-

tian churches in the United States, and some have gone back to Japan to preach the Gospel and to serve Christ in other stations. The Oriental interest in the work in Japan is full of promise. Dr. Brown has long been en-
gaged with Dr. Hepburn and others in translating the Bible into Japanese.

In addition to these Oriental Missions, the board has also co-operated with other missionary boards in the plan of Indian agencies under the government of the United States. The tribes assigned to it are the Pimas, Maricopas, and Papagoes; the Mohaves on the Colorado River Reserve; and the Apaches on the White Mountain Reservation, north of the Mexican line.

The Women's Board of Foreign Missions, an efficient auxiliary to the Synod's Board, was organized in February, 1875. It has between fifty and sixty auxiliaries; is devoted to the increase and maintenance of woman's work for women in heathen lands; and contributes liberally to the support of foreign missions in Amoy, Nagas-
saki, Japan, where it has undertaken to establish a female seminary; and it has also begun to labor for China. It has published in an elegant volume, with maps and many illustrations on wood, a very complete Manual of Foreign Missions of the Reformed Dutch Church in America (8vo, 326 pp.).

The ordinary appropriations of the Board of Foreign Missions for the year ending June 1, 1879, were $56,600.

5. Home Missions—The Board of Domestic Missions consists of twenty-four members, half of whom are lay-

men, and one third are elected annually by the General Synod. It was reorganized in 1849, with a corresponding secretary exclusively devoted to its service. Previous to this, for a number of years, the duties of that office were performed voluntarily by settled pastors. All the Reformed churches were on missionary ground until the independent organization of the denomination was secured in 1771. Soon after this event, ministers and elders were occasionally sent out upon tours of exploration among the Western settlers in the West. In 1862, the General Synod, and to establish mission stations and churches. As the result of these labors, a few new churches were organized—one in Virginia, six in Kentucky, six in Lower Canada, and elsewhere in the regions of the Delaware and Susquehanna rivers, and Central New York. It was then determined to concentrate efforts nearer home, and the distant churches—some of which yet live in other denominations—were left alone. In 1822 the "Missions Society of the Reformed Dutch Church" was organized in the city of New York. A Northern Board was organized in 1827, in which it worshiped cost about $6000, of which the first thousand was given by the native Christians of Honolulu, Sandwich Islands. It seats about 450 persons. In 1889 there were 2 stations and 19 out-stations, and preaching-places with communicants enrolled to the number of 1800 belonging to this mission. The entire native contributions amounted to $8234.70. The mis-

sion has been very successful in the last three years. The present missionary force of this Church in Japan consists of 9 missionaries and 11 assistant mis-

sionaries, all of whom are catechists or teachers. There is one academy at Yokohama, the Isaac Ferris Seminary, for girls, of whom there were 153 at latest date. A theological class or school of 32 young men is also established, under the instructions of the Rev. James L. Amerman.
the West, and two in the South. The number of families in the Mission churches was 6787 and 8896 Church members, of whom 1040 were received during the year. There were 134 Sabbath-schools, with 11,339 scholars. The income from all sources for the missionary operations of the Church, since 1852, more than three hundred churches have been organized—about half of these in the single decade of 1850-60—and many of these under the auspices of this board. Thousands of Hollanders, most of whom are in this denomination, have settled in Michigan, Wisconsin, Iowa, and adjoining states during the last thirty years. These have formed a beneficent element in the missionary growth and extension of the Church in the North-west. Of its nearly 79,000 members, about 11,000 are Hollanders.

6. The Board of Education, which was organized as a voluntary society in the city of New York in 1829, was adopted by the General Synod in 1832. It consists of twenty-four members, who are elected for three years each, one third of whom are elected annually. It has the immediate care of all the beneficiaries and educational interests of the Reformed Church, including such beneficiaries as receive aid from the Van Benschoten and Knox funds, which are held by the trustees of Rutgers College. Every beneficiary must be a member in good and regular standing in the Reformed Church, and must also have been a member of some Protestant Church for at least two years to make him a candidate for aid. He must be recommended to the board by the pastor and consistory of the Church, and by the classis to which said Church belongs, after sustaining a satisfactory examination as to his need of assistance, and physical, mental, and spiritual qualifications for study and for the holy ministry. Every precaution is taken against the introduction or continuation of improper candidates. Repayment of all money received from the board is required from those who do not complete their course of ministerial preparation, unless they are, in the judgment of the board, rendered thereby impaired. The board will accept from all beneficiaries after their licentiate two years' service under the care of the Board of Domestic Missions, as a full satisfaction for all aid rendered to them by the Board of Education. This is a wise provision, which has secured many excellent young laborers in the home missionary field. All the students are considered as under the pastoral care of the corresponding secretary. In 1865 the powers of the board were enlarged to enable it to co-operate with the various academies and classical schools within their bounds. The board was incorporated in 1870, to enable it to hold legal possession of its funds and to secure others that may be deeded to it by will. In addition to the Knox Fund ($20,000), the Van Benschoten Fund ($20,818.57), the Smock Fund ($200), the Maderveille Fund ($29,000), and the Voorhees Fund ($26,000), which are held by the trustees of Rutgers College, and the interest of which is paid out to beneficiaries of this board, it holds twenty-five scholarships, ranging from $1700 to $10,000, in all a capital of $29,000, besides the Reformed Church collections and private donations, amounting in 1877-78 to $11,299.74—all for the education of young men for the ministry. It also holds certain trust funds for Hope College, and receives moneys for parochial schools which are under its care. The total income for the year ending June 1, 1878, was $53,268; and the total number of young men under its care for the same period was eighty-three.

About one third of the present ministry of the Church have been aided by this board in their studies for the sacred ministry. Donations go to institutions that are distinctly literary institutions, but must study theology in one of the seminaries of the Reformed Church.

7. The Board of Publication was organized in 1855 by authority of the General Synod. It consists of twelve ministers and twelve laymen, one third of whom are elected annually by the Synod. To it are "intrusted, with such directions as may from time to time be given by the General Synod, the superintendence of all the publications of the Reformed Church, and the circulation of such works pertaining to the history, government, doctrines, and religious literature of said Church and of other denominations which are for the benefit of the Church, which, when properly approved," it has a corresponding secretary and general agent, and a depository located in the city of New York. Its printing and binding are done by contract. It publishes a semi-monthly newspaper called the Sower and Gospel Field, which is the accredited organ of the beneficiaries of the Board. The catalogue of its books and tracts, for denominational and general uses, is large, and constantly receiving new additions. Sales are made at a moderate profit. Gratuities distributions and liberal discounts are made to weak churches, poor Sunday-schools, and for missionary purposes. During the civil war in the United States, it sent forth large gratuitous supplies into the armies of the Union; and since the cessation of hostilities it has done a good and large work of benevolent circulation in the South, particularly among the freedmen. In India it has published the Reformed Church in Ceylon a schism in Tamil during the year ending June, 1870; and a supply of its elementary books for Sabbath-school and general instruction has been asked for and sent to Japan for use in the government schools under the care of the missionaries. The minutes of the board, June 1, 1878, were reported to the Synod as $12,243.64. Receipts for the year, $9,102.39.

8. The Widow's Fund, or Relief Fund, for disabled ministers and the widows and orphaned children of deceased ministers, was organized in 1857. Its benefits are limited to subscribing ministers who may pay $20 in full, or $10 or $5 annually, and who shall receive, pro rata, the annuities which may be due upon personal disability, or, at their own decease, by their families. Congregations are urged to secure an interest in the fund for their ministers by making the requisite contribution yearly. The funds, which are intrusted to the Board of Direction of Corporation, are invested in bonds and mortgages and in government bonds. One half of the annual payments by ministers, and donations, when specially directed by the donor, are considered income; the other half of the annual payments by ministers, all other donations, and church collections, are considered as principal, and the interest thereof only is used as income. The maximum amount to be paid to parties interested in the fund are: to a minister disabled by sickness or old age, $50 per year; to disabled widows, $200; to children of clergyman, both of whose parents are deceased, $75 per year each until they are sixteen years of age. Other provisions regulate minor payments. The amount of each annuity is of course dependent upon the number of annuitants, and may vary yearly. The maximum may be increased when the state of the fund shall warrant it. The amount of this fund June 1, 1878, was $49,807.99; and the sum paid to annuitants during the previous year was $2,559.99.

9. The Board, besides the Annual Collections, has, in the annual meeting of 1856, established the Annual Fund, which makes it possible for a class who cannot avail themselves of the Widow's, or Relief, Fund, was organized in 1855, under the title of the Seminarian Fund. It is also in trust of the Board of Direction of Corporation. Its moneys are to be kept invested, and to be "used for the support of disabled ministers and the families of deceased ministers, such use may be in need." Applications for aid are made through and recommended by the classes to the applicants belong. Contributions which are donated specifically for principal are so used; all other contributions are applied toward the interest which remains is carried to principal and placed at interest upon first-class securities. Aged and infirm ministers are thus assisted, and also the needy families of deceased clergyman. The amount of this fund reported June 1, 1878, was $15,614.65, of which $14,222 was appropriated to its beneficiaries.
10. The Church-building Fund is held in trust and dispensed by the Board of Domestic Missions at its discretion. Aid is given from it only to churches which shall have no debt after receiving assistance from this fund. A first bond and mortgage is taken from such church, and the Domestic Board may remit the interest thereon; but in no event shall the church be annually contributed for the fund; and every church aided is to pay back the aid received as soon as practicable. The receipts for the year ending June 1, 1878, were $8,659.80.

IX. Correspondence. — The General Synod holds official correspondence by interchange of delegates (or by letter) and letters to and from the general assemblies of the Reformed Presbyterian Church in the United States; the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States; the General Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church; the General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church of North America; the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States (South); the General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States; and the General Council of the Reformed Episcopal Church. With this correspondence has been published in pamphlet form, with the exception of the Waldenses of Piedmont, occasional correspondence is held by letter, and also with the Free Church of Scotland and other ecclesiastical bodies in Europe. The spirit of this correspondence is well described by one of the ministers of the Church in these words, respecting her catholic sentiments and action:

"Our Church has been distinguished by a steady and united adherence to her standards and order, and at the same time friendly and friendly to other evangelical denominations. She has enjoyed peace within her own bosom, while agitation questions have troubled, and even rent, other churches. She has borne a full proportionate share in contributions to Christian benevolence large, both in the heart, as the American Bible Society, the American Tract Society, and others. She is dexterous and anxious, in a sense of privilege and responsibility, to employ her influence for increasing the degree and extent of her influence in all she can for the spread of the Gospel and the salvation of souls. Her pectoral character, her freedom from the niggardliness of the day, her evangelical principles, the peculiar features of her government and order, and the attitude in which she stands in the Church, show the 'peace and prosperity of Christ.'"

X. Statistics. — 1. Numbers and Funds. — In June, 1878, the Reformed Church embraced 4 particular synods, 33 classes, 503 churches, 542 ministers, 6 candidates for the ministry, 39,197 members, 7,106 communicants, of whom were received during the previous year 3,943 on confession and 1,666 by certificates; baptisms of infants, 3,674; of adults, 1,044; catechumens, 24,445; Sabbath school scholars, 80,109; contributions for religious and benevolent purposes, $308,103; for congregational purposes, $788,222. In July, 1889, there were returned 546 churches, 568 ministers, 6,812 communicants.

2. Periodicals. — The Christian Intelligence, weekly, owned and edited by private individuals; the Soeur and Gospel Field, semi-monthly paper, organ of the Church board; and The Churchman Monthly, published by the Board of Foreign Missions.

XI. Denominational Literature. — The following are some of the most important publications:
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delbert Catechism, translated by Prof. J. F. Berg, D.D. (Philadelphia, 1854, 1 vol. 8vo). Dr. Berg also published several volumes on prophecy, the Second Advent, Church and State, etc.; Centennial Discourses, a series of twenty-two sermons delivered in their 1873-1874 order by the General Convention, was set forth in the form of the Reformed Church to liberty and to faith and education, and other topics appropriate to the Centennial year of the republic (8vo, 601 pp.). Quarter-Millennial Anniversary of the Reformed Protestant Dutch Church of the City of New York, 1628-1878 (1879, 8vo, 104 pp.). (W.J.R.T.)

Reformed Episcopal Church, the official designation of a distinct body of Christians in America and Great Britain.

I. History. The ecclesiastical organization took its rise in the city of New York December 2, 1873. The Rt. Rev. George David Cummins, D.D., assistant bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the diocese of Kentucky, separated from that Church, in a letter to presiding bishop Smith dated November 10, 1873. Within one month from that date, the Reformed Episcopal Church was organized, with Dr. Cummins as its first bishop. Bishop Cummins was born December 11, 1822. He was related on the maternal side to the celebrated bishop Asbury, of the Methodist Episcopal Church, but was of Episcopal descent on both sides. He was educated at Dickinson College, Carlisle, in 1841, in the nineteenth year of his age. In the year 1843 he became connected with the Episcopal Church, and in 1845 was ordained to the diaconate by bishop Alfred Lee, of the diocese of Delaware. After a ministry of great eloquence, power, and success in different prominent fields of labor during twelve years, he was consecrated to the episcopate as assistant bishop of the diocese of Kentucky in 1866. During October, 1873, the Evangelical Alliance met in New York city. Bishop Cummins was in attendance, and on the eighth day of that month delivered an address on the subject—Roman and Reformed Doctrines on the Subject of Justification, Contrasted. On the 12th, Sunday, the bishop participated in a joint communion in the Presbyterian Church of which Dr. John Hall is the pastor, delivering an address and administering the cup. The storm of adverse criticism that followed this act served to mature and intensify the conviction that had been gathering form and volume before in the bishop's mind that the Church he had loved and served so well had fully and finally drifted from its old evangelical and Calvinistic teachings. He was convinced that all the points which we do not know, that the thought of a separation from the old Communion arose, and ripened into fixed purpose. The first outward movement looking towards the organization of a separate Communion took place October 30. An account of the meeting then held is here given in the language of a prominent clergyman—Rev. Dr. B. B. Leacock—who was present and participated in its deliberations:

"By invitation of bishop Cummins, five clergymen and five laymen were brought together at the residence of Mr. John A. Duke, of New York city. The bishop startled them by announcing his determination of withdrawing from the Protestant Episcopal Church, and he then urged to reconsider his decision, he promptly stated that this was not a sudden act—that it was a conclusion between himself and God, and as such he had settled it, and that his determination was unalterable. He then said that his object in calling together was to advise as to his future. There were two propositions before him. He had been invited to go to Mexico, and give himself to the work of the mission and building up of the Church of Jesus. Should he do this? or should he remain in this country, and take the course of a bishop and the episcopal office? Those who felt free to speak advised his remaining in this country by all means, and then there and determined that he be ordained and should he be the 'apostolic labor,' to which he would transfer his 'work and office.' Steps were taken before the adjournment of this meeting looking towards the ordination and building up of the Church of Jesus. Should he do this? or should he remain in this country, and take the course of a bishop and the episcopal office? Those who felt free to speak advised his remaining in this country by all means, and then there and determined that he be ordained and should he be the 'apostolic labor,' to which he would transfer his 'work and office.' Steps were taken before the adjournment of this meeting looking towards the ordination and building up of the Church of Jesus. The Rev. Charles Edward Cheney, of Chicago, was elected bishop, his consecration to the office taking place later in the same month. In justification of the action, written in the interest of the Reformed Episcopal Church to the actual state of the Evangelical Church or party in the Protestant Episcopal communion. The errors and excesses of the Tractarian school had been in process of development for a period of nearly forty years. Open and thoroughly confessional and the groundwork of scriptural argument, they were not to wide and moral and strength to be as far absorbing all the vital forces of
the Church. They had become prescriptive, and, by legislative enactment and judicial trials, were repressing evangelical life and energy. Efforts had been made to procure the condemnation and expulsion of these errors from the Church. The results were of so partial and inadequate a character as to encourage rather than discourage the repetition of similar instances, and to prevent immediate abandonment of error and superstition. Then efforts were made to secure revision of the Prayer-book, but only with humiliating failure. Petition after petition to the General Convention was treated with scarcely concealed contempt. Even the professions of liberty to use alternate phrases in the Baptismal Office was unceremoniously denied to a numerously signed petition. In these efforts to obtain relief many participated who are not as yet in the Reformed Episcopal Church, but whose action shows how deeply and earnestly men who loved the pure truth of the Gospel then felt on the subject. Thus, at a meeting in Chicago, June 16 and 17, 1869, among others who strongly advocated revision of the Prayer-book was Rev. Dr. Andrews, of Virginia, one of the ablest presbyters of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and a member of the General Convention. Rev. Dr. Andrews is, indeed, the present rector of the Church of the Epiphany, Philadelphia, introduced the following resolutions:

Resolved (as the sense of this Conference), That a careful revision of the Book of Common Prayer is needful to the best interest of the Protestant Episcopal Church.

Resolved, That all words and phrases seeming to teach that the Christian ministry is a priesthood, or the Lord's anointed, or that the Church is regenerative or that regeneration is from baptism, should be removed from the Prayer-book.

These resolutions were unanimously adopted. But neither these nor any other efforts to obtain redress were of any avail. An imperious and haughty majority bound and held every conscience, and the Church followed the sacramentarian drift uncheckked. Those who organized the Reformed Episcopal Church were, convinced by a long course of stubborn facts, that the cause dear to God, as the case of the true Gospel of Christ, was at stake; that they must either sacrifice the truth or go outside of the old organization to defend and propagate it. Conviction and conscience led them to their action.

The Church thus taking shape in ecclesiastical history, though yet comparatively a small body, has, during the five years of its existence, grown, it is believed, with almost unexampled rapidity. Its apologists emphasize certain facts in this growth:

1. The Extent of Territory it Covers.—Christian denominations have not at such a late period in the early stages of their history, as the causes out of which they have sprung have been local. The imperative need of this Church is shown by the fact that it sprang up almost simultaneously in remote parts of the land, as from a soil quite prepared for the seed. Wherever the Episcopal Church was in existence, the reaction towards medieval corruptions in doctrine and ritual was more or less pronounced; and the recoil from these developments of error equally decided. The Reformed Church took immediate and strong hold of many and was recognized early as a true and weighty means, and as the means and ministers which the infant communion could supply. Within two years from its origin it held positions at various points from South Carolina to Vancouver's Island, on the extreme west of the British North American possessions. The Church is now planted firmly in fifteen states in this country, in the maritime provinces and the various larger cities in the Dominion of Canada. In May, 1877, the General Council resolved, in answer to repeated solicitations, to introduce its work into Great Britain and Ireland. Already that work has extended to two or three missionary stations, and the means and ministers which the infant communion could supply. Within two years from its origin it held positions at various points from South Carolina to Vancouver's Island, on the extreme west of the British North American possessions. The Church is now planted firmly in fifteen states in this country, in the maritime provinces and the various larger cities in the Dominion of Canada. In May, 1877, the General Council resolved, in answer to repeated solicitations, to introduce its work into Great Britain and Ireland. Already that work has extended to two or three missionary stations, and the means and ministers which the infant communion could supply.

2. The Friendliness with which this Church has been received by Protestant Christians and Churches. — The old Protestant Episcopal Church had met with opposition in many places, and the habitual complaint of its ministers and missionaries was that the growth of the Church was hindered by the prejudices and unfriendly criticism of the people. The Reformed Episcopal Church finds no such difficulty. The people everywhere seem willing that it should take its place in the sisterhood of churches, and gather from all communities its appropriate elements. The freedom from assumption in this Church thus has an inviting, mediating, and constructive effect upon the path of progress which it is, believed, leads on to a great future.

3. The Overruling Hand of God in Harmonizing Internal Differences among the Leading and Influential Minds in the Church. — It is no easy thing, under the most favorable auspices for a number of men who come into connection with an old organization and constructing a new, to agree together in anything like a moderate position. In this case the difficulty was enhanced by the circumstances of the separation. The men who left the old Church, though actuated by a common opposition to particular errors in that body, held views, in many cases, divergent in regard to the positive principles to be incorporated in the new organization. These differences have at times appeared so grave that no human wisdom could find a path through them along which all could go. The General Convention has, however, in the person of a number of able leaders, shown a way to meet the difficulties; others with an equally strong tendency to reach out towards the true ideal of a Church for the age we live in; and all men, by the very necessities of their stand, of a somewhat independent tone of mind, it was found by them hard to yield individual and personal views and prejudices for the sake of a common structure of the doctrinal organic structure. In every case of difficulty in the councils arising from these causes, however, the Spirit of the Lord appeared to lead the way. His presence and agency was at times so manifest as to awaken lively emotions of wonder and gratitude. Though in this Church at present, as in all others where intelligent men are free to think and to maintain their views, all do not think alike in everything, there is perhaps as much harmony as can be found in any, and much more than marks most other, communions. In this fact of special divine guidance, this Church seems to see the pledge of future growth and success in its work.

II. DOCTRINES AND USAGES. — 1. Speaking generally, the doctrines of the Reformed Episcopal Church may be identified as those of Orthodox and Evangelical Protestantism. The men who organized the Church were of that class of clergymen and laymen in the old Protestant Episcopal Church who had been largely associated with the Christians of other Protestant Churches, and harmonized with them in belief and practice. In their judgment, the then existing “Article of Religion,” and their refusal to adopt “Articles of Religion,” entitled “Of Election, Predestination, and Free Will,” runs thus: “While the Scriptures distinctly set forth the election, predestination, and calling of the people of God unto eternal life, as Christ saith, ‘All that the Father giveth me shall come to me, and I will bring them to eternal life, and I will raise them up at the last day.’ These Scriptural statements, taken together, do positively affirm man’s free agency and responsibility, and that salvation is freely offered to all through Christ.” This Church, accordingly, simply affirms these doctrines as the Word of God sets them forth, and submits them to the individual judgment of its members, as
taught by the Holy Spirit; strictly charging them that God commandeth all men everywhere to repent, and that we can be saved only by faith in Jesus Christ." This is the only distinct effort we are aware of to unite in one article of religion the two hemispheres of truth that lie, one on the side of faith, the other on the side of man's freedom and responsibility. How far this effort has been successful, the judgment of Christian men must decide. One result of it, however, is evident. The general course of conviction among the clergy of this Church runs nearer the line of separation on these higher points than in most other Communions. The freedom to differ rather constrains to harmony than ministers to license. With but little disposition to censorious criticism, its ministers of either tendency of doctrinal thought find a fair field for united and harmonious action in extending and building up the kingdom of Christ.

In adopting the Nicene Creed as one of its symbols, this Church takes its stand on the historical Church doctrine of the Trinity, asserting not a mere modal distinction, but an essential, tri-personal distinction in the divine nature. Justification by faith, as held and taught by the clergy generally, is not a mere negative state of the remission of sin, but positive, resulting from the imputation of Christ's righteousness. The doctrines that cluster around these, as in a measure dependent upon them, are stated in the articles in harmonious and systematic order.

2. Among the distinctive usages of this Church, the following may be specially designated:

(a) Worship. — The Reformed Episcopal is a Liturgical Church. Those who organized and those who, since its organization, have come into it and helped to form its system and direct its course in history, have been men either trained in the old Protestant Episcopal Church, where they had long practical experience of the value of liturgical forms in public worship, or convinced from experience in churchmanship in any extemporaneous form of importance of a liturgy from the actual lack of it. They have been convinced that the evils connected with liturgic services in the old parent Church are not justly chargeable to a liturgy as such, but to certain doctrinal corruptions retained in those services at the era of the Reformation. During the reign of Edward VI, rapid strides were made in the line of a thorough Protestant revision of the Service-book. Under Mary the reforming work was undone, and the Romish worship restored. Elizabeth, in the spirit of the statecraft, enforced a revision that was more true to her heart than to scripture, and into worship both the Reformed and the Roman Catholic classes of her subjects. The two streams of doctrine were forced into one channel of Church liturgy, where they have been confined in inorganic mixture ever since. Out of the stream thus formed, and flowing down through history, the exhalations of sacramentarianism and ritualism in this age have risen. In the revision of the Reformed Episcopal Church, it is claimed, these elements of erroneous doctrine have been taken out of the stream. The liturgy in this Church embodies the richest and best content, which, for the most part, is the Church's history, shorn of the accretions of superstition and error gathered in the descent. Though it does not claim to be perfect, it does claim to be Protestant, evangelical, scriptural. As such, its use is made obligatory on occasions; and, by usage that is almost common law, is seldom omitted on any occasions of regular public worship. Yet provision is made for free prayer. Meetings for extemporaneous prayer are encouraged, when the stately services of the liturgy are laid aside, either wholly or in part. Each man, or, at most, his conscience, it is, of regular public worship. The minister is free to add, extemporaneously, the prescribed prayer. Dignity and propriety are thus united to that warmth and earnestness which a more unscripted way of approach to God is suited to engender. Thus the continued use of liturgical forms, with their chastening and educating influence, is secured by law, and also that liberty for times and seasons when, by rising out of the limits of prescription, worship can be adapted to all the demands of evangelistic and revival work. This, it is believed, is as near an approach as can be made to a perfect system of worship.

(b) Government. — The government of this Church of Law. Neither in the individual membership, nor in the relations of the separate churches, nor yet in the connection of the larger ecclesiastical divisions is the bond of union that of mere association, under any proper conception of that term. Opinion, whether it refer to doctrine, to polity, or to discipline, forms no barrier to communion on the face of the council. In this way, in free debate, it passes by vote into particular law under the collective expression in the constitution; and then all, whether sections or persons, are bound by the law. The legal system is a body of canons like the old historical episcopal canon law, simply shorn of those arbitrary and tyrannical features of the old system derived from monarchical institutions in the State and autocratic episcopal rule in the Church. The application of a system of government, whether strong or weak, to actual life in a Church is not easy; but there is a tendency under ecclesiastical rule either to arbitrary severity or to the entire relaxation of discipline, according to the temper of persons and times and the class of influences that prevail. But it is believed important not to leave the advantage of this system of government to chance or mere law. It is stable government. That system, which is historical, having stood the test of the ages in the stress of human passion and the strife of opinion and interest, cannot but be strong and conservative. Canon law has ruled nearly all the Christian ages, adjusting itself to each age and growing into greater definiteness of form in each. If, in the purification of the doctrines of the Church, wisdom dictates, not the destruction, but the cleansing and reforming, of the system, it would seem to follow that the same wisdom teaches a people like ours to avoid the straw and take away its tyranny; in place of its arbitrary and unequal distribution of powers and functions, introduce the checks and balances of enlightened statesmanship, and you have in the Church a fair analogy to law in the State, where the principles and forms of the Roman law are not arbitrarily thrown aside, but enlarged, purified, developed into that grand system that secures the rights of men under the Christian civilization of this modern age. Such is the work this Church has sought to do. It has purified and adapted the old system of canon law to its own ends, and by that done what might be called steadfaithfulness and liberty in its scheme of government.

This system of government by canon law is a safeguard against the spread of error. Where the churches of an ecclesiastical organization are independent, or only connected by certain rules of association having no other than moral force, there is apt to be less jealousy and less exciting debate in the meetings of association, because the tendency of opinion and the results of controversy cannot crystallize into forms that bind under penalty. But this very fact is apt to lead to looseness and weakness on the part of the Church's history, shorn of the accretions of superstition and error gathered in the descent. Though it does not claim to be perfect, it does claim to be Protestant, evangelical, scriptural. As such, its use is made obligatory on occasions; and, by usage that is almost common law, is seldom omitted on any occasions of regular public worship. Yet provision is made for free prayer. Meetings for extemporaneous prayer are encouraged, when the stately services of the liturgy are laid aside, either wholly or in part. Each man, or, at most, his conscience, it is, of regular public worship. The minister is free to add, extemporaneously, the prescribed prayer. Dignity and propriety are thus united to that warmth and earnestness which a more unscripted way of approach to God is suited to engender. Thus the continued use of liturgical forms, with their chastening and educating influence, is secured by law, and also that liberty for times and seasons when, by rising out of the limits of prescription, worship can be adapted to all the demands of evangelistic and revival work. This, it is believed, is as near an approach as can be made to a perfect system of worship.

(c) Constitution and Relations of the Ministry of this Church. — In common with the parent Church, the Re-
formed retains a threefold distinction in the ministry—that of bishops, presbyters, and deacons. There is, however, this difference between the two communions in regard to the recognition of ordination. In the Old Church it is generally regarded as a threefold distinction in orders. The prevailing view among the representative writers of that Church is that the Christian ministry is divinely constituted on the Jewish pattern, and answers, in the relations of the New-Test. Church, to the orders of high-priest, priest, and Levite in the Old-Test. economy. The Reformed Church rejects this view as unscriptural and unhistorical. The episcopate it regards as an office rather than a divine order. The opinion that the bishop is an apostle in the scriptural meaning of that term, and as such the divinely ordained fountain of Church authority and Church life, and that the presbyterate descends from the episcopate in virtue of this inherent power to create it and to constitute it as a separate order, is rejected by the Reformed Episcopal Church. Looking at the subject historically, it finds the precise opposite of this to be the true statement. In the earliest infancy of the Church, under apostolic agency, deacons and elders were ordained and their respective functions assigned. About the close of the apostolic age, the emergencies of the growing Church demanded that such a council hold itself up as the representative of individual flocks by the presbyters as settled pastors, but of the general Church, both pastors and flock. This want was supplied by a gradual process, in which able and prominent presbyters were elevated to a general superintendence of the churches. Thus they became bishops, overseers by pre-eminence, presbyters in order, bishops in office. The Reformed Episcopal Church observes this distinction. Its episcopate, as in primitive times, is an office of supervision, not an order of divine command, separated from the presbyterate and with independent control.

According to this scheme, the bishop has no inherent and necessary rights and powers above the legislative control of the Church. He cannot fall back upon essential, divinely given, irresponsible authority to rule. His office and its functions are, under God, wholly from the Church, to which, therefore, he is, in the entire range of his official position and work, responsible. Episcopal tyranny is well-nigh impossible in a system like this. Yet the episcopate is not degraded because deprived of the claim to inherent divine right. The bishops cannot by ordinance put the Church under their sway. They draw to themselves not only personal respect and reverence for their characters, but intelligent official regard. In ordination and confirmation they are the priests, because the Church makes them so. In the difficulties and exigencies of the Church, their acts of discipline according to canon law have full force, and have already settled troubles which, under another scheme, would have been formidable. They are evangelists so far as, in the infancy of the Church, they can be spared from parochial charges, and thus become a more important agency in Church extension.

The deacon in this Church is a subordinate order. In theory the deacon is the helper of the presbyter; in practice his position is, thus far, only a sort of preparatory school for the presbyterate. Just what the office will become in the growth and development of the Church as it passes further into history can hardly be foreseen. Perhaps its relation to the general ministry will not differ greatly from that which prevails in the old Protestant Episcopal Church. This historic ministry is prized, not because of any belief in the notion of an "apostolic succession" in the sense of a doctrine or a fact, but partly because the historic element in a Church is always important, since Christianity itself is a historical religion, and partly because the peculiar mission of this Church is in the line of the English Church. The Reformed Church has kept its unbroken connection with that of the English Reformers; the Reformed Episcopal Church has the basis for its development and work. The Church thus constituted, identical with that of the English Church, gives the Church a vantage-ground where it can stand on an equal basis with the old communion, while it is purified from its errors, and is free to recognise the ministry of other Evangelical Churches as equally valid with its own. It stands in the gap, never here-tofore bridged, between Episcopal and Presbyterian churches. It has the ministry of both. It may be destined to be the medium of reconciliation between them, as it does not arrogate superiority to the one, and lacks nothing the other justly claims.

(d.) Church Councils.—These are of three grades, corresponding to the threefold organization of the Church—Parochial, Synodal, and General. (1) The individual parish is organized by charter under civil law, and is, in that relation, conditioned by the laws of the state in which it is situated. But in its own internal structure it is composed of rector or pastor, as the case may be, two wardens, and a certain number of vestrymen. The control of the temporal affairs of the given congregation outside of the pastor's immediate agency as the shepherd of the flock. It is possible this organization of the parish council may not be permanent in its present form, as there is some diversity of opinion on the subject in the Church. But either it is to remain in form or by violating the wardens ex officio with the functions now restricted to the council elected by the communicants of the parish, this feature of polity will unquestionably become historic in the Church.

(2) The Synodical Council is yet in its incipient stage, as the synod has not thus far taken practical existence and form in more than one or two instances. Provision is made for a certain number of parishes to form themselves into a synodical body under a bishop, who, though he may be nominated by the synod, must be confirmed by the synod, and wholly subject to its action at its will. As the synods multiply in numbers, and their field of work and their immunities become clearly discriminated in the general system of the Church, there will be stated conciliar assemblies at which all legislation and routine business pertaining to the jurisdiction it covers will be transacted. Probably the basis of representation will be so modified that instead of appointments from the several churches, as now, the synodical councils will elect representatives to the General Council.

(3) The General Council is the largest representative body of the Church, and is vested with supreme authority of legislation. It meets, as yet, annually, as its relations in the infancy of the Church are directly, not mediatelY, to the parishes. Already, however, steps have been taken looking to a change in the system of representation in the council, decreasing its number of members and lengthening the intervals of meeting. Eventually this council will, it is believed, meet not oftener than, if so often as, once in three years, and confine its deliberations to the general questions of doctrine and polity that affect the Church.

(4) There is looming up through the mists of the near future a representative assemblage of a still wider and more comprehensive character—something like an ecumenical council. It is the policy of this Church, in the spirit of its mission, to maintain the unbroken succession of unchanging truth through the lines that separate states or nations. It is evident, however, that this can only be done by a
large and liberal allowance for the peculiarities of peoples living under contrasted systems of civil government, and growing up with tastes and social habits and modes of thought of distinct types. The Reformed Episcopal Church in America and in England is the same Church, yet the streams that flow out of the one spring into the several nationalities, are immediately modified by the civil, social, and ecclesiastical soil and climate they find. Identical in doctrine, spirit, and organic life, they vary somewhat in the forms of organization and worship that adapt themselves to their respective spheres. Only a policy is taking shape by which each national Church shall enjoy a limited independence of legislation, discipline, and worship, thus to work out its own history and destiny. Just what shall constitute the basis, the vital ligament that shall make the Church, however widely extended, a unit, an organic body, cannot yet be identified. Such, however, will undoubtedly be the connection that it will embrace provision for the meeting of a council within a certain term of years, and having under its control those wide questions that affect the characters of the local Churches. The London Church was not organized for a day or for a place, but for the world and for time.

These statements in regard to doctrines, orders, worship, discipline, and general usages are little more than the original declarations of principles adopted at the organization of the Church, Dec. 2, 1878, which is given as a comprehensive summary:

I. The Reformed Episcopal Church, holding "the faith once delivered to the saints," declares its belief in the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the word of God, and the sole rule of faith and practice; in the creed commonly called the Apostle's Creed; in the divinity of the several persons of the Godhead; and in the Lord's supper; and in the doctrines of grace substantially as they are set forth in the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion.

II. This Church recognizes and adheres to episcopacy, not as of divine right, but as a very ancient and desirable form of Church polity.

III. This Church, retaining a liturgy which shall not be imperious or repressive of freedom in prayer, accepts the Book of Common Prayer, as it was revised, proposed, and recommended for use by the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church, A.D. 1869, reserving full liberty to alter, abridge, enlarge, and amend the same, as may seem most conducive to the edification of the people, "provided that the substance of the faith be kept whole.

IV. This Church condemns and rejects the following erroneous and strange doctrines as contrary to God's Word:

First, That the Church of Christ exists only in one order or form of ecclesiastical polity.

Second, That Christian ministers are "priests" in another sense than that in which all believers are a "royal priesthood."

Third, That the Lord's table is an altar on which an oblation of the body and blood of Christ is offered anew to the Father.

Fourth, That the presence of Christ in the Lord's supper is a presence in the elements of bread and wine.

Fifth, That regeneration is inseparably connected with baptism.

III. Statistics.—The statistics of this Church thus early in its history are necessarily few and simple. If, however, they are carefully noted, they will, it is believed, indicate wider extension and more rapid growth than have marked most other ecclesiastical bodies in the beginning of their history.

I. The Number of Clergymen as reported to the council of 1878 was eighty-eight, of whom six were bishops, sixty-one prebendaries, and twenty deacons. Already the list has swollen to more than one hundred, and is increasing as rapidly as places and means of support can be supplied to the clergy already ordained; while the number of applicants for orders and for admission from the ministry in other churches, against whom the door is necessarily closed for want of ability to sustain them, is larger than ever before. The tabular report of the Committee on the State of the Church, covering other items made at the council, May, 1878, was very imperfect, as many of the parishes had failed to report. In its statement of the number of communicants it is thought to be very much below the actual number. It is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number of Communicants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sunday scholars</td>
<td>7,814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptized, i.e., during the year preceding</td>
<td>744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmed in each year</td>
<td>615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions of the parishes for all objects during same year</td>
<td>$299,740.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other property at time of report for educational purposes</td>
<td>$200,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"This exhibit shows an increase of more than $172,000 over the amount reported in 1877, notwithstanding the perhaps unparalleled depression of the past year." In July, 1890, there were returned 109 churches, 120 ministers, 10,100 communicants.

2. Literary Institutions.—Of these the Reformed Episcopal Church can, as yet, boast but one, and that only in the infancy of what is hoped will, in due time of maturity, be a vigorous and influential life. The University of the West is at present organized substantially on the plan of the London University. Non-student professors prepare questions on which students are required to stand rigid examinations by written answers. In this university scheme, only the Martin College of Theology is thus far in organized working order. The whole is under the able charge of the Bishop of the Church in the education of its ministry. The times demand a ministry not only of thorough scholastic attainments, but well taught in theology in connection with the peculiarities of the Church they are to labor in. The Church seeks to compass this end by selecting all students in theology to a uniform system of questions in all departments of theological learning. The present plan may be modified when a sufficient endowment fund shall have been secured to meet the requirements of a local institution. Through the munificent liberality of a gentleman of New York, Edward Martin, Esq., the Church is in possession of landed estate in the suburbs of Chicago of large present and much larger prospective value. On this property the authorities of the university propose, eventually, to erect suitable buildings for the several colleges as they shall, from time to time, take form. It is their purpose, as the ability of the Church increases, to spare no pains to make the institution worthy of the Church and of the country.

8. Church Architecture.—The Reformed Episcopal Church supports two papers that set forth its principles and defend its interests. The Episcopal Recorder, published in Philadelphia, is a weekly paper which has become historic. It was the oldest weekly issue in the Protestant Episcopal Church, in which, during more than a half of the century, it advocated those principles of ecclesiastical polity and Christian life and doctrine that are still emblazoned on its banner. Transferred to the Reformed branch of the Church, it but continues its old work in new relations, and proves a highly important agent in the defence and extension of the truth in the newly organized communion. The Chicago Episcopalian, published in Chicago and New York, and issued bi-weekly. While aiming solely to meet the needs of the Church in the great West, it has extensive circulation in all parts of the land; and, though only about three years of age, displays much energy and ability. Its editor-in-chief is the present presiding bishop, Dr. Samuel Fallows, and he is aided by an efficient staff of clergymen of large ability and culture. This paper exerts wide influence in the Church. So early in its history, and with the time and energy of clergy and laymen, it has performed a parochial work, this Church has not as yet produced literary or theological works of extensive and standard character. Its ephemeral productions, however, from the nature of the case largely apologetic, are already numerous. Nearly all the prominent clergymen of this Church have been forced by attacks, often from the
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highest sources, to defend both their Church and their personal action in conforming to it. These writings constitute a body of argument, doctrinal and ecclesiastical, to sustain their Church with entire confidence, and the more so since, so far as is known, there has been no attempt to confute any single one of the many publications in question.

Such, in brief, are the history and principles of the Reformed Episcopal Church—a organization called into existence, its advocates believe, by the providence and spirit of God, and destined to exert a very deep, extensive, and lasting influence, not only in the country of its birth, but in the world. (J. H. S.)

Reformed German Church. See GERMAN REFORMED CHURCH.

Reformed Methodist Church, an American offspring of the Methodist Episcopal Church, had its origin in 1814, and was started by a body of local preachers and exhorters, the most prominent and influential of whom was the Rev. Elijah Bailey, an ordained local preacher in the Vermont Conference. They had become dissatisfied with the polity of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and especially that part of it which relates to the powers and prerogatives of the episcopacy. They decided upon an organized body, as it exists in the Roman Catholic hierarchy, and set up the following standards and purposes:—

"To form a church, where the members have the right of nominating, electing, and discharging their own officers, as also their own members; to propagate the gospel in the Gentile world, and to extend the church of Christ in the heathen nations; to form and establish the government of the church, as also the system of discipline and worship; to form and establish a sound, clear, and simple system of doctrine; to maintain the moral and religious character of the church; to maintain a proper regard for the ordinances of Christ, and to promote the personal salvation of all men;"—with more.

The Reformed German Church was organized in 1814, at the Philadelphia Conference, and its constitution contains the following provisions:

"In the formation of a community of goods on a farm which they purchased at Bennington, Vt., and sustained for about two years. But the attempt to retain them as a community proved abortive, and the members of it soon scattered to different parts of the state of Vermont and New York, and to Upper Canada. In the British territory they succeeded in raising up a number of Reformed societies. In the States, however, their success was small. The dispersion of the community above alluded to operated favorably to the interests of the Church as a whole, as, after that period, they were favored from time to time with gracious revivals of religion. Thousands, no doubt, in following years have been converted and brought to a constant attendance of the services of the preachers of this Church. As a denomination, however, they did not prosper like other organized orthodox churches. They suffered much from dissensions in their own ranks and important secessions from their numbers. About half of their ministers and many of their societies left them in this state of things. This was the case with the Protestant Methodists; and at one time an entire conference of Reformed preachers went over to that denomination. At the time of their greatest prosperity they had five annual conferences and about seventy-five ministers and preachers, and from three to four thousand members. After the organization of another Methodist conference in the United States (the Wesleyan), most of the ministers and members of the Reformed Church came identified with that branch, and finally the body was merged into the so-called Methodist Church."

Doctrines.—In all matters of theology the "Reformers" are, or were, Methodist, if we except their belief in the gift of healing, by which physical maladies might be removed through the power of faith. This belief had gained for the Reformers the names of fanatics and enthusiasts; but they have used the compliment by accusing their calumniators of scepticism and infidelity.

Church Government.—The form of Church government selected by the Reformers was strictly congregational, with an administrative department, annual conferences; the former body not meeting periodically, but only at the call of the latter bodies. Their general rules are similar to those of the parent body, with the addition of some forbidding war, slavery, etc.

The only periodical published under the auspices of this Church at any time was the Luminous and Reformer, edited by Mr. Bailey, a son of the founder of the Church. The paper, however, has for years been discontinued. See Methodism (20).

Reformed Presbyterian Church. This body, like many others, is known by different names; its members have been designated as Mountain Men, Old Dissenters, Cameronsians, and Society People; but their most common designation is Covenanters. The name of "Mountain Men" was given them because they are a remnant of those who were driven to hills, moors, and other unheinhabitable places by persecutions and hardships inflicted by the Stuarts in Scotland. They are called "Cameronsians" from Richard Cameron, one of their leaders during that persecution. They were called "Society People" because they were often confined to prayer-meetings in private as their only means of social intercourse. The leading points in which they differ from other Presbyterian bodies.

1. A prominent feature is their separation from the State. In this country, as well as in the British isles, they withhold their vote, and to their religious observation, for the purpose of gaining a large number of ready, active laborers for their new organization, they resorted to the formation of a community of goods on a farm which they purchased at Bennington, Vt., and sustained for about two years. But the attempt to retain them as a community proved abortive, and the members of it soon scattered to different parts of the states of Vermont and New York, and to Upper Canada. In the British territory they succeeded in raising up a number of Reformed societies. In the States, however, their success was small. The dispersion of the community above alluded to operated favorably to the interests of the Church as a whole, as, after that period, they were favored from time to time with gracious revivals of religion. Thousa
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ereignty of Christ, and each, in its sphere, to be regulated, in a Christian land, by the written law. Where this law is either entirely disregarded or flagrantly violated, they refuse to take any part either in Church or State.

They lay great stress on the witnessing character of the Church (1sa. xiii, 10: "Ye are my witnesses, saith the Lord"). This idea enters largely into the constitution of the New-Test. organization—Acts i, 8: "But ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Spirit is come upon you; and ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth.

This presents the double aspect of the Church's work—one, the salvation of men; one, the glory of God; both harmonizing in the services of ministers and people together (Acts i, 21; iii, 32; iv, 15; iv, 33; v, 22; x, 29; xiii, 31; xx, 21; xxi, 15, 18; xxvi, 16, 22; xxviii, 23; Rev. i, 2, 9; vi, 9; x, 3, 12; xii, 11, 17; xiv, 10).

This feature is presented often in the epistles, and implies three things: (a) setting forth the whole truth of God, keeping nothing back; (b) applying that truth to the persons addressed; (c) pointing out the common denominating evil. Following out this idea, Covenanters have, besides their Confession (d), a Testimony specifying the evils of the time.

Among other things, they speak of the practical testimony against moral evil in the Constitution of the United States. In one important particular the Constitution has already been amended—the clauses bearing on slavery. In this amendment Covenanters rejoice, and take courage to labor for further advance. In the antislavery conflict they stood among the foremost: they preached, they wrote, they labored in all available ways against the slave-holding interest. The articles which they still wish to see amended are such as the following:

(1.) In all the Constitution there is no recognition of God, the government of the world and Source of all authority and power. Justice Bayard and other authors labor earnestly in offering apologies for this defect; but all these apologies are set aside by the Declaration of Independence. In the simple fact that the Supreme is repeatedly acknowledged in that memorable document as nature's God, the Creator, as Divine Providence, and as the Judge of the world; as One on whose protection the nascent empire could exercise a "firm reliance" while struggling for existence. When independence was achieved and a prosperous career fairly entered, his people neglected and forgot the Creator: a change not made by the document, but by the people. In fact, Benjamin Franklin could not succeed in having prayer offered in the convention that framed the Federal Constitution. We think this is the first nation known to history that has set up a government without acknowledging any deity whatever. True it is that many of their deities were not worth the honor, while we as a nation have refused to honor "the God in whose hand our life is, and whose are all our ways."

Considerations: (a) He is not only the Creator of men, but he is the Author of national blessings. He gave the nation its existence at the first, and holds the entire control of all its destinies. (b) Civil government is one of his institutions for the good of men and for his own glory among men. Not only did he direct the people of Israel to set up judges and officers, but in the New Test. he recognizes such officers as his ministers, and their power as his influence. He claims obedience to them as his representatives, and that honor shall be given to them for his sake, while he tells all nations that there is no authority unless it be of God (Rom. xiii, 1-7; 2 Pet. ii, 13-17; Tit. iii, 1). All Christians are agreed that civil government set up on moral principles is the "ordinance of God.

requires even, an acknowledgment of him in the Constitution as well as elsewhere. (c) There are many very solemn services in the exercise of civil rule. Take one of many: A fellow-mortal is charged with murder, and must be dealt with, whether he be a citizen or not. This is in the sight of God: (i) whether we let him loose on society; (ii) whether we hang him up by the neck until he is dead; (iii) whether he is sent to the penitentiary for life; (iv) whether he is found guilty or innocent of the charge. In any and all of these cases civil rulers have the destiny of life and death, and act as an influence which may reach, for good or for ill, to eternity. This responsibility cannot be evaded, and it can be properly met in the fear of God only. So of war and peace, where thousands are involved at once. So of sanitary regulations. So of license to sell strong drink, gunpowder, and poisonous drugs. (d) He severely threatens and awfully punishes the nations that will not honor and serve him. (e) He has given abundant promises to nations who will serve him. (f) There is the same responsibility on a nation that there is on an individual; to the former it is not more than the latter. (g) The United States have received such favors from God, in quality and quantity, as have never been bestowed on any other nation, not even on the chosen family of Israel. Why should we not acknowledge in the most solemn and public manner the hand of God that gives?

(2.) The qualifications for rulers are very defective in the Constitution of the United States. Some officers are required to be of a certain age, and born in the country. It is taken for granted that they will be men of ability. This is as far as it goes; but the Constitution is to be regarded as the minister of God, some degree of moral character ought to be required, and the Constitution is the proper place to begin; then the people can select men of the highest order of Christian morality.

(3.) The government is supreme, set aside, superseded by three provisions: (a) the will of the people as stated in the preamble; (b) the Constitution itself as the expression of that will; (c) laws of Congress and treaties with foreign powers in carrying out the Constitution, art. vi, § 3. If these provisions meant no more than the relation to particular states, it would not be objectionable; but there is no allusion to a higher law in any part of the document.

6. Covenanters claim the universal application of the divine law to all the institutions of men, and to the man in every situation; all civil, military, commercial, financial, legislative, judicial, social, and all possible connections of man with man. They take no stock in street-car or railroad companies, or any institutions which degrade the Sabbath or otherwise trench on any of the ten commandments. They have always excluded freemen from their fellowship.

7. They hold the Old Test. as still the word of God, and of equal authority with the New.

8. In praise they use exclusively the book of Psalms. They also approve of instrumental music in church.

9. They claim that the praying-men, by which ministers and people stand on the same level, is a divine ordinance as much as family worship and public preaching. On this item they and the Methodists were long the only witnesses. For some twenty-five years the idea has been spreading, until all respectable bodies have their prayer-meetings, to say nothing of irregular associations. While other denominations regard rather the utility, propriety, and expediency of these meetings, Reformed Presbyterians stand for their divine institution, and claim obedience to their representatives, and that honor shall be given to them for their sake, while they tell all nations that there is no authority unless it be of God (Heb. x, 20; Col. iii, 16; Mal. iii, 16; John xx, 19; Acts xvi, 13).

10. Besides their adherence to the Scottish covenant, they hold that covenanting is an ordinance of the New Test. as well as of the Old. They thus find hold forth in prophecy (Isa. xvi, 10-21; xlv. 5; xlii. 4; Jer.
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Refugee. See ASYLUM; CHURCH.

Refugee, Cities of. See City of Refuge.

Refugee (Fr. refugé), a name given to persons who have fled from persecution or political persecution in their own country and taken refuge in another.

The term was first applied to those Protestants who found an asylum in Britain and elsewhere at different periods, first during the Flemish persecutions under the duchess of Alva in 1567, and afterwards, in 1565, when Louis XIV of France revoked the Edict of Nantes and drove so many of the Huguenots (q. v.) into involuntary exile. Of the numerous French artisans who settled in England on this last occasion, the most part Anglicized their names, as by substituting Young for "le Jeune," Taylor for "Tellier," etc.; so that their posterity can now hardly be recognized as of foreign origin.

According to Lower (Patronymica Britannica), De Preux became Deprose, and "Richard Despair, a poor man," buried at East Grimstead, was, in the orthography of his forefathers, Despard. There were also refugee families of a higher class, some of whose descendants and representatives came to occupy a place in the peerage. The Bovaries, earls of Radnor, are descended from a French refugee family. The refugee family of Blaquière was joined to that of the Earl of Coleraine. Shaw Lefevre (lord Eversley) is the representative of a family of Irish refugees. The military employment offered in Ireland after 1688 maintained a considerable number of foreign Protestants. General Frederick Armand de Schomberg was raised by William III to the peerage, becoming eventually duke of Schomberg. A Huguenot officer of hardly less celebrity was Henry Massue (marquis de Ruvigny), created by William III earl of Galway. Lord Ligonier was also of a noble Huguenot family, and England has had at least one refugee bishop in Dr. John Goddard, bishop of Chester, and afterwards of Bangor. Among other refugees of note may be enumerated Sir John Houbon, lord mayor of London in 1695, one branch of whose family was represented by the late lord Palmerston; Elias Douberay, or Boireau, D.D., whose descendant was created a bishop as Sir Richard Borough of Haselden Park, Berkshire; as well as Martinneau, Bosanquet, and Papillon, whose descendants have attained more or less eminence in the country of their adoption. The first French Revolution brought numerous political refugees to England, and Great Britain is not the foremost of Europe for affording a ready asylum to refugees of all classes, both political and religious. See Weiss, History of the French Protestant Refugees, from the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes to the Present Time, translated by Hanman (Lond. 1854); Burns, History of the French, Wallace,
Dutch, and other Foreign Protestant Refugees settled in England (Lond. 1846); Smiles, The Huguenots, their Set-
ttlements, Industries, etc., in England, Ireland, and Amer-
ica (N. Y. 1868).

Regali, the name given to the privilege by which the
king of France claimed to enjoy the revenues of a
seat during its vacancy. See REGALIA.

Regalia (or REGALIA), Right of, is the possession of
some of these privileges in ecclesiastical things. As the
regaliæ Petri we distinguish the various rights and
high prerogatives which, according to Romanists, be-
long to the pope as a kind of universal sovereign and
king of kings. Under regale, however, is generally
understood the right which sovereigns claim in virtue
of their royal prerogative. The question as to the ex-
tent of these privileges has frequently been the subject
of controversy between kings and popes. It involved
several points as to presentation to benefices, most of
which formed the object, from time to time, of negotia-
tion by concordat; but the most serious conflict arose
out of the claim made by the crown to the revenues of
vacant benefices, especially bishoprics, and the co-ordin-
ate claim to keep the benefice or the seat vacant for an
indefinite period, in order to appropriate its revenue.
This plainly abusive claim was one of the main grounds
of complaint on the part of the popes as to the practice
of laying (q. v.), and it assumed its height in
England under the first Norman kings, especially Wil-
liam Rufus. The most memorable conflict, however,
on the subject of the regalia was that of Innocent XI (q. v.)
with Louis XIV, which was maintained with great per-
tinacity on both sides for several years, the king extend-
ing the claim to some of the French provinces which had
until then been exempt from it, and the pope refus-
ing to confirm any of the appointments of Louis to
the seats which became vacant as long as the obnoxious
claim should be persisted in. The dispute continued till
after the death of Innocent, Louis IV having gone so
far as to seize upon the papal territory of Avignon in
repiusal; but it was adjusted in the following pontificate,
the most obnoxious part of the claim being practically
abandoned, although not formally withdrawn. The con-
test grew out of the interpretation of French canon law
which gives the right to the kings of France to enjoy
the revenues of all bishoprics during their vacancy, and
also to present to their prebends and all other their
dignities without cure of souls. Such presentations
might be made whether the dignity were vacant both
de jure, by death, as by death, or only either de jure
as if the incumbent were convicted of a crime or had
accepted another dignity, or de facto, as if the regale
should open after the presentation of an incumbent, but
before he had taken possession. The regale lasted till
a new admission to the bishopric was fully completed
by taking the oath of allegiance, when a mandate was
issued by the Chambre des Comptes to the commissary
of the regale to restore the revenues. This right had
one or two singular privileges: it occurred not only on a
vacancy, but also when a bishop was made a cardinal, and
lasted till he resigned the gift of an alienation; it lasted
thirty years as regarded patronage, so that if the king
should leave a dignity vacant and the new bishop fill
it up, the king might appoint a fresh incumbent at
any time within this date; it was absolutely in the
king's discretion, and subject to no other constitutions
whatever. The regale was at different times deprived
of much of its original extent: certain bishoprics, as
those of Languedoc, Provence, and Dauphine, claimed
exemption; and though a decision of Parliament pronounced at one time that the right extended over the
whole kingdom, this was afterward quashed, and the
question remained undecided. Abbeys which were
formerly subject to the regale were discharged, and an
attempt to replace them under it quite failed. Finally
all right to the revenues was resigned by Louis XIII
and that of patronage was retained. See Commentarii
de M. Dupuy sur la Traité des Libertés de M. Picon, i,
146. See also SUPREMACY, PAPAL.

Regalia (perhaps from rigabello, an instrument used
prior to the organ in the churches of Italy), a small
portable finger-organ in use in the 16th and 17th
centuries, and perhaps earlier. Many representations
exist of this instrument, including one sculptured on
Melrose Abbey. The tubes rested on the air-chest, which
was filled by the bellows; the bellows were managed with one hand, and the keys with the other.

Regem (Heb. id. דִּקָּם, friend; Sept. Ρύγιον v. r. Payrij), the first named of six sons of Jabsah (q. v.),
apparently of the family of Caleb (1 Chron. ii, 47).
Ed. post 1568.

Reinemelch (Heb. Re'īm Mel'eh; friend of the Sept.
Αφίτριον v. r. Aphiōtēnos), the name of a person
who, in connection with Sherezzer, was sent on behalf of
some of the captive youth to make inquiries at the
Temple concerning fasting (Zech. vii, 2). B.C. cir. 517.
In the A. V. the subject of the verse appears to be the captive
Jews in Israel, and Bethel, or "the place of God", is
regarded as the accusative after the verb of motion.
The Sept. takes "the king" as the nominative to the verb
sent, considering the last part of the name Re-
ptomelch as an appellative, and not as a proper name.
What reading the Sept. had is difficult to conjecture.
In the Vulgate, Sherezzer, Reinemelch, and their men
are the persons who sent to the house of God. The
Peshito-Syrac has a curious version of the passage:
" And he sent to Bethel, to Sherezzer and Rab-mag; and
the king sent and his men to pray for him before the
Lord." Sherezzer and Rab-mag being associated in Jer.
xxxix, 3, 13. The Hexaplar-Syrac, following the Pe-
shito, has "Rab-mag." On referring to Zech. vii, 5, the
expression "the people of the land" seems to indicate
that those who sent to the Temple were not the captive
Jews in Babylon, but those who had returned to their
own country; and this being the case, it is probable that
in ver. 2 "Bethel" is to be taken as the subject: "and
Bethel," i.e. the inhabitants of Bethel, "sent." From its
connection with Sherezzer, the name Reinemelch (lit.
"king's friend," comp. 1 Chron. xxxvii, 33) was probably
an Assyrian title of office. See Rab-mag.

Regeneratio, a term applied to baptism because when
any one becomes a Christian he enters upon a
real and new spiritual life. See BAPTISM.

Regeneration (φαναγραγνια, Tit. iii, 5, a be-
ning born again), that work of the Holy Spirit by which we
experience a change of heart. It is expressed in Scriptu-
re by being born anew (John iii, 7; "from above"); be-
going quenched (Eph. ii, 2): by Christ being found in
the heart (I John iv, 19): a new creation (2 Cor. v, 17): a
renewing of the mind (Rom. xii, 2): the washing, i.e.
the purifying of regeneration (Tit. iii, 5); a resurrec-
tion from the dead (Eph. i, 6): a putting off the old
man, and a putting on the new man (iv, 22-24). And
the subjects of the change are represented as begotten
of God (John i, 18; 1 Pet. i, 8); begotten of the Spirit
(John iii, 8); begotten of water, even of the Spirit (ver.
5): new creatures (Gal.vi,15): and partakers of the divine
nature (2 Pet. i, 4). The efficient cause of regeneration
is the divine Spirit. Manifestation of regeneration
(John i, 12, 18; iii, 4; Eph. ii, 8, 10); the instrumen-
tal cause is the word of God (James i, 18; 1 Pet. i,
22; 1 Cor. xiv, 15). The change in regeneration con-
stitutes in the recovery of the moral image of God upon
the heart, so as to love him supremely and serve
him ultimately as our highest end. Regenera-
tion consists in the implantation of the principle of
love to God, which obtains the ascendency and habitually
prevails over its opposites. Although the inspired
writers use various terms and modes of speech to describe
this change of mind, styling it conversion, regeneration,
a new creation, etc., yet it is all effected by the word of truth or the Gospel of salvation gaining an entrance into the human mind and the heart. The second, the understanding, is the will, and to reign in the affections. In a word, it is faith working by love that constitutes the new creature or regenerate man (Gal. v. 6; 1 John v. 1-5). Regeneration, then, is the recovery of the moral image of God, and consequent of spiritual life, to a soul previously dead in trespasses and sins. It is the work of the Holy Spirit, opening the eyes of the mind, and enabling the sincere penitent to believe the Gospel and receive Christ as his only Saviour. This process is accomplished, as it is chiefly summed up in the character of the Holy Spirit and with the constitution of man; hence, by no violence is done to any physical, intellectual, or moral law or mode of action in human nature. The change is produced in the will, or heart, that is, in the moral, and not the natural, faculties of the soul. As depravity is wholly in the will and heart, the source and seat of all moral action, the divine operation consists in renewing the heart, and communicating a change of views, with a relish for the things of the Spirit. As justification places us in a new relation to God, so regeneration produces a new state of mind. In the case of children dying in infancy, they, of course, need regeneration to fit them for the eternal world. And there can be no difficulty in conceiving that they are regenerated by the Holy Spirit, in virtue of Christ's death, in the same sense in which they are deprived in consequence of Adam's fall. The disposition to sin is removed, the disposition to holiness is implanted, and thus their salvation is secured. The evidences of regeneration are conviction of sin, holy sorrow, deep humility, knowledge, faith, repentance, love, and devotedness to God's glory. The properties of it are these: 1. It is a receptive work, and herein it differs from conversion. In regeneration we receive from God; in conversion we are active and turn to him. 2. It is a powerful work of God's grace (Eph. iii. 8). 3. It is an instantaneous act, for there can be no medium between life and death; and here it differs from sanctification, which is progressive. 4. It is a complete act, and perfect in its kind; a change of the whole man (2 Cor. v. 17). 5. It is a great and important act, both as to its author and effects (Eph. ii. 4, 5). 6. It is an internal act, not consisting in the outward forms (Ezek. xxxvi, 26, 27). 7. Visible as to its effects (1 John iii. 14). 8. Delightful (1 Pet. i. 8). 9. Necessary (John iii. 3). See CONVERSION; NEW BIRTH.

Our Lord in one instance (Matt. xix, 28) uses the term regeneration. Accordingly, Dr. Campbell translates it "the renovation," and remarks that the relation is here to the general state of things in the future world, when all things will become new. See NEW CREATION; RESTITUTION.

REGENERATION BY WATER. In our Lord's discourse on the subject of regeneration (Matt. xviii, 19): "He that believeth and is baptized shall receive new life."

Nicolaites, the sect which professed to be Baptists, and who were not content with the outward forms of the Gospel, were called by the apostles "Baptizers." The influence of this office is to bring the following words of the apostle Paul to mind: "But whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report, if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think on these things" (Phil. iv. 8).

5. Our Lord himself dispensed with baptism in the admission of at least one member into his kingdom, namely, the dying thief (Luke xxiii, 42, 43).

6. Christ certainly does mean to attach importance to water-baptism as an initiative rite into his Church or kingdom. The body of believers exists under two aspects, the visible and the invisible—the outward or nominal, and the inward or real. Baptism is as imperative a mark of admission to the former as spiritual new birth is to entrance into the latter. In order to a full recognition of its significance, the true meaning of the term is truly essential. This doctrine, which orthodox ecclesiastics have always maintained, is thus strictly in accordance with the tenor of the text in question.

On the dogma of baptismal regeneration, see the 71-
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Regens. See Ratisbon.

Reggio, Isaac Samuel, a Jewish writer, was born Aug. 15, 1784, at Goetz, in Illyria. As the son of a rabbi, he received a thorough Jewish education, and with his brilliant powers he soon became master of Jewish literature, and acquired an extraordinary knowledge of Hebrew. His talents and fame secured for him the appointment to the professorship of mathematics at the Lyceum when Illyria became a French province. He succeeded his father in the rabbinate of his native place, and died Aug. 29, 1855. Of his many writings, we mention, הֵיטוֹפְלָיִיתִוּת, a treatise on the inspiration of the Mosaic law, incorporated in the introduction to the Pentateuch (Vienna, 1818); דַּרְשָׁה לַמִּצְוֹת, an Italian translation of the Pentateuch, with a Hebrew commentary and a more elaborate introduction, in which he gives an account of 148 Hebrew expositions of the Pentateuch of various ages (ibid. 1821, 5 vols. 8vo); On the necessity of having a Theological Seminary, in his writings in Italian (Venice, 1822); in consequence of which the Collegium Rubinitianus was opened at Padua in 1829, for which he had drawn up the constitution: Contrattualita di Religione e Filosofia (Vienna, 1827)—a dissertation, Whether Philosophy is in Opposition to Tradition, תְּאָדוֹתַד הָעָנְתָא (Leipsic, 1840):—Il Libro d'Inizi, Versione poetica fatta sull'originale Testo Ebraico (Vienna, 1843)—a historical-critical introduction to the book of Esther, entitled הַנִּֽתִית הַנְּיִּֽהָה (ibid. 1841). Besides these, Reggio wrote numerous treatises on various points connected with the Hebrew Scriptures and literature in the different Jewish periodicals.


Regina Coeli (Lat. for Queen of heaves), an application given by the ancient church to June.

Region-round-about, (גָּדוֹלַחַר), this term had perhaps originally a more precise and independent meaning than it appears to a reader of the A. V. to possess. It is used by the Sept. as the equivalent of the singular Hebrew word הָעָנְתָא (חָנָת, literally "the round"), a word the topographical application of which is not clear, but which seems in its earliest occurrence in the singular Hebrew word הָעָנְתָא (חָנָת, literally "the round"), a word the topographical application of which is not clear, but which seems in its earliest occurrence in the singular Hebrew word הָעָנְתָא (חָנָת, literally "the round") of the "cities of the Circum" (Gen. xii, 10-12; xix, 17, 25, 28, 29; Deut. xxxiv, 3). Elsewhere it has a wider meaning, though still attached to the Jordan (2 Sam. xxvii, 8; 1 Chron. iv, 17; Neh. iii, 22; xii, 24, 26, etc.), and in this less restricted sense that הָעָנְתָא occurs in the New Test. In Matt. iii, 5 and Luke iii, 3 it denotes the populous and flourishing region which contained the towns of Jericho and its dependences in the Jordan valley, enclosed in the amphitheatre of the hills of Quenausta, a densely populated region, and important enough to be reckoned as a distinct section of Palestine—Jerusalem, Judea, and all the "region of Jordan" (Matt. iii, 5; also Luke vii, 17). It is also applied to the district of Gennesaret, a region which presents certain similarities to that of Jericho, being enclosed in the amphitheatre of the hills of Hattis and bounded in front by the water of the lake, as the other was by the Jordan, and also resembling it in being very thinly populated (Matt. xiv, 35; Mark vi, 55; Luke vi, 57; xvi, 17). It is perhaps nearly equivalent to the modern Arabic appellation of the גָּדוֹלַחַר. See Topographical Terms.

Regiuntari, one of the three classes of subdecons at Rome, appointed in the 11th century, and employed in various occupations in the several regions or districts of that city. The other classes were called Pallatinus (q.v.) and Stationarius (q.v.).

Regius, Jean Baptiste de, a French Jesuit and geographer, was born at Istres, in Provence, in 1725, and was sent as a missionary to China about 1700. His scientific attainments gained him a place at court and the favor of the emperor Hang-he, who, in 1706, placed him at the head of a commission of Jesuits to make a survey and draw up a map of the Chinese empire. His labors were interrupted in 1724 when the emperor Yung-ching proscribed the Christian religion. He wrote a full history of his labors, a condensation of which may be found in Du Halde's Description de la Chine. He translated into Latin the Yih-kung, edited by Julius Nies (Nütsch und Tullaengen, 1854, 2 vols.). The MS. is in the National Library, Paris.

Registrers. See Dyptichs.

Registrars of Ordination were first ordered to be preserved in 1257 in the bishop's house or in the cathedral.

Registrers, Parish, were required to be kept as a record of baptisms, marriages, and burials in 1338 by Cromwell, by the royal injunctions of 1474, and the 70th Canons of 1638.

Regium Donum, a sum of money annually allowed by the crown to dissenting ministers. It originated in a donation, made in the way of royal bounty, by George II, in the year 1723, consisting of £500, to be paid out of the treasury, for assisting first of all the widows, and afterwards either ministers or their widows, who were in want of assistance. The first minister to receive it was Mr. Daniel Burgess, who had had for some time been secretary to the princess of Wales, and was approved by Lord Townshend, secretary of state, and Sir Robert Walpole, chancellor of the exchequer, who entered readily into the measure because the Dissenters proved themselves very friendly to the house of Brunswick, and he wished to reward them for their loyalty. When the money was paid, a strict charge was given that the matter should be kept very secret. Some few years after, the sum was raised to £1,500 half-yearly; and at present, though no longer a regular donation, it is still annually granted by Parliament, amounting to about £5,000, but including the relief granted to "Poor French refugee clergy, poor French Protestant laity, and sundry small charitable and other allowances to the poor of St. Martin's-in-the-Fields, and others."

REGIUM DONUM, Irish, a pecuniary grant, voted annually by the British Parliament, out of the national exchequer, to aid certain bodies of Presbyterians in Ireland by providing stipends for their ministers. This grant, which now amounts to about £40,000 a year, is divided among six different bodies of Presbyterians, viz. 1. The Remonstrants, or Unitarian Synod of Ulster. 2. The Presbyterian Assembly. 3. The Synod of Munster. 4. The Synod of Ulster. 5. The Synod of Monriver. 6. The Parliament of Munster. During the reign of Queen Anne, this grant was only allowed to the Presbyterians of Ireland, and under the mild sway of Usher their clergy became incumbents of parishes, and were permitted to enjoy tithes and other emoluments. But after the accession of Charles II they were wholly dependent upon their grants. In 1672 a king gave Sir Arthur Forbes £600 to be divided among them. William III issued an order, June 19, 1690, authorizing the payment of £1200 to Patrick Adair and six other clergymen. In the following year this bounty was removed from the customs, and made payable out of the Irish exchequer.
Such was the origin of the Regium Donum in its present permanent character. There was this important change made, however: the power of allocating the amount was taken from the trustees and transferred to the Lord lieutenant. In 1631 the grant was placed on the English miscellaneous estate and the annuity principle was abandoned, and £75 Irish currency was promised to every minister connected with the Synod of Ulster and the Secession Synod, with the proviso (1640) that he was to receive at least £35 of yearly stipend. The amount required was increasing at the rate of £40 a year, to meet the demands of new congregations. The Regium Donum was withdrawn by the act of 1689, which came into force Jan. 1, 1671, disallowing the Irish Episcopal Church.

Regius, the Latinized name of Urban König, a learned theologian, preacher, and writer, and also an influential promoter of the Reformation. He was born in 1490 of parents in moderate circumstances, and resident at Langenargen, near Lake Constance. At the age of seventeen he was evagelized, and in 1498 he went to Basle as a student of theology, and by his application and progress won the favor of his professors; but an injudicious defense of the disputations of John Eck, later the noted opponent of Luther, led to his suspension from the university in 1498 and his removal to Basle. After a brief sojourn in Basle, he was called to the chair of poetry and oratory in the University of Ingolstadt, where Eck was likewise employed as professor of theology, and where a circle of humanists were then striving to bring the classics into honor. Regius distinguished himself to such a degree as to receive from the hands of the emperor Maximilian a laurel crown in recognition of his services, and saw his classes grow continually. But his success was interrupted by the neglect of patrons to settle bills which he had contracted, and some years were his pupous, so that, in utter discouragement, he became a soldier in the imperial army—a situation from which he was fortunately delivered by the interference of Eck, who secured his discharge from the army and also the payment of his debts, as well as an increased salary for the future.

Regius, however, began to dislike the studies in which he was engaged, and to manifest a growing predilection for theology. He was especially impressed with the influence of the Wittenberg reformational movements, and from the increase of the synthesis of the papal party against him, and compelled his removal; but he soon returned, and labored with great energy for the extension of the evangelical doctrines, from 1522 to 1530, by presenting them to the people in sermons from the pulpit of St. Ann's Church, and by disputations and controversial writings. Luther came to regard him as the principal supporter of evangelicalism in Swabia, while Eck charged him with black ingratitude, and prosecuted him with passionate hatred and malicious cunning. It was perhaps owing to the bitterness of such experiences that he concluded to imitate the example of other Reformers and establish for himself the refuge of a home. He married Anna Weisbrücke, a native of Augsburg, who sustained him faithfully while he lived, and by whom he became the father of thirteen children.

The fame of Regius had in the meantime become so extended that his counsel and aid were frequently sought even by distant cities and countries. Duke Ernest of Lüneburg, summoned the Confessor, urged him to assist in introducing the Reformation into that territory, and Regius pledged his services to that end, removing to Celle, and exercising all the functions of the new position. He was soon appointed general superintendent over the whole duchy, and in that position was enabled, by judicious counsels and restless activity, to rapidly advance the interests of the Reformation. Two years were spent in superseding the Roman clergy and their services with an evangelical ministry and worship, in improving the schools and gymnasium of the country, and also in establishing the infant Church on a legal foundation, and in securing the transfer of the confiscated goods of monasteries to the use of the Church and of schools. A call to return to Augsburg at this time (1532) was declined, and his life was thenceforward spent in the service of the prince and people of the duchy of Lüneburg, though he took an active part in the introduction and development of Protestantism in other places: e.g. the county of Hoya, to which he was appointed in 1534, Hanover, Brunswick, Minden, and Hörster, the territory of Schaumburg, etc. He also responded to the request of count Enno for evangelical preachers by sending Martin Onderkam and Matthias Gündich to East Friesland. He ranks, accordingly, as one of the most active promoters of the Reformation in Germany. In 1537 he accompanied duke Ernest to the convention at Smalcald, and signed the Smalcald Articles; in 1538 he was present at the Convention of Brunswick, and in 1540 at Hagenau, where an abortive attempt at reconciliation between the papal and the evangelical parties was made, and where the king, Ferdinand, issued a decree for a religious conference at Worms. Physical inability prevented Regius from participating in the proceedings of the latter diet. A severe cold incurred on his return from Hagenau resulted in a dangerous sickness, and on May 23, 1541, he ended his useful life. The veneration of his contemporaries proved his worth.

In appearance, Regius was a man of medium height and spare and delicate figure, easy and yet resolute in his bearing, and characterized by an air of intelligence and moral earnestness. His writings breathe the same Christian spirit which belonged to his personality. They number ninety-seven different works, which were published at Nuremberg in 1562, the German in four parts, and the Latin in three. His exegetical works deserve special attention of the student of the fundamental and thoroughness and skill with which the sense of Scripture is developed in them; and, in addition, the following are worthy of note: Formulse quadam caute et citra Scandimum Logendi de Praeceptis Christianae Doctrinae Loca (1535), which has almost reached the position of a standard work in the English language;—Catechismus Minor (1536), and Catechismus Major (1537), which are peculiar in that the questions are placed in the mouth of the pupil, and the answers are assigned to the teacher:—Erklaerung der zwey Artikel des christlichen Glaubens (1525); and others among them several works on Church discipline, which have been often reprinted.

Literature.—The writings of Urban Regius himself contain sources respecting his life, as does also the Vita Urban Regii, etc., written by his son Ernest. Comp. also Bertram, Ref. u. Kirchenkunde d. Stadts Lüneburg (1719); Meier, Ref.-Gesch. d. Stadt Hamme r (1730); Launeinstein, Hildesheim Reformationhistorias (1720); Geffken, Dr. Urb. Regius, sein Werth zum ersten Hamb. Superintendanten, etc.; Schlegel, Kirchen- u. Ref.-Gesch. d. Norddeutschland (Hamburg, 1848), vol. ii.; Liebenstein, Gesch. d. Lande Braunschweig und Lüneburg (Gotting, 1855), vol. ii.; Heimburg, Urbanus Regius, etc. (Hamburg and Gotting, 1851); Hagen, Deutschlands Bt. u. rel. Verhaeltisse im Ref.-Zustande (Erlangen, 1841-44); Uhlen, Urban Regius im Abendland (in the Jahresber. d. deutschen Gesellschaft d. Altertums, 1890), vol. v., No. 1.—Hertzog, Real-Encyclop. s. v.
REGUÍS CODEX. See PARIS MANUSCRIPT.

Regnum, a name for the crown or diadem of the popes, encircled with three crowns. It is (says Innocent III. cir. 1260) the imperial crown, representing the pope's power and plenitude, absolutely unwavering. According to some authors, Hornisclus first wore a crown which had been sent to him as a mark of fealty by the emperor Anastasius, to whom Clovis had presented it in 550, while some refer it to a gift of Constantine to pope Sylvester. At the entrance of a church the pope, when borne on a litter, laid aside the regnum and put on a precious mitre, but resumed when he left the building. Paul II made a new regnum, and enriched it with precious stones, when its use had long lapsed. At first it was a round or conical cap, ending in a round ball, and wreathed with a single gold crown, representing regal and temporal power. It is mentioned in the 11th century. In the 9th century, on mosaics, Nicholas I is represented wearing two circles, the lower labelled "The crown of the kingdom, from God's hand," and the upper inscribed "The crown of empire, from St. Peter's hand." Boniface VIII (1294-1303) added a second or spiritual crown, while Benedict XII (1334), others say John XII or Urban V, contributed the third coronet of papal sovereignty, and about that time the ornament assumed an oval form, and was called the papal ring. The papal tiara is a triple tiara, representing three crowns on the tiara. On putting on the tiara, the cardinal-deacon says to the pope, "Receive the tiara, adorned with three crowns, and know that thou art father of kings and princes, the ruler of the world." The crowns represent the three realms of heaven, earth, and purgatory, according to Baur; but as Jesus explains it, the three divisions of the earth—Europe, Asia, and Africa. Pope Adrian VI's effigy at Viterbo has no crowns on the tiara. See TIARA.

Regula Fidéi. See FAITH, RULE OF.

Regular Canons (Lat. Canonici Regularis, canons bound by rule), the name given, after the reform introduced into the system of cathedral clergy in the 11th century, to the members of those canonical bodies which adopted that reform. They were thus distinguished from the so-called "secular canons," who continued exempt from rule, and who are represented down to modern times by the canons, prebendaries, and other members of the cathedral clergy, in those churches in which the full cathedral system of the Roman Catholic Church is maintained. The rules of the regular canons being variously modified in different countries and ages, a variety of religious orders arose therefrom—Augustines, Premonstratensians, etc. See CANONS, REGULAR.

Regular Clerks are modern religious orders founded for preaching, medicine, or education. The principal are the Theatines (q. v.), founded by Paul IV, and the Oratorians (q. v.), instituted in 1550 by Philip Neri, of Florence. See CANONS, REGULAR.

Regulars or Regulærs. During the 4th and 5th centuries it was not customary to place monks, as such, on equal footing with the clergy; nor were they regarded as part of the clerical body until the 10th century. Before this they were distinguished by the name of religious or regulæers, and afterwards a distinction was carefully made between clerici secularis, i.e. parish priests and other secular clergy, who were charged with the care of souls, and clericæ regulæ, i.e. those belonging to monastic orders. This name was applied to the latter because they were bound to live according to certain rules (regulae).—Riddle, Christian Antig.

Rehab'ïah (Heb. Rehob'ah, רֶהָבָא, enlarged by Jehorah; also, in the prolonged form, Rehob'ah, רֶהָבָא, 1 Chron. xxiv. 21; xxvi. 25; Sept. Pashi'ah or Pash'ia, v. r. Pash'ia or Pash'ia, the only son of Eli-

Rehearse, in the Prayer-book, is understood to imply distinctness of utterance, in opposition to a low and hesitating manner, as in the catechism. Sometimes the word simply denotes saying or reading, or a recapitulation; as where Latimer remarks in a sermon, "I will therefore make an end, without any rehearsal or recital of that which is already said." See REHEARSE.

Reh经查, Carl Dr., a Jewish rabbi, was born Feb. 9, 1792, at Aldorf, in Breisgau. When fifteen years of age he went to Yverdon, in Switzerland, to attend the lectures at the Pestalozzi Institution there. He then entered the lyceum at Rastatt, and after due preparation was enabled to attend the lectures at the Heidelberg University, where he was promoted, Aug. 25, 1834, as doctor of philosophy. Having completed his studies, he was appointed preacher of the Jewish congregation at Heidelberg, where he died, Feb. 18, 1842. He translated into German the శాసనాచర్య, a Jewish ritual used for the sick, etc. (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1834). Besides, he published a number of school-books. See Forst, Bibl. Jud. (Berlin, 1837), and Kornmoller, Die Juden in Deutschland, p. 558 sq.; Steinschneider, Bibliothek. Heinen, p. 115; Zunz, Die Monatsschr. der K. J. Gesellschaft (Berlin, 1872; Engl. transl. by Rev. B. Pick in the Jewish Messenger, N. Y., 1874-75); Allgemeine Zeitung des Judentums, 1845, p. 249. (B. P.)

Rechob (Heb. Rechob, רֶכֶךֹב, [twice רֶכֶה, 2 Sam. x. 8; Neh. x. 11], a street, from its width: Sept. Padd'ash, Padd'iss, Padd'iss, etc.), the name of two men and also of three places in the north of Palestine.

1. The father of the Hadadezer, king of Zobah, whom David smote at the Ephrathites (2 Sam. viii. 3, 12). B.C. ante 1045. Josephus (Ant. vii. 5, 1) calls him Arous (Aroos), and the old Latin version Aronas. The name possibly had some connection with the district of Syria called Rehoboam, or Beth-rehob (2 Sam. x. 6, 8).

2. A Levite who sealed the covenant with Nehemiah (Neh. vi. 11). B.C. 440.

3. The northern limit of the exploration of the spies who explored Canaan (Num. xi. 21). It is specified as being "as men come unto Hamath," or, as the phrase is elsewhere rendered, "at the entrance of Hamath," i.e. at the commencement of the territory of that name, by which in the early books of the Bible the great valley of Lebanon is meant. Rechabaha of the modern Arabs, seems to be roughly designated. This, and the consideration of the improbability that the spies went farther than the upper end of the Jordan valley, seems to fix the position of Rechob as not far from Tell ed-Dûd, the ruins at the head of the Wady Kady, and Banias. This is confirmed by the statement of Judg. xix. 28, that Laish or Dan (Tell el-Kady) was "in the valley that is by Beth-rehob." Dr. Robinson (Later Bib. Res. p. 571) proposes to identify it with Haman, an ancient fortress in the mountains north-west of the plain of Halieh, the upper district of the Jordan valley. But since the names of Kuebeh, of a valley, and Jeir-Rehob, of an Arab mine, are found near Banias, Thomson (Land and Book, i. 591) prefers that vicinity. There is no reason to doubt that this Rechob or Beth-rechob was identical with the place mentioned under both names in 2 Sam. x. 6, 8, in connection with Maachah, which was also in the upper district of the Huleh. See BETH-REHOB.

4. One of the towns allotted to Asher (Josh. xix. 28), and which from the list appears to have been in close proximity to Zidon. It is named between Ekron, Abdon, and Hammon. Schick, however, gives it a position seven and a half miles east of Tyre, on the river Leontes; referring, perhaps, to the modern village Reich or Harsyek.
Asher contained another Rehob (Josh. xix. 30). One of the two was allotted to the Gershonite Levites (xxi. 31; 1 Chron. vi. 75), and of one its Canaanitish inhabitants (Josh. xi. 27, etc.) the mention of Aphiq in this latter passage may imply that the Rehob referred to was that of Josh. xix. 30. This, Eusebius and Jerome (Epist. confess. a. v. “Hodh”) confounded with the Rehob of the spies, and place it four Roman miles from Scythopolis. The place they refer to still survives as Rehob, three or four half miles south of Beisan, but their identification of a town in that position with one in the territory of Asher is obviously inaccurate. The Rehob in question is possibly represented by the modern Tell Kurdayyin, south of the river Belus, near the north-western corner of the sea of Galilee where there is a splendid spring (Robinson, Late Bib. Rev. p. 104).

Rehoboam (Heb. Rechab, רכזם, enl. of the people [see Exod. xxxvi. 24, and comp. the name Ephroim]; Sept. Pojoua: Josephus, Pojouamoc. Ant. viii. 8,1), the only son of Solomon, by the Ammonitish princess Naamah (I Kings xiv. 21, 31), and his successor (xii. 43). Rehoboam’s mother is distinguished by the title the (not as, as in the A. V. Ammunito. She was therefore one of the foreign women whom Solomon married in his kingdom (II Kings xi. 19). In the Sept. (I Kings xii. 22, 24, answering to xvi. 31 of the Hebrew text) she is stated to have been the “daughter of Ana (i.e. Hana) the son of Nahash.” If this is a translation of a statement which once formed part of the Hebrew text, and which was preserved as authentic history, it follows that the Ammonitish war into which Hanan’s insurrection had provoked David was terminated by a re-alliance. Rehoboam was born B.C. 1014, when Solomon was but twenty years old, and as yet unanointed to the throne. His reign was noted for the great political scheme which he attempted, and which continued to the end of both lines of monarchy.

From the earliest period of Jewish history we perceive symptoms that the confederation of the tribes was but imperfectly cemented. The powerful Ephraim could never break a position of inferiority. Throughout the book of Judges (viii. 1, xii. 1) the Ephraimites show a spirit of restless jealousy when any enterprise is undertaken without their concurrence and active participation. From them had sprung Joshua, and afterwards (by his command) the tribe was never to be considered theirs; and though the tribe of Benjamin gave to Israel its first king, yet it was allied by hereditary ties to the house of Joseph, and by geographical position to the territory of Ephraim, so that up to David’s accession the leadership was practically in the hands of the latter tribe. The Ephraimites of the north, in fact, were always threatened to be a formidable rival. During the earlier history, partly from the physical structure and situation of its territory (Stanley, Syr. and Palest., p. 162), which secluded it from Palestine just as Palestine by its geographical character was secluded from the world, it had stood very much aloof from the nation [see Judah, Tribe of], and even after Saul’s death, apparently without waiting to consult their brethren, “the men of Judah came and anointed David king over the house of Judah” (2 Sam. ii. 4), while the other tribes adhered to Saul’s family, thereby anticipating the final disruption which was afterwards to rend the nation permanently into two kingdoms. But after seven years of disaster a reconciliation was forced upon the contending parties; David was acknowledged as king of Israel, and soon after, by fixing his court at Jerusalem and bringing the tabernacle there, he transferred from Ephraim the greatness which had attached to Shechem as the ancient capital and to Shiloh as the seat of the national worship. In spite of this he seems to have enjoyed great national popularity among the Ephraimites, and to have treated many of them with special favor (1 Chron. xii. 30; xxvii. 10, 14), yet this roused the jealousy of Judah, and probably led to the revolt of Absalom (q. v.). Even after that perilous crisis was passed, the old rivalry broke out afresh and almost led to another insurrection (2 Sam. xx. 1, etc. [comp. Ps. lxxxviii. 60, 67, etc., in illustration of these remarks]). Solomon’s reign, from its severe taxes and other oppressions, aggravated the discontent, and latterly, from its irreligious character, alienated the prophets and provoked the displeasure of God. When Solomon’s strong hand was withdrawn, the crisis came (B.C. 973). Rehoboam selected Shechem as the place of his coronation, probably as an act of concession to the Ephraimites, and perhaps in deference to the suggestions of those old and wise counsellors of his father whose advice he afterwards unhappily rejected. From the present Hebrew text of 1 Kings we cannot get the exact details of the transactions at Shechem are involved in a little uncertainty. The general facts, indeed, are clear. The people demanded a remission of the severe burdens imposed by Solomon, and Rehoboam promised them an answer in three days, during which time he consulted first his father’s counsellors, and then the young men “that were grown up with him and which stood before him,” whose answer shows how greatly during Solomon’s later years the character of the Jewish court had degenerated. Rejecting the advice of the elders to conciliate the people at the minimum and to promise them “no more burden than the Egyptians,” he “sent word in their behalf to say, My father’s burdens will I increase on you; my son’s burdens will I add to your burdens; and I will chastise you with scorpions” (i.e. scourgies furnished with sharp points; so in Latin, scorpio, according to Liddell [Orig. v. 27], is “vircg nodosa at aculeata, quia arcuato vulnere in corpus inflictur” [Faciolati, s. v.]). Thereupon arose the formidable song of insurrection, heard abroad in the land before the tribes quarrelled after David’s return from the war with Absalom:

“What portion have we in David? What inheritance is Jesse’s son? To your tents, O Israel! Now see to thy own house, O David!”

Rehoboam sent Adoram or Adoniram, who had been chief receiver of the tribute during the reigns of his father and his grandfather (1 Kings iv. 6; 2 Sam. xx, 24), to reduce the rebels to reason, but he was stoned to death by the people; and his attendants, when his chariots were returned to Jerusalem, were slain in the streets. This was in the days of Rehoboam, when the land was not yet divided into the two kingdoms.

Israel heard that Jeroboam was come again, and they sent and called him unto the congregation and made him king.” We find in the Sept. a long supplement to this 12th chapter, possibly ancient, containing fuller details of Jeroboam’s biographical or the Hebrew. See Jeroboam. In this we read that after Solomon’s death he returned to his native city,Charlotte, which he fortified, and lived there quietly, watching the turn of events until the long-expected rebellion broke out, when the Ephraimites heard (doubtless through his own agency) that he had returned, and invited him to Shechem to assume the crown. From the same supplementary narrative of the Sept. we might infer that more than a year must have elapsed between Solomon’s death and Rehoboam’s visit to Shechem, for, on receiving the news of the former event, Jeroboam requested from the king of Egypt the right to return to his father’s country. This the king tried to prevent by giving him his sister-in-law in marriage; but on the birth of his child Abijah, Jeroboam renewed his request, which was then granted.
It is probable that during this year the discontent of the northern tribes was making itself more and more manifest and that this led to Rehoboam's visit and intimated inauguration. The comparative chronology of the reigns determines them both as beginning in this year.

On Rehoboam's return to Jerusalem he assembled an army of 180,000 men from the two faithful tribes of Judah and Benjamin (the latter transferred from the side of Joseph to that of Judah in consequence of the position of David's capital within its borders), in the hope of reconquering Israel. The expedition, however, was forbidden by the prophet Shemaiah, who assured them that the separation of the kingdoms was in accordance with God's will (1 Kings xii, 24). Still, during Rehoboam's lifetime peaceful relations between Israel and Judah were never restored (2 Chron. xii, 15; 1 Kings xiv, 30). Rehoboam now occupied himself in strengthening the territories which remained to him by building a number of fortresses of which the names are given in 2 Chron. xi, 6-10, forming a girdle of "fenced cities" round Jerusalem. The pure worship of God was maintained in Judah, and the Levites and many pious Israelites from the North, came to the city-solitary introduced by Jeroboam at Dan and Bethel, in imitation of the Egyptian worship of Men-Kheper, came and settled in the southern kingdom and added to its power. But Rehoboam did not check the introduction of heathen abominations into his capital. The lascivious worship of Astarte was allowed to exist by the side of the true religion (an inheritance of evil doubtless left by Solomon), "images" (of Baal and his fellow-divinities) were set up, and the worst immoralities were tolerated (1 Kings xiv, 22-24). These evils were punished and put down by the terrible calamity of an Egyptian invasion. Shortly before this time a change in the ruling house had occurred in Egypt. The twenty-first dynasty of Thiniteis, whose last king, Pisham or Pussennes, had been a close ally of Solomon (iii, 1; vii, 8; ix, 16; x, 29, 29), was succeeded by the twenty-second of Bubastites, whose first sovereign, Sheshak (Sheshonk, Sesonchis, Zauaraxis), was himself connected, as we have seen, with Jeroboam. That he was incited by him to attack Judah is very probable. At all events, in the fifth year of Rehoboam's reign the country was invaded by a host of Egyptians and other African nations, numbering 1200 chariots, 60,000 cavalry, and a vast miscellaneous multitude of infantry (B.C. 959). The line of fortresses which protected Jerusalem to the west and south was forced, Jerusalem itself was taken, and Rehoboam had to purchase a temporary peace by delivering up all the treasures with which Solomon had adorned the Temple and palace, including his golden shields, 200 of the larger and 300 of the smaller size (x, 16, 17), which were carried before him when he visited the Temple in state. We are told that after the Egyptians had retired, his vain and foolish successor was comforted by substituting shields of brass, which were solemnly borne before him in procession by the body-guard, as if nothing had been changed since his father's time (Ewald, Geschichte der Volks Israel, iii, 346, 404). Sheshak's success is commemorated by sculptured monuments of Champollion on the outside of the great temple at Karnak, where among a long list of captured towns and provinces occurs the name Judah Malek (kingdom of Judah). It is said that the features of the captives in these sculptures are unmistakably Jewish (Rawlinson, Herodotus, ii, 376, and Bampton Lectures, p. 126; Benson, Egypt, iii, 242). After this great humiliation the moral condition of Judah seems to have improved (2 Chron. xii, 12), and the rest of Rehoboam's life to have been unmarked by any events of importance. He died B.C. 956, after a reign of seventeen years, having ascended the throne at the age of forty-one (1 Kings xiv, 21; 2 Chron. xii, 13). In the addition to the Sept. already mentioned (inserted after 1 Kings xii, 24) we read that he was sixty years old at his accession—a misstatement probably founded on a wrong interpretation of 2 Chron. xiii, 7, where he is called "young" (i.e. new to his work, inexperienced) and "tender-hearted" (ךְֵצֶט לוֹ, wanting in resolution and spirit). He had eighteen wives, sixty concubines, twenty-eight sons, and sixty daughters. The wisest thing recorded of him in Scripture is that he refused to waste away his sons' energies in the wretched existence of an Eastern zemina, in which we may infer, from his helplessness at the age of forty-one, that he had himself been educated, but dispersed them in command of the new fortresses which he had built about the country. Of his wives, Mahalath, Abihail, and Maachah were all of the royal house of Jesse. Maachah loved best of all, and to her son Abijah he bequeathed his kingdom. See Kiesling, Hist. Rehoboam (Jena, 1793). See JUDD, KINGDOM OT.

Rehoboth [many Rehboth] (Heb. Re'ebôth), רֶהֶבֹּת [once רֶבִּי, Gen. x, 11], outside places, i.e. streets, as in Prov. i, 20, etc., the name of three places.

1. Rehoboth the Well (Sept. Ἰωράπερα: Vulg. Latitudine), the third of the series of wells dug by Isaac in the Philistines' territory (Gen. xxvi, 22). He had dug several wells before, but was obliged to abandon them in consequence of the quarrels of the Philistines. When this one was completed they did not strive for it. He celebrated his triumph and bestowed its name on the well in a fragment of poetry of the same nature as those in which Jacob's wives gave

Portrait of Rehoboam. (From the Egyptian monuments.)
names to his successive children: "He called the name of it Rehoboth (room) and said,

"Because now Jehovah hath made room for us, and has opened our way before us.""

The name was intended to indicate the fact that the patriarch had at length got space to rest in. Most of the ancient versions translate the word, though it must evidently be regarded as a proper name. Isaac had left the valley of Gerar and its turbulent inhabitants before he was born, and he had been reared in the well of Beer-sheba (ver. 22). From it he, in time, "went up" to Beer-sheba (ver. 23), an expression which is always used of motion towards the land of promise. The position of Gerar has not been definitely ascertained, but it seems to have lain a few miles to the south of Beer-sheba and nearly due east of Beer-sheba. In this direction, if anywhere, the wells Sinna, Essel, and Rehoboth should be searched for. The ancient Jewish tradition confined the events of this part of Isaac's life to a much narrower circle. The wells of the patriarch were shown near Askelon in the time of Origen, Antoninus Martyr, and Eusebius (Reland, Polist., p. 580); the Samaritan version identifies Gerar with Askelon; Josephus (Ant. i, 12, 1) calls it "Gerar of Ptolustrium," i.e. of Philistia. It is a remarkable fact that the name clings to the spot still. In the wilderness of Elath, about twenty-three miles south-west of Beer-sheba, is a wady called er-Rahisibeh, in which and on the adjoining heights are remains of antiquity thus described by Robinson: "In the valley itself is the ruin of a small rough building with domes built in the manner of a mosque. On the right of the path is a confused heap of hewn stones, the remains of a square building of some size, perhaps a tower. On the acclivity of the eastern hill we found traces of walls, a deep cistern, or rather cavern, and a fine circular thresholding floor, evidently antique. On ascending the hill on the left of the valley then we were astonished to find ourselves amid the ruins of an ancient city. Here is a level track of ten or twelve acres in extent entirely and thickly covered over with confused heaps of stones, with just enough of their former order remaining to show the foundations and form of the houses, and the course of some of the streets. The houses were mostly small, all solidly built of bluish limestone, squared and often hewn on the exterior surface. Many of the dwellings had each its cistern, cut in the solid rock; and these remain quite entire. Once, as we judged upon the spot, this must have been a city of not less than twelve or fifteen thousand inhabitants" (Bib. Res. i, 106). This identification is adopted by Rowlands (in Williams, Holy City, i, 465), Van de Velde (Memor., p. 341), Stewart (First and Khan, p. 13), and others. Dr. Leake was reluctantly led to the conclusion that the ancient city was not the one here pointed out by Robinson. But from an examination of the city and from the results of excavations in the neighborhood of Askelon, the Samaritans distinctly assert that Askelon is the true site of the ancient city. The site is remarkable for the excellence of its archaeological ruins and the general symmetrical arrangement of its streets. This identification is supported by a number of inscriptions which indicate that Askelon was of very ancient date.

2. REHOBOTH THE CITY (Heb. rehoboth' 'Ir, רֶהֶבֶּה יָרוֹן, i.e. Rehoboth of the River; Sept. Pousos ['v. t. Powsos] ή πόσα πάθησα; Vulg. de fercio Roboth, or Rehoboth, que justa annem sae eest], the city of a certain Saul or Shaul, one of the early kings of the Edomites (Gen. xxxvi, 37; 1 Chron. i, 48). The appellation "the river" fixes the situation of Rehoboth as on the Euphrates, emphatically "the river" to the inhabitants of Western Asia (see Gen. xxxii, 21; xv, 18; Deut. i, 7; Exod. xxxii, 31). The Targum of Onkelos adds, "Rehoboth, which is on the Phœnix." There is no reason to suppose that the limits of Edom ever extended across the river, and it is probable that the name of the city was derived from the name of the kings of Edom possibly a trace of an Assyrian incursion of the same nature as that of Chedorlaomer and Amraphel. At all events, the kings of Edom were not all natives of that country. Schultens in his note (Index Geogr. in T. Saldan, v. "Rahabah") identifies it with Rehoboth of Gen. xxxvi, 37; and this is the view of Bochart (Opp. i, 225), Winer, Genesiou (Thesaur., p. 1291), and others; but as the Euphrates was far distant from the site of Nineveh, there is a strong probability that against this opinion (Rehoboth was also mentioned by Abufida. In his day there was a small village on the site. The name still remains attached to two spots on the Euphrates—the one, simply Rahabeh, on the right bank, eight miles below the junction of the Khabur, and about three miles west of the river; the other, five miles farther on the left bank. The latter is said to be called Pahabay-malik, i.e. "royal" (Kalisch, Kapian), and is on this ground identified by the Jewish commentators with the city of Saul. The existence of the second locality, however, rests, not on direct evidence, but on the map in Layard's Nineveh and Babylonia, and is mentioned by the two Jewish authorities quoted above; but it does not appear on the map of canal Cheshm.
The other locality is unquestionably authentic. Chesney says, "On the right bank of the Euphrates, at the north-western extremity of the plain of Shanir, and three or half a miles south-west of the town of Maydin, are extensive ruins around a castle still bearing the name of Reboth" (i, 119; ii, 222).

Rebum (Heb. and Chald. Rebcm, Ῥηβµ, compassionante; Sept. Ροσπα, but in Neh. iii, 17 'Ροσποι), the name of five men.

1. One of the "children of the province" who returned from the Babylonian captivity with Zerubbabel (Ezra ii, 2) B.C. 536. In the parallel passage (Neh. vii, 7) he is called Nehum.

2. One of the priests who returned from Babylon at the same time (Neh. xii, 3). B.C. 536. In a subsequent verse (ver. 15) he seems to be called Hamin (q.v.).

3. A Persian officer in Samaria, joint author with Shinsalai of a letter which turned Antiochus against the building-plans of the Jews (Ezra iv, 8, 9, 17, 23). B.C. 535. "He was perhaps a kind of lieutenant-governor of the province under the king of Persia, holding apparently the same office as Tattai, who is described in Ezra v, 6 as taking part in a similar transaction, and is there called 'the governor on this side the river.' The Chaldee title, ἱβικελὲν, literally 'lord of decrees,' is left untranslated in the Sept. Baalkel and the Vulg. Bedleum; and the rendering 'chancellor' in the A.V. appears to have been derived from Kimchi and others, who explain it, in consequence of its connection with 'scribe,' by the Hebrew word which is usually rendered 'recordor.' This appears to have been the view taken by the author of 1 Esdr. ii, 25, ὅ γραφων τὰ προσώπιον, and by Josephus (Ant. xi, 2, 1), ὁ πάντα τὰ προσώπια γράφων. The former of these seems to be a gloss, for the Chaldee title is also represented by Baalkešecq.'

4. A Levite, son of Ban, and one of the builders of the wall of Jerusalem under Nehemiah (Neh. iii, 17). B.C. 445.

5. One of the chief Israelites who signed the covenant with Nehemiah (Neh. x, 25). B.C. 410.

Reth (Heb. Ῥηθ, Ῥθ, friendly; Sept. Ρήθ v. τ. 'Ρηθ), one of David's officers, who refused to rebel with Adonijah (1 Kings i, 6). B.C. 1015. "Jerome (Quast. Hebr. ad loc.) states that he is the same with 'Hiram the Zairite,' i.e. Era the Jairite, a priest and prince upon person of the David. Ewald (Grisez, iii, 201 infra) pointing on the occurrence of Shimei in the same list with Ret, suggests that the two are David's only surviving brothers, Rei being identical with Raidai. This is ingenious, but there is nothing to support it, while there is the great objection to it that the names are in the original extremely dissimilar, Rei containing the Ain, a letter which is rarely exchanged for any other, but apparently never for Deltur (Genesiach, Theaur, p. 976)."


Reichardt, John Christian, a minister of the Episcopal Church, was born at Ruhrtort, on the Rhine, in 1838. He was educated first at the public school in his native place, and afterwards pursued his studies at the gymnasium at Duisburg. Feeling a desire to devote himself to missionary work, he was recommended to the missionary society at Barnem, which received him, and he was sent by it to the excellent Jäncke's Missionary Institution at Berlin. Jäncke had no funds at command to enable him to send forth missionaries, but the missionary societies in England, in Holland, and elsewhere were thankful to avail themselves of those who had been trained under the venerable pastor in Berlin. In the year 1824 the London Missionary Society agitated the Gospel among the Jews appointed Mr. Reichardt for the mission in Poland, in connection with Mr. Becker, a former pupil of father Jäncke. During 1825 and 1826 he travelled extensively through Poland; from 1827 to 1829 he was engaged in frequent missionary journeys in Holland and Bavaria, and in 1831 he was active, together with the late Rev. M. S. (afterwards bishop) Alexander, in preaching the Gospel to the Jews in London and the principal towns of England. From that time his permanent residence was at London, in prosecution of the missionary work in behalf of his society. In October, 1857, Mr. Reichardt left England on a special mission to Jerusalem, where he also remained for a time. After his return from Jerusalem, his time and efforts were mainly directed to the work of the society in England, with occasional visits to various missionary stations. His main work, however, was the revision of the text of the Hebrew New Test., which was printed and published several times, and in correcting for the press multiplied editions of the Test., which the London Society for Prop. to the Hebrew, as well as the British Bible Society, published. He also took part in the training of candidates for missionary employment, and, after he was permitted to labor until his death, March 31, 1873. In connection with his missionary work, he published a number of pamphlets, which have been translated by his fellow-laborers into Dutch, French, etc., viz., Proofs that Jesus of Nazareth is the Son of David (Lond. 1851, and often), or Proofs that Jesus of Nazareth is the Son of David, is also the Son of God (ibid. 1851) and often; The Scriptural Doctrine of the God of Israel (ibid. 1851, and often); and The Two Coronations, or Messiah and Christianity (2d ed. ibid. 1857). — Investigation of the Prophet Joel with Special Reference to the Coming Crisis (ibid. 1867). — See Jewish Intelligence, 1851, p. 427 sq.; Janz, May, 1873; Dörre Emeth, oder Stimme der Nahrung (Breslau, 1873), p. 97 sq.; Delitzsch, Starn auf Hoffnung (1873), x, 228 sq.; Fürst, Bibl. Jud. iii, 143; Zuchb, Bibl. Theol. ii, 1044. (B. P.)

Reichel, John Frederick, a distinguished bishop
of the Moravian Church, was born at Leuna, in Alltenburg, Germany, May 16, 1731. His father and grandfather were both Protestant clergymen, and the latter was expelled from Bohemia on account of his faith. Reidel studied theology at the University of Jena, and entered the ministry of the Lutheran Church at the age of twenty-one. About the middle of April, 1758, he joined the Moravian community, the members of which were at that time the only Moravians in the United States.

Reidy, Joseph, a Presbyterian minister, was born in 1824, near Romeo, Mich. He was of Scotch parentage and received a careful religious training. He was graduated at the University of Michigan in 1844, and has spent the greater part of his life in theological training in Union Seminary. He was regularly ordained, and went to Kansas to enter the missionary field. At a place called Manhattan, and the region around, he spent five years of arduous toil, when he returned to Michigan, that he might be near his parents and comfort them in their age.

Reidy, Thomas, a celebrated Scotch divine and metaphysician, was born in 1720 at Strachan, Co. Down, N. I., and educated at Marischal College, Aberdeen, and became its librarian, a position which he resigned in 1786. In 1779 he was appointed professor of logic and metaphysics in the above-named college in 1752. In 1764 he succeeded Adam Smith as professor of moral philosophy in the University of Glasgow, retiring in 1781. He died Oct. 7, 1796. He published, Essays on the Powers of the Human Mind (Edinb. 1781, 3 vols. 8vo), Inquiry into the Human Mind (Edinb. 1781; 4th ed. 1812, 8vo). These and numerous other Essays, etc., were collected and published under the title of The Works of Thomas Reid, D.D., now fully Collected, etc. (6th ed. Edinb. 1868, 2 vols. 8vo). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s. v. See Scott's Philosophy.

Reidy, William Shields, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born in West Nottingham, Chester Co., Pa., April 21, 1778, and graduated with honor at Princeton College in 1802. He was then for about two years assistant teacher in an academy in Georgetown, D. C., afterwards in Shepherdstown, Va.; then, about 1804, he became professor in Hampden-Sidney College, and finally president of that college some two years later. He was licensed by the Presbyterian Church in the spring of 1806, and dissolved his connection with the college about eighteen months afterwards. In 1808 he settled at Llewellyn, Pa., and opened a school for males as a means of support, and at the same time labored to build up a Presbyterian Church in the village. In this he succeeded, and was installed as pastor in 1822. Still, his principal field of labor was his school, which after a while became a boarding-school for young ladies, and stood first among similar institutions in Virginia. Here his labors for the good of his charge were crowned with distinguished success. Having become incapacitated for public labor, he resigned his charge in 1848, and lived in retirement till his death, June 29, 1853. —Sprague, Memoir of the Amer. Pulpit, iv, 388.

Reidy, James Ross, a minister of the German Reformed Church, was born in Meyertown, Lebanon Co., Pa., Oct. 31, 1788. He began his theological studies with Dr. Becker, of Baltimore, Md., in 1809, was li- censed as an elder in 1812, and became pastor of churches in Rich- man's Valley, Dauphin Co., Pa. In 1813 he was sent as an exploring missionary to North Carolina, after which he returned to his charge. He was called to Ha- gerstown, Md., in 1819; resigned in 1823, to accept the pastorate of churches in Vincennes, Ind., in 1825; in securing aid from the Reformed Church there for the endowment of the Theological Seminary of the German
Reform Church and collecting books for its library. In this he was successful, returning in November, 1826. He became pastor in York, Pa., in 1827. His health failing, he resigned in July, 1831. He now supported himself in a secular calling amid continued ill-health, and died March 18, 1844. Mr. Reily was a man of great energy and originality, and withal somewhat eccentric; in the pulpit he was grave, earnest, and more than ordinarily eloquent. He preached in German and English.

Reilly, John, a minister in the Reformed Presbyterian Church, was born in Ireland about 1770, and came to this country when about seventeen. He engaged in teaching in Philadelphia and vicinity for several years, but studied theology, and was licensed to preach by the Special Presbytery at Philadelphia, May 24, 1809. He was taken on trial Aug. 15, 1812, ordained in 1818, and sent as missionary to South Carolina, Kentucky, and Ohio. He had not been long in South Carolina before he was installed as pastor of the united congregations of Beaver Dams and Waterford, where he labored with great acceptance and success until his death, August 1820. Mr. Reily was a man of childlike simplicity, godly sincerity, singleness of purpose, and undaunted intrepidity.—Sprague, Amusa of the Amer. Pulpit, i. 60.

Reimarus, Hermann Samuel, a learned German philologist, was born in Halle, Germany, in 1713, and studied first under his father and afterwards under Wolf and Fabricius. He next went to study at Jena, and later at Wittenberg. After having traveled over Holland and England, he was appointed rector at Weimar in 1728, and in 1729 was called to Hamburg as teacher of Hebrew in the gymnasium. He died there, March 1, 1765. His theological writings are a Disseratio de Assessoribus Synodi Magni (Hamb. 1751, 4to):—Das vornehmsten Wahrheiten der natürlichen Religion (ibid. 1754), and a few others of less importance. He is espe- cially noted with the editorship of the famous Wolfenbüttel Fragments (q. v.). See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, s. v.; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s. v.

Reinbeck, Johann Gustav, a German theologian and philosopher, was born Jan. 25, 1683. His father, Andreas, was superintendent at Brunswick, and published two enormous volumes on the Hebrew accents. Johann studied theology at Halle, pursuing Hebrew under Michaelis, and philosophy under Wolf. He was called in 1709 as preacher to the Friedrichswender Church in Berlin, and in 1718 became pastor of the Church of St. Peter at Cologne. He was a favorite with the Elector, and is also reckoned to be a great poet. He died Aug. 21, 1741. Reinbeck is the author of several Biblical, homiletical, and philosophical works, which are enumerated in Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, s. v.

Reinccius, Christian, a Lutheran divine, was born Jan. 22, 1668, at Grossmutlingen, in Zerbst, and died Oct. 18, 1702, at Weisenfels, where for about thirty years he had acted as rector of the academy. Reineccius was a voluminous writer, and his Dissertations, which he published as rector of Weisenfels, are still very valuable. Besides his edition of Lankisch's Concordius Bibliorum Germanico-Hebraico-Graeco (Lipsiae, 1718), and of Vetus Testamentum Græcum in Versum Septuaginta Interpretatum, sua cum Libris Apocryphi, etc. (ibid. 1730-57), he published Ebole Hebraico, ad Optimorum Codicum et Editionum Fidei Recensita, etc. (ibid. 1725). In the preface we are told, as is already indicated in the title-page, that in editing this Bible MSS. have been perused, but their use is nowhere pointed out. An alphabetical table of the Parashoth and a table of the Haphtaroth are given at the end. The text is correct. A second edition of the Hebrew Bible was published in 1739, which is but a reprint of the first, repeating even its mistakes, and making still greater ones. A third edition was pub- lished in 1756, after Reineccius's death, by C. G. Pohl, who also wrote the preface, in which he speaks of the changes made by him. In 1758, Dörriensie and Meisner published Reineccius's Oeum Vetus Testamento- bus ex Ingeni Codicis Copiae a C. G. Renuccio et B. J. de Rossii Collatorum, which is very valuable. It was republished by Knapp (Halle, 1818). Reineccius also wrote, Index Memorialis, quo Voci Hebraici et Graeci, quae ab Hebraice dictae sunt, etc. (Lipsia. 1737, and often), which is appended to some editions of his Hebrew Bible:—Manuale Bibliicum ex Concordantia Graecis et Aram, in quo Voci Greco-Osmes in LXXX Interpretatione Versione Bibliorum Graecae et in Apocrypica V. T. See nos in Test. Orig. Graece N. T. Occurrant, etc. (ibid. 1734):—Biblia Sacra Quadrupl. in V. T. Hebr., giving the He- brew, Greek (according to Graebe's text), the German of Luther, and Latin translation of Sebah. Schmidt, 3 vols., the three containing the Apocrypha in Greek, Latin, and German and (ibid. 1751):—Jnvoe Hebraico Lingua V. T. etc. (ibid. 1704; last ed. by Hechhoph, 1788). See First, Bibl. Jud. iii, 144 sq.; Rosenmeiller, Handbuch der philologis.- Litteratur, i. 236 sqq.; Winer, Handbuch der theolog. Literatur, i. 85, 89, 47, 120, 521, 557, 591; ii. 726; Theol. Universal-Lexicon, s. v.; Carpoz, Critica Sacra (2d ed. 1746), p. 648, 650; Kritz, Cyclop. s. v. (B. P.)

Reinhard, Franz Volkmann, an eminent Ger- man Philologist, was born in Schleswig, in the Province of Schleswig in 1758. He studied with his father, a deacon, until he was sixteen, when he entered the gymnasium of Ratisbon. Here he remained five years, and in 1778 removed to the University of Wittenberg. In 1780 he was called to the chair of printed professor of Hebrew, and in 1784 preacher to the university and assessor of the consistory. In 1792 he was preacher to the court at Dresden, ecclesiastical counsellor and member of the supreme consistory, and held these positions until his death, Sept. 6, 1812. He published, Sermones (Sulzbach, 1811, 8vo),—Christian Ethics (5 vols.),—Confe- dations, etc.

Reinhard, Lorenz, a German doctor of theology, was born Feb. 22, 1700, at Hellingen, in Franconia. After the completion of his studies, he was first tutor and afterwards professor at the gymnasium in Hildburg- hausen. In 1727 he was called as deacon and professor of the gymnasium to Weimar, and in 1741 as superin- tendent to Butzdorf, where he died, Nov. 18, 1752. He wrote, De Libro Secundum non Canonicum, etc. (Witten. 1719):—Die Theologie der Patristischen vor und nach der Sühnezeit, etc. (Hamb. 1737):—Observationes Philol. ad Bibliorum Hebraicos, Graecos, et Lati- nos, cum Breviar. Controversiar. cum Reformatis, etc. cum Bre- viario Contrarever. cum Armeniniis (Weimar, 1735):— Chrono- tactis Conciiti Conciitorum Solarum, etc. (ibid. 1741):—Commentario de Assumps, etc. (ibid. 1742):—Exkzer und Zerlederung des Buches Bisch. (etc. cap. 1749—50). See Winer, Handb. der theolog. Literatur, i. 247, 358; ii. 727; Fürst, Bibl. Jud. iii, 147. (B. P.)

Reins, a name for the kidneys, derived from the Latin renes, and in our English Bible employed in those passages of the Old Test. in which the term for kidneys (תַּלָּדְיוֹן, talad'tôn) is used metaphorically, i.e. except in the Pentateuch and in Isa. xxxix, 6, where this word is rendered kidneys. In the ancient system of physiology the kidneys, from the sensitiveness of that part of the person, were believed to be the seat of desire and longing, which accounts for their often being coupled with the heart (Psa. xvii. 9; xxxii. 2; Jer. xi. 20; xxvi. 10, etc.). See Kidneys.

The word "reins" is once used (Isa. xi. 5) as the equivalent of בְּעֵשָׂבָא, chalad'tav, elsewhere translated "loins" (q. v.).

Reischl, Wilhelm Carl, a German Roman Catho- lice divine, doctor and professor of theology at Munich, was born in that city Jan. 18, 1818. Having completed his studies in his native place, he was made a priest in
1835, and, after having occupied several positions as priest and chaplain, he was promoted in 1842 as doctor of philosophy. For some years he lectured at Munich, but in 1845 went to Amberg, occupying the chair of professor of dogmatics and exegesis. In 1851 he was called to Regensburg as professor of Church history and canon law, till he was recalled to his native city in 1867 as professor of patrology, where he died, Oct. 4, 1873. In connection with others, he published a commentary on the Holy Bible, the New-Testament part being his sole work. See Biographie de l'abbé Tisserant, 1873, p. 494. (B.P.)

Reiser, Anton, a German theologian, was born at Augsburg, March 7, 1628. He was first preacher at Schermzitz, and in 1659 became pastor of the Lutheran church at Freiburg. Having in 1672 espoused Calvinism, he was thrown into prison and at length banished. Eventually, however, he served as rector of the gymnasium at Augsburg, preacher at Oerlingen, and after 1678 as pastor of the Church of St. James at Hamburg, where he died, April 27, 1686. He was the author of a number of theological treatises, enumerated in Hoëter, Novis. Biog. Générale, &c.  (B.P.)


Relasmann, Johann Valentin von, a German doctor of theology, and bishop of Wurtzburg, was born Oct. 12, 1807, at Allersheim, in Lower Franconia. He completed his studies at the University of Wurtzburg, which honored him with the degree of doctor of philosophy and theology. Towards the end of the year 1830 he was ordained priest and appointed to Volkach, but in 1834 he was called to Wurtzburg as ordinary professor of exegesis and Oriental languages. This prominent position he occupied till Dec. 7, 1846, when he became a member of the chapter, and for a number of years he stood at the head of the diocesan government. In 1861 he was made provost of the cathedral; and when, in 1870, his bishop died, he was appointed by the king of Bavaria, Oct. 28, 1870, bishop of Wurtzburg, and confirmed by the pope in the following year. He occupied the episcopalsee as a few years, and died Oct. 17, 1876. See Biographie de l'abbé Tisserant, 1876, p. 58 sq. (B.P.)

Reiter, Ernst Anton, a Roman Catholic priest, was born in 1821 at Arnberg. He received holy orders in 1846, and came in 1854 as missionary to the United States. In 1859 he was appointed pastor of the German church of the Trinity at Boston, Mass., and died May 5, 1875, at Erie, Pa. He wrote a very important work on the statistics of the Roman Catholic Church of the United States, entitled Schmeratismus der katholischen deutschen Geistlichkeit in den Ver. Staaten Nordamerikas (N. Y. 1865). See Literarischer Handwörter für das katholische Deutschland, 1869, p. 465 sq.; 1873, p. 271. (B.P.)

Reiter, William, a minister of the German Reformed Church, was born in Lancaster County, Pa., Sept. 13, 1787. After his youth in Westmoreland County, Pa., he studied theology privately with several ministers successively in Stark County, O., preaching meanwhile in the way of missionary tours under their direction. He was ordained in 1819, and took charge of a number of German Reformed congregations in Tuscarawas County, O., in whose service he continued up to the time of his death, May 8, 1826. He was a diligent student, and a minister that had much of the true missionary spirit.

Reithmayr, Franz Xavier, doctor and professor of theology, a Roman Catholic divine of Germany, was born in 1809 at Dillingen, near Regensburg. In 1822 he was made priest; in 1836 the Munich University made him doctor of theology; in 1837 he was extraordinary professor; in 1841 ordinary professor of the New Testament, exegesis, and died Jan. 26, 1872. Reithmayr was one of the most prominent theologians of the Roman Catholic Church, and published in 1858 a work on patrology, in 1859 a Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans (Regensb. 1854). In 1862 he published his Introduction to the Canonical Books of the New Testament (Ibid.); and in 1865 a Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians. His last great work was the edition and edition of the fathers, which he edited in connection with others, and which is still in the course of publication at Kempten, under the title Bibliothek der Kirchenlehrer. See Zachold, Bibl. Theol. ii., 977; 1861; Literarischer Handwörterbuch, 1871, p. 52 sq.; 1872; p. 142. (B.P.)

Re'kem (Heb. יָרֵךְ, יָרֵק), a description, or perhaps i.q. of the root, the name of three men, and of a city.

1. (Sept. 'Rqem; A.V. Rcem, the name being cains "in pasture," יָרֵק) Brother of Ulam, and a descendant of Machir, the son of Manasseh, by his wife Maachah; apparently a son of Sheerah (1 Chron. vii. 16). B.C. ante 1619.

2. (Sept. 'Rqem v. t. 'Rqem). One of the five kings of the Midianites slain by the Israelites along with Balaam (Num. xxiii. 8; Josh. xiii. 21). B.C. 1818.

3. (Sept. 'Rqem, Rqem v. t. 'Rqem). The third named of the four sons of Hebron, and father of Shammai, of the tribe of Judah (1 Chron. ii. 43, 44). B.C. 1818. "In this genealogy it is extremely difficult to separate the names of persons from those of places—Ziph, Maresah, Tappuah, Hebron, are all names of places, as well as Maon and Beth-zur. In Josh. xviii, 27, Rekem appears as a town of Benjamin, and perhaps this genealogy may be intended to indicate that it was founded by a colony from Hebron"

4. (Sept. 'Rqem). A city in the territory of Benjamin, mentioned between Moazah and Irpeel (Josh. xiii, 27). Josephus, in speaking of the Midianitish kings slain by Moses (Jast. iv. vii. 1), mentions a city named after Rekem (No. 2, above), which was the chief city of all Arabia, and was called 'Apxaqm, Atarne, by the Arabs, and Petra by the Greeks. This is, of course, different from the Rekem of Benjamin. As the latter is in the group of the south-eastern tribe, the site was possibly that of the present ruins called Deir Yasin, about three miles west of Jerusalem (Robinson, Researches, i., 141; Bâdeker, Palestina, p. 298).

Reke. See HIRSE.

Reland, Adriaan, a celebrated Orientalist, was born July 17, 1676, at Ryn, a village in Northern Holland, where his father was pastor. He early devoted himself to the study of Oriental languages under Leusden, with the aid of Henry Sicke. After staying six years for this purpose at Utrecht, he went to Leyden to finish his theological studies. He was soon afterwards offered a professor's chair at Liége, but he preferred to return to his aged father. In 1699 he was made professor of philosophy and Oriental languages at Harderwyck, and two years afterwards was called to teach Oriental languages and ecclesiastical antiquities at Utrecht, a position he held during the last years of his days, having in 1713 refused a professor's chair at Frankenberg, and in 1716 another at Leyden. He died of small-pox, Feb. 5, 1718. Reland is admitted to have been by far the greatest Orientalist of his day, and his writings display an exhaustiveness of learning, the most pains-taking accuracy, and sound judgment. He was also not lacking in imagination, as some of his earlier proclamations showed. To these admirable qualities he added great affability of manners and a noble sweetness of
RELIC-CASE

RELIGION

Character. Of his numerous writings we here mention only the most important: Anolecta Rabbinica (Ultraj. 1702) — De Religione Mohammeci (ibid. 1705 and later); — Dissertationem Morlemum (ibid.1707); — Antiquitates Veteris Testamenti (1708); — Neniae Vet. Hebraeorum (ibid. 1709); — Palestinae et Monumenta Veteris Biblias Illustrata (ibid. 1714), a work which in its way can never be superseded: —De Spoliis Templo (Traject. 1716); — Elenchus Philologicus (Ultraj. 1709). See Hoefler, Narr. Hist. Generale, s. v.; Herzog, Real-Encyclop. s. v.

Relic-case. See RELIQUARY.

Relica. By this term are usually understood the bodies or clothes of saints and martyrs, or the instruments by which they were put to death or suffered torment, which were so revered in the Romish Church as to be worshipped and carried about in procession. The honoring of the relics of saints, on which the Church of Rome afterwards founded her superstitious and lucrative use of them, as objects of devotion, as a kind of charms, or amulets, and as instruments of pretended miracles, appears to have originated in a very ancient custom that prevailed among Christians, of assembling at the cemeteries or burying-places of the martyrs for the purpose of commemorating them and of performing divine worship. Here they displayed their affection for their saintly fellow-sufferers, and thus were dictated by fervent affection and were consistent with the principles of religion.

In the 4th century the boundary between respect and worship was passed. Helena, the mother of Constantine, made a journey to Jerusalem and there discovered, as she supposed, the wood of the true cross, a part of which she gave to the city of Jerusalem, and sent the other part to Constantine, who encased it in his own statue and regarded it as the palladium of his new city. When the profession of Christianity obtained the protection of the civil government, under Constantine the sacred shrines of the martyrs were erected. Sepulchres, and the names and memories of the departed were treated with every possible token of affection and respect. This reverence, however, gradually exceeded all reasonable bounds; and those prayers and religious services were thought to have a peculiar sanctity and virtue which were performed over their tombs; hence the practice which afterwards obtained of depositing relics of saints and martyrs under the altars in all churches. This practice was early thought of such importance that St. Ambrose, in the 4th century, would not consecrate a church because it had no relics; and the Council of Constantinople, in Trullo (A.D. 692), ordained that those altars should be demolished under which were found no relics. Such was the rage for them at one time that even Mabillon, the Benedictine, justly condemned, as he was later to be, was led to deposit over suspected relics, numerous spurious ones being everywhere offered to the piety and devotion of the faithful. He adds, too, that bones are often consecrated which, so far from belonging to saints, probably do not belong to Christians. From the catacombs of Italy, Sicily, and other places which had served as the burial-places of the primitive Christians, although the catacombs have both before and since been used for other purposes, numerous relics have been taken. Even as early as 386 Thesleſius was urged to pass a law forbidding the people to dig up the bones of martyrs or traffic in their remains. The superstition grew until, in the 9th century, these relics were not only treated with veneration, but were supposed to have the virtue of healing disorders of body and mind and defending their possessors against the devil. Not was this efficacy destroyed or lessened when the relic was distributed in fragments. In the 11th century relics were tried by fire, and those which did not consume were reckoned genuine, and the rest not. Relic-collecting has been carried to a great extent in Europe, both in Roman and in Greek churches, especially being full of fictitious relics. The following is only a sample of those in the Church of Santa Croce de Jerusalem: three pieces of the true cross, the title placed over the cross; two thorns from the crown of our Lord; the sponge extended to our Lord with vinegar and gall; a piece of the veil and hair of the Virgin; a chip from the true cross where the devil bit the shin of Jesus; some of the manna gathered in the desert, etc.

Relics of saints were regarded as the palladium of cities, as St. Martin's body was carried out to the gates of Tours in 845 to repel a siege by the Danes. St. Werburgh's relics were borne in procession to quell a fire at Chester, and the canons bore them through the diocese to invite alms for the erection of Salisbury Cathedral. At Lichfield the bells were rung at their departure and return. In the 6th century the custom of swearing upon relics, as later upon the Gospels, began. Relics were, and still are, preserved on the altars whereon mass is celebrated, a square hole being made in the middle of the altar large enough to receive the hand, and therein is deposited the relic, being first wrapped in red silk and enclosed in a leaden box. In Catholic countries these relics are popularly esteemed the most precious treasures of the churches, and in earlier times they had even a high marketable value, large sums having been often raised by necessitous princes by the sale or mortgage of pieces of the "true cross." Before the Reformation relics were in demand in Scotland, and their sale was a fertile source of revenue for the church. They were forbidden to be brought into England by several statutes, and justices were empowered to search houses for them and to deface and destroy them when found. This folly has not been without learned and laborious defence, antiquity and scripture both having been appealed to in its support. Bellarmine cites the following passages: Exodus, xiii, 19; Deut. xxxiv, 6; 2 Kings, xii, 21; xxxii, 16-18; Isa. xi, 10; Matt. ix, 20-22; Acts, xii, 12; xix, 11, 12. But there is no doubt that the worship of relics is an absurdity, without the guarantee of the Catholic Church. The problem of the primitive Church, and irreconcilable with common-sense, Latin monographs upon relics and relic-worship have been written by Cellarius (Helm. 1656), Jung (Hanor. 1768), Kurrholtz (1680), Morellius (Rome, 1721), Seger (Leips. 1688), Batii (1655), Kirselin, Rambach (Halle, 1722). See Barmun, Romurumus de It Is: Methodist Quar. Rev. Oct. 1866; Mosheim, Eccles. Hist.; Neander, Hist. of Christian Church.

Relief Synod (or CHURCH). See SCOTLAND, CHURCHES OF.

Religion (Lat. religio, religio). This word, according to Cicero (Div. Instil., 4), is derived from, or rather compounded of, re and ligere, to read over again, to reflect upon or to study the sacred books in which religion is taught. With suspicion of the devil, re and ligere, to read, were joined to make religio, from re-ligere, to bind back, because religion is that which furnishes the true ground of obligation.

Religion has been divided into natural and revealed. By natural religion is meant that knowledge, veneration, and love of God, and the practice of those duties to him, our fellow-creatures, and ourselves, which are discoverable by the right exercise of our rational faculties, from considering the nature and perfections of God, and our relation to him and to one another. By revealed religion is understood that discovery which he has made to us of his mind and will in the Holy Scriptures. As respects natural religion, some doubt whether, properly speaking, there can be any such thing; since, through the fall, reason is so depraved that man cannot attain to the greatest darkness and misery, as may be easily seen by considering the history of those nations who are destitute of it, and who are given up to barbarism, ignorance, cruelty, and evils of every kind. So far as this, however, may be observed, it is the light of nature that furnishes the ideas of God, nor inform us what worship will be acceptable to him. It does not tell us how man became
fallen, sinful creature, as he is, nor how he can be recovered. It affords us no intelligence as to the immortality of the soul; and, therefore, a future state of happiness and misery. The apostle, indeed, observes that the Gentiles have the law written on their hearts, and a law unto themselves; yet the greatest moralists among them were so blinded as to be guilty of, and actually to countenance, the greatest vices. Such a statement, indeed, would seem to be religious which leaves man in such uncertainty, ignorance, and impurity. See NATURAL THEOLOGY. Revealed religion forms the correlate of natural religion, or the religion of reason. It is not the result of human invention, but the result of human dependence upon a personal and unique communication from God, is therefore infallible; where as, on the contrary, all processes of human thought are more or less subjected to error. Hence we can explain why it is that religion gives itself out to be, not a product of the reason merely, not anything which originated from human inquiry and study, but a result of a divine revelation. The religious feeling is undoubtedly a propension of human nature; yet without a divine revelation the mind would sink in dark and perpetual disorder. Of the whole family of man, existing in all ages, and exposed to the hold of ignorance or error, there is not one well-authenticated exception to the fact that moved by an inward impulse, and guided by revelation or tradition, man worships something which he believes to be endowed with the attributes of a superior being. Even the Germans, for instance, who, on the one hand, are among the various idolatrous systems are but the traditions of ancient revelations, more or less corrupted, which have descended from the first worshippers. Revealed religion comprehends, besides the doctrines of natural religion, many truths which were beyond the reach of human reason, those not contained in the revered, and are the knowledge of which we are indebted directly to the Old and New Testaments. While other religions had been variously accommodated to the peculiar countries in which they flourished, Christianity was so framed as to be adapted to the whole human family. It is the one thing needful for the elevation of our race, and is destined alike to universality and perpetuity.

In all forms of religion there is one part, which may be called the doctrine or dogma, which is to be received by faith; and the cult or worship, which is the outward expression of the religious sentiment. By religion is also meant that homage to the Deity in all forms which pertain to the spiritual life, in contrast with theology, the theory of the divine nature and government. See Theology.

RELIGION, PHILOSOPHY OF, the science of religion; the application of philosophical principles to the discussion of its general character, origin, and claims. It presents, 1. religion in general; 2. revealed religion; 3. the Christian religion; 4. the Christian Church. This subject is discussed by Apel (1809), Beneke (1840), Chateaubriand, Deuzinger (1857), Fichte, Hegel (Weber, vol. xii), Kant (Religion im ewigen, with Kirchmann's notes), Krug (1819), Morel (Philosophy of Religion; see the Methodist Quarterly Review, July, Oct., 1850), Pascal (Pensees), Otto Pfeiffer (1809), Heinrich Ritter (1858, 1859), Arnold Ruge (1809), Schleiermacher (Morgenl.) F-X. Schleiermacher, 1840, and Spinoza, 1677, of the Scholastic, and Kneclius, 1840, of the Modern School. See also Foley and Kneclius, 1840.

RELIGION, PRACTICE OF. Far in the distance, beyond Buddhism, Brahminism, Zoroastrianism, Confucianism, and all the ten religions so graphically set forth by Freeman Clarkson, there lies a primitive faith of great power, to which our attention is called in Heb. xi, 2: "For by it the ancients obtained a good report." To this primitive religion all the others are so entirely related, and of idolatry, with all the mixtures of good and evil pertaining to religions now ancient, owe their origin, whether we can or cannot trace the genealogy. The faith of all the patriarchs anterior to the call of Abraham may be reckoned to this early form of the knowledge, fear, love, and service of the true God. How it came that deceiving descendants of the stock of Heth precipitated men blinded into ignorance, crime, and abominable idolatry, we are told in Rom. i, 28: "And even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind." Thus they lost that faith in which they had been instructed by Noah during three centuries, after whom they were called to be religious which leaves man in such uncertainty, ignorance, and impurity. See Natural Theology. Revealed religion forms the correlate of natural religion, or the religion of reason. It is not the result of human invention, but the result of human dependence upon a personal and unique communication from God, is therefore infallible; whereas, on the contrary, all processes of human thought are more or less subjected to error. Hence we can explain why it is that religion gives itself out to be, not a product of the reason merely, not anything which originated from human inquiry and study, but a result of a divine revelation. The religious feeling is undoubtedly a propension of human nature; yet without a divine revelation the mind would sink in dark and perpetual disorder. Of the whole family of man, existing in all ages, and exposed to the hold of ignorance or error, there is not one well-authenticated exception to the fact that moved by an inward impulse, and guided by revelation or tradition, man worships something which he believes to be endowed with the attributes of a superior being. Even the Germans, for instance, who, on the one hand, are among the various idolatrous systems are but the traditions of ancient revelations, more or less corrupted, which have descended from the first worshippers. Revealed religion comprehends, besides the doctrines of natural religion, many truths which were beyond the reach of human reason, those not contained in the revered, and are the knowledge of which we are indebted directly to the Old and New Testaments. While other religions had been variously accommodated to the peculiar countries in which they flourished, Christianity was so framed as to be adapted to the whole human family. It is the one thing needful for the elevation of our race, and is destined alike to universality and perpetuity.

In all forms of religion there is one part, which may be called the doctrine or dogma, which is to be received by faith; and the cult or worship, which is the outward expression of the religious sentiment. By religion is also meant that homage to the Deity in all forms which pertain to the spiritual life, in contrast with theology, the theory of the divine nature and government. See Theology.

RELIGION, PHILOSOPHY OF, the science of religion; the application of philosophical principles to the discussion of its general character, origin, and claims. It presents, 1. religion in general; 2. revealed religion; 3. the Christian religion; 4. the Christian Church. This subject is discussed by Apel (1809), Beneke (1840), Chateaubriand, Deuzinger (1857), Fichte, Hegel (Weber, vol. xii), Kant (Religion im ewigen, with Kirchmann's notes), Krug (1819), Morel (Philosophy of Religion; see the Methodist Quarterly Review, July, Oct., 1850), Pascal (Pensees), Otto Pfeiffer (1809), Heinrich Ritter (1858, 1859), Arnold Ruge (1809), Schleiermacher (Morgenl.) F-X. Schleiermacher, 1840, and Spinoza, 1677, of the Scholastic, and Kneclius, 1840, of the Modern School. See also Foley and Kneclius, 1840.
and Philel the general, came to Isaac and renewed their covenant of peace at the same place where they had made it with his father. During the time of Jacob we find no friendly association with the Philistines. In Joshua’s time their land was to be given to Israel. During the period of the Judges we find only hostility, conflicts, and wars. Worship in the temple was the office of the government. The worship of God and other idols had now supplanted every vestige of the ancient faith. Beelzebub was the god of Ekron. David burned the images that he found in the conquered camp. The overthrow of Saul was published in the house of their idols, and his armor deposited in the temple of Ashtaroth. Their overthrow is noted by Isaiah (ii, 6). The illegal associations formed with Ashdod in the days of Nehemiah were most damaging to the people of the Lord. God diddef the God of Israel, and cursed David by his gods.

III. Conununiah.—Another illustration of the primitive religion we have in Melchizedek and his people. He was king of Salem, priest of the Most High, and a very eminent type of the expected Deliverer. While Melchizedek lived, and others of the same faith, in suffering, their influence on the heathen nation, it was announced to Abraham that the iniquity of the Amorites was “not yet full.” Some four hundred years were yet allowed them to improve or misimprove their privileges. A very few, like Rahab of Jericho, were willing to obey the word of God and be saved. The seven nations, as such, had, who apostatized to the god of this world, almost probable, that there was still some regard for the true religion among those known as Jebusites, although they did not surrender to Joshua. The following considerations are in their favor: (a.) They were long spared after the other nationalities had been broken up. They held their capital till the time of David. (b.) This capital was the ancient seat of Melchizedek, where we might expect the truth to be kept in families when the nation had given it up. (c.) Arunah the Jebusite is handsomely noted in the history of David, after their capital had surrendered. (d.) At Arunah’s threshing-floor the destroying angel suspended his work. (e.) He made to David a noble offer—victims for the sacrifice, and wood to burn it from his farming implements. (f.) He is living in Jerusalem, not as an idolater, but apparently like the people around him. (g.) In 2 Sam. xxiv, 23, the Hebrew reading is, “All these did king Arunah give to the king.” This would indicate that he was a lineal descendant of the royal line of Melchizedek, and was king of the Jebusites when they surrendered, and as such met the consessor of the ark, though a conquered subject; and he readily fell in with the new religion, although it was an advance on that of his ancestors. For some such reasons, he readily sold the old homestead—the floor for fifty shekels of silver, the farm for six hundred shekels of gold.

IV. Melopotamia.—Terah and his sons, Abram, Nahor, and Haran, in Ur of the Chaldees, were brought up in this primitive religion; but it had become corrupted by idolatrous excesses, and although they belonged to the witnessing line, they became involved in the idolatries of the land (Josh. vi, 22). “They served other gods.” To preserve yet a faithful testimony, Abraham was called out of that land when he was about seventy years old, had the covenant of God renewed to him, and commenced a renovated service on the basis of the old faith, with new revelations. Abraham, after the death of his father, removed to Canaan, leaving a resident at Haran, where he had resided five years. Thus freed from all family connections, except those under his own control, he carried down the true religion in its purity to Isaac and Jacob, with their adherents, all living beyond the Euphrates in a foreign country. The ancient religion still received new developments of the coming Deliverer, superadded to all former revelations; nor was it a new religion, but a new edition of the old, that was given to Moses. Meantime, the old religion retained, in the family of Nahor, some at least of the old corruptions. The teraphim, for example, Rachel wished to introduce into Jacob’s family. Laban called these his gods; the Sept. calls them idols. On what terms of religious observance Jacob lived in Laban’s family we have nothing specific; but after the parting we find that each had his own distinct religion. Laban swears by the gods of his father, and the gods of his father, and the God of their father. Jacob appeals to the God of Abraham, and the Fear of Isaac (Gen. xxxii, 43, 53). The memorial pillar points to him who is the Rock of Ages, while the heap of gathered stones seems to indicate the Church’s concerns about ineradicable truths, on which we all hold communion with one another and with God in his ordinances. How long this imperfectly organized Church continued in Padaan-aram we have no indication, but we know that the Aramites were no friends to Israel in the days of the kings. A very interesting item on the religion of Bethuel’s family is connected with the visit of Abraham’s prime minister. The friends of Rebekah recognize Jehovah, the covenant God; and they give their farewell blessing in the name of the promised Deliverer: “Let thy seed possess the gate of those who hate him.” Excepting Luther, translators have made and work with this verse (xxxiv, 60).

Perhaps to this connection belongs Balaam the soothsayer; from Aram, from the mountains of the east, from the river of his people, from the thorn of Aram-naharaim. From some passages it seems he had obtained a profound knowledge of God and of his ways; yet so perveted was his heart that he endeavored to bring all that knowledge to effect the destruction of Israel. From the tops of the rocks he could see the Deliverer coming, yet so deep was his malignity that he could meet death in this world and damnation in the next rather than have this man rule over him. He furnishes an awful example of those who hold the truth in unrighteousness.

V. Midianites.—In those days we have brought up a most beautiful lamp of the holy peaceful faith, by the prince and priest of Midian. It is true that the Midianites were descended from Abraham by Keturah; but their relations with Isaac and his descendants would not have kept up, and did not keep up, the faith of Abraham in its advanced stages. All that they received directly from Abraham needed some kind of support after they were sent away from Isaac; this support could come only from the scattered fragments of primitive religion floating among their new associations, and collected into a focus by such a man as Jethro. So long as the Midianites held that his son Hobab has joined the camp of Moses, we find no more faith among the Midianites, nor any friendship for the people of the Lord.

VI. Magians.—In the court of Persia, as late as the captivity, we find traces of the primitive religion. Not only was Cyrus individually called for special service, but there was much favor shown to the Jews by native Persians, while foreign satraps, like Sanballat, Tobiah, and Geahem, used all their craft, as well as their power, to frustrate the labors of Nehemiah in restoring the city. How often the following are repeated, “They serve, or they are to be told here; nor does this invalidate the idea of friendly relations when these could have fair play. Writers like James Freeman Clarke, after tracing far into antiquity the Zoroastrian faith, are unwilling to recognize an ancient faith to which belong the sacred fire, the sacred tree, and other items, while traces of it are found mixed in with later observances. Such writers can see any religion only as the philosophical outgrowth of the human mind, but not as a divine revelation. Of a different cast is a late writer in the Rev. and Col., Rev. and Col., J. Murray, Mitchell, LL.D. When treating of another, though ad-
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The ancient religion of Persia." See the Methodist Quarterly Review, January, 1879. India itself? Is there not evidence through the medium of Moos and medium by which they were carried far beyond the period of the Vedas? To say nothing of moral precepts, a Creator, a Triad—Brahma, Vishnu, and Siva—the Incarnation of Vishnu in the ten Avatars, these and other items claim our attention as elements of a spiritual creed.

However much like they may have learned from the return of Balaam's retinue, after he was killed in battle (Num. xxxi, 8), certain it is that the primitive religion furnished a healthy stock on which to engraft the "Star of Jacob" in Persia and all over the East, whose name is traced from Babylon to Jerusalem when Christ was born in Bethlehem of Judaea.

VII. Arabian.—Among the very interesting details of the ancient religions we find Job and his friends. Without going into minute inquiry, let us place him somewhere about the period of the Babylonian, the father of Arabian. He is classed with the "sons of the East," yet we cannot locate him in the East like the Persian Magi. His own name, and the names of his friends, resemble more than any other the names of the Semites, among whom, in later times, Esau and his posterity intersected in many lines. In such a way we find the names Tamar, Job, Shadrach, Teshach, with others not identical, but of the same general cast as the names of Job's associates. The faith of these godly men, wherever they may have lived, is of a very high order; the purity of their life, the number of their ways, is of the highest degree. Neither by Job nor by any of his friends is there the least allusion to the covenant of Abraham. Whatever mistakes they labored under, they are recognized as true worshippers, and God deals with them as his own.

VIII. Assyrian.—Late discoveries by Layard and Rawlinson have brought us into contact with the ancient Assyrians in much of their religion, as well as war and civil policy. Among the sculptures exhumed, none are more interesting than the winged quadrupeds finished off with a human head, or the human form with eagle's head and wings. These convey us back to the early ch vendor, the forms of which must have been preserved by Noah and his sons. At first sight these Assyrian images may seem no more than mere idols—false gods; but they were not made by human hands, nor were they coated with any color. It is quite possible that they were set up by the Assyrians, who venerated them as the symbols of the gods of the Semites, as well as the Semites of the Semites, as well as the Semites of the Hebrews, who were more deeply involved, and went still further from the truth till the days of Sardanapalus, Nebuchadnez- zar, and Belshazzar. Whether in the Arabian line there was kept any physical type of the original cherubim and seraphim is not certain; but there are some hints worthy of our serious consideration. (a) Behemoth went somewhere to inquire of the Lord and received a specific answer. May not this have come from sacred utensils still in the custody of Abraham? (b) Before Moses had set up the new tabernacle there was some kind of tabernacle in use (Exod. xxviii, 7). A sacred chest belonged to many of the ancient idolatries. Was it copied from a true original? (c) In the higher rank of families the teraphim were long retained in connection with the true religion. Not only did the Mosaic law forbid them; but when they were kept by them with whom God had dealings, as with Michal brought one into David's; and they are classed with recognized symbols in Hose. iii, 4. On the other side they are classed with idols, and were used by the king of Babylon for idolatrous purposes. May they not have been like the brazen serpent, at first a mere memorial of truth, afterwards turned into an object of false worship. See Teraphim.

IX. Inferences.—Other ancient religions we must pass over here in order to take a survey of the leading features of the primitive, from which they are all derived, and from which they have inherited some features in common, while each seems to have dropped other matters, according to their various tastes and circumstances (see Princeton Rev. July, 1872; Taylor Lewis, The Primitive Greek Religion).

On what foundation did the primitive faith rest its confidence?

1. The knowledge, fear, and reverence which Adam retained even after the fall. Let it be fairly admitted that Adam, by transgression, was lost—lost to all spiritual good accompanying salvation; that the first of all the commandments—love—was completely obliterated in his heart; that he was dead in trespasses and sins. Still the apostle tells us that where the law of love had been written there was still left to ἀγάπη τοῦ πάντων ἔργων, the "work" of the law, which work is still written in the heart of even the heathen (Rom. ii, 14, 15). This work he places largely in the domain of knowledge, and even conscience, yet it is not in any degree the law of love (i, 32): "Who, knowing the judgment of God, that they who commit such things are worthy of death, not only do the same, but have pleasure in them that do them." This by nature is our own moral state; yet, blessed be God, knowledge, memory, reason, conscience, have not been entirely destroyed, though conscience has been seared, and all the faculties greatly debilitated. Adam, on leaving the garden, still retained some semblance of it, as in the great variety, now lost! lost! lost forever through the former channel. With all that he had lost, who is there among us that would not travel a long, long pilgrimage to hear him tell the beauty of the garden inside; the perfect satisfaction of everything he saw, heard, felt, while innocent; the nature of that holiness which is only now to be regained by incessant labor, suffering, and watching; unimpeached communion with God. Darwin himself, and the modern race of scientists, are worthy of death, not only do the same, but have retained even then. Acquaintance with God! Fellowship of the Spirit! Seeing him as he is! Social worship in the holy family! The first Sabbath-day!

2. The promise of a Seed, a coming Deliverer, while as yet he had no child. Modern theologians can see in the first promise a deliverance, but many of us cannot see a personal Deliverer. It was not so with Eve, the mother of all living (Gen. iv, 1): "I have obtained a man, the Lord." What if she were mistaken in the time, the individual, and many other material considerations? What if she was unutterably deceived in the "Seed"? Such can be found under brighter skies to-day.

* The particle IN here, however, is correctly rendered "from" in the English version.—En.
She had faith in One who is able to save to the uttermost. See SEED OF PROMISE. Through all those ancient faiths noted above there are traces of the coming One. Some of them retain this idea while they have lost many others, and sunk into dark paganism. Witness the ten Avatars of Vishnu, as well as the "Desire of all the gods" (Isa. lii. 5).

3. The institution of sacrifice. This needs not here to be discussed; how early it was observed, how extensively propagated, however altered and perverted, it held a place in all ancient religions, teaching in some sense or other the doctrine of atonement by blood, as well as of purification by blood and water. See ALTAR; ATONEMENT; SACRIFICE.

4. The cherubim. For the structure and uses of these, see the word. For their spiritual meaning, see LIVING CREATURES; SERAPHIM. Set over against the sword of flame, they were the symbols of mercy to those reconciled by the sacrifice. Their place in the ancient religion is well known, even after those religions had departed far from primitive rectitude, both in ritual and moral code.

The temples of Babylon and Egypt; the griffins of Assyria, Persia, Egypt, Greece, and Rome; the seraphim of Egypt, Greece, and Rome; the apes of Egypt; the Moloch of Moab and the Ammonites; the baals of Syria, in all their variety; the ox of Bengal; the five; buffalo of Central India; the sacred bull; and hundreds of other sacred images, including the teraphim—these all were derived from the original cherubim at the east of Paradise. At first these imitations may have been considered as mere memorials of the early devotion of honored and godly ancestors; but, in process of theological improvements, they became associated with the sun, moon, stars, fructifying and other general powers of nature, as well as with the more spiritual demands of man's higher nature, till they are seen clothed with the attributes of deity, and worshipped and served more than the Creator. To the tradition of the early cherubim, we think, more than to the inventive genius of any priesthood, must be traced these homogeneous idols with all their diversities of aspect. The true symbol of the cherubim belonged to the universal and primal religion; the isolated imitations had their diversities from human fancy. This will account for the worship of the golden calf, to which the Israelites themselves were so easily seduced. Of all the deprecated forms of the early cherubim the Assyrian quadrupeds are the most complete. Layard passes high encomium upon this judgment of the inventors (?) of selecting the four highest forms of mundane life to represent the higher sphere of existence, while he utterly ignores the divine originals from which they were copied.

The cherubim at the Garden of Eden set over against the sword of flame, as well as those seen by Ezekiel evolved from a mass of fire, evidently were intended to symbolize that mercy which rejoices against judgment and delivers from wrath to come.

5. The flaming sword kept before the mind of worshipers, to be endured. Whether we trace this to the sword of flame, the death of the victim, or the universal conscience, it is equally a portion of the primitive religion. The soul that sineth deserves to die (Rom. i. 32). And we know no better symbol that could have been introduced to exhibit the wretchedness of those who are twice dead.

6. The tree of life, untouched, waved its laden branches in the garden long after the expulsion of our first parents. While this emblem must of necessity call up the feeling of deep regret, it would, at the same time, after the door of mercy was opened, be for all the joy and all the effort that belong to a well-grounded hope. That tree could never be regained, perhaps not desirable now that it should be; but another Tree of Life in a higher paradise yields its fruit every month (Rev. xxi). Here it may be proper to observe that each of these early emblems of man's recovery is, from the very gate of Eden, carried uninterruptedly down the stream of revelation till we come to the last chapter of the last book; while other emblems have been added as occasion might demand. The rainbow had an early place, and holds it still after the flag till the last (Gen. x. 14). 7. Occasional revelations made to such men as Enoch, Noah, and perhaps Lamech, the father of Noah (Gen. v. 29), were still added to the former stock, and thus were all advances made to rest on the word of God. Before the use of writing, and even now, we find appeals made to what had been taught to the ancestors, whether by Providence or by revelation (Job viii. 7; xx. 10, 18; Deut. iv. 31; xxxii., 7; Psa. xlix., 1). We think that none of these revelations that God has made has ever been lost.

X. Features.—Having seen the sure basis of this early religion, it is proper to glance at some of its characteristics.

1. It was a universal religion, adapted to man as such in every climate and for all time, having its primary relation to the first man. It was the world, as it is now, to top off and add to the truth of God till they had as many religions as languages throughout the world.

2. It was monotheistic: one Lord, one faith, one Spirit. It is, one Mediator, one Advocate. The question whether the Persians borrowed from the Hebrews or the Hebrews from the Persians has no place here: the origin of both from one primitive source is sufficient to account for all the items of similarity, or even identity, in the two religions. So, also, we may reckon of the Hebrews and Egyptians, the Hebrews and the Greeks, and all affinities of this kind. While the primitive religion was monotheistic, there are many indications of a plurality of persons, as in Gen. i. 1, where a singular verb is joined with נְגָדָה, as in a thousand other instances. So, too, ch. i. 24 and iii. 22.

3. Delight in all that God has revealed of himself—the fact, as well as the doctrines, of inspiration. Adam was extensively a prophet—a seer. Not merely had the institution of the Deliverer, but there was given to him the future history of the whole race—the standing, irrepressible conflict, the numerous progeny, the heavy labor, the sore pain, the deep sorrow, all ending in the death of the body and its return to dust. On the other hand, the productivity of the soil for constant support, acceptances of his service, occasional victories over evil, final triumph over sin and Satan in the One Seed. The third chapter of Genesis is too little studied. If John the Baptist could point to the Lamb of God, Adam had the first intimation of his coming, whether Adam was born of woman or not. So happily and largely are the words of inspiration connected with our redemption that Christ is pleased to wear the happy name, the Word of God.

But here, again, while the nations in separating from one another took, each one, some degree of respect for the Word revealed, or for some part of it, it was imparted to one nation only to preserve it pure and entire. "To the Jews were committed the oracles of God." Other nations retained a glimmering tradition, a tetragrammaton, a holy phrase, of which they knew not the meaning and used it merely as a charm—a σωτηρίων. How the true believer in every age and country appreciates the word, we may learn, if not by happy experience, by Psa. cxix. Under these beams of the Sun of Righteousness, Enoch walked with God. Light and life and love were again restored. If we come to the particular doctrines of this primitive religion, we have many scattered hints of, say, acceptance with God, in the sacrifice of Abel; a higher life, in the translation of Enoch; retribution, in the consciousness of Cain: calling on the name of the Lord, in the days of Enoch: judgment combined with mercy, in the deluge and the cities.
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RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

Religious liberty, a term applied, until the 16th century, to those who led a monastic life, to distinguish them from the clergy and laity; and justly, for they were also called Ca
nunci and Regulares (q. v.).

Religious, in a general sense, is something that relates to religion; and, in reference to persons, that which indicates that they give their attention to religion, and are so influenced by it as to differ from the world. It was also applied to members of monastic orders. See Religious.

RELIGIOUS CORPORATIONS. In the United States, as there is no civil patronage to the Church, societies for public worship are incorporated in accordance with the statutes of the several states. In most of them there is a provision enabling any body of personscomposed of five or more members to incorporate themselves a corporation, and to elect trustees to hold and manage the property in its behalf. Some of the older denominations are incorporated under special acts and with particular regulations. A convenient digest of these laws is given in the Laws of Religious Corporations (N. Y., 1876, 8vo). In many states there are likewise general laws for the incorporation of most kinds of benevolent, literary, and other bodies of a religious and social character. See Church and State.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION. Both nature and revelation teach that it is the duty of parents to care for the religious education of their children. The mind of the child is in a receptive condition, and the first light it receives should be light from heaven, the first truths those that are eternal and immutable, never to desert them. The mind of the child cannot be shut up until he is of an age to investigate and determine for himself. It becomes, therefore, a high duty to furnish the expanding intellect with truths such as piety cherishes. The apostle says, "Fathers, bring up your children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord" (Eph. vi. 4). In the education of children, the separation of Church and State must be avoided: (1) That the habits of childhood only are to be regarded, and that, in time, principles will follow of course. Habits, without principles of piet, are nothing better than a citadel ungarrisoned and uncommanded. (2) That many of the subjects in Religious Education are beyond the capacity of children, and that, therefore, to instruct them in Christianity is only to load their memories with words. Yet we do not defer other kinds of instruction till their nature and use can be completely understood by the pupils. But, in fact, many of the truths of religion are some of the most simple and intelligible which can be proposed to the human mind. (3.) That to furnish children with religious ideas is to infuse them with prejudices. But we must be careful to discriminate between religious ideas and prejudices, for the latter is an unexamined opinion. And, further, by this very conduct we prejudice him against religion as something unworthy his concern, or beyond his comprehension. We do not so treat literature, politics, or science. (4.) That the child will acquire in school and the public institutions of the Gospel an adequate sentiment and knowledge of religious truths. But if the love or natural interest of the parent in the child does not stimulate him to this duty, can it be expected that it will be voluntarily assumed by others? The institution of Sunday-schools does not diminish, in the least, the responsibility of those having charge of children to train them for God. See PEDAGOGICS.

RELIGIOUS LIBERTY is the absolute freedom of religious opinion and worship based upon the fact that all men are bound by the laws of God and are responsible to him. From this primary and supreme obligation, the conscience cannot be exempt. If the government has a right to hinder any form of religion, nor to support any to the injury of others. This implies the equality of all churches, religious associations, or persons in the matter of protection or restraint by the civil
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Religions Societies, associations for the promotion of personal piety established among members of the Church of England about 1678, and which existed until the rise of the Methodist movement. They began with a few young men who had been impressed by the preaching of Dr. Humeck, preacher at the Savoy, and of Mr. Smithies, lecturer at St. Michael's, Cornhill. The organization was somewhat similar to the societies of St. Vincent de Paul in Paris, or like those of the Collegians and other pietistic communities in Holland and Germany. The members met once a week for religious conference and devotion, the meetings being conducted with singing, Scripture reading and exposition, and with special preparation for the holy communion. They added also practical works of charity, the establishment and maintenance of schools, the visitation of the poor, and support of missions in America. They were closely connected with the Society for the Reform of Manners, established in 1691, and efficient allies to the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge. That at Oxford was joined by John and Charles Wesley, and by George Whitefield. One of the last of the annual meetings of the London religious societies was held at Bow Church in 1796. See Woodward, Rise and Progress of Religious Societies; Nelson, Respect to Persons of Quality; id., Festivals and Fasts (Preface); Blunt, Hist. of Sects, etc., s. v.

Reliquary, a vessel for holding relics, and enclosing, in the 13th century, three grains of incense in a golden vessel. Powers. We must not confound religious liberty with religious toleration, for the latter is the assumption of the right by civil process to regulate religious affairs; and to permit implies the right to prevent. This secession of spiritual and civil affairs is emphatically taught by our Lord: “My kingdom is not of this world” (John xviii, 36). A distinctive American principle of government is that what is religious is necessarily, from its very character, beyond the control of the civil government. In the United States, therefore, religious liberty is an absolute personal right. All denominations, churches, and religious faiths are equal and free in the eye of the law, none receiving gratuities, none subjected to inequalities. There is, thus, an entire divorce of Church and State. The Constitution of the United States contains these two articles: “No religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States” and “Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.” The state constitutions are equally emphatic, and generally more specific in the expression of their jealousy of ecclesiastical ambition and sectarian intolerance. This example was set by Rhode Island, which has the honor of being the first state in the world to incorporate its organic law, and to practice, absolute religious liberty. Under the influence of this American principle of government much change has been wrought in other countries. Toleration is becoming general, and the tendency is towards unrestrained liberty of worship. France bestows patronage upon several denominations; Germany, though claiming the management of ecclesiastical affairs, interferes but little with the right of worship. In Russia, Spain, and Italy there is less of former exclusiveness, and in the two latter countries different forms of faith are entitled to protection. Under English rule the colonies enjoy perfect religious liberty; the Anglican Church has been dissolved in Ireland, and there is in Great Britain no public position, not ecclesiastic, for the tenure of which a particular religious belief is required, except the throne and governorship of a few colleges. The connection of Church and State is increasingly regarded as corrupting to the Church, destructive of the purity and spirituality of religion, and antagonistic to the rights of men. See Brooks, History of Religious Liberty; Madison, Memorial and Remonstrance; Wayland, Discourses.

Religious Societies, associations for the promotion of personal piety established among members of the Church of England about 1678, and which existed until the rise of the Methodist movement. They began with a few young men who had been impressed by the preaching of Dr. Horneck, preacher at the Savoy, and of Mr. Smithies, lecturer at St. Michael's, Cornhill. The organization was somewhat similar to the societies of St. Vincent de Paul in Paris, or like those of the Collegians and other pietistic communities in Holland and Germany. The members met once a week for religious conference and devotion, the meetings being conducted with singing, Scripture reading and exposition, and with special preparation for the holy communion. They added also practical works of charity, the establishment and maintenance of schools, the visitation of the poor, and support of missions in America. They were closely connected with the Society for the Reform of Manners, established in 1691, and efficient allies to the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge. That at Oxford was joined by John and Charles Wesley, and by George Whitefield. One of the last of the annual meetings of the London religious societies was held at Bow Church in 1796. See Woodward, Rise and Progress of Religious Societies; Nelson, Respect to Persons of Quality; id., Festivals and Fasts (Preface); Blunt, Hist. of Sects, etc., s. v.

Reliquary, a vessel for holding relics, and enclosing, in the 13th century, three grains of incense in a golden vessel.
RELY

perception he preached a finished salvation, called by the apostle Jude "the common salvation." The Relynites are the observers of ordinances such as baptism and the sacrament, but profess to believe only in one baptism, which they call an immersion of the mind or conscience into truth by the teaching of the Spirit of God; and by the same Spirit they are enabled to feed on Christ as the bread of life, professing that in and with Jesus they possess all things. They inculcate and maintain good works for necessary purposes, but contend that the principal and only work which ought to be attended to is the doing real good without religious ostentation; that to relieve the miseries and distresses of mankind according to our ability is doing more real good than the superstitious observance of religious ceremonies. In general they appear to believe that there will be a resurrection to life and a resurrection to condemnation; that believers only will be among the former, who as first-fruits, and kings and priests, will have part in the first resurrection, and shall reign with Christ in his kingdom of the millennium; that unbelievers who are after raised must wait the manifestation of the Saviour of the world under that condemnation of conscience which a mind in darkness and wrath must necessarily feel; that kings, queens, popes, cardinals, and bishops, will be made the medium of communication to their condemned brethren, who, like Joseph to his brethren, though he spake roughly to them, in reality overflowed with affection and tenderness; that ultimately every knee shall bow and every tongue confess that in the Lord they have righteousness and strength; and thus every enemy shall be subdued to the kingdom and glory of the Great Mediator. Rely was succeeded (in 1781) by an American preacher, Elhanan Winchester, who had been a Calvinistic Baptist, but the congregation in London was left to working up. This movement, or Rely's was the first attempt to consolidate a sect of which Universalism should be the leading tenet. A Mr. Murray belonging to this society emigrated to America, and preached these sentiments at Boston and elsewhere. Mr. Rely published several works, the principal of which are:

Union.—The Trial of Spirits.—Christian Liberty.—One Baptism.—The Sult of Sacrifices.—Antichrist Restored.—Letters on Universal Salvation:—The Chromatic Mythology. See Universalists.

RELY, JEAN DE, a French preacher, was born about 1490. He was made doctor of theology at Arras, and became successively canon, chamberlain and archdeacon of Notre Dame at Paris, and rector of the university. In this capacity he drew up in 1461 the Remonstrances which the Parliament presented to Louis XI. for the maintenance of the Pragmatic Sanction, written with real dignity of style and often reprinted both in French and in Latin. In 1485 he was deputy to the States-General of Tours, and presented to Charles VIII the result of their deliberations. In 1490 he became canon of St. Martin of Tours, and in Dec., 1491, he was elected bishop of Angers. He accompanied Charles VIII to Italy, where he was charged with several duties near pope Alexander VI. Rely died at Saumur March 27, 1499. Besides the Breviary of St. Martin of Tours, he revised by royal command the translation of the historical books of the Bible by Guyart de Moulins (1495, fol.),—Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Générale, s. v. 

Remali'ah (Heb. Remalai'ah,ı̂m ְלַעֲדָה, protected of Jehovah; Sept. Ρεμαλαίς of Ραμαλαίς, v. Ραμαλία), the father of Pekahiah, who was the son of Israel (2 Kings xv. 25, 27, 30, 32, 37, xvi. 1, 5; 2 Chron. xxvii. 6), probably a man whose character was such as to make his name a reproach to his descendants (Isa. viii. 4, 5, 8, 8.), B.C. ante 756. See Pekahiah.

Rembrandt, commonly called Rembrant or Elsys, was born in Leiden, 1578, and was buried in his father's mill on the banks of the Rhine, between Leydertorp and Koudekerk, near Leyden, June 15, 1606 (or 1608). The former date rests on the authority of Orler, Description of Leyden (1641). The latter date rests on the painter's marriage certificate, lately discovered, dated June 10, 1604, in which Rembrandt's age is stated to be twenty-six. He became the pupil of Pieter Lastman at Amsterdam, and Jacob Pinas at Haarlem. He settled at Amsterdam in 1630, and appears to have died there, according to Immerezel, July 19, 1664; but no register of his burial has yet been discovered. Rembrandt was equally distinguished as an etcher and a painter. His etchings amount to nearly 400, and they are dated from 1628 to 1661. The chief characteristic of his works is forcible light and shade. Among his most remarkable historical paintings are Moses Destroying the Tables of the Law;—The Sacrifice of Abraham:—The Woman Taken in Adultery:—The Descent from the Cross:—The Nativity:—Christ in the Garden with Mary Magdalene:—And The Adoration of the Magi. There are 640 of his paintings specified in Smith's Catalogue. The best of these are still owned in Holland. He is well represented in the National Gallery, and his influence has been more direct upon the British school of painters than that of any other master. See Immerezel, Annuaire-Tempeur de la Levrevede, Rembrandt, also De Levens en Werken der Hollanders en Vlaamseke Künstlers, etc. (1453); Bartch, Le Peintre-graveur; Burnet, Rembr. and his Works (1448); Mitchell, Etched Work of Rembr. (Lond. 1879). 

Rem'th (Heb. רְמֵת, remet, height; Sept. Ρεμαίμ v. r. 'Pamayim), a city in the territory of Issachar (Josh. xix. 21), called, as it seems, Ramoth (q. v.) in 1 Chron. vi. 76. As the place is named in the first of the above passages next to Enumim (Jezreel), the site is possibly represented by a tell with ruins south of Zerin (Jezreel) between Sundela and Mukeileh. Dr. Porter (in Kitto's Cyclop. s. v.) suggests that the place may be identical with the ruined fortress and village called Weraz, occupying the northern slope of the face of Mt. Gilboa (Robinson, Researches, iii. 157, 169; new ed. iii. 339).

Remi. See Remigius.

Remigius of Auxerre was a learned French Benedictine monk in the 9th century, and was brought up in the abbey of St. Germain, Auxerre. He was appointed teacher to the schools belonging to the monastery, afterwards taught at Rheims, then went to Paris and opened the first public school in that city after learning had sunk under the ravages of the Normans. His works are, Commentaries in Omer Dursia Paulinus (Cologne, 1506), Commentations in Passio et Vita et Miracula SS. M. Prophetarum (Antwerp, 1545), with the Commentaries of Eucherius on the Acts and Epistles, and those of Arethas on Revelation:—and Expositio Missae. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Générale, s. v.

Remigius, or Remi (St.), of Lyons, a celebrated French archbishop in the 9th century, and grand almoner to the emperor Lothaire, succeeded Amolus in the above see about the year 835 or 845. It is supposed to be this St. Remigius who, in the name of the Church of Lyons, wrote an answer to the three letters of Hincmar of Rheims, and others, in which he defends St. Augustine's doctrine of grace and predestination. This answer may be found in the Vindicatio Predestinationis et Gratiae (1650, 2 vols. 4to), and in the library of the fathers. He presided at the Council of Valencia in 855, and of others of the same kind; and, after founding some pious institutions, he died Jan. 333. He is one of the most celebrated of the fathers, and in the library of the fathers are attributed to him. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Générale, s. v.; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s. v.
REMMIGIUS, or REMI, or STRASBURG, a bishop known only for having founded the monastery of Aschau. He died in 903. He is often confounded with pope Remi of Munster, who died in 768. See Hoefer, Notor. Biogr. Graec. s.v.

Remisaciore (rememor), a name sometimes given to the second Sunday in Lent, from the first word of the Introit, "Remember, O Lord, thy tender mercies," etc. (Ps. xxv. 6).

Reming, Franz Xaver, a Roman Catholic divine, was born in 1803 at Edenkoben. In 1827 he was ordained a priest, and in 1832 he became a member of the chapter of the University of Munich, which appointed him as corresponding member, and in 1836 the Munich University honored him with the degree of doctor of philosophy. He died June 28, 1873. He wrote, Das Reformationswerk der Piffl (Mannheim, 1845).—Geschichte der Bischöfe zu Speyer (Mainz, 1853–54, 2 vols.).—Erkundenbuch zur Geschichte der Bischöfe von Speyer (ibid. 1852, 1853 sq.). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. ii, 1054; Literarischer Handwörterbuch, 1865, p. 443 sq.; 1866, p. 298; 1873, p. 480. (B.P.)

Rem'mon (Josh. xix. 7). See RIMMON.

Rem'mon-meth 'ôr (some Meth'ôr) (Josh. xix. 13). See RIMMON.

Remoboth and Sarabaimes, names given to associations of hermits in the early Church who refused to submit to the monastic regulations of the Rule of Remoboth, whose name originated in Syria, are mentioned as belonging to this class by Jerome (Ep. 18 ad Eutociachum, De Custodis, Virginiae). He says that they were more numerous than other monks in Syria and Palestine; that they lived in the towns in complete independence, and in companies of not more than two or three persons; that they supported themselves by labor, and often quarreled among themselves. A similar class of hermits, living in Egypt, is mentioned in Cassin (Collatio, xviii, c. 7) under the name Sarabaimes, said to have been applied to them because they separated themselves from the monasteries and personally made provision for their needs. Herzog, Real-Encyclop. s. v.

Rémond (or Ramond), Florimond de, a French historian, who was born about 1540, and died in 1602, is noteworthy here only for his spleen against the Huguenots, which was vented especially in his Antichrist. He also wrote in refutation of the story of the popess Joan (v. c.), as did likewise his son, abbé Charles Rémont, among other things. See Hoefer, Notor. Biogr. Générale. s. v.

Remonstrance, a complaint framed by the Commons of England in 1628, and addressed to Charles I, setting forth the increase of popery in consequence of the relaxation of the penal laws, the preference given to papists; and a commission being issued to compound for the penalties incurred by papist recusants. It also described the discouragement shown to orthodox preachers and teachers, and the prohibition of their books. The king attempted to suppress this remonstrance, and afterwards published an answer to its allegations.

Remonstrants, a name given to the Arminians (v. c.) by reason of a remonstrance which, in 1610, they made to the States of Holland against the decree of the November Synod of Dort, which condemned them as heretics. Episcopius and Grotius were at the head of the Remonstrants. The Calvinists presented a counter-address, and were called Controversomonstrants.

Rem'phan (擢甫毘 v. t. 擢甫毘) is named in Acts vii. 43 as an idol worshipped by the Israelites in the desert, intoned by Stephen, from Amos v. 9, where the Sept. has 擢甫毘 v. t. 擫甫毘, for the Heb. דִּיצָר, Chiasm. In the following discussion we review the various explanations given of this word. Much difficulty has been occasioned by this cor-

responding occurrence of two names so wholly different in sound. The most reasonable opinion seemed to be that Chium was a Hebrew or Semitic name, and Remphan an Egyptian equivalent substituted by the Sept. The former, rendered Saturn in the Syriac, was compared with the Arabic, Armenian, and Persian planets; and Saturn, and, according to Kircher, the latter was found in Coptic with the same signification; but perhaps he had no authority for this, excepting the supposed meaning of the Hebrew Chium. They, indeed, occur as such in the Coptic-Armenian Lexicon of Kircher (Ling. Egypt. Retic. i. 49; Copt. Mag. i. 386); but Jablonski has long since shown that this and other names of planets in these lexicons are of Greek origin, and drawn from the Coptic versions of Amos and the Acts (Jablonski, Remphan Egyptian in Opusc. ii. 1 sq.). Epigraphy, however, moves, shown that this is not the true explanation. Among the foreign divinities worshipped in Egypt, two, the god Renpu, perhaps pronounced Rempu, and the goddess Ken, occur together. Before endeavoring to explain the passages in which Chium and Remphan are mentioned, it will be desirable to speak, on the evidence of monuments of the foreign gods worshipped in Egypt, particularly Renpu and Ken, and of the idolatry of the Israelites while in that country. Besides the divinities represented on the monuments of Egypt which have Egyptian forms or names, or both, others have foreign forms or names, or both. Of the latter, some appear to have been introduced at a very remote age. This is certainly the case with the principal divinity of Memphis, Ptah, the Egyptian Hephastus. The name Ptah is from a Semitic root, for it signifies "open," and in Heb. we find the name דִּיצָר, and its cognates, "he or it opened," whereas there is no word related to it in Coptic. The figure of this divinity is that of a deformed pygmy, or perhaps un- born child, and is unlike the usual representations of divinities on the monuments. In this case there can be no doubt that the introduction took place at an extremely early date, as the name of Ptah occurs in very old tombs in the necropolis of Memphis, and is found throughout the religious records. It is also to be noticed that this name is not traceable in the mythology of neighboring nations, unless, indeed, it corresponds to that of the Egyptian Ishtar, who, according to Herodotus, were the figure-heads of Pharaonic ships (iii. 87). The foreign divinities that seem to be of later introduction are not found throughout the religious records, but only in single tablets, or are otherwise very rarely represented, and two out of their four names are immediately recognized in the antelope. They are Renpu, and the goddesses Ken, Anta, and Astarta. The first and second of these have foreign forms; the third and fourth have Egyptian forms: there would therefore seem to be an especially foreign character about the former two. (1.) Renpu, pronounced Rempu (?), is represented as an Asiatic, with the full beard and apparently the general type of face given on the monuments to most nations east of Egypt, and to the Ebre or Libyans. This type is evidently that of the Semmites. His hair is bound with a fillet, which is ornamented in front with the head of an antelope. (2.) Ken is represented perfectly naked, holding in both hands corn, and standing upon a lion. In the last particular the figure of a goddess at Maltheiyeh, in Asyria, may be compared (Layard, Nineveh, ii. 212). From this occurrence of a similar representation, from her being naked and carrying corn, and from her being worshipped with Khem, we may suppose that Ken corresponded to the Syrian goddess, at least when the latter had the character of Venus. She is also called Ketesh, which is the name in high-epochal times for the great Hirte town on the Orontes. This in the present case is presumably a title, דִּיצָר; it can scarcely be the name of a town where she was worshipped, applied to her as per-
sonifying in (3). Anata appears to be Anaitis, and her foreign character seems almost certain from her being jointly worshipped with Renpu and Ken. (4.) Astarte is of course the Ashtoreth of Canaan. On a tablet in the British Museum the principal subject is a group representing Ken, having Khem on one side and Renpu on the other; beneath is an adoration of Anata. On the half of another tablet Ken and Khem occur, and a dedication to Renpu and Ketsch.

We have no clue to the exact time of the introduction of these divinities into Egypt, nor, except in one case, to any particular places of their worship. Their names occur as early as the period of the 18th and 19th dynasties, and it is therefore not improbable that they were introduced by the Shepherds. Astarte is mentioned in a tablet of Amenoph II, opposite Memphis, which leads to the conjecture that she was the foreign Venus there worshipped, in the quarter of the Phoenicians of Tyre, according to Herodotus (ii, 112). It is observable that the Shepherds worshipped Sutekh, corresponding to Seth, and also called Bar (that is, Baal), and that he is the older king. Appear he was the male god of the foreigners. Sutekh was probably a foreign god, and was certainly identified with Baal. The idea that the Shepherds introduced the foreign gods is therefore partly confirmed. As to Renpu and Ken we can only offer a conjecture. They occur together, and Ken is a form of the Syrian goddess, and also bears some relation to the Egyptian god of productiveness, Khem. Their similarity to Baal and Ashtoreth seems strong, and perhaps it is not unreasonable to suppose that they were the divinities of some tribe from the east, not of Phoenicians or Canaanites, settled in Egypt during the Shepherd period. The naked goddess Ken would suggest such worship as that of the Babylonian Mylitta, but the thoroughly Semitic appearance of Renpu is rather in favor of an Arab source. Although we have not discovered a Semitic origin of either name, the absence of the names in the mythology of Canaan and the neighboring countries, as far as they are known to us, inclines us to look to Arabia, of which the early mythology is extremely obscure.

The Israelites in Egypt, after Joseph's rule, appear to have been little interested in these deities. It is only twice distinctly stated and once alluded to (Josh. xxiv, 14; Ezek. xx, 7, 8; xxiii, 3), but the indications are perfectly clear. The mention of Chiu or Remphan as worshipped in the desert shows that this idolatry was in part at least, that of foreigners, and no doubt of those settled in Lower Egypt. The golden calf, at first sight, would appear to be an image of Apis of Memphis, or Mnevis of Heliopolis, or some other sacred bull of Egypt; but it must be remembered that we read in the Apocrypha of "the heifer Baal" (Tab. i, 5), so that it was possibly a Phoenician or Canaanish idol. The best parallel to this idolatry is that of the Phoenician colonies in Europe, as seen in the idols discovered in tombs at Cimnus in Rhodes by M. Saladnak, and those found in tombs in the island of Euboea (of both of which there are specimens in the British Museum), and those represented on the coins of Miletus and the island of Euboea.

We can now endeavor to explain the passages in which Chiu or Remphan occur. The Masoretic text of Amos v, 26 reads thus: "But ye bare the tent [or "tabernacle"] of your king and Chiu your images, the star of your gods [or "your god"], which ye made for yourselves." In the Sept., we find remarkable differences; it reads, Καὶ ἕνα ἀντρον τοῦ Ιοβ ὑμῶν Ῥεμφαν, τοὺς τίτους αὐτὸς ἐν τῷ ἔσχατῳ τῶν ἡμερῶν. The Vulg. agrees with the Masoretic text in the order of the clauses, though omitting Chiu or Remphan. "Et portastis tabernaculum Molocho vestro, et imaginem idolorum vestrorum, sidus dei vestri, que fecistis vos." The passage is cited in the Acts almost in the words of the Sept.: "Yea, ye took up the tabernacle of Molocho, and the star of your god Remphan, figures which ye made to worship them" (Καὶ ἔνα ἀντρον τοῦ Μολόχ, καὶ τὸ ἄστρον τοῦ Ιοβ ὑμῶν Ῥεμφαν, τοὺς τίτους αὐτὸς ἐν τῷ ἔσχατῳ τῶν ἡμερῶν). A slight change in the Hebrew would enable us to read Molech (Melcam or Milcom) instead of "your king." Beyond this it is extremely difficult to explain the differences. The substitution of Remphan for Chiu cannot be accounted for by verbal criticism. The Hebrew does not seem as distinct in meaning as the Sept.; and if we may conjecturally emend it from the latter, the last clause would be "your images which ye made for yourselves;" and if we further transpose Chiu to the place of "your god Remphan," in the Sept., and do not see an unwarrantable conjecture that τοῖς τίτους αὐτὸς cor- responds in position to τοῖς τίτους αὐτων, and it does not seem a mistake written in the place of cuer by some copyist, καὶ ἔνα ἀντρον τοῦ Μολόχ was also transposed. It appears to be more reasonable to read "images which ye made" than "gods which ye made," as the former word occurs. Supposing these emendations to be probable, we may now examine the meaning of the passage.

The tent or tabernacle of Molocho is supposed by Gesenius (Theoseor. s. v. Ρεμφαν) to have been an actual tent, and he compares the σφήνι τιμὴς of the Carthaginians (Diod. Sic. xx, 65). But there is some difficulty in the idea that the Israelites carried about so large an object for the purpose of idolatry, and it seems more likely that it was a small model of a larger tent or shrine. The reading Molocho appears preferable to "your king;" but the mention of the idol of the Ammonites as worshipped in the desert stands quite alone. It is perhaps worthy of note that there is reason for
supposing that Moloch was a name of the planet Saturn, and that this planet was evidently supposed by the ancient translators to be intended by Chium and Remphan. The correspondence of Remphan or Rai pam, with Chium is certainly remarkable, and can, we think, only be accounted for by the supposition that the Sept. translator or translators of the prophet had Egyptian knowledge, and being thus acquainted with the ancient joint worship of Ken and Remphu, substituted the latter for the former, as they may have been unwilling to repeat the name of a foreign Venus. The star of Remphan, if indeed the passage is to be read so as to connect these words, would be especially appropriate if Remphan were a planetary god; but the evidence for this, especially as partly founded upon an Arabic or Persian word like Chium, is not sufficiently strong to enable us to lay any stress upon the agreement. In hieroglyphics the sign for a star is one of the two composing the word Seb, "to adore," and is undoubtedly there used in a symbolical as well as a phonetic sense, indicating that the ancient Egyptian religion was partly derived from a system of star-worship; and there are representations on the monuments of mythical creatures or men adoring stars (Ancient Egyptians, pl. 30 a). We have, however, no positive indication of any figure of a star being used as an idolatrous object of worship. From the manner in which it is mentioned, we may conjecture that the star of Remphan was of the same character as the tabernacle of Moloch, an object connected with false worship rather than an image of a false god. According to the Sept. reading of the last clause, it might be thought that these objects were actually images of Moloch and Remphan; but it must be remembered that we cannot suppose an image to have had the form of a tent, and that the version of the passage in the Acts, as well as the Masoretic text, if in the latter case we may change the order of the words, gives a clear sense. As to the meaning of the last clause, it need only be remarked that it does not oblige us to infer that the Israelites made the images of the false gods, though they may have done so, as in the case of the golden calf; it may mean no more than that they adopted these gods. It is to be observed that the whole passage does not indicate that distinct Egyptian idolatry was practiced by the Israelites. It is very remarkable that the only false gods mentioned as worshipped by them in the desert should be probably Moloch and Chium and Remphan, of which the latter two were foreign divinities worshipped in Egypt. From this we may reasonably infer that while the Israelites sojourned in Egypt there was also a great stranger-population in the Lower Country, and therefore that it is probable that then the Shephelah still occupied the land. See also, De Tabern., Molochi et Stella Dei Remph., (Marb. 1745); Maius, Histor. de Chium et Remphan (1763); Journ. Sac. Lit. Oct. 1852, p. 1039; Gesenius, Thesaur. p. 669, 670. See Chium.

Renaissance. (Fr. new birth), a term used alike in architecture, sculpture, and ornamental art, to designate a revival period or style after the Middle Ages. The Renaissance had its origin in Italy, where, at best, Gothic architecture secured but a precarious hold. The discovery (early in the 15th century) of the productions of the ancients in statues and painting, and the bringing to light of long-hidden stores of Greek and Latin MSS. (as, for instance, Vitruvius on the architecture of the ancients), could not fail to bring Roman buildings into prominent notice, and to predispose the public mind in favor of the classical style. A new system was consequently developed, during the first stages of which (namely, the Transition period) the elements of Roman architecture came again into use, although the forms which belong to the Later-Romanic period—such, for instance, the division of the window-arches by mullions—were not entirely abandoned. Starting in Italy, this new style reached its zenith in that country in the course of the same century. Although derived from that of Italy, each country had its peculiar Renaissance, described accordingly as French, German, and English Renaissance, preserving a general likeness, but each exhibiting traits exclusively its own.

1. Italian. At the early epoch of its existence, the new style of architecture displays not so much an alteration in the arrangement of the spaces and of the main features of the buildings as in the system of ornamentation and in the aspect of the profiles. During the early period the endeavor was maintained to adapt classical forms with more or less freedom to modern buildings, while later (in the 16th century), a scheme based on ancient architecture was universally prescriptive. Two distinct styles belong to this first period, viz. the Early Florentine and the Early Venetian. In the Roman Renaissance, the system of the second period, which confines itself more closely to classical elements, is more prevalent. The decoration of the interiors of the buildings of the Renaissance is copied from ancient Roman architecture. The rooms are either vaulted or have flat ceilings; but in both cases they are adorned with paintings, after the manner of those discovered in the Baths of Titus. Ornamented panels were employed in large palaces for horizontal ceilings, as also in churches, though in the latter case they were more often applied to cupola vaultings, as notably in St. Peter's. See ROM.

2. French. France was the first to introduce the new style north of the Alps. Fra Giocondo, an Italian artist, having been summoned thither by Louis XII. Giocondo erected for cardinal D'Amboise, the minister of that monarch, the celebrated Château Gaillon. At this time the Flamboyant (q. v.) style was still in its vigor, and the consequence was that a blending of the two styles...
temporarily prevailed. After the period of Phillibert Delorme, who completed the chapel of the Château d'Étampes in 1555, the Gothic style was, as a rule, abandoned. At the same time, the general arrangement of the Gothic churches was retained, and it was only the Renaissance system of decoration which was substituted for the Gothic. The ground-plan, the proportions, and the whole structure, with its flying buttresses, pinnacles, clustered columns, and deeply recessed portals, are borrowed from the pointed style.

It was only in the details and in the ornamentation that the Renaissance was followed. The Tulleries, as built for Catherine de Medicis, is a great example of French Renaissance where the new style is developed. In its elevation richness is perceptible without excess, and symmetry is attained without stiffness: in fact, it presents a design in which aesthetic laws are fully considered, and the details harmoniously, if not magnificently, executed.

3. German.—The Renaissance style was not employed in Germany before the middle of the 16th century, and the most noteworthy instances of it are the Belvedere of Ferdinand I on the Harraschin at Prague, and the so-called Otto Henry buildings at Heidelberg Castle. In Germany, as in other countries, the elements of the preceding style are mingled with those of the Renaissance during the early period of its prevalence. The fault of the German Renaissance style is a certain heaviness—an exuberance, not to say extravagance, in its constructive character and decorative details.

In Spain an Early Renaissance style appears, a kind of transitional Renaissance, belonging to the first half of the 16th century. It consists of the application of Moorish and pointed-arch forms in conjunction with those of classical antiquity. In this way a conformity was produced which was peculiar to Spain, and the style is characterized by bold lightness, by luxuriance in decoration, and by a spirit of romance. In the reign of Charles V, this ornate Early Renaissance style gave place to a later one, which, in reality, belongs to the Rococo style. Among the Renaissance edifices of Spain may be mentioned the upper gallery of the cloister of the Convent of Huerta, the townhall of Saragozza and of Seville, and the Alcazar at Toledo.

5. English.—The Italian Renaissance style was introduced into England about the middle of the 16th century by John of Padua, the architect of Henry VIII. English buildings of this style are distinguished by capricious treatment of forms, and generally exhibit a deficiency of grace and dignity, both in detail and ensemble, which lend a peculiar charm to Italian structures. Thus, in English style, Longleat, Wiltshire, and Wollaton Hall are specimens of this style. See English Cyclop. & v.; Rosengarten, Architectural Styles. See Rococo; Romanesque Architecture.

Renanah. See Peacock.

Renaudot, Évrard, a French savant, was born at Paris, July 20, 1646. His early studies were carried on among the Jesuits, and in the College of Harcourt. On their completion he entered the Congregation of the Oratory, but without taking orders. Though he remained but a short time in this institution, the whole of his life was passed in similar ones, and was devoted to his favorite studies of theology and Oriental literature. His knowledge of ecclesiastical affairs caused him to be employed in many negotiations with foreign countries, and his talent made him a favorite at court. In 1700 abbe Renaudot went to Rome, and received from Clement XI the priory of Frossay, in Brittany. During his whole career he endeavored to re-establish the printing of the Oriental classics, and interested the duke of Orleans, but it was not accomplished. He died at Paris, Sept. 1, 1720. Renaudot's writings were numerous, though he published nothing until a few years before his death. We mention, Défense de la Perpétuité de la Foi, etc. (Paris, 1708) := Grenaditi Patriarcha homilia de Eucharistia, etc. (ibid. 1709) := La Perpétuité de la Foi de l'Eglise sur les Sacraments, etc. (ibid. 1718) := Histoire Patriarchales de l'Alexandrin de Jacobitum, etc. (ibid. 1713). This is the most complete work ever written upon the history of Egyptian Christianity. It is based upon the Arabic narrative of bishop Severus, and contains a complete list of the Jacobite patriarchs from Cyril to John Touski, who lived early in the 18th century. —Liturgium Orientalium Collectio (ibid. 1715-16) := Anciennes Religions des Indo et de la Chine, etc. (ibid. 1718). Besides these, he left works upon purely literary subjects, and several valuable MSS. —Histoire de Saladin := Histoire des Patriarches du Saint-Empire := Notes de Travail de l'Eglise d'Ethiopie. See De Beri, Hist. de l'Acad. des Inscrip.; Nicerson, Memoires, xii and xx. —Hoefner, Nouv. Biog. Générale, s. v.

Renard is the translation of several Heb. and Gr. words in the Bible. The following only are of special significance.

1. The rendering (רֵנַּר, ῥήγαρ) of one's clothes is an expression frequently used in Scripture as the token of the highest grief. Reuben, to denote his sorrow for Joseph, rent his clothes (Gen. xxxvii, 29); Jacob did the like (ver. 34), and Ezra, to express the concern and uneasiness of his mind, and the apprehensions he entertained of the divine displeasure on account of the people's unfaithfulness. It is said to have fallen on the garments and mantle (Ezra ii, 3), that is, both his inner and upper garment. This action was also an expression of indignation and holy zeal; the high-priest rent his clothes, pretending that our Saviour had spoken blasphemy (Matt. xxvi, 65), and so did the apostles when the people intended to flay them divine honors (Acts xiv, 14). See Clothing.

To rend the garments was in Eastern countries and among ancient nations a symbolic action, expressive of sorrow, fear, or contrition. (See the monographs on the subject in Latin by Grünwold [Haan. 1708]; Hiliger [Witten. 1716]; Böhrensee [ibid. 1668]; Schrüder, [Jen. 1716]; and Wickmanhausen [Witten. 1716]). The passage in Joel (ii, 13), "Rend your hearts, and not your garments," is in allusion to this practice. But the phrase here is a Hebrewism, meaning "rend your hearts rather than your garments," or "rend your hearts, and not your garments only:" for the prophet does not forbid the external appearances of mourning, but he cautions them against a merely hypocritical show of sorrow, and exhorts them to cherish that constitude and broken spirit which is acceptable in the sight of God. See Buñuel: Mourning.

2. In the prophet Jeremiah (iv, 80), when he denounces the divine judgments upon the people, it is said, "Though thou rendest (רֵנַּר) thy face with painting:" the Hebrew has, instead of face, "eyes," and the expression is an allusion to the Eastern practice of painting the eyes, which we have explained under the words Eye and Paint.

Rendu, Louis, a French prelate, was born at Meyrin, Dec. 19, 1789. He entered the priesthood and spent his life in teaching and scientific research. In 1833 he published a work entitled De l'Influence des Lois sur les Mœurs et des Mœurs sur les Lois. This gained for the author a wide reputation. He was second cousin to the Bishop of Annecy. His works were entirely scientific—on geology, meteorology, chemistry. He died Aug. 18, 1880. See Mgr. Louis Rendu, by the abbé M. Mermillod. —Hoefner, Nouv. Biog. Générale, s. v.

Renée d'Este, duchess of Ferrara and princess of France, whose career was closely interwoven with the history of her native country and the life of her time. She was the second daughter of John XXII of the Este family, born at Ferrara, Oct. 11, 1318, and married in 1236 to King Louis X, King of France, her first husband, and in 1248 to King Louis XII, King of France, her second husband. She was married July 30, 1272, to Duke Hercules of Burgundy. She was also the mother of a number of children, including the Duke of Orleans, the Duke of Burgundy, and the Duke of Savoy. She was a patron of the arts, and a friend of the poet Dante. She was also a patron of the arts and sciences, and a friend of the poet Dante. She was buried in the church of San Pietro in Montorio, in Rome.
of Ferrara, and became the mother of five children; and in the exercise of her tastes for literature and art she made the court of Ferrara a centre of culture which emulated that of Florence and the Medici. Her sympa-thy with the Italian Reformers penetrated her whole being; she endeavored to instruct everything in the traditions of her family and her early education, were with the Reformation. She encouraged Brucioli to prepare an Italian version of the Bible, and allowed him to dedicate to her the first edition (1541), and when she afforded a refuge to fugitive Protestants. Calvin availed himself of this asylum in 1543, and this began a relation which was of great value to the duchess while he lived. He was allowed to pray and expound the Scriptures in a chapel which is still shown, until reminiscences from Rome induced the duke to banish him, and with him all the Protestant friends of his consort, down to the servants brought with her from France. The same influence led to the persecution of Renée in person. The relations of Ferrara with France had been broken off, and political added to religious prejudices aggravated the situation; but beyond restraints and disrespect she suffered little, until in 1545 the Inquisition was established in Ferrara and the reconquest of the land to Romanism began. The co-operation of Henry II of France was secured; Renée was compelled to listen to sermons in denunciation of her principles; her husband, angered at her heresy, imprisoned her with two of her women, and placed her daughters Leonora and Lucrezia in a convent. These measures broke her spirit and brought her to confession and attendance on the mass. She was restored to liberty Dec. 1, 1554, after an imprisonment of two and a half months. She had enjoined the counsel of Protestant friends during much of her period of trial: Calvin had written frequent letters, and had sent Francis Moré (of Collangies) to act as her spiritual adviser; and her former secretary, Leon James, had also sustained her faithfully; but, in the heat of a persecution in which but few stood firm, her resolution gave way. The unfailing fidelity of the whole of her subsequent life stoned for that single and temporary lapse. The experience of Renée was sufficiently trying in other respects as well. Her daughter Anna was married, against the earnest protest of her mother, to the chief opponent of the Protestant cause, duke Francis of Guise (Sept. 29, 1548). Her eldest son, Alphonso, quarreled with his father and fled the country in 1552. Her husband died Oct. 8, 1559, after exacting from her an oath that she would love his son no less than her own. She succeeded in her latter wish, obedient to Calvin, from which she was, however, absolved by Calvin. Alphonso succeeded his father, and, influenced by pope Pius IV, at once compelled his mother to renounce his country or her faith. She chose the former alternative, and returned to France in September, 1560, leaving her children in a period troubled with the disputes of Navarre and Conde with the Guises, and Conde lay in prison awaiting death. Renée did not hesitate to censure the diabolic cruelty of the Guises; and when their power was broken, on the death of Francis II, she became the open protector of the Reformation. She invited Protestant clergymen into the country and caused Protestant worship to be held at her seat of Montargis and wherever she might make a temporary home in other places; but she was none the less earnestly engaged in promoting peace between the contending parties. At Montargis she so complicated their disputes that they were definitely laid aside. Her charities and her counsels were expended upon applicants of every class. When her won-in-law, the duke of Guise, began the war which during thirty years drenced France with blood, she determined that Montargis should be a refuge to all Protestant fugitives. Francis of Guise died Feb. 24, 1563, and the peace of Amboise was declared in March of the same year; and, as she was thereafter forbidden to celebrate the worship of her God, she retired to her own house, in her own home, permanently to Montargis, though she subsequently accompanied Charles IX on his tour through the kingdom.

She founded a school, enlarged and beautified the town, and took a lively interest in the translation of the New Testament into Spanish. At this time she received a last letter from Calvin, written (April 4, 1564) while he was on his death-bed, by the hand of his cipher; from this period the records of her life become rare. The second religious war (Sept., 1567, to March, 1568) did not disturb her. She was at the Hôtel de Laon in Paris during St. Bartholomew's Night, but was exempted from the general massacre, and succeeded in rescuing several of her eloquent champions, who had been condemned and aided to effect their ultimate escape. She ended her noble life June 12, 1575. An eloquent testimony to her faith was included in her will. Her remains were interred in the church at Montargis. See Münch [Ernat], Répertoire de l'Est et de l'Est de Tichet (1831-33, 2 vols.), not important and not always trustworthy; Cautele-Cattelville, Vie de Renée de France (B. 1781-83). Brief biographies are given in McCrie, Hist. of the Ref. in Italy; and Gerlach, Species Italiane Reformatæ; and a more detailed life in Young, Life and Times of Anne Poleurius (Lond., 1690, 2 vols.); Blevil, La France Protestante, viii; Bonnet [Jules], La Vie d'Oliver Morate; and Lettres de Jean Calvin.—Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s. v.

Renesse, Ludwig Gerard Van, a Dutch ascetic, author, was born at Breda, May 11, 1599. As an evangelical minister he preached at Maestricht. From time of Utrecht. In 1638 he was called to Breda, where he founded a college, of which he was the first director and professor of theology. The University of Oxford conferred upon him the degree of doctor of theology. He was a fine linguist, and corresponded with the most celebrated theologians of his time. His principal works are, Paëntz Jecelb (1654) —Treatises on the Cure, Authority, and Duty of Elders in the Church (1659-64) —and Meditations on religious subjects. These are all written in Flemish.—Hoeft, Now. Begr. Geneal., s. v.

Rennell, Thomas (1). D.D., an English clergyman, was born in 1574, and was educated at Eton and at King's College, Cambridge. He became curate of Barmack, and prebendary of Winchester (resigned 1637); rector of St. Magnus's, London Bridge, in 1792; master of the Temple from 1797 to 1827; dean of Winchester in 1805; rector of Alton, Hants, in 1809; vicar of Barton Stacey, Hants, in 1814. He died in 1840. He published, single Sermons (Lond. 1788-98), and a volume of Discourses (ibid. 1801). Mr. Pitt styled him "the Democritus of the Deity." See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s. v.; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. s. v.

Rennell, Thomas (2). D.D., a learned English divine, son of the above, was born at Winchester in 1767, and was educated at Eton and at King's College, Cambridge. He became Christian advocate at Cambridge and vicar of Kensington in 1816; and master of St. Nicholas's Hospital and prebendary of Salisbury in 1825. He died in 1824. Mr. Rennell was one of the editors of and contributors to the (Eton) Miniature and the British Critic. He published, Paæntz Morilis —Aminations en Le Visiteur Voulant la Nouvelle Grande, (1811, 8vo); Remarks on Sorciere, (1819, 12mo; 6th ed. 1824) —Proofs of Inspiration, etc. (1822, 8vo); —Sermons (3d ed. Lond. 1831, 18vo). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s. v.; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. s. v.

Renniger, or Rangger, Michael, was born in Hampshire, 1529, and was educated at, and a fellow of, Magdalen College, Oxford. He embraced the principles of the Reformation, resided chiefly at Strasbourg during the reign of Mary, and was made chaplain to Elizabeth on her accession. He became prebendary of Winchester in 1560, precentor and prebendary of Lincoln Cathedral in 1567, and dean of the same in 1568. He died Aug. 26, 1609, and was buried in the church of Crawley. He wrote: Car-
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minas in Mortem Duorum Fratrum (Lond. 1553, 4to): —
De Pfi V et Gregorii XIII Fœdus contra Elizabetham Reginam Anglica (1582, 8vo); — Exhortation to True Lawes and Ordinaries with an Answer of the Right Hon. Lord John Compton, and of God's high and holy glory of the world, with all covetous desires of the same and the carnal desires of the flesh, so that thou wilt not follow nor be led by them?" The answer is, "I renounce them all."

Renunciators. See Apotatici.

Renwick, James, a noted Nonconformist divine, was born at Dumfriesshire, Scotland, Feb. 15, 1662. He was an uncompromising Covenanting Presbyterian, and was executed Feb. 17, 1688, for "denying the king's authority, owning the covenants," etc. He wrote, with Alexander Shields, An Informatory Indication of the Covenanters (Edinb. 1744, small 8vo) — A Choice Collection of Prefaces, Lectures, and Sermons, etc. (Glasgow, 1777, 8vo).

Reoordination, the repetition of the sacramental ordinance of ordination, has ever been held to be contrary to the true theory of sacraments, and has been forbidden by the Church under pain of severe penalties. The ground of this prohibition is well expressed by Mou- "In the sacrament of ordination, as in baptism, a character is conferred which cannot be effaced or taken away." The historical evidence as to both the doctrine and practice of the Church is full and complete. The 68th apostolical canon condemned it, and pronounced severe sentences of deposition against the ordained. The third Council of Carthage (canon 59) forbade it along with robbery. Whether the ordinations of heretics and schismatics are to be held valid, and whether those who have received them are on their reconciliation to be received in their several orders, is a question in respect to which the practice of the Church has varied considerably. The Council of Nice decreed that those who had been ordained by Meletius should be admitted to serve the Church by reordination. The 68th apostolical canon, while condemning the reordination of those once ordained in the Church, allows that of those who had only received heretical ordination. The second Council of Sardica (A.D. 552) ratifies the baptism of the Arians, but condemn their ordinations. In later times the practice of the Roman Catholic Church has also been very contradictory. Thus the ordinations of such persons were declared valid to all by Stephen VI, considered valid by John IX, and again declared invalid by Sergius III. The modern Roman practice of reordaining those ordained in the Church of England is not based on any decree of the Church, and has not been invariable. The custom of the Church of England forbids reordination in the case of those ordained within the Church, and asserts the indebility of the ordination character. See Aquinas, Summ. pars iii, qu. xxxviii, art. II, Augustine, Conf. Parmum, lib. ii, c. 13; Ep. 50 ad Rom. iuc. ii, 661 (ed. Bened.); Bingham, Christian Antiq., bk. iv, ch. 7; Courayer, Valid. Angl. Ord. (Oxf. 1844); Palmer, On the Church, pt. vi, ch. vi. See Ordination.

Repairs of Churches. Canon 85 of the Church of England enacts, "The churchwardens or quæstors shall take care and provide that the churches be well and sufficiently repaired and maintained, and so from time to time be well and maintained," etc., specifying the work upon windows, floor, churchyard, walls, and fences. They are also to "see that at every meeting of the congregation peace be well kept, and that all persons so communicant, and so doth the same, be kept out of the church." Canon 86 adds, "Every dean, dean and chapter, archdeacon, and others which have authority to hold eclesiastical visitations by composition, law, or prescription, shall survey the churches of his or her jurisdiction once in every three years, or cause the same to be done," etc. Usually the repair of the church belongs to the rector, and that of the nave to the parishioners.
REPENTANCE

The repairing of the Established churches in Scotland belongs to the heritors, who, if they resolve to build a new church, must build it so large as to accommodate two thirds of the examinable permanent population, or persons above twelve years of age. The presbytery can ordain the means to make the necessary repairs, can appoint a visitation to a decayed church, receive the report of the tradesmen, and come to a decision. Undivided congregations build and repair their own places of worship.

Repentance (παραστάσας, παραστάσας) signifies a change of the mind from a rebellious and disaffected state to that submission and thorough separation from iniquity by which converted sinners are distinguished (Matt. iii, 2-8). Repentance is sometimes used generally for a mere change of sentiment, and an earnest wishing that something were undone that has been done. In a sense analogous to this, God himself is said to repent; but this can only be understood of his altering his conduct towards his creatures, either in the bestowing of good or the infliction of evil—where change in the divine conduct is founded on a change in his creatures: and thus, speaking after the manner of men, God is said to repent. In this generic sense also Esaú "found no place of repentance, though he sought it carefully with tears," that is, his father did not repent of what he had done, or to recall the blessing from Jacob and confer it on himself (Heb. xii, 17; Rom. xi, 29; 2 Cor. vii, 10). There are various kinds of repentance, as (1) a natural repentance, or what is merely the effect of natural conscience; (2) a national repentance, such as the Jews in Babylon were called unto, to which temporal blessings were promised (Ezek. xlviii, 30); (3) an external repentance, or an outward humiliation for sin, as in the case of Ahab; (4) a hypocritical repentance, as represented in Ephraim (Hos. vii, 16); (5) a legal repentance, which is a more work of the heart and the effect of convictions of sin by it, which in time wear off and come to nothing; (6) an evangelical repentance, which consists in conviction of sin, accompanied by sorrow for it, confession of it, hatred to it, and renunciation of it. A legal and an evangelical repentance are distinguished thus: 1. A legal repentance flows only from a sense of danger and fear of wrath, but an evangelical repentance produces a true mourning for sin and an earnest desire of deliverance from it. 2. A legal repentance arises from unbelief, but evangelical repentance is always wrought by faith. 3. A legal repentance consists of an aversion to God and to his holy law, but an evangelical flows from love to both. 4. A legal repentance ordinarily flows from discouragement and despondency, but evangelical from encouraging hope. 5. A legal repentance is temporary, but evangelical is the daily exercise of the true Christian. 6. A legal repentance does at most produce only a partial and external reformation, but an evangelical is a total change of heart and life. The author as well as object of true repentance is God (Acts x, 31). The subjects of it are sinners, since none but those who have sinned can repent. The means of repentance is the Word and the ministers of it; yet sometimes private consideration, sanctified afflictions, conversation, etc., have been the instruments of repentance. The blessings connected with repentance are pardon, peace, and everlasting life (xi, 16). The time of repentance is the present life (Isa. lv, 6; Eccles. ix, 50). The evidences of repentance are faith, humility, prayer, and obedience (Zech. xii, 10). The necessity of repentance appears evident from the evil which it removes, and the benefit which it involves to society; the commands given us to repent in God's Word; the promises made to the penitent; and the absolute incapability of enjoying God here or hereafter without it. See Dickinson, Letters, let. 9; Owen, On the 13th Psalm; Vill. Bishop, Treatises, v. "Repentance;" Ridgley, Body of Divinity, ii, 75; Davies, Sermons, iii, serm. 44; Case, Sermons, serm. 4; Whitefield, Sermons; Saurin, Sermons (Gottsched's transl.), vol. iii; Scott, Treatise on Repentance. See Penance; Penitence.

Repentance, a term for State holidays.

Repentation. Our Lord in his sermon on the Mount (Matt. vi, 7) cautions his followers against using vain repetitions (παραστάσας) in prayer. See Prayer, Forms of. It is well to distinguish that this is not directed against simple repetitions, which may often arise in the fervor and urgency of earnest supplication, but against the vain repetitions of such as think, whether in theory or practice, "that they shall be heard for their much speaking." The idea that a prevailing merit was attached to much speaking in prayer with multitudinous repetitions has been, and is, found in most of the false systems of religion. Perhaps we find it among Baal's worshippers, who "called upon the name of Baal from morning to noon, saying, O Baal, hear us!" (1 Kings xviii, 26). The practice was certainly common among the classical heathen, and is noticed by some of their more serious writers with disapprobation and laughed at by their satirists. If we may judge by the hymns of Homer, Orpheus, and Callimachus, we may suppose that the pagan prayers were so stuffed up with synonymous epithets and prerogatives of the Deity as to be justly liable to the censure of "vain repetitions." The Jews also were not without these, but it was greatly against them that the great number of them was a universal custom, and that it was one of their maxims, "He that multiplies prayer shall be heard." The same idea was inculcated with much earnestness by Mohammed, and is at this day exhibited in full force among his followers. Witness the following from the Makhad ut-HaKeem: "The prophet said, Shall I not teach you an act by which you may attain the greatness of those who have gone before you, and by which you shall precede your posterity, excepting those who do as you do? Then they said, Instruct us, O prophet of God. He said, Repetition after a prayer, and the people of Allah! [O most pure of God!] eleven times, and Allah akeen [God is very great] eleven times, and Alhando lildahi [praise to God] eleven times." Compare this puerility with the sublime instructions of our Saviour. But again: "Whoever says Subhan Allah and Bismillah a hundred times a day, his faults shall be silenced, though they be as great as the waves of the sea. Whoever says, morning and evening, Subhan Allah and Bismillah a hundred times, no one will bring a better deed than his on the day of resurrection, except they who have said like him, or done a like thing thereto." To these precepts the Mohammedans have been most attentive. There are those among Christians, especially Roman Catholics, who repeat the Lord's Prayer and other forms a great number of times, and vainly think that the oftener the prayer is said the better is the effect. This is, i.e., if repeated two hundred times it will be twice as good as if repeated only one hundred times. (See a literature in Volbeding, Index programmatus, p. 33; Hase, Leben Jesu, p. 229.) See Ave Maria; Pattensoner; Rosary.

Repetitions in the Liturgy. An objection has been made to the Liturgy of the English Church that involves vain repetitions and a useless prolixity. It is replied, repetition is one thing, but a vain repetition quite another. The repetitions in the Liturgy are principally in the cry "Have mercy upon us," and in the use of the Lord's Prayer twice, or at most thrice, in the longest service of the New Year, and three times in the Decalogue. Reference is also made to the example of our Saviour who prayed thrice in Gethsemane, saying "the same words" (Matt. xxvi, 44). Further, the petitions which we address to Heaven must, for the most part, have the same general drift; and there can be no advantage in arranging them in a perpetually changing dress, nor will they be the better received because of their novelty.

Ro'phael (Heb. Raphaie, רפַּחְא, healed of God;
REPHAH (Heb. "Rephah"). a son of Simeon, the Levite, of the house of Obad-edom, an able-bodied porter in the service of the house of God in David's reign (1 Chron. xxvi, 7). B.C. cir. 1015.


REPHAIH (Heb. "Rephaihu", רְפַחִי, header of Jeborah; Sept. "Rapha" v. "Rapha", the name of five Israelites. 1. A double name of six sons of Toba, head of a family in Issachar (1 Chron. vii, 2). B.C. ante 1668. 2. Son of Binea, and eighth in lineal descent from Saul's son Jonathan (1 Chron. ix, 43). B.C. last post 1000. He is also called Rapha (1 Chron. viii, 57). 3. Son of Ishi, and one of the chieftains of the tribe of Simeon, in the reign of Hezekiah, who headed the expedition of five hundred men against the Amalekites of Mt. Seir and drove them out (1 Chron. iv, 42). B.C. cir. 725.

The name of Hur, and ruler of "the half" of Jerusalem. He aided in rebuilding the wall (Neh. iii, 9). B.C. 445. 5. Son of Hananiah and father of Aman, among the descendants of Zerubbabel (1 Chron. iii, 21); the same with Herson (q. v.) of the genealogy of Christ (Luke iii, 27).

REPHAIIM (many Rephaim) (Heb. usually with the art. the "Rephaim"). כְּרֶפַךְ (see before), a name which frequently occurs, and in some remarkable passages, as that of a race of unusual stature, who originally dwelt in the country east of the Jordan. The earliest mention of them is the record of their defeat by Chedorlaomer and some allied kings at Ashteroth Karnaim (Gen. xiv, 5). They are again mentioned (xx, 20); their dispersion recorded (Deut. x, 20, 20), and Og the giant king of Bashan said to be "the only remnant of them" (iii, 11; Josh. xii, 4; xii, 12; xviii, 15). Extir- pated, however, from the east of Palestine, they long found a home in the West; and in connection with the Philistines, under whose protection the small remnant of them may have lived, they still employed their arms against the Hebrews (2 Sam. xxii, 18 sq.; 1 Chron. x, 4).

In the latter passage there seems, however, to be some confusion between the Rephaim and the sons of a particular, but not of that, nation named Rapha. Such a name may have been conjectured as that of a founder of the race, like the names Ion, Dorus, Tent, etc. (Böttcher, De Infeririis, p. 96, note): Rapha occurs also as a proper name (1 Chron. vii, 25; viii, 3, 27). It is probable that they had possessed districts west of the Jordan in early times, since the "valley of Rephaim" (םֹעְלֵה רַמוֹת תָּירָם; 2 Sam. v, 18; 1 Chron. xi, 18; Isa. viii, 5; κ. τ. γίγαντων, Joseph. Ant. vii, 4, 1), a rich valley south-west of Jerusalem, derived its name from them. That they were not Canaanites is clear from there being no allusion to them in Gen. xx, 15-19. They were probably one of those aboriginal peoples to whose existence the traditions of many nations testify, and of whose genealogy the Bible gives us no information. The few names recorded have, as Ewald remarks, a Semitic aspect (Gesch. der Volker Isr. i, 811); but from the nature, existing between them and both the Canaanites and Hebrews, some suppose them to be Japhethites, "who comprised especially the inhabitants of the coasts and islands" (Kalisch, on Gen. p. 581). See CANAANITE.

REPHAIIM is rendered by the Greek versions very variously (Sept. Ραφαηλι, γίγαντας; γιγαντας, Σπαθαρος, Τιρανος, and Ταρταρος [Psa. lxxvii, 10; Isa. xxvi, 14, where it is rendered with Σπαθαρος] v. Gen. 1, 23, and sometimes ζευς, τερατοις, especially in the later versions). In the A. V. the words used for it are "Rephaim," "gigants," and "the dead." That it has the latter meaning in many passages is certain (Psa. lxxviii, 10; Prov. ii, 18; ix, 18; xxi, 16; Isa. xxvi, 14, 19). The question arises, how are these meanings to be reconciled? Genesius gives no derivation for the national name, and derives "gigants" from γιγαντας, and the proper name Rapha from an Arabic root signify "sharpen," that to seeming to sever all connection between the meanings of the word, which is surely most unlikely. Masius, Simon, etc., suppose the second meaning to come from the fact that both spectres and giants strike terror (accepting the derivation from γιγαντας, reminisci, "unstrung with fear," R. Bechall, on Deut. xi); Virgina and Miller from the notion of length involved in stretching out a corpse, or from the fancy that spirits appear in more than human size (Miller, Syntagma, Hermen. p. 202; Virg. Aen. ii, 772, etc.). J. D. Michaelis (ad Loebel S. Poes. p. 460) endeavored to prove that the Rephaim, etc., were traglogydes, and that hence they came to be identified with the dead. Passing over other conjectures, Böttcher sees in γιγαντας a double root, and thinks that the giants were called レフア (languagefici) by a euhemerism; and that the dead were so called by a title which will thus exactly parallel the Greek καμπτος, κατημπτος (com. Buttman, Lex. ii, 287 sq.). An attentive consideration seems to leave little room for doubt that the dead were called Rephaim (as Genesius also hints) from some such word as being stretched out. Of the fallen spirits or buried giants. The passages which seem most strongly to prove this are Prov. xxii, 16 (where obviously something more than mere physical death is meant, since that is the common lot of all), Isa. xxvi, 14, 19, which are difficult to explain without some such word (comp. Gen. xiv, 49 sq.; Isa. xiv, 5 sq.; comp. Gen. Lxxvii, 18 sq.; Deut. ii, 1, 27). The word יונית (Sept. או יונית תיגי, if taken in its literal meaning of goats, may mean evil spirits represented in that form (comp. Lev. xvii, 7), and especially Job xxxii, 5, 6. "Behold the grancies (A. V. "dead things") grown under the waters" (Doverav version), where there seems to be clear allusion to some subaquatic prison of rebellious spirits; like that in which (according to the Hindo legend) Vishnu the water-god confines a race of giants (comp. παράρχος, as a title of Neptune, Hesiod, Thucy. 782; Nork, Bambrian, and Rabb. p. 319 sq.). See GIANTS. Branches of this great unknown people were the following:

1. EMIM (גָּםְיָמִים; Sept. 'Omeim, 'Itmaim), smitten by Chedorlaomer at Shaveh Kiriathaim (Gen. xiv, 5), and occupying the country afterwards held by the Moabites (Deut. ii, 10), who gave them the name יונית, "terror." The word rendered "tall" may perhaps be merely "haughty" (גייום). See EMIM.

2. ANAKIM (אַנָקִים), the imbecile terror of the spies exaggerated their proportions into something superhuman (Numb. xiii, 26, 33), and their name became proverbial (Deut. ii, 10; ix, 2). See ANAKIM.

3. ZIZIM (זִיִּים), whose principal town was Zab (Gen. xiv, 5), and who lived between the Arnon and the Jabbok, being a northern tribe of Rephaim. The Amnonites who defeated them called them Zizanim, יונית (Deut. ii, 20 sq., which is, however, probably an early gloss). See Jour. Soc. Lit. Oct. 1851, p. 101 sq.; Jan. 1852, p. 268 sq.; Apr. 1852, p. 55 sq.; July 1852, p. 302 sq.; Oct. 1852, p. 87 sq., Jan. 1853, p. 279 sq.). See ZIZIM.

REPHAIM, VALLEY OF (Heb. 'Elmek Rephaim; הָרְפָאִים, "Rephaim", the head of the "Rephaim", the head of the "Rephaim"), in Josh. v, 7; Judges iv, 1; after Joshua's death the whole of the region east of the Jordan was inhabited by the Rephaim (Gen. xxv, 3-8; Judg. i, 7). The valley appears to derive its name from the ancient nation of the Rephaim. It may be a trace
of an early settlement of theirs, possibly after they were driven from their original seats east of the Jordan by Chedorlaomer (Gen. xiv. 5), and before they again migrated northward to the more secure wooded districts in which we find them at the date of the partition of the conquest (Josh. x. 35). In this case it is a parallel to the “mount of the Amalekites” in the centre of Palestine, and to the towns bearing the name of the Zemaraim, the Avim, the Ophnites, etc., which occur so frequently in Benjamin. The wall of Bethlehem is first mentioned in the description given by Joshua of the northern border of Judah. The passage is important: “The border went up by the valley of the son of Hinnom unto the south side of the Jebusite: the same is Jerusalem; and the border went up to the top of the mountain that lieth before the valley of Hinnom westward, which is at the end of the valley of the giants northward” (xx. 8). The last clause in the Hebrew is not quite clear (מייסוֹ דַיָּם). It may mean that the boundary-line was north of the valley, or that the valley was north of the boundary. The latter construction is possible; but the former is unquestionably the more natural, and is supported by support of the Sept., and by most commentators. If this interpretation be admitted, the situation of the valley is certain: it lay on the south of the hill which enclosed Hinnom on the west. This view is further strengthened by the notice in Josh. xviii. 10, that the city of Adullam was hiding from the war in the cave of Adullam, as it were, the Philistines, no doubt taking advantage of intestine troubles, invaded the mountain fastnesses of Israel. A band of them pitched in the valley of Rephaim, and at the same time seized and garrisoned Bethlehem, David’s native place (2 Sam. xxiii. 13; 1 Sam. xxvii. 7). It was then that David’s warriors, to gratify a wish of their chi.-fr.: broke through the enemies’ lines and drew water from the well by the gate of Bethlehem. The narrative shows clearly that the valley of Rephaim could not have been far distant from Bethlehem, which is close (Josh. xvii. 14; Jer. ii. 19). The “hold” (ver. 14), in which David found himself (though it is not clear) to have been the cave of Adullam, the scene of the commencement of his freebooting life; but, wherever situated, we need not doubt that it was the same fastness as that mentioned in 2 Sam. v. 17, since in both cases the same place is marked, with the same “wells,” and that not a usual one, is employed. The story shows very clearly the predatory nature of these incursions of the Philistines. It was in “harvest time” (ver. 13). They had come off the ripe crops, for which the valley was proverbial (Isa. xxi. 5), just as at Pico-lam-Ach (31) we find them in the parcel of ground full of barley, at Lehi in the field of lentils (2 Sam. xxiii. 11), or at Keilah in the threshing-floors (1 Sam. xxiii. 1). Their animals (7777) were scattered, among the rife corn receiving their load of plunder. The “garrison,” or the officer in charge of the expedition, was on the watch in the village of Bethlehem. On two other occasions, soon after, the king, the Philistines invaded the mountains and drew up their armies on the same plain; they were at once attacked by David’s veterans and routed with great slaughter (2 Sam. v. 18, 22; 1 Chron. xiv. 9-13). The destruction inflicted on them and on their idols was so signal that it gave the place a new name, and impressed itself on the popular mind of Israel with such distinctness that the prophet Isaiah could employ it, centuries after, as a symbol of a tremendous impending judgment of God—nothing less than the desolation and destruction of the whole earth (Isa. xxvi. 21). See PERRAM, MOUNT.

But from none of these notices do we learn anything of the position of the valley. Josephus in one place (Ant. vii. 4, 1) says that the valley of the giants was near Jerusalem; and in another place (vii. 12, 4), when narrating the story of the drawing of water from the well at Bethlehem, in which he makes a strange blunder, he says the valley extended from Jerusalem “to the city of Bethlehem.” Eusebius and Jerome, on the other hand, place it on the north of Jerusalem (Onomast. s. v. “Rephaim”), and in the territory of Benjamin (ibid. s. v. “Izareo” [Jebus]; “Eumer Hec.” xv. 10); but this is unsatisfactory (see Onomast. s. v. “Celus Titanus,” and the excellent note by Bodmer). A position north-west of the city is adopted by Florus (Hist. c. 4, 383 b), apparently on the ground of the terms of Josh. xix. 8, and xvii. 16; which certainly leave it doubtful whether the valley is on the north of the boundary or the boundary on the north of the valley; and Tobler, in his last investigations (Dritte Wanderung, p. 202), conclusively adopts the Wady el-Javid (W. Mahlker, on Van de Velde’s map), one of the side valleys of the great Wady Beit Hamra, as the valley of Rephaim. This position is open to the obvious objection of too great distance from both Bethlehem and the cave of Adullam (according to any position assignable to the latter) to meet the requirements of 2 Sam. xxi. 13. Since the latter part of the 16th century the name has been attached to the upland plain which stretches south of Jerusalem, and is crossed by the road to Bethlehem—the Beit Kish of the modern Arabs (Tobler, Jerusalem, ii. 401). Dr. Robinson says: “As we advanced (towards the holy city) we passed on the right hand side of the road, to the left the cultivated valley or plain of Rephaim, or the giants, with gentle hills beyond. This plain is broad, and descends gradually towards the south-west until it contracts in that direction into a deeper and narrower valley, called Wady el-Herod, which unites farther on with Wady Ahmad, and finds its way to the Mediterranean. The plain of Rehaim extends nearly to the city, which, as seen from it, appears to be almost on the same level. As we advanced the plain was terminated by a slight rocky ridge, forming the brow of the valley of Hinnom” (op. cit. p. i, 219). It is thus that this valley has more of the nature of a plateau or plain considerably elevated than a valley in the ordinary sense. But on the south-west it does partake more of this character (see Donar, Land of Promise, p. 177), and possibly in designating so wide and open a tract by the name of the Rehaim valley there was a sort of popular race with which it was associated, as if it, like them, must set at naught ordinary dimensions. South of Mount Zion—the most southern part of the valley of Gilon—is called Wady Refaith by the Arabs, which corresponds with the valley in Hebrew. Dr. Robinson infers that this is the true valley of Rehaim, though usually taken for that of the son of Hinnom (Pales- tan, p. 240). See JERUSALEM.

Repha’ims, so the Hebrew plural Rephaim (q. v.) is incorrectly pluralized again in English in the A.V. (Gen. iv. 5; xxv. 20). Rephid’im (Heb. Rephidhîm, רפִּידוֹת), supports, i.e., perhaps, resting-places; Sept. and Josephus, Pago- sia, a station of the Israelites on their journey through the Arabian desert to which they passed from the Desert of Sin (Exod. xvii. 1), situated, according to Numb. xxxiii. 14 sq., between Alash and the wilderness of Sinai. Here the Amalekites attacked Israel, but were repulsed (Exod. xvii. 8, 9). Here also Moses struck the rock, from which the fountain of water leaped forth; to which the later Jewish traditions added many other wonders, as that the rock itself followed the people in their journey, supplying water always (see Wettstein and Schottgen, on 1 Cor. x, 4; Buxtorf, Exercit. p. 391 sq.). The knowledge of this miraculous gift of water reached the Roman empire, Nerva having alluded to it (Juv. Met. v, 258), and the emperor Trajan imposed that Moses was guided by wild ass, and then by the green pasture, to the exact spot where water was concealed (comp., in the Grecian mythology, especially Pausan. ii. 66, 8: but the legend of Hippocrene [Ovid, Met. v, 298] may have borrowed it from the Bible), and gave it (as of arianship). The most definite indication as to the situation of Reph-
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idim is incidentally supplied in the Scripture account of the above miracle. While encamped at Rephidim, "there was no water for the people to drink," and they murmured against Moses. He was therefore commanded to "go on [בָּאָשׁ, pass. i.e. cross the desert shore] before the people," and with his rod to smite "the rock in Horeb," upon which (ץָּבַע, the towering cliff bounding the range et-Tih) Jehovah stood. (This admirably suits the entrance of Wady Hibrân, but is utterly vague and inapt if spoken of the interior.) In consequence of this, Rephidim was called Massaah ("temptation") and Meribah ("contention"). As the Israelites, though encamped in Rephidim, were able to draw their needful supply of water from "the rock in Horeb," the two places must have been adjacent. Assuming Jebel Misa to be Sinai (or Horeb), and that the Israelites approached it by Wady es-Sheik, which is the only practicable route for such a multitude coming from Egypt, it follows that Rephidim was not more than one march—and apparently a short one—distant from the mountain. Notwithstanding this indication, however, the position of Rephidim has created much discussion among the theologians. Josephus appears to locate it very near to Sinai, and states that the place was entirely destitute of water, while in their preceding marches the people had met with fountains (Ant. iii. 1, 7, and 5, 1). Eusebius and Jerome say it was near Mount Sinai, and it forms part of the Cosmography of Ptolemy, which places it at the distance of six miles, which agrees pretty nearly with that of Nehemiah (Topographia Chris- tiana, v. 207 sq.). Robinson removes it some miles farther down Wady es-Sheik to a narrow gorge which forms a kind of door to the central group of mountains. He gets over the difficulty in regard to the proximity of Horeb by affirming that that name was given, not to a single mountain, but to the whole group (Itib. Res. i, 120). See Mose. Mr. Sandie places Rephi- dim at the extreme end of Wady er-Râbâh, and identifies it with a Wady Kathleen. He supposes that the Israelites marched from the coast plain of el-Kâa by Wady Daghshâlah (Horeb and Jerusalem, p. 159). This route, however, would scarcely be practicable for such a multitude. Lepsius (ed. Bohn, p. 310 sq.), Stewart (Test. and Klauw.), Bitter (Pal. and Syr., i. 738 sq.), Stanley (Syr. and Pal., p. 40 sq.), and others, locate Rephidim in Wady Feirân, near the base of Mount Serbal, especially at the oasis of el-Hessheh or the rock Hezy el-Khatatun (Palmer, Desert of the Exodus, p. 136). The great dis- tance from Sinai—more than four eternal miles from the abysmal depths of Wady Feirân—will be fatal to this theory. No spot in the whole peninsula has such a supply of water, and Feirân is on this account called "the paradis of the Bedawin." The position of Rephidim, it is thus seen, largely depends upon the route which the Israelites may be supposed to have taken from the Desert of Sin to Mount Sinai. Murphy (Comment, on Exod., p. 174 sq.) regards that by way of Wady Hibrân as being out of the question, partly on account of its length (whereas it is really little, if any, farther than either of the other practicable ones, especially the northern one by way of the Debet er-Râmîch, which he prefers); and partly on account of the narrow and difficult passes (especially Nagb Ajâmeh) along it, which, however, are no worse than many others in different parts of their identified route (see Palmer, Desert of the Exodus [Amer. ed.], p. 229). Keil, who likewise prefers the same northern route for reaching Sinai, observes (Comment, on Pent. Clarke's ed. ii, 75) that Rephidim lay at only one day's distance from Sinai (Exod. xix. 2). He therefore locates Rephidim at the point where the Wady Feirân crosses the road of the Israelites. But though this would be almost at the foot of Sinai, and past several fountains which would have relieved their thirst without the need of a miracle. If, on the other hand, we should place Rephidim at the other end of the Wady es-Sheik, this, according to Keil's own showing, would be about as far from Sinai as the mouth of Wady Hibrân, which last is, after all, only twenty miles, following the windings of the valleys. The great objection to the access by way of the Debet er-Râmîch is that although this (as the name signifies) is in the main a sandy plain, yet there are not wanting springs at various points and at its course—a circumstance which, in the Arabic, 1. e. the green), being situated just at its junction with Wady es-Sheik (Robinson, Bib. Res. i, 125). By the way of the plain el-Kâa and Wady Hibrân, on the contrary, there is total drought, so that the Israelites, as the narrative requires, would have exhausted the stock brought probably from Elim, without having been mean- while in a region where their scouts could have procured water within any reaching distance. For the same reason, the most natural route of all—by way of Wady Feîrân—must be suspected, which, as already said, is the best watered and most fertile of all in that vicinity (ibid. i, 126). There is still another route from the Red Sea at Ras Abu-Zenimah (where the Israelites evidently encamped) to Sinai—namely, by way of Sarabet el-Khadim. This, although not so smooth as by wadies Feirân and es-Sheik, is quite practicable, and is often taken by modern travellers. This is advocated by Knobel, Keil, Cook (in his Speaker's Com- mentary), and others, who find the Desert of Sin in Debet er-Râmîch, Dophkah in Wady Tih, and perhaps Ashw in Wady el-Esh. The water supply on this route is somewhat present, but may be, as there are many springs at the mines in Sarabet el-Khadim, a grave ob- jection to its having been followed by the Israelites. There are two tradional spots fixed upon as the scene of Moses' smiting of the rock, and hence called Hajr Misa, or "Moses' Rock." One is pointed out by the Arabs in Wady Feirân, and the other by the monks in Wady Lejâh. The former is too distant and the latter too near for the Biblical account. See מיסא. If the Israelites approached Sinai by way of Wady Hibrân, we should look for Rephidim at the entrance of that valley from the plain along the Red Sea, as suggested under the article EXORD; but if they reached Mount Sinai by way of Wady Feirân, as most writers suppose, or by way of Sarabet el-Khadim, then we must prob- ably look for Rephidim somewhere near the entrance from Wady es-Sheik to the plain er-Râbâh, perhaps at the pass of el-Watîyeh, indicated above by Robinson. This defile was visited and described by Burckhardt (Syria, etc. p. 488) as at about five hours' distance from where issues from the plain er-Râbâh, narrowing be- tween abrupt cliffs, and bordered by the same sandy fields in width. Here is also the traditional "seat of Moses." Within the pass the valley expands, affording ample space for a large camp. The nearest water is in Wady Sheb, two miles distant to the south-west (Porter, Hand-book, p. 63). See Ridgeway, The Lord's Land, p. 57 sq. The arguments in favor of the location of Rephidim at el-Watîyeh are forcibly presented by Mr. Holland in Jerusalem Recovered, p. 420 sq. See סָּלַל.

Reposein. 1. A receptacle for the tabernacle in the procession of Corpus Christi. 2. A chapel and shelter for travellers on the way to Rome, located in Italy: one of the 13th centuries is near Fiesma. A pilgrim's chapel remains on Landsum, near Bath.

Repousade, a French artistic term signifying colored wood.

Representation. The theological use of this word by English writers of the 16th and 17th centuries was, in the strict sense of its Latin original, that of "presenting over again" in reality; the subordinate idea was of "putting into the form of." Hence, in all, use by them. Thus when bishop Pearson writes, "by virtue of his death, perpetually represented to his Father, he destroyeth him that hath the power of death," the word refers to our Lord's continual pleading of the sacrifice once offered. It is of importance to
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remember this use of the term "representation," as it is not unfrequently used with reference to the eucharistic sacrifice; and by losing sight of the sense in which the word was understood by former writers, modern readers have understood "representation" to mean literal imitation rather than a real and actual making present, and offering over again, of that which is present by virtue of the once only offered sacrifice.

Representation, Lat. See Lay Representation.

Representers, or Marrow Men. See Marrow Controversy.

Reproof (usually ἀληθής, ἀληθέος), the act of finding fault in opprobrious terms, or attempting to expose to infamy and disgrace. In whatever cause we engage, however disinterested our motives, however laudable our designs, reproach is what we must expect. But it becomes us not to retaliate, but to bear it patiently; and so to love that very charge which against us we be groundless. If we be reproached for righteousness' sake, we have no reason to be ashamed, nor to be afraid. All good men have thus suffered, Jesus Christ himself especially. We have the greatest promises of support. He has a tendency to humble us, detach us from the world, and excite in us a desire for that state of blessedness where all reproach shall be done away.

Reprobation is equivalent to rejection; and by it is usually understood the Calvinistic doctrine, that a portion of mankind, by the eternal counsel or decree of God, has been predestined to eternal death. Conditional reprobation, or rejecting men from the divine mercy, because of their impenitence or refusal of salvation, is a scriptural doctrine. Against the unconditional, absolute reprobation taught by rigid Calvinists, the following objections may be urged: 1. It cannot be reconciled to the love of God. "God is loving to every man, and his tender mercies are over all his works." 2. Nor to the wisdom of God; for the bringing into being a vast number of intelligent creatures under a necessity of sinning and of being eternally lost, teaches no moral lesson to the world; and contradicts all those notions of wisdom in the ends and processes of government which we are taught to look for, not only from natural reason, but from the Scriptures. 3. Nor to the grace of God, so often magnified in the Scriptures. For if it does not, certainly, argue superabounding richness of grace, when ten thousand have equally offended, to pardon one or two of them. 4. Nor to those passages of Scripture which represent God as tenderly compassionate and pitiful to the worst of his creatures; "I have no pleasure in the death of him that dieth;" "The Lord is long-suffering to usward, not willing that any should perish." 5. Nor to his justice. We may affirm that justice and equity in God are what they are taken to be among reasonable men; and if men everywhere would consider it as contrary to justice that a sovereign should condemn to death one or more of his subjects for not obeying a law, which it was utterly impossible for them to obey, it is manifestly unjust to charge God with acting in precisely the same manner. In whatever light the subject be viewed, no fault, in any right construction, can be chargeable upon the person so punished, or, as we may rather say, destroyed, since punishment supposes a judicial proceeding which this act shuts out. Every received notion of justice is thus violated. 6. Nor to the sincerity of God in offering salvation by Christ to all who hear the Gospel, of whom this scheme supposes the majority, or at least great numbers, to be among the reprobate. That God offers salvation to those who he knows will never receive it, is true; but there is here no insincerity, for the atonement has been made for their sins. 7. Nor with the scriptural declaration, that "God is no respecter of persons." To have respect of persons is a phrase in Scripture which sometimes refers to judicial proceedings, and signifies to judge from partiality and affection, and not upon the merits of the question. "Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons; but in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him" (Acts x, 34, 35). But if the doctrine of reprobation be true, then it necessarily follows that there is precisely this kind of respect of persons with God. 8. This doctrine brings with it the repulsive and shocking opinion of the eternal punishment of infants. The escape from this is either by annihilation of those dying in infancy, or by assuming that they are among the elect. 9. This doctrine destroys the end of punitive justice. That end can only be to deter men from offence, and to add strength to the law of God. But if the whole body of the reprobate is left to the influence of their fallen nature without remedy, they cannot be deterred from sin by threats of inevitable punishment; nor can they ever submit to the dominion of the law of God: their doom is fixed, and threats and examples can avail nothing. Comp. Election.

Reproof (γρηγορία, φρεκτίζω, ἀληθέος), blame or reprehension spoken to a person's face. It is distinguished from a reprimand, when he who reproves points out his fault, and blames him; he who reprimands affects to punish, and mortifies the offender. In giving reproof, the following rules may be observed: 1. We should not be forward in reproving our elders or superiors, but rather to remonstrate and make a personal supplication for redress. What the ministers of God do in this kind, they do by special commission as those that must give an account (1 Tim. vi, 1; Heb. xiii, 17). 2. We must not reprove rashly; there should be proof before reproof. 3. We should not reprove for slight matters, for such faults or defects as proceed from frailty, from inadvertency, or mistake in matters of small consequence. 4. We should never reprove unreasonably, as to the time, the place, or the circumstances. 5. We should reprove mildly and sweetly, in the calmest manner in the gentlest terms. 6. We should not affect to be reprehensive; perhaps there is no one considered more troublesome than he who delights in finding fault with others. In receiving reproof, it may be observed, I. That we should not reject it merely because it may come from those who are not exactly on a level with ourselves. 2. We should consider whether the reproof given be not actually deserved; and whether, if the reprover knew all, the reproof would not be sharper than it is. 3. Whether, if taken humbly and patiently, it will not be of great advantage to us. 4. That it is an illness but pride to suppose that we are never to be the subjects of reproof, since it is human to err.

Reptile, a word not used in the A.V., which designates this class of animals by the term "creeping thing" (q.v.), but covers thereby a much wider range of creatures. The following are the true reptilia mentioned in Scripture. They are almost exclusively consisted of various unknown species of serpents and lizards. (Of course both these classes were unclean to the Hebrews.)

Crocodylus (Tetrapods) — Legatianum.
Cynodon — Leptis.
Battaglia — Croc.
Fratr — Fraternit.
Telesphor — Fusch.
Bono — Chameleon.
Lizard — Lizard.
Zittu — Semeith.
Lisk — Mole.
Mel — Adder.
Akebhu — Adder.
Ephes — Adder.
Draco — Adder.
Echidna — Adder.
Cynodon — Adder.
Tetrapods — Adder.
Serpent — Adder.
Crocodile — Adder.
Reptilia — Adder.

Requiem, a musical mass for the dead in the
Church of Rome, so called from the words of the Introit, "Requiem aeternam dona eis, Domine," Give them eternal rest, O Lord, etc. (2 Esd. ii, 34, 35); and the antiphon for the psalms in place of the Gloria Patri.

Reredos (written also lardus, from Fr. larderreidos), the wall or screen at the back of an altar, seat, etc. It was usually ornamented with paneling, etc., especially behind an altar, and sometimes was enriched with a profusion of niches, buttresses, pinnacles, statues, and other decorations, which were often painted with brilliant colors. Reredoses of this kind not unfrequently extended across the whole breadth of the church, and were sometimes carried up nearly to the ceiling, as at St. Alban’s Abbey, Durham Cathedral, Gloucester Cathedral, St. Saviour’s Church, Southwark; Christ Church, Hampshire, etc. In village churches they were generally simple, and appear very frequently to have had no ornaments formed in the wall, though sometimes cornices or niches were provided to carry images, and sometimes that part of the wall immediately opposite the altar was panelled.

Remains of these, more or less injured, are to be found in many churches, particularly at the east ends of aisles, as at St. Michael’s, Oxford; Hanwell and Eton, Oxfordshire; Solihull, Warwickshire, etc.; and against the east wall of the transept, as at St. Cuthbert’s Wells. It was not unusual to decorate the wall at the back of an altar with panelings, etc., in wood, or with embroidered hangings of tapestry-work, to which the name of reredos was given; it was also applied to the screen between the nave and choir of a church. The open reredos was the great city, frequently used in ancient domestic halls, was likewise called a reredos.

See ALTAR.

Resciassy Act, an act of the Scotch Parliament passed on the restoration of Charles II, annul- ling all acts passed between 1689 and 1650 for re- ligion and the Reformation; denouncing the Solemn League and Covenant and the Glasgow Assembly of 1688, and declaring that the government of the Church, as an essential royal prerogative, belongs alone to the crown.

Rescript, or Codex Rescriptus, a manuscript, the original writing of which had been virtually wiped out, and the works of some saint or father written over it. A codex of this class is called Codex Ephraemi in the Imperial Library of Paris. Several works of the Syrian father were written over both of the Old and New Testaments. It has been published by Tischendorf, with a curious fac-simile of the older and newer handwriting. By the application of a chemical tinture, the original writing of a rescript can now be well deciphered. See EPHRAIM MANUSCRIPT; PA-LIMPSEST.

Resemblance to GOD. See Image of GOD.

Resen (Heb. שֶּׁרֶן, a halter, as in Isa. xxx, 20; Sept. Σαρήν v. Σαρήν), an ancient town of Assyria, described as one of the lying between the Tigris and the Calah (Gen. x, 12). Many writers have been inclined to identify it with the Rhesi or Resena of the Byzantine authors (Amm. Marc. xxiii, 5; Procop. Bell. Pers. ii, 19; Steph. Byz. s. v. Prasieion, and of Proclom (Geograph. v, 18), which was near the true source of the western Euphrates, and which is most probably the modern Rus el-Ain. There are no grounds, however, for this identification except the similarity of name (which similarity is perhaps fallacious, since the Sept. evidently reads שַׁרֶן for יָרָן, but not the Samar.), while it is a fatal objection to the theory that Resen or Reshina was not in Assyria at all, but in Western Mesopo- tamia, 200 miles to the west of both the cities between which it is said to have lain. Biblical geographers have generally been disposed to follow Bochart (Phaleg, iv, 23) in finding a trace of the Hebrew name in Lu- rissas, which is mentioned by Xenophon (Anab. iii, 4, 9) as a desolate city on the Tigris, several miles north of the Lycurus. It is not of the resemblance of the names is too the resemblance of the names is too strong to support the inference of identity; but the situation is not irreconcilable with the scriptural intimation. Ephrem Syrus (Comment. ad loc.) says that Resen, which he substitutes for Resen (the Peshito has Ressina), was the same as the Rishi (fountain-hill) by which Assemani understands him to mean, not the place in Mesopotamia so called, but another Resh-Ain in Assyria, near Saphasphe, in the province of Marga, which he finds noticed in a Syrian monastic history of the Middle Ages (Assemani, Biblioth. Orient. iii, 2, p. 709). It is, however, still uncertain if Resna be the same with Rish- Ain; and, whether it be so or not, a name so exceedingly uncommon (corresponding to the Arabic Ras el-Ain) affords a precarious basis for the identification of a site so ancient. The Lurissa of Xenophon is most cer- tainly the modern Nimrīd. Resen, or Resnā—whichever may be the true form of the word—must assuredly have been in this neighborhood. As, however, the Nimrīd ruins seem really to represent Calah, while those opposite Mosul are the remains of Nineveh, we must look for Resen in the tract lying between these two sites. Assyrian remains of some considerable ex- tent are found in this situation, near the modern village of Selsemiyeh, and it is perhaps the most probable conjecture that these represent the Resen of Genesis (see Rawlinson, Ancient Monarchies, i, 292). No doubt it may be said that a "great city," such as Resnā is de- clared to have been (Gen. x, 12), could scarcely have intervened between two other large cities which are not twenty miles apart; and the ruins at Selsemiyeh, it must be admitted, are not very extensive. But perhaps we ought to understand the phrase "a great city" rela- tively—i.e., great, as cities went in early times, or great, considering its proximity to two other larger towns. If this explanation seem unsatisfactory, we might perhaps conjecture that originally Asshur (Kalēh-Shergat) was called Calah, and Nimrīd Resen; but that, when the seat of empire was removed northwards from the former place to the latter, the name Calah was transferred to the new capital. Instances of such transfers of name are not unfrequent. The later Jews appear to have identified Resen with the Kalēh-Shergat ruins. At least the Targums of Jonathan and of Jerusalem explain Resen by Tel-Assur (תליוס), or in Tiberian, "the mound of Asshur." See ASSYRIA.

Resentment, generally used in an ill sense, implying a determination to return an injury. Dr. Johnson observes that resentment is a union of sorrow with malignity; a combination of a passion which all en- deavor to avoid with a passion which all concur to de- test. The man who retires to meditate mischief and to exasperate his own rage; whose thoughts are em-
played only on means of distress and contrivances of ruin; whose mind never passes from the remembrance of his own sufferings but to indulge some hope of enjoying the calamities of another, may justly be numbered among the most miserable of human beings—among those who are guilty, who have neither the gladness of prosperity nor the calm of innocence.

Reservation, or Restriction, in ethics, is the keeping back in the mind; equivocation, by a phrase which means one thing to the users and another to those who hear it. It may be distinguished as real and mental.

1. *Real restriction* takes place when the words used are not true if strictly interpreted, but there is no deviation from truth if the circumstances be considered. One man asks another, Have you dined? and the answer given is, No. The party giving this answer has dined, times without number: but his answer is restricted by the circumstances, as to-day, and in that sense is true.

2. *Mental restriction* consists in saying so far what is true and can be believed, but adding mentally some qualification which makes it not to be so. A debtor asked by his creditor for payment of his debt, says, "I will certainly pay you to-morrow," adding to himself, "in part;" whereas the words audibly uttered referred to the whole amount. —See Fleming and Krauth, *Vocabulary of Philosophical Science*, a. v.

Reserve in Teaching. This is the *suppression*, in the instruction of the great mass of Christians, of a portion of those (Gospel) doctrines which are most earnestly set forth in Scripture, as if they were a sort of esoteric mystery of which ordinary believers are unworthy, and which should be reserved as a reward for a long course of pious submission. The maintainers of this system of teaching are ignorant of the highest and most sacred doctrines of Christianity (such as the atonement, the divinity of our Lord, etc.); they regard them as too solemn and divine to be vulgarized by being explicitly and prominently put before the Christian world at large. They would make men "economize" the knowledge of such deep doctrines, reserving them for communication to those worthy of being initiated, meanwhile asserting that the ordinary Christian is put in possession of these truths, and to a certain degree derives virtue out of them, by partaking of the sacraments, etc. It is on the authority of the fathers that the advocates of "reserve" chiefly dwell as most fully and expressly supporting the principle; but they adduce also, in justification of the system, the reverence it has a tendency to bestow for sacred things (as if it were reverence, and not superstition, in those who know not what they are reverencing), and allege that doing thus they are acting a merciful part in keeping those in ignorance who would not make a profitable use of knowledge (just as if they had the power of discerning spirits). They contend that they are imitating the most perfect Pattern of wisdom and mercy, who thus economizes light and knowledge (e. g., concealing the Gospel at first under the veil of the Mosaic ritual), as if it were a system of philosophy of their own they undertook to teach, or as if they were imitating the Deity in concealing what he had revealed. The Father our Lord is appealed to, who, they say, taught openly by parables, but privately explained the mysteries of his kingdom to his disciples: a case quite inapplicable, as our Lord used reserve, not to his disciples, but towards wilful unbelievers. The system is so well guarded by studied confounding it with the *gradual* initiation of Christians in the knowledge of their religion, and the necessity of gradual teaching; and the care requisite to avoid teaching anything which, though true in itself, would be falsely understood by the hearers, confounded with the system of withholding a portion of Gospel truths from those able and willing to receive it. It is almost needless to add that the entire system is opposed to the Word of God, which commands ministers not to shun to declare to the people "all the counsel of God," and that it is calculated to throw doubt and uncertainty upon the whole Christian religion; for, as in this system of "reserve" there may be an indefinite number, none can ever be sure that he has fathomed the system, and ascertained what is the realmost doctrine of its advocates. See the Rev. Dr. West's *Sermon on Reserve in Teaching*.

Reserved Cases, among Roman Catholic canonists, are certain sins which are to be dealt with by higher ecclesiastics than the mere priest, who may, however, bestow absolution if the penitent be at the point of death. To this class of sins belong heresy, simony, sacrilege, and certain offences against the priesthood.

Res'heph (Heb. id. ד'ֶס, frame, as often; Sept. Parth. v. r. Zebaph), one of the descendants of Ephraim, a "son" of Beriah (q. v.) (1 Chron. vii. 25). B.C. post 1658.

Residence. In the early Church there were laws regulating the residence of the clergy, and their design was to bind them to constant attendance upon their duty. The Council of Sardica had several canons relating to this subject. The seventh decreed that no bishop should go up, upcountry, to the emperor, or address the emperor by letter called him thither; but if any petition was to be preferred to the emperor relating to any civil contest, the bishop should depute his episcopii, or resident at court, to act for him, or send his deacon, or some other of his clergy, to solicit the matter in his name, that the Church might neither receive damage by his absence nor be put to unnecessary expenses. Another canon of the Council of Sardica limited the absence of a bishop from his church for three weeks, unless it was upon some very weighty and urgent occasion. Another allowed the same affect for a time to a bishop and the revenues of his estate, provided he there celebrated divine service every Lord's day. By two other canons, presbyters and deacons were similarly tied. The Council of Agde made the like order for the French churches, decreeing that a presbyter or deacon who was absent from his church for three weeks should be three years suspended from the communion. By a rule of the fourth Council of Carthage, every bishop's house was to be near the church. The fifth council prescribed that every bishop should have his residence near his principal or cathedral church, which he should not leave, to the neglect of his cure.

In Great Britain, at the present time, residence is now regulated by 1 and 2 Vict. c. 106. The penalties for it, without a license from the bishop, are, one third of the annual value of the benefice when the absence exceeds three but not does exceed six months: one half of the annual value when the absence exceeds six but does not exceed eight months: and when it has been for the whole year, three fourths of the annual income are forfeited. Certain persons are exempted from the penalties of non-residence, as the heads of colleges at Oxford and Cambridge, the warden of Durham University, and the headmasters of Eton, Winchester, and Westminster schools. Privileges for temporary non-residence are granted to a great number of persons who hold offices in cathedrals and at the two universities of Oxford and Cambridge. See Bingham, *Christian Antig.* bk. vi. eh. iv. p. 7; *Eccles. Cyclop.* a. v.

Resignation, a patient, unresisting submission to the will of God, acknowledging both his power and right to all. The obligations to this duty arise from: 1. The perfection of the God (Deut. i. 11). 2. The purpose of God (Eph. i. 11). 3. The commands of God (Heb. xii. 9). 4. The promises of God (1 Pet. v. 7). 5. Our own interest (Hos. ii. 14, 15). 6. The prospect of eternal felicity (Heb. iv. 9). See *Patience*.

RESIGNATION. ECCLISIASTICAL. The ancient Church was very strict in the matter of resignations,
and yet there were cases in which they were allowed: 1. When a bishop, through the obstinacy, hatred, or disgust of any people, found himself inability of doing them any service, and that the burden was an intolerable oppression to him; in that case, if he desired to resign, his resignation was accepted. Thus Gregory Nazianzen renounced the see of Constantinople because he was shorn by his people. This was called the resignation. 2. When in charity a bishop resigned, or showed himself willing to resign, to cure some invertebrate schism. Thus Chrysostom announced his willingness to resign if the people had any suspicion that he was a usurper. In such cases canonical pensions were sometimes granted. The following are the rules that the Church of England: It can be made only to a superior, and it must be to such a superior as the one from whom it was immediately obtained; for example, where institution was required, the party having the right to institute is the same to whom resignation is to be made; and in the case of donatives, resignation is to be made to the patron. Resignation must be made personally, and not by proxy: that is, it must be made either by personal appearance before the ordinary, or by an instrument properly attested and presented to him. It must be made within thirty days after the decision of the instrument, it must be made "absolutely et simpliciter," and it must further be, in the words of the same instrument, "sponte et pure." It must also be made voluntarily, and it must not proceed from any corrupt inducement. If an incumbrance, sum of money, or other benefits, directly or indirectly, or for or in respect of the resigning of a benefice having cure of souls, such a transaction is criminal in the view of the law, and both the giver and receiver in it are liable to legal penalties. No resignation can be valid till accepted by the proper ordinary, but the law has provided no remedy if the ordinary should refuse to accept. In as far as legal decisions have hitherto gone, the ordinary is no more compellable to accept a resignation than he is to admit persons into holy orders. When a resignation has been accepted, notice is to be given to the patron, if different from the ordinary; and lapse does not begin to run, as against the patron, until notice of the vacancy has been properly given to him. A Presbyterian minister resigns to the presbytery in whose bounds his charge is. See Bingham, Christian Antiq. bk. v. p. 9; Eden, Thol. Dict. p. 150. Resolutioners, or Resolutionists, were those who approved of the answer given by the commissioners of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland (which met at Perth in the time of Charles II) to the question proposed to them by the Parliament, viz. what persons were to be admitted to rise in arms against Cromwell. The resolution was, that all persons capable of bearing arms were to be admitted, except those of bad character, or obstinate enemies to the Covenant. Those who supported it were called Resolutioners, while those who opposed it were designated Protectors or Anti-Resolutioners.

Respect of Persons (προσωπολογία, Rom. ii. 11; Eph. vi. 9; Col. iii. 25; James ii. 1; a later Greek word) found only in the New Test., and modelled after the use of τιμή with τιμῆσθαι, partiality for individuals. God appointed that the judges should pronounce sentence without respect of persons (Lev. xix. 15; Deut. xvi. 17, 19). They should consider neither the poor nor the rich, the weak nor the powerful, but should attend only to truth and justice. The Jews complimented our Saviour that he told the truth, without respect of persons, without fear (Matt. xxii. 16; Isa. xxxiii. 1-16). Jude (ver. 16), instead of the phrase "to have respect of persons," has "to admire persons." Our English term respect seems to imply some kind of deference or submission to a party; but this is not always the proper meaning to be annexed to it in Scripture. When we read (Exod. ii. 29) "God had respect to the children of Israel," it can only express his compassion and sympathy for them; when God had respect to the offering of Abel (Gen. iv. 4), it imports to accept favorably, to notice with satisfaction. (Comp. 1 Kings viii. 28; Numb. xvi. 15.)

Respond, before the Reformation, was a short anthem interrupting the middle of a chapter; when two or three verses had been read, the respond was sung, after which the chapter proceeded.

RESPOND, a half-partial or pier, in Middle-age architecture, attached to a wall to support the arch, etc. Responsum are very frequently used by themselves, as at the sides of the entrances of chancels, etc., and are also generally employed at the terminations of ranges of pillars, such as those between the body and aisles of churches. In these last-mentioned situations they usually correspond in form to the pillars, but are sometimes different. The name frequently occurs in mediaval contracts, and may have its origin in the notion of the two pilasters responding to, i.e. corresponding with, each other. Thus the breadth of the nave of Eton College chapel between the "responders" was directed by the will of king Henry VI to be thirty-two feet. See Antic.

Responsabili were a sort of residentia in the imperial city in the name of foreign churches and bishops, whose office was to negotiate as procurors at the emperor's court in all ecclesiastical causes wherein their principals might be concerned. The institution of the office seems to have been in the time of Constantine, or not long after, when the emperors having become Christians, foreign churches had more occasion to promote their suits at the imperial court than formerly. However, we find it established by law in the time of Justinian. It does not appear from that law that responsabili were clergyman, but from other writings we may easily collect it. See Bingham, Christian Antiq. bk. iii. ch. xiii. p. 6.

Response. Among the Hebrews the usual response by the people to prayer was by the utterance of the word Amen at the close; and this practice was naturally adopted, or rather continued, by Christians likewise. This word (Ἀμήν), literally "firm, true," was used as a substantive, "that which is true," "truth" (Isa. lxxv. 16). It was employed in strong asseverations, fixing, as it were, the stamp of truth upon the assertion which it accompanied, and making it binding as an oath (comp. Num. v. 22). In the Sept. of 1 Chron. xxvi. 36; Neh. v. 13; viii. 6, the word appears in the form Ἀμήν, which is used throughout the New Test. In other passages the Hebrew is rendered by verbum, except in Isa. lxxv. 16. The Vulgate adopts the Hebrew word in all. Except in the Psalms, where it is translated fiat. In Deut. xxvii. 15-26, the people were to say "Amen" as the Levites pronounced each of the curses upon Mount Ebal, signifying by this their assent to the conditions under which the curses were pronounced. Our English word is a direct translation of the Hebrew. In accordance with this usage we find that among the rabbinis "Amen" involves the ideas of swearing, acceptance, and truthfulness. The first two are illustrated by
RESPONSES

the passages already quoted, the last by 1 Kings i, 36; John iii, 8, 5, 11 (A. V. "verily"), in which the assertions are made with the solemnity of an oath and then strengthened by the repetition of "Amen." "Amen" was the proper response of the person to whom an oath was administered (Neh. v, 13; vii, 6; 1 Chron. xvi, 36; Jer. iv, 22; 31: 38; 44: 27; and the Deut. vi. 13, from which the appeal is made on such occasions, is called "the God of Amen" (Isa. lxv, 16), as being a witness to the sincerity of the implied compact. With a similar significance Christ is called "the Amen, the faithful and true witness" (Rev. iii, 14). One who shall go before your brethren until the Lord shall give rest to your brethren, as well as to you, and until ye are come into the land whither ye are going to possess it" (Deut. iii, 20). So also Deut. xii, 9: "For ye are not as yet come to the rest and to the inheritance which the Lord your God giveth you," i.e. you are not as yet settled in that land which you are to possess; for someone says to Ruth, "My daughter, shall I not seek rest for thee, that it may be well with thee?" (Ruth iii, 1) — i.e. I shall endeavor to procure you a settlement. David, speaking of the ark of the covenant, which till his time had no fixed place of settlement, says: "And the Lord, into thy rest, thou and the ark of thy strength" (Psa. xxxii, 9). Likewise Eccles. xxxvi, 15: "O be merciful unto Jerusalem, thy holy city, the place of thy rest." Rest has the following figurative meanings: to lean, or rest trust is (2 Chron. xxiii, 8); to continue fixed (Isa. ii, 4); to come to an end (Ezek. xvi, 42; xxii, 17); come from near (Josh. xiv, 15).

Rest, like sleep, is in the Scriptures sometimes used as the symbol of death. Thus the patriarch exclaims, "For now should I have lain still and been quiet, I should have slept; then had I been at rest, with kings and counsellors of the earth" (Job iii, 18); and thus a charge is given to Daniel: "Go thou thy way till the end be: for thou shalt rest, and stand in thy lot at the end of the days" (Dan. xii, 9). This phrase also occurs in 1 Sam. xxvii, 15; Job xiii, 16; Acts ii, 26; Rom. xi, 9; and is common on Jewish monuments for the dead, as "May his rest be in the garden of Eden, with the other just men of the world." "May his soul rest in peace till the Comforter come." "May his rest be in the garden of Eden, with other just men. Amen, amen, amen, Selah." In a moral and spiritual sense, rest denotes a cessation from carnal trouble and sin (Matt. xvi, 28, 29). Finally, it is used to represent the fixed and permanent state of repose enjoyed by the blessed in heaven; and so to this Psalm is applied as a symbol of the settlement of the Israelites in the Land of Promise: "I will be to them a Father, saith the Lord of hosts, and they shall be to me a people; and in this place will I be their God, and they shall be my people. And they shall sit every man under his vine and fig tree, and none shall make them afraid; for the mouth of the Lord of hosts is spoken" (Hos. x, 10-11). The rest assuredly is a mercy; and intimates that the prayer of the speaker is heard and approved by him who gives this response. (2) Hallelujah. This was adopted from the Jewish psalmody, particularly from those psalms (cxiii—cxviii) which were sung at the Passover, called the Great Hallel, or Hallelujah day. Use of this phrase was not adopted by the Church at Jerusalem, and from this was received by the other churches, and was restricted to the fifty days between Easter and Whitsunday. In the Greek Church it was expressive of grief, sorrow, and penitence, while in the Latin it depicts a joyful spirit. (3) Hosannah. The Church, both ancient and modern, has ascribed to this word a meaning similar to that of hallelujah. The true significance is "Lord save" (Psa. cxviii, 25). (4) "O Lord have mercy"—κύριε ἥλησθον. The Council of Vaison, A.D. 492, canon 8, ordained that this response should be introduced into the morning and evening worship, and into the public religious service. Gregory the Great introduced a threelfold form, "O Lord, " Lord have mercy," "Christ have mercy." (5.) "Glory, glory in the highest," in use on festive occasions in the 5th century, and in general use in the 7th century. (8) "The Lord be with you!" "Peace be with you," ordained by the Council of Braga, A.D. 561, to be the uniform salutation of bishops and prelates when addressing the people. The last-mentioned salutation alone is in use in the Greek Church. See Coleman, Christ Antip. Eccles. Theoph. (1830). 

RESPONDS. Psalm means either the repetition of the verses by the people, or the repetition of the last words of the psalm, with the addition of the "amen" or the doxology: or that the psalms were so selected as to correspond to the subject of the lessons which had been read. — Eadie, Eccles. Cyclop. s. v. "Psalmody."
xxi, 22). (2) Twofold, fourfold, and even fivefold restitution of things stolen, and restitution of property unjustly retained, with twenty per cent. over and above. He who, by ignorance, should omit to give to the Temple of the Lord his share in the Produce of the Fruits or first-fruits—was obliged to restore it to the priests and to add a fifth part besides, over and above which he was bound to offer a ram for his expiation. Nehemiah prevailed with all those Israelites to make restitution who had taken interest of their brethren (Neh. v. 10, 11), and Zaccheus (Luke xix, 8) promises a fourfold restitution to all from whom he had extorted in his office as a publican. The Roman laws condemned to a fourfold restitution all who were convicted of extortion or fraud. Zaccheus here imposes that penalty on himself, to which he adds the half of his goods, which was what the law did not require. (8.) If a man killed a beast, he was to make it good, beast for beast (Lev. xxiv, 18). If an ox pushed or gored another man's servant to death, his owner was bound to pay for the servant thirty shekels of silver (Exod. xxii, 32). In the case of one man's ox pushing the ox of another man to death, as it would be very difficult to ascertain which of the two had been to blame for the quarrel, the two owners were obliged to bear the loss between them: the living and the dead are one kind: the dead beast, was to be equally divided by them. If, however, one of the oxen had previously been notorious for going, and the owner had not taken care to confine him, in such case he was to give the loser another and to take the dead ox himself (ver. 50). (4.) If a man dug a pit and did not cover it, or let an old pit remain open, and another man's beast fell into it, the owner of such beast was obliged to pay for the beast and had it for the payment (ver. 33, 34). (5.) When a fire was kindled in the fields and did any damage, he who kindled it was to make the damage good (xxvi, 6). See Damages. Moralist observe respecting restitution: (1.) That where it can be made in kind, or the injury can be certainly valued, we are to restore the thing or the value. (2.) We are bound to restore the thing with the natural increase of it, i.e., to satisfy for the loss sustained in the meantime and the gain hindered. (3.) Where the thing cannot be restored and the value of it is not certain, we are to give reasonable satisfaction according to a middle estimation. (4.) We are at least to give by way of restitution what the law would give, for that is generally the best and most safe. (5.) A man is not only bound to restitution for the injury he did, but for all that directly follows from the injurious act; for the first injury being wilful, we are supposed to will all that which follows upon it. 2. ἀποκαταστάσις, a form which, in its Greek sense, occurs but once in the New Testament, in the phrase "restitution of all things," ἀποκαταστάσεως κάινων (Acts iii, 21). As an event, it is in that passage connected with the "refreshing" (ἰδίκυφες) from the presence of the Lord" (ver. 19). The grammatical construction as well as exegetical interpretation of this and the future life (Morus: the Messianic times), and refers the "times of restitution" (full and perfect fulfillment of prophecy) to the consummation of that auspicious period when all enemies shall be subdued (1 Cor. xx, 25 sq.; Heb. x, 12; 15; comp. 2 Pet. x, 13), and every influence opposed to true religion removed. Many of these interpretations are obviously fanciful, and most of them too vague, although some contain an element of truth. The word ἀποκαταστάσις signifies emendation, restoration to a pristine condition, change to a better state. (So Josephus, Ant. xli, 9, 4; iv, 6; Philo, De Incarnatione, p. 767 b; De Resp. Dom. Per. p. 522 c.) Atonement and Phanerostasis are words used in it by τέλευτας; but the scholiast in the Cod. Nor. ad loc. renders αὐθαίρετας, ἦτοις. In like manner ἀποκαταστάσις signifies complete, bring to a conclusion; see the Sept. at Job viii, 6, where it corresponds with בָּלָם; so in Gen. xli, 13; Jer. xxii, 8; comp. Polyb.
RESTORATION

Iv, 23, 1; Diod. Sic. xx, 54.) By the expression "until the times of the restitution of all things which God hath spoken," etc., Peter means the time when all affairs shall be consummated, all the prophetic announcements shall be accomplished, including the inauguration of the kingdom of the Messiah and its attendant events, the full extension of the Gospel, the resurrection of the just, the last judgment, the end of the world (see Olashausen, De Wette, Hackett, and most others, ad loc.). See ESCHATOLOGY.

Restoration, The, a name generally given to the return of the Church of England to the previously appointed ecclesiastical policy, and to their allegiance to the regular prince, Charles II., which took place in 1660. It has been held by authority, that May 29 in every year shall be kept with prayer and thanksgiving to Almighty God for this event.

RESTORATION OF THE JEWS. This term is applied to two very different classes of prophesies relating to the Hebrew race.

1. Their Return from Captivity. It is maintained by various writers (see, e.g., v. xxi) that the ten tribes intermarried so freely with the surrounding population as to have become completely absorbed; and it appears to be a universal opinion that no one now knows where their descendants are. But it is a harsh assumption to reject entirely the prophecy concerning the ten tribes than with the two; and certainly, in the apostolic days, the twelve tribes are referred to as a well-known people, sharply defined from the heathen (Acts xxiv, 7; James i, 1). Not a trace appears that any repulsive principle existed at that time between the Ten and the Two. "Ephraim no longer envied Judah, nor Judah vexed Ephraim;" but they had become "one nation;" though only partially "on the mountains of Israel" (Isa. xi, 18; Ezek. xxxviii, 22). It would seem, therefore, that one result of the captivity was to blend all the tribes together, and produce a national union which had never been effected in their own land. If ever there was a difference between them as to the books canonized sacred, that difference entirely vanished; at least, no evidence appears of the contrary fact. When, moreover, the laws of landed inheritance no longer enforced the maintenance of separate tribes and put a difficulty in the way of their intermarriage, an almost inevitable result in course of time was the entire obliteration of this distinction; and, as a fact, no modern Jews know to what tribe they belong, although vanity always makes them choose a descent by some tribe of the ancient house of the ten tribes. That all Jews now living have in them the blood of all the twelve tribes ought (it seems) to be believed, until some better reason than mere assertion is advanced against it.

When Cyrus gave permission to the Israelites to return to their own country, and restored their sacred vessels, it is not wonderful that few persons of the ten tribes were eager to take advantage of it. In two centuries they had become thoroughly naturalized in their Eastern settlements; nor had Jerusalem ever been the centre of proud aspirations to them. It is perhaps remarkable that in Ezra ii, 2, 36 (so also x, 18, 25), the word Israel is used to signify what we might call the laity as opposed to the priests and Levites, which might seem as if the writer were anxious to avoid asserting that all the families belonged to the two tribes. (If this is not the meaning, it at least shows that all discriminating force in the words Israel and Judah was already lost. So, too, in the book of Esther, the twelve tribes through all parts of the Persian empire are called Jews.) Nevertheless, it was to be expected that only those would return to Jerusalem whose expatriation was very recent, and principally those whose parents had dwelt in the holy city or its immediate neighborhood. The emigrants, doubtless, consisted chiefly of the priests and the poor; and as the latter proved docile to their teachers, a totally new spirit reigned in the restored synagogues. Why, then, should the anxious Ezra might discern in his comrades, is it no slight matter that he could induce them to divorce their heathen wives—a measure of harshness which Paul would scarcely have sanctioned (1 Cor. vii, 12); and the century which followed was, on the whole, one of great religious activity and improvement. Permanent results on the moral character of the nation. Even the prophetic spirit by no means disappeared for a century and a half; although at length both the true and the false prophet were supplanted among them by the learned and disputing schools of the over-literal or over-figurative critic. In place of a people prone to go astray after sensible objects of adoration, and readily admitting heathen customs; attached to monarchical power, but inattentive to a hierarchy; careless of a written law, and moveable by alternate impulses of apostasy and repentance, we behold them in them a deep and permanent reverence for Moses and the prophets, an aversion to foreigners and foreign customs, a profound hatred of idolatry, a great devotion to pious and Levitical rank, and to all who had an exterior of piety. Now began the term, a slave, called Ezekiel, to deliver a vision of the two houses of Israel, the Assyrian, and the Babylonian, and a future age which was to be a type of the Messiah, and his kingdom (Ezek. xxxvii). It is now, for the first time, that the book of Daniel is read with interest, and the belief in the Messiah was spread among the people (Dan. xii). Now began the time, and that memorable period which was to form the turning point of Jewish history. Now began the time when the Jews might be considered a nation. The time of the Exile is over; and the Jewish period of the Dispersion begins. The Jews are to be a people, a name, and a seed. Whatever else may befall them, they are to be a people, a name, and a seed. Whatever else may befall them, they are to be a people, a name, and a seed. Whatever else may befall them, they are to be a people, a name, and a seed.

2. Their Future Return to Palestine. It is a favorite view with many that the Jewish race, now scattered over the face of the earth, will eventually be brought back to their own land. To this is generally added the belief that they will yet return in a converted, i.e., Christian, state. The final ingathering of the Jews, no less than that of all Gentiles, is to be not only in the Old Testament, but likewise in the New (see Rom. xi, 11-25). But it appears to be an error to infer that, therefore, they will generally be restored to their original home. See SWAIN, OBJECTIONS TO THE RESTORATION.
RESTORATIONISTS

The name assumed by a body of Puritans who, in great extent, were identical with the Unitarians, on the one hand, and the Universalists, on the other. Their peculiar doctrine is that all men will ultimately become holy and happy. They maintain that God created men only to bless them, and that he sent his Son to "be for salvation to the ends of the earth." They further teach that man's probation is not confined to this life, but extends throughout the mediatorial reign of Christ; and that, as he died for all, all will eventually be saved. They consider that punishment is reformatory in its character, and has for its object the conversion of the sinner. Although the Restorationists, as a separate body, have only existed for a few years, their sentiments are by no means new. Some of the early fathers—Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen, Didymus of Alexandria, Gregory Nyssen, and others—believed and advocated the restoration of all fallen intelligence. A branch of the German Baptists, before the Reformation, held and propagated the doctrine. In Europe many prominent names may be cited as its advocates. It was introduced into America about the middle of the 18th century, but not much taught until about 1780, when John Murray and Elhanan Winchester became its advocates. Afterwards we find Dr. Chauncey, of Boston; Dr. Rush, of Philadelphia; Dr. Smith, of New York; and Mr. Foster, of New Hampshire, as advocates, although most of them continued in the ranks of the various sects. In 1786 a convention was organized at Oxford, Mass., under the auspices of Moses Winchester and Murray; and as all who believed in universal salvation believed that the effects of sin and the means of grace extended into a future life, the term "Restorationist and Universalist" was commonly used, and the convention adopted the latter as their distinctive name. In 1818 the Rev. Hosea Ballou, of Boston, advanced the doctrine that all retribution is confined to this world; to which was added by others the doctrine of the mortality of the soul, that the whole man dies a temporal death, and that the resurrection would introduce all men into everlasting happiness. As a result a distinct sect, by the name of Universal Restorationists, was formed at Mendon, Mass., Aug. 17, 1831; but it soon became extinct. The Restorationists maintain that a just retribution does not take place in this life; that those who are invited to it are invited to reference to a future life; that there are grades of reward and punishment; that it is not death or the resurrection that introduces men into heaven. The Restorationists have never been numerous; they are found more extensively in Massachusetts, although they have a few societies in other states. At one time they published a weekly newspaper, and had from twenty to thirty ministers, with from two to three thousand members. Very many, however, are found in the other sects who entertain the peculiar views of the Restorationists. See Ballou, Ancient History of Universalists; Belcher, Religion; Beccaria, Bonne; foster, Examination of Strong; Hudson, Letter and Reply; Chauncey, Salvation of all Men; Hartley, On Men; Stonehouse, Universal Retribution; Smith, On Divine Government. See Universalism.

Resurrection (ανάστασις) of the Body, the re-

The resurrection of the body after it has been forsaken by the soul at the reunion of the two, which was possessed in the present world. This is one of the essential points in the creed of Christendom. 1. History of the Doctrine.—It is admitted that there are no traces of such a belief in the earlier Hebrew Scripture. It is not to be found in the Pentateuch, in the historical books, or in the Psalms: for Ps. xii. 15 does not relate to this subject; neither does Ps. xiv. 29, 30, although so cited by Theodoret and others. The celebrated passage of Job xix, 25 sq. has indeed been strongly insisted upon in proof of the early belief in this doctrine; but the most learned commentators are agreed, and scarcely any one at the present day disputes, that such a view of the text arises either from an error of transcription or misapprehension, and that Job means no more than to express a confident conviction that his then diseased and drip-culled corrupted body should be restored to its former soundness; that he should rise from the depressed state in which he lay to his former prosperity; and that God would manifestly appear (as was the case) to vindicate his uprightness. That no meaning more reconcileable is to be found in the text is agreed by Calvin, Mercier, Grotius, Le Clerc, Patrick, Warburton, Durell, Heath, Kennicott, Doderlein, Dathe, Eichhorn, John, De Wette, and a host of other learned men; and that it alludes to the time when God will be disposed to take his people to a better life (ch. iii. vii. 7, 8; x. 20, 22; ch. xiv. xvi. 11, 16). 2. It is not proposed as a topic of contention by any of the friends of Job; nor by Elisha, who acts as a sort of umpire; nor by the Almighty himself in the decision of the controversy. 5. The later Jews, who eagerly sought for every intimation bearing on a future life which their Scriptures might contain, never regarded this as such; nor is it once referred to by Christ or his apostles. 6. The language, when exactly rendered, contains no warrant for such an interpretation; especially the phrase "yet in my flesh shall I see God," which should rather be rendered "out of my flesh." See Jon., Book of.

Isaiah may be regarded as the first Scripture writer in whom such an allusion can be traced. He compares the restoration of the Jewish people and state to a resurrection from the dead (xxvi. 19, 20); and in this he is followed by Ezekiel at the time of the exiles (ch. xxxvi.). From these passages, which are, however, not very clear in their intensions, it is not easy to form an opinion on this, as in other matters, the twilight of spiritual manifestations brightened as the day-spring from on high approached; and in Dan. xii. 2 we at length arrive at a clear and unequivocal declaration that those who lie sleeping under the earth shall awake, some to eternal life, and others to everlasting shame and contempt. In the time of Christ, the belief of a resurrection, in connection with a state of future retribution, was held by the Pharisees and the great body of the Jewish people, and was only disputed by the Sadducees. Indeed, they seem to have regarded the resurrection as complete without the body; and so intimately were the two things—the future existence of the soul and the resurrection of the body—connected in their minds that any argument which proved the former they considered as proving the latter also (see Matt. xxv. 35, xxvi. 32). This belief, however, led their course minds into gross and sensuous conceptions of the future state, although there were many among the Pharisees who taught that the future body would be so reformed as not to need the indulgences which were necessary in the present life; and they assented to our psalmist's notion that the risen saints would not marry, but would be as the angels of God (Matt. xxi. 30; comp. Luke xx. 34).

So Paul, in 1 Cor. vi. 13, is conceived to intimate that the necessity of food for sustenance will be abolished in the world to come. In further proof of the commonness of a belief in the resurrection among the Jews of the time of Christ, see Matt. xxii; Luke xx; John xvii, 24; Acts xxiii, 6-8.
Josephus is not to be relied upon in the account which he gives of the belief of his countrymen (Ant., xviii, 2; War, ii, 7), as he appears to use terms which might suggest one thing to his Jewish readers and another to the Greeks and Romans, who quoted the idea of a resurrection of the body. But there were many scriptural books in the library of the Old Testament (Wis. iii, 1, etc.; iv, 15; 2 Macc. vii, 14, 23, 29, etc.). Many Jews believed that the wicked would not be raised from the dead; but the contrary was the more prevailing opinion, in which Paul once took occasion to express his concurrence with the Phar- rai.

But although the doctrine of the resurrection was thus prevalent among the Jews in the time of Christ, it might still have been doubtful and obscure to us had not Christ given it to the sanction of his authority, and declared it a constituent part of his religion (e.g. Matt. xxii; John v, viii, xii). He and his apostles also were careful to correct the erroneous notions which the Jews entertained on this head, and to make the subject more obvious and intelligible than it had ever been before.

A special interest is also imparted to the subject from the manner in which occasion the New Testament represents Christ as the person to whom we are indebted for this benefit, which, by every variety of argument and illustration, the apostles connect with him, and make to rest upon him (Acts iv, 2; xxvi, 3; 1 Cor. xv; 1 Thess. iv, 14, etc.).

II. Scripture Details.—The principal points which can be collected from the New Testament on this subject are the following: 1. The raising of the dead is everywhere ascribed to Christ, and is represented as the last work to be undertaken by him for the salvation of man (John v, 21; xi, 25; 1 Cor. xv, 22 sq.; 1 Thess. iv, 15; Rev. i, 18). 2. All the dead will be raised, without respect to age, rank, or character in this world (John v, 28, 29; Acts xxiv, 15; 1 Cor. xv, 22). 3. This event is to take place not before the end of the world, or the general judgment (John v, 24; 1 Cor. xv, 15; 1 Thess. iv, 15; Rev. xxi, 22-28; 1 Thess. iv, 15; Rev. xx, 11). 4. The manner in which this marvellous change shall be accomplished is necessarily beyond our present comprehension, and therefore the Scripture is content to illustrate it by figurative representations, or by proving the possibility and intelligibility of the leading facts. Some of the figurative descriptions occur in Matt. xxiv; John v; 1 Cor. xv, 52; 1 Thess. iv, 16; Phil. iii, 21. The image of a trumpet-call, which is repeated in some of these texts, is derived from the Jewish custom of convening assemblies by the sound of a trumpet. 5. The possibility of a resurrection is powerfully argued by Paul in 1 Cor. xv, 52 sq., by comparing it with events of common occurrence in the natural world. (See also ver. 12-14; and comp. Acts iv, 2.)—Kitto. 6. The numerous instances of an actual raising of individuals to life by our Lord and his apostles, not to speak of a few similar acts by the Old-Testament prophets, and especially the crowning fact of our Lord’s resurrection from the grave, afford some light on these particulars. (See below.) 7. The fact of the general judgment (v. v.) is conclusive as to the literal truth of the great doctrine.

But although this body shall be so raised as to preserve its identity, it must yet undergo certain purifying changes to fit it for the kingdom of heaven, and to render it incapable of immortality (1 Cor. xv, 35 sq.), so that it shall become a glorified body like that of Christ (ver. 49; Rom. vi, 9; Phil. iii, 21); and the bodies of those whom the last day finds alive will undergo such similar changes without tasting death (1 Cor. xv, 51, 58; 2 Cor. v, 4; 1 Thess. iv, 15 sq.; Phil. iii, 41). To the Subject.—With the soul, between the death and the resurrection of the present body, exists independent of any envelope, we know not. Though it may be that a union of spirit with body is the general law of all created spiritual life, still this view gives no countenance to the notions of those who have attempted to prove, from certain physiological opinions respecting the renewal—even few years—of the human frame during life, and the final transmission of its decomposed elements into other forms of being, that the resurrection of the body is impossible. The apostle asserts the fact that the “dead shall be raised incorruptible,” that is to say, for this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality (1 Cor. xv, 35-58). While this passage affirms the identity of the body before and after the resurrection, it by no means affirms the identity of the constituent particles of which the body is, at different periods, supposed to be made up. The particles of a man’s body may change several times between infancy and old age; and yet, according to our ideas of bodily identity, the man has had all the time “the same body.” So also all the particles may be changed again between the process of death and the resurrection, and the body yet retain its identity (see the Bibliotheca Sacra, iv, 615 sq.). Doubtless the future body will be incorruptible, ineradicable, and capable of being moved at will to any part of the universe. The highest and most enriched exercises of thought and feeling will doubtless be an essential part of our future existence. They will divest us of all the circumstances which so frequently entice and affect the affections from their strength and perfection (see The Brit. and For. Encycl. Rev., April, 1862). But there is no analogy—that the new body will have no connection with the old. In connection with that, in fact, the resurrection of the body is not a doctrine of Scripture—does not appeal to us to have been satisfactorily proved by the latest writers on the subject (Bash, Aenartatia, N. Y., 1865), and we think so highly of his ingenuity and talent as to believe that no one else is likely to succeed in an argument in which he has failed.

Among the speculations propounded as a solution of the problem of the resurrection, the most ingenious, perhaps, as well as fascinating, is the persico theory, which assumes that the soul at death retains a certain ethereal substance (or spirit), which, in this state, is the power of secreting to itself a new body for the celestial life. This is substantially the Swedenborgian view as advocated by the late Prof. Bush, and has recently received the powerful support of Mr. Joseph Cook in his popular lectures. It is thought by this school (see especially by Paul’s language—1 Cor. xv) concerning the “spiritual body” of the future state (ver. 4), and his figure of the renewed grain (ver. 57). This explanation, however, is beset with many insuperable difficulties.

(a) The apostle’s distinction between the psychical (ψυχικόν, “natural”) and the pneumatical (πνευματικόν, “spiritual”) in that passage is not of material (ψωμία, physical) as opposed to immaterial or disembodied; but both are equally called body (σώμα, actual and tangible substance), such as we know our Lord’s resurrection body was composed of (Luke xxiv, 39). It is merely, as the whole context shows (“corruptible—incorruptible,” “mortal—immortal,” etc.), the difference between the feeble, decaying body of this life in its present mortal state, and the glorious, faultless, future world in its transfigured condition hereafter; in short, its aspect as known to us here from natural phenomena, and its prospect as revealed to us in Scripture. This appears from the contrasted use of these terms in another part of the same epistle (1 Cor. ii, 14, 15) to describe the unregenerate as opposed to the regenerate heart, the former being its usual or depraved, and the latter its transformed or gracious, state.

(b) In like manner the apostle’s figure of grain as sown, while it admirably illustrates, in a general way, the possible moral changes in the future life, as that which will take place in the resurrection body, yet—like all other metaphors—was never intended to teach the precise mode of that transformation, and accordingly it fails in several essential particulars to correspond to the revival of the body from the grave. 1. The seed never actually dies, nor any part of it. It is
the germ alone that possesses vitality, and this simply expands and develops, gathering to itself the material of the rest of the seed, which undergoes chemical and vital changes fitting it for nutriment until the young plant becomes sufficient to imbibe nourishment from the outer world. This whole process is as truly a growth as that anywhere found in nature; it is, in fact, essentially the same as takes place in the hatching of an egg or the gestation of an animal.

2. The real identity of the original plant or seed and its subsequent crop is lost in this transmutation, as the apostle himself intimates (ver. 37). It is, in fact, the reproduction of another but similar thing rather than the continuation or renewal of the same. The old plant, indeed, perishes, but it never revive. The seed is its offspring, and thus only represents a parent. Nor is the new plant anything more than a lineal descendant of the old one. We must not confound the resurrection with mere propagation. The young plant may, we admit, in one sense be said to be identical with the germ sown, notwithstanding the great change which it takes on in the process of growth; and this is the precise point of the apostle’s simile. But we must not press his figure into a literal strictness when comparing things so radically different as the burial of a corpse and the planting of grain. The principle of life is continuous in the one as well as in the other; it is a distinct substance, like the soul; it is merely a property of matter, and in the case of the body must cease with physical dissolution.

(c) We would ask those who maintain this theory a simple question: Is the so-called germ or “enawtchement” which is supposed to survive, escape, or be eliminated from the body at death—is it matter or is it spirit? We presume all will admit that there are but these two essential kinds of substance. Which of these, then, is it? It must, of course, belong to the former category. Then the body does not actually and entirely die; it remains for all the known phenomena in the case. The whole theory under discussion is not only a pure begging of the question really at issue, but it is improbable and inconsistent. There is absolutely not the slightest particle of scientific or historical evidence that the body leaves a vital residuum in dissolution, or evolves at death an ethereal frame that survives in any physical sense whatever as a representation. We remand all such hypotheses to the realm of ghostland and “spiritualism.”

(d) In the case of the resurrection of the body of Jesus Christ, there is the only definite instance on record, it is certain that this theory will not apply. Not only is no countenance given to it by the language of Holy Scripture concerning the agency which effected that resuscitation, viz. the divine and miraculous power of the Holy Spirit, but the circumstances obviously exclude such a process. There was the defunct person, entire except that the spark of life had fled. If it be said that there still lingered about it some vital germ that was the nucleus around which reanimation gathered, what is this but to deny that Jesus was truly and absolutely dead? The apostle says he, “my hands and my feet, that it is I myself; handle me, and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me here.” He showed them his hands and his feet, which the nail-prints attested to be the same which had hung upon the cross. Our Lord also invited Thomas to thrust his hand into his wound side; and, to remove the last remaining shadow of doubt from the minds of his disciples that it was he himself in the same human body, “he called for food, and he took and did eat before them” (Luke xxi, 22-48; John xvii, 27). The fact is that our Lord passed forty days upon earth after his resurrection, in the same human body in which he was crucified, shows plainly that he did not rise from the tomb in a glorified body. And the evidence is equally strong that he now dwells in heaven in a glorified body (Phil. iii, 21; Col. iii, 4).

Since this event, however, independently of its importance in respect to the internal connection of the Christian doctrine, was manifestly a miraculous occurrence, the credibility of the narrative has from the earliest times been brought into question (Calv. apud Orig. confess., xi. 38; ch. i. 20, “the miracles, disc. vi.” Chubb, Poets, Work. i, 330; Morgan, The Resurrection Considered [1744]). Others who have admitted the facts as recorded to be beyond dispute, yet have attempted to show that Christ was not really dead, but that he became dead and was therefore brought back to life after the appearance of death, and was afterwards restored to
consciousness by the cool grave and the spices. The refutation of these views may be seen in detail in such works as Doctor's Essays, 41st. By Dr. [name] and other religious and theological works. The resurrection of Jesus Christ, says Saurin, "was not raised from the dead, it must have been stolen away. But this theft is incredible. Who committed it? The enemies of Jesus Christ? Would they have contributed to his glory by countenancing his resurrection? Could his disciples? It is probably they would not, and it is next to certain they could not. How could they have undertaken to remove the body—fraud and timorous creatures, people who fled as soon as they saw him taken into custody? Even Peter, the most courageous, trembled at the voice of a servant-girl, and three times denied that he knew him. Would people of this character have dared to resist the authority of the governor? Would they have undertaken to oppose the determination of the Sanhedrin, to force a guard, and to elude, or overcome, the forces of animation and edification of the disciples? If Jesus Christ was not risen again (I speak the language of unbelievers), he had deceived his disciples with vain hopes of his resurrection. How came the disciples not to discover the imposture? Would they have hazarded themselves, and for more than an imposture in favor of a man who had so cruelly imposed on their credulity? But were we to grant that they formed the design of removing the body, how could they have executed it? How could soldiers, armed and on guard, suffer themselves to be overreached by a few timorous people? Either (says Saint) Augustine) they were asleep or awake; if they were awake, why should they suffer the body to be taken away? If asleep, how could they know that the disciples took it away? How dare they then dispose that it was stolen? The testimony of the apostles furnishes us with arguments, and there are eight considerations which give the evidence sufficient weight. 1. The nature of these witnesses. They were not men of power, riches, eloquence, credit, to impose upon the world; they were poor and mean. 2. The number of these witnesses. (See I Cor. xv; Luke xxiv. 34; Mark xvi. 14; Matt. xxviii, 10.) It is not likely that a collusion should have been held among so many to support a lie, which would be of no utility to them. 3. The facts themselves which they asow: not suppositions, distant events, or events related to their own persons, but real facts which they saw with their own eyes (1 John i). 4. The agreement of the evidence: they all deposed the same thing. 5. Observe the tribunals before which they gave evidence: Jews and heathens, philosophers and rabbis, counselors and lawyers. If they had been impostors, the fraud certainly would have been discovered. 6. The place in which they bore their testimony. Not at a distance, where they might not easily have been detected, if false, but at Jerusalem, in the synagogues, in the praetorium. 7. The time of this testimony: not years after, but three days after, they declared he was risen; yea, before the rage of the Jews was quelled, while Calvary was yet dyed with the blood they had spilled. If it had been a fraud, it is not likely they would have come forward in such broad day-light, amid so much opposition. 8. Lastly, the motives which induced them to publish the resurrection: not to gain fame, riches, glory, profit; no, they exposed themselves to suffering and death, and proclaimed the truth from conviction of its importance and certainty. Objections have also been raised upon the apparent discrepancy between the Gospel and the narrated events of the event. These discrepancies were early perceived; and a view of what the fathers have done in the attempt to reconcile them has been given by Nieymer (De Evangelistum in Narrando Christi in Viva Redita Dissonione (1824)). They were first collated with much acuteness by Morgan in the work already cited, and at a later period by another scholar. The subjects were edited and supported by Lessing, the object of which seems to have been to throw uncertainty and doubt over the whole of this portion of Gospel history. A numerous host of theologians, however, rose to combat and refute this new argumentation, and the names of Doderlein, Less, Semler, Teller, Maschius, Michaelis, Plessing, Eichhorn, Herder, and others. Among those who have more recently attempted to reconcile the different accounts is Griesbach, who, in his excellent Proflatio Proflusius unde Evangelicae usu de Resurrectione aut Christi testimonio, has shown that all the discrepancies are trifling, and not of such moment as to render the narrative uncertain and suspected, or to destroy or even diminish the credibility of the evangelists, but serve rather to show how extremely stupid they were of truth, and how closely and even scrupulously they followed their documents." Griesbach then attempts to show how these discrepancies may have arisen, and admits that, although unimportant, they are hard to reconcile, as is indeed evinced by the amount of controversy they have excited. The principal one of these discrepancies has been discussed under Appearance.


Reticulated Work (Lat. opus reticulatum = net work), masonry constructed with diamond-shaped stones, or square stones placed diagonally. In the city of Rome this mode of decorating the surface of a wall is generally characteristic of the period of the early empire; it was frequently imitated in Romanesque work in the tympanum of a door-way, especially in Norman work.

Retribution, Future. That man is a responsible being, and that his responsibility extends into his future state of existence, is generally admitted throughout the world. The mode of decorating the surface of a wall is generally characteristic of the period of the early empire; it was frequently imitated in Romanesque work in the tympanum of a door-way, especially in Norman work.

Retribution, Future. That man is a responsible being, and that his responsibility extends into his future state of existence, is generally admitted throughout the world. That man is a responsible being, and that his responsibility extends into his future state of existence, is generally admitted throughout the world. That man is a responsible being, and that his responsibility extends into his future state of existence, is generally admitted throughout the world. That man is a responsible being, and that his responsibility extends into his future state of existence, is generally admitted throughout the world.
1. Those passages which declare that certain sinners shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven (Matt. v. 20; vii. 13, 21, 23; xvi, 3; Mark x. 23–27; Luke xiii. 24, 26; John iii. 3–5; 1 Cor. vi. 9, 10; Gal. v. 19–21; Eph. v. 5; Heb. iii. 19; iv. 1, 13). If some men, according to the law of our Lord, were excluded from heaven, they must necessarily sink to hell; for the Scriptures give us no intimation of a middle state.

2. Those passages which describe the future and final state of man in contrast (Ps. cxvii. 3, 25; Dan. iii. 2; Matt. iii. 12; vii. 13, 14, 21; viii. 11, 12; xxxii. 49–47; 45–50; xxiv. 45–51; xxxv. 25–26; Mark xvi. 16; Luke xvii. 23, 24, 47–49; John iii. 16, v. 29; Rom. vi. 21–23; ix. 21–23; Gal. vi. 7, 8; Phil. iii. 17–21; 2 Thess. i. 5–12; 2 Tim. ii. 19, 20; Heb. vi. 8, 9; 1 Pet. iv. 18). These passages are believed to refer to the final state of man because (1) in several of them the state is expressly called their end. (2) The state of the righteous and that of the wicked are put in exact opposition to each other; and if one is not final, neither is the other. (3) There is a dead silence about any succeeding state; and (4) the phraseology of some of the passages will admit of no other interpretation.

3. Those passages of Scripture which apply the terms "eternal," "everlasting," "eternal," "ever," and "for ever and ever" to this future state (Matt. v. 11; vi. 12, 16; Mark x. 22, 30; Rom. viii. 27; Col. iii. 3; xxv. 26; xxix. 46–47; Mark iii. 29; 2 Cor. iv. 18; 2 Thess. i. 9; 2 Peter ii. 17; Jude 6, 7, 13. Rev. xiv. 10–13; xix. 3, xx, 10). Those passages which express future punishment by phrases which imply its everlasting duration (Matt. x. 28; xii. 31, 32; Mark iii. 29; ix. 43–45; Luke xv. 25, 26; John iii. 36; vii. 21; xvii. 9; Phil. iii. 10; Heb. vi. 2; x. 26, 27; James ii. 18; 1 John vi. 16).

5. Those passages which intimate that a change of heart and a preparation for heaven are confined to this life (Acts x. 24, 25; 1 Cor. vii. 29; xx. 18; Luke xiii. 24–29; John xii. 36; 2 Cor. vi. 1, 2; Heb. iii. 1–10, 13–15; 2 Pet. iii. 12; Rev. xi. 11).

6. Those passages which foretell the consequences of rejecting the Gospel (Psa. ii. 12; Prov. xxvi. 19; Acts xiii. 40–46; xx. 26; xxviii. 26, 27; Rom. x. 12; 1 Cor. i. 18; 2 Cor. iii. 15, 16; iv. 8; 1 Thess. v. 3; 2 Thess. i. 8; 10, 12–13; Heb. ii. 1–3; iv. 11; x. 26–31, 38, 39; xxii. 23–29; James ii. 14; 1 Pet. iv. 17, 18; 2 Pet. ii. 1, 2; 1 Peter. 2–3). The Gospel being the only way of salvation for man (Acts iv. 12), its rejection is that of the only true method of salvation. See Punishment; Everlasting; Universalism.

Rettberg, Friedrich Wilhelm, a German theologian, was born at Cello, Aug. 21, 1805. After teaching in several small institutions, he became professor of theology at Marburg, where he died, April 7, 1849. His works are: De Purbulosia Jesu Christi (Göttingen, 1827); — Caprariusus nach seinem Leben und Wirken (ibid. 1831); — Heilahrer des Christenthums nach den Grundrissen der lutherischen Kirche (Leips. 1838); — Kirchengesellschafts Deutschlands (Göttingen, 1846–48).—Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, s. v.

Retz, Henri de Gondi de, a French prelate, was born at Paris in 1572. He was canon of Notre Dame, and held many rich abbeyes. In 1596 he became coadjutor of his uncle, cardinal Pierre de Gondi, bishop of Paris, with the promise of succeeding to his title. He received the cardinal's hat in 1618, and, as cardinal de Retz, took part in the affairs of State. He published only one work, Ordinances Synodales. He was the last bishop of Paris. His death occurred at Biéziers, Aug. 2, 1622. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, s. v.

Retz, Jean François Paul de Gondi, Cardinal de, often written Rois, a French prelate, was born at Montmirail in Oct. 1614. By birth he was a Knight of Malta, and was destined by his father for the Church, in the hope that he might succeed his uncle as archbishop of Paris. The ecclesiastical life was wholly distasteful to him, and his earlier years were spent in prodigality and excesses of all kinds: but, at the same time, he prosecuted his theological studies with great success, and received valuable benefices. He was made canon of Saint-Denis in 1641, and succeeded his uncle, cardinal de Retz. His ambition and hardihood gained for him the friendship of the count de Saisoons, and by the conspiracy planned by that nobleman he hoped to be released from his ecclesiastical life and enter upon a political one, which was more congenial to his intriguing nature. After the death of the count, he devoted himself with more regularity to his profession, and succeeded in gaining so great a popularity that Louis XIII, on his death-bed, appointed him coadjutor to his uncle, the bishop of Paris. In this position he gained the hearts of the people by his charities and great attention to all the outward requirements of religion. During the war of the Fronde he rendered valuable assistance to the royal cause; but finding that he was distrusted, he finally became the secret leader of the popular party, and the greatest opponent of cardinal Mazarin. He was made cardinal in 1652, and received exempting offers of a position as ambassador of France to the Holy See; but before he had decided to accept this proposition, he was arrested by order of Louis XIV, and was kept closely confined at Vincennes. On the death of his uncle, March 21, 1664, he was appointed the archbishop in his name. By resigning his claims, he succeeded in gaining a change of residence, and was removed to the Château de Nantes. He escaped from his confinement Aug. 6, 1654, and after many adventures reached Spain. Philip IV offered him an escort, and he immediately hastened to Rome, where he declared himself archbishop of Paris, the pope having refused to acknowledge his resignation. Retz subsequently travelled through Europe; and having been prohibited by Louis XIV from occupying his archbishopric in person, he governed it by years and subordinates until 1662, when he formally resigned all claim to it in consideration of receiving other valuable benefices. He was reconciled to the king, and received permission to establish himself at Commercy, where he kept up a petty state, and occupied himself in study and works of charity. He died at Paris, Aug. 24, 1679. His writings are chiefly political, and as such are not of interest here. But his greatest work is his Mémoires, composed during his years of retirement. They were first published in 1717, and have been reprinted in several editions. — See Mémoires du Cardinal de Retz; Lettres de Madame de Séguin; Voltaire, Sûde de Louis XIV.—Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, s. v.

Retz, Pierre de Gondi de, a French cardinal, was born at Lyons in 1533. After entering the ecclesiastical life, he received many favors from Catherine de Mecdi, and advanced rapidly. He was made bishop of Langres in 1566, and was transferred to the see of Paris in 1570, and became grand — almoner, chancellor, and chief of the council of Charles IX. He was several times ambassador to the Holy See, and in 1561 was created cardinal. He refused to take the oath of allegiance, and explained in a letter, that he considered the rulers of the League were entitled to it. — See Biog. Universelle, s. v.

Re'ū (Heb. ῥerde', 17*, friend; Sept. ῥαουνον v. n. 'Peynū, 1 Chron. i. 25), the son of Polg and father of Serug in the human ancestry (Gen. xi. 18, 21; 1 Chron. i. 25). B.C. cir. 1500. He is called Ragun in Luke iii. 35. He lived 259 years. "Bunaen (Bibliaer) says Reu is Rode, the Arabic name for Edema, an assertion which, borrowed from Knobel, is utterly destitute of foundation. The Hebrew and Arabic words are a closer resemblance might
be found between Reu and Rhaøe, a large town of Media, especially if the Greek equivalents of the two names be taken.

Reu'ben (Heb. Reuben, רְאוּבֵן, see a son [see below]; Sept. and New Test. Poujdry), the name of one of the Jewish patriarchs and of the tribe descended from him. The following account is chiefly compiled from the Scriptural statements. See JACOB.

1. Reuben was Jacob's first-born child (Gen. xxix, 82), the son of Leah, apparently an unexpectedly fruitful marriage of the verse (31; Josephus, Ant. i, 19, 8). B.C. 1919. This is perhaps denoted by the name itself, whose literal meaning is the obvious signification of its present form — רְאוּבֵן, i.e. "beloved ye, a son!" (Green. Thesaur. p. 1247 b)—or the explanation given in the text, which seems to imply that the original form was רְאוּבָן, רְאוּבָן, "Jehovah hath seen my affliction," or that of Josephus, who uniformly presents it as Rouvel (Poujdry) so also in Ant. ii, 8, 1, and explains it (Ant. i, 19, 8) as the "pity of God."—Deov rōv Θεόν, as if from ὀφθαλμός; (Furst, Heb. Lex. p. 1269). The tribe of Reuben was the second of the Arabic verse of Joshua (chs. xii—xiv) with this last form. Reeloh (Die alttestamentlichen Namen, p. 86) maintains that Reuben is the original form of the name, which was corrupted into Reuben, as Bethel into the modern Beita, and Jezerrel into Zer. He treats it as signifying the "flock of Bel," a deity whose worship greatly flourished in the neighboring country of Moab. In the days of the Judges it had a famous sanctuary in the very territory of Reuben. In this case it would be a parallel to the title, "people of Chemosh," which is bestowed on Moab. The alteration of the obnoxious syllable in Reubel would, on this theory, find a parallel in the Meribaal and Eshkol of Saul's family, who became Mehibaalbeth and Ishibobeth. But all this is evidently fanciful and arbitrary.

The notices of the patriarch Reuben in the book of Genesis and the early Jewish traditional literature are unusually frequent, and on the whole give a favorable view of his disposition. To him, and him alone, the preservation of Joseph's life appears to have been due. B.C. 1895. His anguish at the disappearance of his brother, and the frustration of his kindly artifice for delivering him (Gen. xxxvii, 22); his recollection of the minute details of the painful wound many years afterwards (xlii, 22); his offer to take the sole responsibility of the safety of the brother who had succeeded to Joseph's place in the family (ver. 47), all testify to a warm and (for those rough times) a kindly nature. We are, however, further than this, and more responsible for the safety of Joseph than were the others, and it would seem that he eventually acquiesced in the deception practiced upon his father. Subsequently Reuben offered to make the lives of his own sons responsible for that of Benjamin, when it was necessary to prevail on Jacob to let him go down to Egypt (ver. 37, 38). The fine conduct of Judah in afterwards undertaking the same responsibility is in advantageous contrast with this coarse, although well-meant, proposal. For his adulterous and incestuous conduct in the matter of Bilhah, Jacob in his last blessing deprived him of the pre-eminence and double portion which belonged to his birthright, assigning the former to Judah and the latter to Joseph (xlii, 3, 4; comp. vers. 8-10; xlviii, 5). Of this repulsive crime we know from the Scripture only the fact (xxxv, 22). In the post-Biblical traditions it is treated either as not having actually occurred (as in the Targum Pseudo-Jonathan), or else as the result of a sudden temptation acting on a hot and vigorous nature (as in the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs)—a parallel, in some of its circumstances, to the instance of David with Bathsheba. Some severe doubts as to the occurrence of the temptation must surely have been implied Reuben to an act which, regarded in its social rather than in its moral aspect, would be peculiarly abhorrent to a patriarchal society, and which is specially and repeatedly reproved in the law of Moses. The Rabbinical version of the occurrence (as given in the Targum Pseudo-Jonathan) is very characteristic, and well illustrates the influence of the spirit of late Jewish history. "Reuben went and disordered the couch of Bilhah, his father's concubine, which was placed right opposite the couch of Leah, and it was counted unto him as if he had lain with her. And when Isaiah heard it, he displeased him, and he said, Lo! an unworthy person shall proceed from me, as Ishmael did from Abraham, and Esau from my father. And the Holy Spirit answered him and said, All are righteous, and there is not one unworthy among them." Reuben's anxiety to save Joseph is represented as arising from a desire to conciliate Jacob, and his absence while Joseph was sold, from his sitting alone on the mountains in penitent fasting. These traits, slight as they are, are those of an ancient, impetuous, unbalanced, but not ungenerous, nature; not crafty and cruel, as were Simeon and Levi, but rather, to use the metaphor of the dying patriarch, boiling up (епп. A.V. "unstable," Gen. xlix, 4) like a vessel of water over the rapid wood-fire of the nomad tent, and as quickly subsiding into apathy when the fuel was withdrawn.

2. The Tribe of Reuben.—At the time of the migration into Egypt (or rather at the time of Jacob's decease, for the sons were four (Gen. xlvi, 8)) the tribe of Reuben would, from the general distribution of the population, be in the westernmost part of the land of Goshen. In process of time the northern part of the land of Canaan, after the plague which punished the idolatry of Baal-peor, the numbers had fallen slightly, and were 45,730; Gad was 40,500; and the number in the two in the list is lower than before, Ephraim and Simeon being the only two smaller tribes (xxvi, 7, etc.). During the journey into the wilderness the position of Reuben was on the south side of the Tabernacle. The "camp which went under his name was formed of his own tribe, that of Simeon (Leah's second son), and that of Gad (son of Zilpah, Leah's slave). The standard of the camp—"the eldest son, was Reuben, the shepherd's son;" "rav! the Lord thy God is one Lord!" and its place in the march was second (Targum Pseudo-Jonathan [Numb. ii, 10-16]).

The Reubenites, like their relatives and neighbors on the journey, the Gadites, had maintained through the march to Canaan the ancient calling of their forefathers. The patriarchs were "feeding their flocks" at Shechem when Joseph was sold into Egypt. It was as men whose "trade had been about cattle from their youth" that they were presented to Pharaoh (Gen. xlv, 32, 34), and in the land of Goshen they settled "with their flocks and herds and all that they had" (ver. 32; xvii, 1). Their cattle accompanied them in their flight from Egypt (Exod. xii, 38): not a hoof was left behind; and there are frequent allusions to them on the journey (xxxiv, 9; Numb. xi, 22; Deut. vii, 13, etc.). But it would appear that the tribes who were destined to settle in the confined territory between the Mediterranean and the Jordan had, during the journey through the wilderness, fortunately relinquished that taste for the possession of cattle which they could not have maintained after their difference to the shepherds from the wide pastures of the wilderness. Thus the cattle had come into the hands of Reuben, Gad, and the half of Manasseh (Numb. xxxiii, 1), and it followed naturally that when the na-
tion arrived on the open downs east of the Jordan, the three tribes just named should prefer a request to their leader to allow them to remain in a place so perfectly suited to their requirements. The country east of Jordan does not appear to have been included in the original allotment to the Reubenites, and it was necessary that the land comprised, on the east and west, between the "coast of Jordan" and "the sea." But for the pusillanimity of the greater number of the tribes it would have been entered from the south (xiii, 30), and in that case the east of Jordan might never have been peopled by Israel at all. Accordingly, when the Reubenites and their allies approach Moses with their request, their main objection is that by what they propose they will discourage the hearts of the children of Israel from going over Jordan into the land which Jehovah had given them (xxxiii, 7). It is only on their undertaking to fulfill their part in the conquest of the western country, the land of Canaan proper, and thus satisfying him that their proposal was grounded in no selfish desire to escape a full share of the difficulties of the conquest, that Moses will consent to their proposal.

The "blessing" of Reuben by the departing lawgiver is a passage which has severely exercised translators and commentators. Strictly translated as they stand in the received Hebrew text, the words are as follows:

"Let Reuben live, and not die, let him not be a leper number." As to the first line there appears to be no doubt, but the second line has been interpreted in two exactly opposite ways. 1. By the Sept.,

"And let his men be many in number." This has the disadvantage that it is never employed elsewhere for a large number, but always for a small one (e.g. 1 Chron. xvi, 19; Job xvi, 22; Isa. x, 19; Ezek. xii, 16). 2. That of our own A.V.,

"And let not his men be few." Here the negative of the first line is presumed to convey its force to the second, though not there expressed. This is countenanced by the ancient Syriac version (Peshito) and the translations of Junius and Tremellius, and Schott and Winzer. It also has the important support of Gesenius (Thesaur., p. 968 a, and Pent. Sum., p. 44). It is, however, a very violent rendering. 3. A third and very ingenious interpretation is that adopted by the Veneto-Greek version, and also by Michaelis (Bibel für Unterricht, Text), which assumes that the vowel-points of the word פֶּן, "his men," should be altered to פֶּן, "his dead'"

"And let his dead be few"—as if in allusion to some recent mortality in the tribe, such as that in Simeon after the plague of Baal-peor. These interpretations, unless the last should prove to be the original reading, originate in the fact that the words in their naked sense convey a curse, and not a blessing. Fortunately, though differing widely in detail, they agree in general meaning. The benediction of the great leader goes out over the tribe which was about to separate itself from its brethren, in a fervent aspiration for its welfare through all the risks of that remote and trying situation. Both in this and the earlier blessing of Jacob, Reuben retains his place at the head of the family, and it must not be overlooked that the tribe, together with the two who associated themselves with it, actually received its inheritance before either Judah or Ephraim, to whom the birthright which Reuben had forfeited was transferred (1 Chron. vii, 1).

From this time it seems as if a bar, not only the material one of distance, and of the intervening river and mountain-wall, but also of difference in feeling and habits, gradually grew up more substantially between the Eastern and Western tribes. The first act of the former after the completion of the conquest, and after they had taken part in the solemn ceremonial in the valley between Ebal and Gerizim, shows how wide a gap already existed between their ideas and those of the Western tribes. The pile of stones which they erected on the western bank of the Jordan to mark their boundary-to testify to the fact that they were separated by the rushing river from their brethren and the country in which Jehovah had fixed the place where he would be worshipped, they had still a right to return to it for his worship—was erected in accordance with the unalterable habits of Bedouin tribes both before and since. It was an act identical with that in which Laban and Jacob engaged at parting, with that which is constantly performed by the Bedouin of the present day. But the Israelites west of Jordan, who were fast relinquishing their nomad habits and feelings for those of more settled permanent life, this act was completely misunderstood, and was construed into an attempt to set up a rival altar to that of the sacred tent. The incompatibility of the idea to the mind of the Western Israelites is shown by the fact that, notwithstanding the disclaimer and a most extraordinary and a not surprisingly that disclaimer having proved satisfactory even to Phinehas, the author of Joshua xxii retains the name midbar for the pile, a word which involves the idea of sacrifice—i.e. of slaughter (see Genesis, Thesaur., p. 402)—instead of applying to it the term "qalum," as is done in the case (Gen. xvi, 30) of the precisely similar "heap of witness." Another Reubenitish erection, which long kept up the memory of the presence of the tribe on the west of Jordan, was the stone of Bahan ben-Reuben which formed a landmark on the boundary between Judah and Benjamin (Josh. xv, 6). This was a single stone (Eben), not a pile, and it appears to have stood somewhere on the road from Bethany to Jericho, not far from the ruined khaneh so well known to travellers.

The doom, "they shall not excel," was exactly fulfilled in the destinies of the tribe descended from Reuben, which makes no figure in the Hebrew history, and never produced any eminent person. No judge, no prophet, no hero of the tribe of Reuben is handed down to us, unless it be "Adina the Reubenite, a captain of the Reubenites, and thirty with him" (1 Chron. xi, 42). In the dire extremity of their brethren in the days under Deborah and Barak, they contented themselves with debating the news among the streams (328) of the Mishor. The distant distress of his brethren could not move Reuben: he lingered among his sheepfolds, and preferred the shepherd's pipe and the bleating of the flocks to the clanging of the trumpet and the turmoil of battle. His individuality fades more rapidly than Gad's. The elevation of Gadites to a seat on the border at its highest, to join the son of Jesse in his trouble (1 Chron. xii, 8-15); Barzillai; Elijah the Gileadite; the siege of Ramoth-gilead, with its picturesque incidents—all give a substantial reality to the tribe and country of Gad. But no person, no incident, is recorded to place Reuben before us in any one distinctly. The benediction of the great leader goes out over the tribe which was about to separate itself from its brethren, in a fervent aspiration for its welfare through all the risks of that remote and trying situation. Both in this and the earlier blessing of Jacob, Reuben retains his place at the head of the family, and it must not be overlooked that the tribe, together with the two who associated themselves with it, actually received its inheritance before either Judah or Ephraim, to whom the birthright which Reuben had forfeited was transferred (1 Chron. vii, 1).

From this time it seems as if a bar, not only the material one of distance, and of the intervening river and mountain-wall, but also of difference in feeling and habits, gradually grew up more substantially between the Eastern and Western tribes. The first act of the former after the completion of the conquest, and after they had taken part in the solemn ceremonial in the valley between Ebal and Gerizim, shows how wide a gap already existed between their ideas and those of the Western tribes. The pile of stones which they erected on the western bank of the Jordan to mark their boundary—to testify to the fact that they were separated by the rushing river from their brethren and the country in which Jehovah had fixed the place where he would be worshipped, they had still a right to return to it for his worship—was erected in accordance with the unalterable habits of Bedouin tribes both before and since. It was an act identical with that in which Laban and Jacob engaged at parting, with that which is constantly performed by the Bedouin of the present day. But the Israelites west of Jordan, who were fast relinquishing their nomad habits and feelings for those of more settled permanent life, this act was completely misunderstood, and was construed into an attempt to set up a rival altar to that of the sacred tent. The incompatibility of the idea to the mind of the Western Israelites is shown by the fact that, notwithstanding the disclaimer and a most extraordinary and a not
of the national government and of the national religion, it is not to be wondered at that Reuben relinquished the faith of Jehovah. “They went after the gods of the people of the land whom God destroyed before them,” and we hear little more of them till the time of Hazael, king of Syria, who ravaged and for a time held possession of their country (2 Kings x, 33). The last historical notice which we possess of them, while it records this fact, records also its natural consequence, that the Reubenites and Gadites and the half-tribe of Manasseh were carried off by Pulu and Togiti-puliser, and placed in the districts on and about the river Khabour, in the upper part of Mesopotamia—“in Halah, and Habor, and Hara, and the river Gozan” (1 Chron. v. 26).

The following is a list of all the Biblical localities in the tribe of Reuben, with their probable identifications. For the boundaries, see Trube.

Abarim. MOUNTAINA. El Belka.
Almon-diblathaim. TOWN. [N. of Diblaih?]
Arnon. RIVER. Moab.
Aror. TOWN. Moab.
Asheeth-plagha. TOWN. See Pisgah.
Ataroth. TOWN. Atrakas.
Baal-meon. TOWN. [Main.]
Baihith. TOWN. See Baal-Meon.
Bamoth (baal). [Hill of Misgab?]
Beerothaim. Well. [Ou-Ab-Shadad?]
Beon. TOWN. See Bela-Meon.
Beth-baal-meon. TOWN. See Baal-Meon.
Bib-lathaim. TOWN. See Bela-Diblathaim.
Beth-jeshitha. TOWN. Brit-Jeshimoth.
Beth-meon. TOWN. See Baal-Meon.
Beth-helek. Temple. [N. W. of Hebron?]
Bezer. TOWN. [Bezerim?]
Dibon (or Dimon). TOWN. Dibon.
Elishah. TOWN. El-Att.
Heshbon. TOWN. Heshbon.
Habza. TOWN. [Khaz-e-Sheba?]
Kedemoth. TOWN. Kedemoth.
Kiriathaim. TOWN. Kerioth.
Lath. TOWN. See Ersin-neri.
Mahanaim. TOWN. [In plain Ard Ramsan?]
Medeba. TOWN. Medeba.
Mephaath. TOWN. [Pem el-Wela?]
Mephaath. TOWN. Mephath.
Minnith. TOWN. Minnath.
Nahal. TOWN. See Hamath.
Nahal. TOWN. [N. of Wady Maleh?]
Nebo. TOWN. Neba.
Nophah. TOWN. [El-Halil?]
Plagath. TOWN. See Nemo.
Shechem Shebam. TOWN. [Es-Samack?]
Zarefat-hazarah. TOWN. [Pile on of Medeba?]

The country allotted to the Reubenites extended on the south to the river Arnon, which divided it from the Moabites (Josh. xiii, 8, 16); on the east it touched the desert of Arabia; on the west were the Dead Sea and the Jordan. The northern border was probably marked by a line running eastward from the Jordan through Wady Hesban (vers. 17-21; Num. xxxii, 37, 38). This country had originally been conquered and occupied by the Moabites; but they were driven out a short time before the Exodus by Sihon, king of the Amorites, who was in his turn expelled by the Israelites (Deut. ii; Numb. xxxi, 22-31). Immediately after the captivity the Moabites again returned to their old country and occupied their old cities. This is the reason why, in the later prophets, many of the cities of Reuben are embraced in the curses pronounced upon Moab (Jer. xlviii). The territory was divided into sections—the western declivities towards the Dead Sea and the Jordan valley, which were steep, rugged, and bare, with the little section of Jordan (called in Scripture “the plains of Moab”) [Numb. xxii. 1] as their base; and the high table-land stretching from the summit of the ridge away towards Arabia. The latter, from its even surface, as contrasted with the rocky soil of Western Palestine, received from the accursed sacred writers the appropriate name Mahes (q. v.). Under its modern name of the Belka it is still esteemed beyond all others by the Arab shepherds. It is well watered, covered with smooth, short turf, and losing itself gradually in those limitless wastes which have always been, and always will be, the favorite resort of pastoral nomad tribes. The whole region is now deserted; there is not a single settled inhabitant within its borders. Its great cities, mostly bearing their ancient names, are heaps of ruins. The wild wandering tribes of the desert visit it periodically to feed their flocks and herds on its rich pastures and to drink the waters of its fountains and cisterns. See Burchhardt, Travel in Syria, p. 365 sq.; Irby and Mangles, Travels, p. 460 sq.; Porter, Hand-book for Syria, p. 298 sq.

REUBENITE (Heb. with the art. ha- Reubeni; אַבְנַי the numerous in the plural, occasionalled as such Poabiy or Peobey, a descendant of Reuben (Numb. xxxii. 1, etc.).

Reuchlin, Johann von, an eminent German scholar, who adopted the Grecized name of Copernicus, was born at Pforzheim in 1454. After serving in different political functions, he became, in 1520, professor of Greek and Hebrew at Ingolstadt, whence he removed to Tubingen, thence to Stuttgart, where he died, Dec. 28, 1521. Besides his memorable services in connection with classical literature and general culture, he may be regarded as the principal promoter of the study of Hebrew in his day. He published a Hebrew grammar and lexicon under the title Ad Dionysium Fratrem suam de Judaica Hebraica Libri III (s. l. 1506, 4to), of which an improved edition, under the auspices of the Seh. Minster, appeared in 1537 (Basel, fol.). Reuchlin wrote also De Aesculapio et Orthographia Ling. Heb. (Hagenau, 1518, 4to).

REL'EL (Heb. Reuel, רְאוּל, friend of God; Sept. 'Pawon'; A. V. Roygut (Numb. x. 29)), the name of three or four men.

1. A son of Esau by Bashemath (Gen. xxxvi. 4, 10; 1 Chron. i, 55, 57); his four sons (Gen. xxxvi. 15) were princes, i.e. chiefs of the Edomites (ver. 17). B.C. post 366. See ESAY.

2. A Midianitish priest and nomadic herdsmen in the wilderness, to whom Moses fled from Egypt, and whose daughter Zipporah he married (Exod. xi, 16 sq.); but in Exod. iii, 1, iv, 18, 19, it is called the law of Moses and, in i, 1, is made priest and herdsmen. Various methods are suggested for meeting the difficulty: (1.) Josephus (Anti. ii, 12, 1) considers Reuel and Jethro as two names of one man. So Lengerke (Kemana, 1, 325) and Bertheau (Israel. Gesch. p. 242). (2.) Aben-Ezra, followed by Joseph, understands Jethro as father in Exod. ii, 18, grandfather. (3.) Edward (Iscr. Gesch. i, 14) thinks “Jethro son of” has fallen out of the text before Reuel in Exod. iii, 18. (4.) Ranke (Penat. i, 8) understands the word chodim, כּוֹדִים, rendered father-in-law, to mean brother-in-law, and compares the ambiguous use of the word γαῖρος. We must suppose that Jethro had succeeded in the priesthood and became of his deceased father (Exod. iii, 1). (5.) Others find a
double genealogical tradition (Hartmann, Pestaloz. p. 229 sq.; comp. De Wette, Einleit. ins A. T. p. 196). On this supposition, no. 2. The fourth supposition is forced. If we decide for any particular view, it seems simplest to understand grandson for father (Exod. ii, 18); since Reuel was the father of the house until Jethro acquired independence. See Horab: Ra-
guel.

2. Father of Eliashaph, the leader of the tribe of Gad at the time of the census at Sinai (Num. ii, 14). In the parallel passages (i. 14; vii. 42, 47; x. 20) the name is given Deuril (q. v.).

3. Son of Ithuba, father of Shephatiah (1 Chron. ix, 8), of the tribe of Benjamin. B.C. ante 1618.

Reth'mah (Heb. Re'ithmah), יִרְתָּם, elevated [Ge-
men.,] or peari [Fürst.; Sept. Pe'eri], a concubine of Na
dav, Abraham's brother; and by him mother of
Tebah and others (Gen. xxii, 24). B.C. cir. 2040.

Reuss, René VON (Countess), a German hym-
nist, was born at Ebersdorf Dec. 15, 1695, where she also
died. Aug. 1, 1751. She was a sister of count Henry
XXIX of Reuss-Ebersdorf, and of the countess Erdmuth
Dorothea, wife of count von Zinzendorf. She was a
great poetess, and by her hymnody, which has been
translated into English: Komm Sejen aus der Höhe
(Engl. transl. in Sacred Lyrics from the German,
p. 155, “Attend, O Lord, my daily toil.” (B. P.)

ReuterdaI, Henrik, a Swedish Protestant di-
vine, was born in 1759 at Malmö, in Sweden. He
studied at Lund, and in 1817 commenced lecturing as “pri-
vat docent” of theology. In 1818 he was made adjunct to
the theological faculty, in 1820 prefect of the semi-
nary, in 1827 member of the chapter, in 1828 librarian,
and in 1844 professor of theology at Lund. In 1852 he
was appointed state-councillor and head of the depart-
ment for religious matters, which position he occupied
until 1855, when he was made bishop of Lund, and in 1856
archbishop of Upsala. He died in 1870. He wrote:
On the Study of Theology (Lund, 1834):—Introduction
to Theology (ibid. 1837):—History of the Swedish Church
(ibid. 1858-63, 3 vols.). Besides, he also published
since 1828 the Queristologische Quartalblitter, and continued
the Appendix ad Historiam Suedo-Gothicum,
commenced by Céleb: His De Fontibus Historiae Ecclesiasti-
cae Suecianae, published in 1826, in 4 pts., is of great
value. See Winer, Handbuch der theologischen
Literatur, i. 885, 892, ii, 730, Zachold, Bibl. Theol. ii,
1829 sq. (B. P.)

Reval-Estonian Version of the Scriptures.
This version, which is used by the inhabitants of the
north of Livonia, including the three adjacent islands of
Ösel, Daggen (or Dagoie), and Mohn, was first print-
ed at Reval in 1739, and partly published at the expense
of the celebrated count Zinzendorf. In 1815, through
the exertions of the Society for the propagation of the
British and Foreign Bible Society, an edition of 10,000
copies of the New Test., was printed. Prior to 1824 the
Russian Bible Society published 5100 copies of the Old
Test., and some recent editions have been issued at
Dorpat. Of late the American Bible Society has un-
dertaken the publication of the whole Bible in the Re-
val-Estonian, now printing at Berlin, which is proba-
bly now ready, having the previous year (1876) issued
an edition of 20,000 copies of the New Test., with
the Psalms, in 12mo. We subjoin the Lord's Prayer in that
dialect from Dalton: Das Gebet des Herrn in den Sprachen
Russlanda, p. 65: "Meie iza, kes sa olet teesaw, pihit-
setud sagu sinu nimi, sinu rik tulgu, sina tahtmine
stindiga ku teesaw nenda kää mä peal; meje ignipie-
wane leja anna meje täna päeva; ja anna andeks meje
mej wölad, kui kää mejme andeks anname oma wögla-
tele; ja isä sada meid meitse kiiaotsuate naise, wael pe-
naa meid ära sa järeli rik, ja wäig ja
350 sq.; Dalton, Das Gebet des Herrn in den Sprachen
Russlanda, p. 25 sq., 65; Annual Reports of the Ameri-
can Bible Society, 1876, 1877. (B. P.)

Revelation (dróorduakS), a disclosure of some-
thing that has been unknown; and divine revelation
is the direct communication of truths before unknown
from God to men. The disclosure may be made by
dream, vision, oral communication, or otherwise (Dan.
ii, 19: 1 Cor. xiv, 26; 2 Cor. xii, 1; Gal. i, 12; Rev. 1).
Revelation here that is how it should be confounded.
The former refers to those things only of which the sa-
cred writers were ignorant before they were divinely
taught, while the latter has a more general meaning.
Accordingly revelation may be defined that operation
of the Holy Spirit by which truths which were unknown
are communicated to men; and inspiration, the opera-
tion of the Holy Spirit by which not only unknown truths
are communicated, but by which also men are excited
to publish truths for the instruction of others, and are
guarded from all error in doing it. Thus it was revealed
to the ancients that the Messiah should appear, and they
were inspired to publish the fact for the benefit of others.
The affecting scenes at the cross of Christ were not revealed to John, for he saw them with his own eyes (John xix, 35); but he was inspired to write
thereof in the Apocalypse. The acts of a priori revelation
were kept from all error in his record. It is therefore
ture, as the apostle affirms, that every part of the Bible is
given by inspiration of God (2 Tim. iii, 16), though
every part of the Bible is not the result of immediate
revelation. For convenience' sake, we call the whole
Bible a revelation from God, because most of the truths
it contains were made known by direct communication
from God, and could have been discovered in no other
way; and generally it is only the incidental circum-
stances attending the communication of these truths
that would be ascertained by the writers in the ordinary
modes of obtaining information.

Concerning a divine revelation, we remark that, 1.
It is possible. God may, for aught we know, think
proper to make known to his creatures what they before
were ignorant of; and, as a Being of infinite power, he
cannot be at a loss for means of communication. 2. It is
desirable; for while reason is necessary to examine
the matter of revelation, it is incapable, unsolved, of
finding out God. 3. It is necessary; for without it we
can attain to no certain knowledge of God, of Christ,
and of salvation. 4. Revelation must, therefore, be
sufficiently marked with internal and external evi-
dences. These the Bible has. 5. Its contents must be
agreeable to reason. Not that everything revealed
must be within the range of reason; but this may be
true, and yet there be no contradiction. To calm dis-
passionate reason there is nothing in doctrine, com-
mand, warning, promises, or threatening which is op-
posed thereto. 6. It must be credible; and we find
the facts of Scripture supported by abundant evidence
from reason and fact. 7. Revelation is also inspira-
tion; for it impressively bears the prevailing impress of the circumstances and
tastes of the times and nations in which it was originally
given. The Bible, however, though it bears the dis-
tinct impress of Asiatic manners, as it should do, is most
remarkable for rising above all local and temporary pe-
cularities, and setting on the great principles common
to human nature under all circumstances; thus showing
that as it is intended for universal benefit, so will it be
made known to all mankind. The language of the Bi-
ble is the language of men, otherwise it would not be a
divine revelation from men to men; and it is the same
means and according to the same laws by which all
other human language is understood. It is addressed
to the common-sense of men, and common-sense is to
be consulted in its interpretation.
In a narrower sense, "revelation" is used to express the manifestation of Jesus Christ to Jews and Gentiles (Luke ii, 32); the manifestation of the glory with which God will glorify his elect and faithful servants at the last judgment (Rom. vii, 19), and the declaration of his just judgments in the conduct of the world, and to bring them to the rebuke (ii, 9-16). There is a very noble application of the word revelation to the consummation of all things, or the revelation of Jesus Christ in his future glory (I Cor. i, 7; I Pet. i, 13), see Brown, Compendium of Natural and Revealed Religion: With Prolegomena, by Bickersteth. Revelation Examined; Ellis, On Divine Things; Fuller, Works: Horne, Introduction: Leland, Necessity of Revelation: View of Desistical Writers. See Inspiration; Miracol: Prophecy.

I. Revelation, Book of. This last of the books of the New Testament, according to their usual arrangement, is entitled in the A. V. "The Revelation (Αποκάλυψης, Apocalypse) of [St.] John the Divine (τοῦ Θεολόγου);" but in Codices Alex., Sinait., and Ephr. Recp. it is simply Αποκάλυψης Ιωάννου; and in Cod. Vind. it takes the fuller and more explicit form of Αποκάλυψης Ιωάννου Θεολόγου και Εὐαγγελιστοῦ, thus clearly identifying the author with the writer of the fourth gospel. The true and authoritative title of the book, however, is that which it bears in its own name, without the addition of the Θεολόγου. This has been restored by Tregelles in his critical edition of 1844, and which has been adopted by most of the critical authorities and versions since.

2. Canonical Authority and Authorship.—These two points are intimately connected with each other. If it can be proved that a book, claiming so distinctly as this does the authority of divine inspiration, was actually written by John, then no doubt will be entertained as to its title to a place in the canon of Scripture. We must be justified, then, in the title to the Revelation? This question was first mooted by Dionysius of Alexandria (Eusebius, H. E. vii, 25). The doubt which he modestly suggested has been confidently proclaimed in modern times by Luther (Vorrede auf die Offenbarung, 1522 and 1554), and widely diffused through his influence. Lutke (Einleitung, p. 802), the most learned and diligent of modern critics of the Revelation, agrees with a majority of the eminent scholars of Germany in denying that John was the author. But however bold the belief of the mass of ostensible Christians in all ages has been in favor of John's authorship.

1. Evidence in Favor of the Apostolic Authorship.—This consists of the assertions of the author and historical tradition.

(i.) The author's description of himself in the first and twenty-second chapters is certainly equivalent to an assertion that he is the apostle. (a) He names himself simply John, without prefix or addition—a name which at that period, and in Asia, must have been taken by every Christian as the designation, in the first instance, of the great apostle whom he dwelt at Ephesus. Doubtless there were other John's among the Christians at that time, but only arrogance or an intention to deceive could account for the assumption of this simple style by any other writer. He is also described as (b) a servant of Christ, (c) one who had borne testimony as an eye-witness of the word of God and of the testimony of Christ—terms which were surely designed to identify him with the writer of the verses John xix, 35; i, 14; and i John 1, 2. He is (d) in Patmos for the word of God and the testimony of Jesus Christ: it may be easy to suppose that other Christians of the same name were banished thither, but the apostle is the only John who is distinctly named in early history as an exile at Patmos. He is also (e) a fellow-sufferer with those whom he addresses, and (f) the authorized channel of the most direct and important communication that was ever made to the seven churches of Asia, of which church---
there is very little to weigh against them. (a) Justin Martyr (cir. A.D. 150) says: "A man among us whose name was John, one of the apostles of Christ, in a revelation which was made to him, prophesied that the believers in our Christ shall live a thousand years in Jerusalem" (Tryph. § 81, p. 179, ed. Ben.). (b) The author of the 2nd Fragment of Eusebius (cit. John vi. 26) mentions this among the books of Melito which had come to his knowledge; and as he carefully records objections against the apostle's authorship, it may be fairly presumed, notwithstanding the doubts of Klenker and Lucic (Eisdeu. p. 614), that Eusebius found no doubt as to John's authorship in the book of this ancient Asiatic bishop. (c) Theophilus, bishop of Antioch (cir.180), in a controversy with Hermogenes, quotes passages out of the Revelation of John (Eusebius, H. E. iv. 24). (d) Ireneus (cir. 150), apparently never having heard of any other authorship of the Apocalypse, often quotes the Revelation as the work of John. In iv. 20, § 11, he describes John the writer of the Revelation as the same who was leaping on Jesus' bosom at supper, and asked him who should betray him. The testimony as to the authorship of Revelation as, perhaps, more important than that of any other writer: it mounts up into the preceding generation, and is virtually that of a contemporary of the apostle. For in v. 30, § 1, where he indicates the true reading (666) of the number of the Beast, he cites in support of it, not only the old copies of the Septuagint, but also the oral testimony of the very persons who themselves had seen John face to face. It is obvious that Ireneus's reference for information on such a point to those contemporaries of John implies his undoubting belief that the writer was himself, viewed as the writer of the book. Lucic (p. 574) suggests that this view was possibly groundless because it was entertained before the learned fathers of Alexandria had set the example of historical criticism. But his suggestion scarcely weakens the force of the fact that such was the belief of Asia, and it appears a strange suggestion when we remember that the critical discretion of the Alexandrians, to whom he refers, led them to coincide with Ireneus in his view. (f) Apollonius (cir. 200) of Ephesus (?), in controversy with the Montanists of Phrygia, quotes passages of the Revelation of John, and bears witness to a miracle wrought by John at Ephesus (Euseb. H. E. v. 18). (g) Clement of Alexandria (cir. 200) quotes the book as the Revelation of John (Stromata, v. 13, p. 657), and as the work of an apostle (Pard. ii. 12, p. 207). (A) Tertullian (A.D. 207), in at least one place, quotes by name "the apostle John in the Apocalypse" (Ad. Marcion. iii. 14). (i) Hippolytus (cir. 230) is said, in the inscription on his statue at Rome, to have composed an apology for the Apocalypse and Gospel of St. John the apostle. He quotes it as the work of John (De Arian. §§ 86, p. 756, ed. Migne). (J) Orig. (cir. 233), in his commentary on John, quoted by Eusebius (H. E. vi. 25), says of the apostle, "he wrote also the Revelation." The testimonies of later writers, in the 3d and 4th centuries, in favor of John's authorship of the Revelation are equally distinct and far more numerous. They may be seen quoted at length in Luccic, p. 628-638, or in dean Alford's Prolegomena (N. T. vol. iv. pt. ii). It may suffice here to say that they include the names of Victorinus, Methodius, Ephrem Syrus, Eiph. Phraim, Hilary, Athanasius, Gregory, Didymus, Ambrose, Augustine, and Jerome. All the foregoing writers, testifying that the book came from an apostle, believed that it was a part of Holy Scripture. But many whose extant works cannot be quoted for testimony to the authorship of the book refer to it as possessing canonical authority. Thus (c) Papias, who is described by Ireneus as a hearer of John and friend of Polycarp, is cited, together with other writers, by Andreas of Cappadocia, in his commentary on the Revelation, as a guarantee to later ages of the divine inspiration of the book (Iouth, Rel. Sacr. i. 15; Cramer, Catech. [Oxford, 1840], p. 170). The value of Papias's testimony is weakened by the controversy to which it has given rise, in which Lucic, Bleeck, Hengstenberg, and Rettig have taken different parts. (b) In the epistle from the churches of Lyons and Vienne, A.D. 177, inserted in Eusebius, H. E. v. 1-3, sections 1-10 are quoted or referred to in the same way as passages of books whose canonical authority is unquestioned. (c) Cyprian (Ep. 10, 12, 14, 19, ed. Fell) repeatedly quotes it as a part of canonical Scripture. Chrysostom makes no distinct allusion to it in any extant writing; but we are informed by Sozomen that he received it as canonical. Although omitted (perhaps as not adapted for public reading in church) from the list of canonical books in the Council of Laodicea, it was admitted into the list of the third Council of Carthage, A.D. 397.
he did not understand how John could write in the style in which the Revelation is written, he yet knew of no authority for attributing it, as he desired to attribute it, to some other of the numerous persons who bore the name of John.

A weightier difficulty arises from the fact that the Revelation is one of the books which are absent from the ancient Peshito version, and the only trustworthy evidence in favor of its reception by the ancient Syrian Church is a single quotation which is adduced from the Syriac version of the Apocalypse of Eusebius. Eusebius it is remarkably sparing in his quotations from the "Revelation of John," and the uncertainty of his opinion about it is best shown by his statement in H. E. iii. 89, that "it is likely that the Revelation was seen by the second John (the Ephesian presbyter), if any one is unwilling to believe that it was seen by the apostle." See John The Presbyter. Jerome states (Ep. ad Dardanum, etc.) that the Greek churches felt, with respect to the Revelation, a similar doubt to that of the Latins respecting the Epsilite to the Hebrews. Neither nor his equally influential contemporary Augustine shared such doubts. Cyril of Jerusalem, Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Theodoret abstained from making use of the book, sharing it, it is possible, the doubts to which Jerome refers. But they have not gone so far as to express any opinion upon the point of whether it is a genuine book. Eusebius and writers is the latest evidence of any importance that has been adduced against the overwhelming weight of the testimony in favor of the canonical authority and authorship of this book. See Canon of Scripture.

II. Time and Place of Writing. — The date of the Revelation is given by the great majority of critics as A.D. 95-97. The weighty testimony of Ireneus is almost sufficient to prevent any other conclusion. He says (Ad. Haer. v. 30, § 3), "It [i.e., the Revelation] was seen no very long time ago, but almost in our own generation, by John the son of Domitian." The silence of the first three centuries. The date of the Revelation is given by the great majority of critics as A.D. 95-97. The weighty testimony of Ireneus is almost sufficient to prevent any other conclusion. He says (Ad. Haer. v. 30, § 3), "It [i.e., the Revelation] was seen no very long time ago, but almost in our own generation, by John the son of Domitian." The silence of the first three centuries.

Unsupported by any historical evidence, some commentators have put forth the conjecture that the Revelation was written as early as the time of Nero. This is not supported by the evidence from the contents of the book. It is difficult to see in the passages i. 7; i. 9; III. 9; vi. 12, 16; xi. 42, anything which would lead necessarily to the conclusion that Jerusalem was in a prosperous condition, and that the predictions of its fall had not been fulfilled when those verses were written. A more weighty argument in favor of an early date might be urged from a modern interpretation of xi. 10, if that interpretation could be established. Galba is alleged to be the sixth king, the one that "is." In Nero these interpreters see the beast that was wounded (xiii. 3), the beast that was and is not (xvi. 8), the beast "that was and is not, and is and is about to come" (xiv. 11), in the name of Nero the Roman populace believed that he was not dead, but had fled into the East, whence he would return and regain his throne; and these interpreters venture to suggest that the writer of the Revelation shared and meant to express the absurd popular delusion. Even the ability of his critics (Theo. i. 448), by way of supporting this interpretation, advances his untenable claim to the first discovery of the name of Nero Caesar in the number of the beast, 666. The inconsistency of this interpretation with prophetic analogy, with the context of Revelation, and with the fact that the book is of divine origin, is pointed out by Hengstenberg, in an end of his Commentary on ch. xxxii., and by Elliott, Her. Apoc. iv. 547.

It has been inferred from i. 2, 9, 10, that the Revelation was written in Ephesus; immediately after the apostle's return from Patmos. But the text is scarcely sufficient to support this conclusion. The style in which the messages to the seven churches are delivered rather suggests the notion that the book was written in Patmos. See John The Apostle.

III. Language. — The thought first suggested by Hengstenberg, that the Revelation was written in Aramaic, has met with little or no reception. The silence of all ancient writers as to any Aramaic original is alone sufficient answer to the suggestion. Lücke (Eischr. p. 441) has collected internal evidence to show that the original is the Greek of a Jewish Christian.

Lücke has also (p. 448-454) examined in minute detail, after the preceding labors of Donker-Curtius, Vogel, Winer, Ewald, Klothoff, and Hitzig, the peculiarities of language which obviously distinguish the Revelation from every other book of the New Testament. In subsequent times it has been found that the difference between the Revelation, on one side, and the fourth Gospel and first Epistle, on the other, in respect of their style and composition and the mental character and attainments of the writer of each, Hengstenberg, in a dissertation addressed to his Commentary, maintains that they are by one writer. That the anomalies and peculiarities of the Revelation have been greatly exaggerated by some critics is sufficiently shown by Hitzig's plausible and ingenious, though unsuccessful, attempt to prove the identity of style and diction in the Revelation and the Gospel of John. But it is much to be feared that the Revelation has many surprising grammatical peculiarities. But much of this is accounted for by the fact that it was probably written down, as it was seen, "in the spirit," while the ideas, in all their novelty and vastness, filled the apostle's mind, and rendered him less capable of attending to forms of speech. His Gospel and Epistles, on the other hand, were composed equally under divine influence, but an influence of a gentler, more ordinary kind, with much care, after long deliberation, after frequent recollection and recital of the facts, and deep pondering of the teaching of Jesus obscure and in later authorities say that John was banished under Nero.

Unsupportd by any historical evidence, some commentators have put forth the conjecture that the Revelation was written as early as the time of Nero. This is not supported by the evidence from the contents of the book. It is difficult to see in the passages i. 7; i. 9; iii. 9; vi. 12, 16; xi. 42, anything which would lead necessarily to the conclusion that Jerusalem was in a prosperous condition, and that the predictions of its fall had not been fulfilled when those verses were written. A more weighty argument in favor of an early date might be urged from a modern interpretation of xi. 10, if that interpretation could be established. Galba is alleged to be the sixth king, the one that "is." In Nero these interpreters see the beast that was wounded (xiii. 3), the beast that was and is not (xvi. 8), the beast "that was and is not, and is and is about to come" (xiv. 11), in the name of Nero the Roman populace believed that he was not dead, but had fled into the East, whence he would return and regain his throne; and these interpreters venture to suggest that the writer of the Revelation shared and meant to express the absurd popular delusion. Even the ability of his critics (Theo. i. 448), by way of supporting this interpretation, advances his untenable claim to the first discovery of the name of Nero Caesar in the number of the beast, 666. The inconsistency of this interpretation with prophetic analogy, with the context of Revelation, and with the fact that the book is of divine origin, is pointed out by Hengstenberg, in an end of his Commentary on ch. xxxii., and by Elliott, Her. Apoc. iv. 547.

IV. Contents. — A full analysis of the book would involve much that is disputed as to its interpretation. We therefore content ourselves with a few general observations, with the results which the main visions are specified.
The first three verses contain the title of the book, the description of the writer, and the blessing pronounced on the readers, which possibly, like the last two verses of the fourth gospel, may be an addition by the hand of inspired survivors of the writer. John begins (i. 1) by signing from the seven churches of Asia. This, coming before the announcement that he was in the spirit, looks like a dedication not merely of the first vision, but of all the book, to those churches. In the next five verses (i. 2-9) he touches the key-note of the whole following book, the great fundamental ideas; though all our accounts of the great church of the world and the church are built—the person of Christ; the redemption wrought by him; his second coming to judge mankind; the painful, hopeful discipline of Christians in the midst of this present world; thoughts which may well be supposed to have been uppermost in the mind of the persecuted and exiled apostle even before the divine inspiration came on him. a. The first vision, (i. 7-iii, 22) shows the Son of Man with his injunction, or epistles to the seven churches. While the apostle is pondering those great truths and the critical conditions of his church, that church has left a Divine Person resembling those seen by Ezekiel and Daniel, and identified by name and by description as Jesus, appears to John, and, with the discriminating authority of a son and judge, reviews the state of those churches, comes to a decision as to their several characters, and takes occasion from them to speak to all Christians who may desire similar encouragement or similar condemnation. Each of these sentences, spoken by the Son of Man, is described as said by the Spirit. Hitherto the apostle has been speaking primarily, though not exclusively, to some of his own contemporaries concerning the present events and circumstances. Henceforth he ceases to address them particularly. His words are for the ear of the universal Church in all ages, and show the significance of things which we now see as hope or fear, in sorrow or in joy, to Christians everywhere. b. In the next vision (iv. 1-viii, 1), Patmos and the Divine Person whom he saw are gone. Only the trumpet sound is heard again calling him to a change of place. He is in the highest court of heaven, and sees God sitting on his throne. The seven-sealed book or roll is produced, and the slain lamb, the Redeemer, receives it amid the sound of universal adoration. As the seals are opened in order, the apostle sees (1) a conqueror on a white horse; (2) a red horse, and a terrible disease; (3) a black horse of death; (4) the cager souls of martyrs under the altar; (5) an earthquake, with universal commotion and terror. After this there is a pause, the course of avenging angels is checked while 144,000, the children of Israel, servants of God, are sealed, and an innumerable multitude of the redeemed of all nations are seen worshipping God. Next (7) the seventh seal is opened, and half an hour’s silence in heaven ensues. c. Then (viii, 2-xxi, 19) seven angels appear with trumpets, the four horses of the岁以上 is struck with fire from the altar, and the seven trumpets are sounded. (1) The earth, and (2) the sea, and (3) the springs of water, and (4) the heavenly bodies are successively smitten; (5) a plague of locusts afflicts the men who are not sealed (the first woe); (6) the third part of men are slain (the second woe); but the rest are impotent. Then there is a pause: a mighty angel with a book appears and cries out; seven thunders sound, but their words are not recorded; the approaching completion of the mystery of God is announced; the angel binds the apostle to the book, and describes its prophecies with its worshippers, and the outer court given up to the Gentiles; the two witnesses of God, their martyrdom, resurrection, ascension, are foretold. The approach of the third woe is announced, and (7) the seventh trumpet is sounded, the reign of Christ is proclaimed. God has taken his great power, the time has come for judgment and for the destruction of the destroyers of the earth. The three preceding visions are distinct from one another. Each of the last two, like the longer one which follows, has the appearance of a distinct prophecy, reaching far beyond the range of the seven churches of Asia. This second half of the Revelation (ch. xii-xvii) comprises a series of visions which are connected by various links. It may be described generally as a prophecy of the assaults of the devil and his agents (i.e. the dragon, the ten-horned beast, the two-horned beast or false prophet, and the harlot upon the Church and their final destruction. It appears to begin with a reference to events anterior, not only to those which are predicted in the preceding chapter, but also to the time in which it was written. It seems hard to interpret the birth of the child as a prediction, and not as a retrospective illusion. d. A woman (ch. xii) clothed with the sun is seen in heaven, and a great red dragon with seven crowned heads stands waiting to devour her offspring; her child is caught up into God, and the mother flees into the wilderness for 1260 days. The dragon, and her seed on earth by the dragon is described as the consequence of a war in heaven which the dragon was overcome and cast out upon the earth. The Revelator (ch. xiii), standing on the sea-shore, sees a beast with seven heads and ten horns, and ten crown horns, rising from the water, the representative of the dragon. All the world wonders at and worships him, and he attacks the saints and prevails. He is followed by another two-horned beast rising out of the earth, who compels men to wear the mark of the beast, whose number is 666. Next (ch. xiv) the lamb is seen with 144,000 standing on Mount Zion, learning the song of praise of the heavenly host. Three angels fly forth calling men to worship God, proclaiming the fall of Babylon, denouncing the worshippers of the beast. A blessing is pronounced on the faithful dead, and the judgment of the world is described under the image of a harvest reaped by angels. John (ch. xv, xvi) sees in heaven the saints who had overcome the beast, singing the song of Moses and the Lamb. Then seven angels come out of the heavenly temple having seven vials of wrath, which they pour out upon the earth, sea, rivers, sun, the seat of the beast, Euphrates, and the air, after which there is a great earthquake and a hail-storm. One (ch. xvi, xvi) sees last seven angels carry John into the wilderness and shows him a harlot, Babylon, sitting on a scarlet beast with seven heads and ten horns. She is explained to be that great city, sitting upon seven mountains, reigning over the kings of the earth. Afterwards John sees a vision of the destruction of Babylon, portrayed as the burning of a great city amid the lamentations of worldly men and the rejoicing of saints. Afterwards (ch. xix) the worshippers in heaven are heard celebrating Babylon’s fall and the approaching marriage-supper of the Lamb. The Word of God is seen going forth to war at the head of the heavenly armies: the beast and his false prophet are taken and cast into the burning lake, and their worshippers are slain. An angel (xx-xxi, 5) binds the dragon, i.e. the devil, for one thousand years, while the martyred saints who had not worshipped the beast reign with Christ. Then the devil is loosed, gathers a host against the camp of the saints, but is overcome by fire from heaven, and is cast into the burning lake with the beast and false prophet. John then witnesses the process of destruction of the temple of the great harlot, and describes the new heaven and the new earth, and the new Jerusalem, with its people and their way of life. In the last sixteen verses (xxi, 6-21) the angel solemnly ascertains the truthfulness and importance of the foregoing sayings, promises a blessing on those who keep them exactly, gives warning of his speedy
coming to judgment, and of the nearness of the time when these prophecies shall be fulfilled.

V. Schemes of Interpretation.—Few, if any, books of the Bible have been the sport of so great differences of view as this, arising largely from prejudice and the passion of the age. The chief divisions of the line of these conflicting opinions, which prevail even to the present day.

1. Historical Review.—The interval between the apostolic age and that of Constantine has been called the Chaldaic period of Apocalyptic interpretation. The visions of John were chiefly regarded as representations of general historical facts, scarcely yet embodied in actual facts, for the most part to be exemplified or fulfilled in the reign of Antichrist, the coming of Christ, the millennium, and the day of judgment. The fresh hopes of the early Christians, and the severe persecution they endured, taught them to live in those future events with intense satisfaction and comfort. They did not entertain the thought of building up a definite consecutive chronological scheme even of those symbols which some moderns regard as then already fulfilled; although from the beginning a connection between Rome and Antichrist was universally allowed, and parts of the Revelation were regarded as the filling-up of the great outline sketched by Daniel and Paul. The process or gradual interpretation in this period are the interpolated commentary on the Revelation by the martyr Victorinus, cit. A.D. 270 (Biblio-
theca Patrum Minima, iii, 414, and Migne, Patrologia Latina, v, 518; the two editions should be compared), and the disputed treatise on Antichrist by Hippolytus (Migne, Patrologia Graeca, x, 726). But the prevalent views of that age are to be gathered also from a pas-sage in Justin Martyr (Trypho, 80, 81), from the later books, especially the fifth, of Irenaeus, and from various scattered passages in Tertullian, Origen, and Methodius. The event of the last days of the world in Lactantius, vii, 14-23, has little direct reference to the Revelation.

Immediately after the triumph of Constantine, the Christians, emancipated from oppression and persecution, and dominant and prosperous in their turn, began to lose their vivid expectation of our Lord's speedy advent and their spiritual conception of his kingdom, and to look upon the temporal supremacy of Christianity as a fulfilment of the promised reign of Christ on earth. The Roman empire, because Christian, was regarded no longer as the object of prophetic denunciation, but as the scene of a millennial development. This view, how-ever, was soon met by the figurative interpretation of the millennium as the reign of Christ in the hearts of all true believers. As the barbarous and heretical in-vasion of the Roman empire wavered, they were regarded by the suffering Christians as fulfilling the woes denounced in the Revelation. The beginning of a regular chronological interpretation is seen in Berengaud (assigned by some critics to the 9th century), who treated the Revelation as a history of the Church from the beginning of the world to its end. The original Comment-arv of the abbot Joachim is remarkable, not only for a further development of that method of interpretation, but for the scarcely disguised identification of Babylon with papal Rome, and of the second beast or Antichrist with some universal pontiff. The chief commentators belonging to this period are that which is ascribed to Tichonius (cit. A.D. 390), printed in the works of Augustine; Primasius of Aquitaine in Africa (A.D. 530), in Migne, Patrologia Latina, lxxvii, 1406; Andreas of Crete, in the Gesta(Contact) of Constantine and Eumenius of Thessaly in the 10th century, whose commentaries were published together in Cramer's Catena (Oxon. 1840); the Explanatio Apoc. in the works of Beile (A.D. 730); the Expositio of Berengaud, printed in the works of Ambrose of Milan (Oxon. 1583), first published at Cologne in 1581; a short treatise on the seals by Anselm, bishop of Havelberg (A.D. 1145),

printed in D'Achery's Spicilegium, i, 151; the Expositio of abbot Joachim of Calabria (A.D. 1290), printed at Venice in 1527.

In the dawn of the Reformation, the views to which the reputation of abbot Joachim gave currency were taken up by the followers of the school of Halle, as by Wycliffe and others; and they became the foundation of that great historical school of interpretation, which up to this time seems the most popular of all. (For the later commentaries, see § vi, below.)

2. Approximate Classification of Modern Interpretations.—These are generally placed in three great divisions.

(1.) The Prerestorist expositors, who are of opinion that the Revelation has been almost, or altogether, fulfilled in the time which has passed since it was written; that it refers principally to the triumph of Christianity over Judaism and paganism, signalized in the downfall of Jerusa-

lem and of Rome. The most eminent exponents of this view are Alcalas, Grotius, Hammond, Bosuer, Calmet, Wettstein, Kiechel, Hug, Herder, Ewald, Lietke, De Wette, Distelreick, Stuart, Hartle, and Maurice. This is the favorite interpretation with the critics of Germany, one of whom goes so far as to state that the writer of the Revelation promised the fulfilment of his visions within the space of three years and a half from the time in which he wrote the only prophecy for which in all

Agains the Preristorist view it is urged that the prophecies fulfilled ought to be rendered so perspicuous to the gen-

eral sense of the Church as to supply an argument against infidelity; that the destruction of Jerusalem, having occurred twenty-five years previously, could not occupy a large space in a prophecy; that the sup-

posed predictions of the downfall of Jerusalem and of Nero appear from the context to refer to one event, but are by this scheme separated, and, moreover, placed in a wrong order; that the measuring of the Temple and the publishing of the death of the priests (Revel. xxi), cannot be explained consistently with the context.

(2.) The Futurist expositors, whose views show a strong reaction against some extravagances of the pre-

ceding school. They believe that the whole book, excepting perhaps the first three chapters, refers principally, if not exclusively, to events which are yet to come. This view, which is asserted to be merely a revival of the primitive interpretation, has been advocated in recent times by Dr. J. H. Todd, Dr. S. R. Maitland, B. Newton, C. Maitland, I. Williams, De Burgh, and others.

Against the Futurist it is argued that it is not consistent with the repeated declarations of a speedy fulfil-

ment at the beginning and end of the book itself (see i, 8; xxii, 6, 7, 12, 20). Christians, to whom it was originally addressed, would have derived no special comfort from it had its fulfilment been altogether deferred for so many centuries. The rigidly literal inter-

pretation of Babylon, the Jewish tribes, and other sym-

bols which generally forms a part of Futurist schemes, presents peculiar difficulties.

(3.) The Historical or Continuous expositors, in whose opinion the Revelation is a progressive history of the fortunes of the Church from the first century to the end of time. The chief supporters of this most interesting interpretation are Mele, Sir I. Newton, Vitingga, Ben-

nel, Woodhouse, Faber, E. B. Elliott, Wordsworth, Heng-

stemberg, Ebrard, and others. The recent Commentarv of John Alford belongs mainly to this school.

Against the historical scheme it is urged that its advocates differ very widely among themselves; that they assume without any argument that the events of the first three chapters are so many years; that several of its applications—e. g. of the symbol of the ten-horned beast to the popes, and the sixth seal to the conversion of Constantine—are inconsistent with the context; that attempts by this school to predict future events by the help of Revelation have been, in repeated instances, disproved.

Two methods have been proposed by which the sta-
The Revelation may escape the incongruities and fallacies of the different interpretations while he may derive edification from whatever truth they contain. It has been suggested that the book may be regarded as a prophetic poem, dealing in general and inexact descriptions, much of which is set down as poetical imagery—mere embellishment. But such a view would be difficult to reconcile with the belief that the book is an inspired prophecy. A better suggestion is made, or rather is revived, by Dr. Arnold in his sermons On the Interpretation of Prophecy: that we should bear in mind that predictions have a lower historical sense, as well as a higher spiritual sense; and that there may be one, no more than one, typical, imperfect, historical fulfillment of a prophecy, in each of which the higher spiritual fulfillment is shadowed forth more or less distinctly. See Double Sense.

In choosing among the various schemes of interpretation, we are inclined to adopt that which regards the first series of prophetic visions proper (ch. iv.—xii.) as indicating the collapse (in part at the time already transpired) of the nearest persecuting power, namely, Judaism; the second series (ch. xiii.—xix.) as denoting the ultimate triumph: the success of the persecutor, i.e. Rome (first in its pagan and next in its papal form); and the third series (xx., 1—10) as briefly outlining the final overthrow of a last persecutor, some yet future power or influence (figuratively represented by a name borne to the earth). The most prominent opponents of Christianity are set forth as successive developments of Antichrist, and the symbols employed are cumulative and reiterative rather than historical and consecutive. For special explanations, see Antichrist; Magog; Number of the Beast, etc.

VI. Commentaries. Most of the above questions are treated in the regular commentaries and introductions, and in numerous monographs, published separately or in periodicals. The following are the exegetical helps solely on the whole book; to the most important we prefix an asterisk: St. Anthony, Expositio (in Opp. p. 645); Victorinus, Scholia (in Bibl. Max. Patr. iii., 414; Galland, Bibl. Patr. iv., 49; also Par. 1549, 1609, 8vo); Berengaud, Expositio (in Ambrosii Opp. ii., 499); Trichonius, Expositio (in Augustini Opp. xvi., 617); Primiuis, Commentarius (in Bibl. Max. Patr. vol. x.); Andreas Caes. Commentarius Ind. v., 1612; Arrianus, Expositiones (ibid. ix., 741; also in Gecumenii Opp. vol. ii.); Bede, Exploratio (in Opp. v., 701; also in Works, i., 189; xii., 337); Ambrosius Autpert. In Apocal. (in Bibl. Max. Patr. xiii., 403); Alciati, Commentarius (in Mai, Nov. x., 1543; also in Bibl. Frat.); Eaker, Apocal. (Opp. v.); Hervaeus, Enarrationes (in Anselmi Opp. ed. Picard, 1612); Rupert, In Apocal. (in Opp. ii., 450); Anon. Glossa (Lips., 1481, 4to); Albert, Comment. (Basil. 1506, 4to; also in Opp. xi.); Joann. Viterb. Glossa (Coln. 1507, 8vo); Joachim, In Apocal. (Ven., 1519, 1527, 4to); Hua, Commentarius (ed. Luther, Vittembe, 1528, 4to); Lambert, Exegesis (Marp., 1528; Basil., 1539, 8vo); Aino, Commentarius (Coln., 1529, 1531, 1584; Par., 1540, 8vo); Melch. Hoffmann, Auselegung (Argent., 1580, 8vo); Buling, Conciliaer (Basil., 1535, 1570, and often, fol.; also in Opp. xii.); Thomas Aquinas, Thesaurus (Flo., 1546, 8vo); also in Aquin, Comment. Paris, 1641); Bibliander, Commentarius (Basil., 1549, 8vo); Meyer, Commentarius (Tigr., 1554, 1603, fol.); Fulke, Profectiones (Lond., 1557, 1573, 4to); Conrad, Commentarius (Basil., 1560, 1574, 8vo); Borhous, Commentarius (ibid. 1561; Tigr. 1600, fol.); Serranus, Commentarius (Complut., 1563, fol.); Chytren, Commentarius (Vittembe, 1568, 1571, 1575, 8vo; Rost., 1581, 4to); Artopeus, Expositio (Basil., 1583, 8vo); Selnecker, Erklärung (Jen., 1587, 1589, 1608, 4to); Gyldenstjerne, Commentarius (Lond, 1587, 8vo); Brocardus, Interpretatio (L. B. 1580, 1590, 8vo; also in English, Lond., 1588, 4to); De Fermo (Rom. Cath.), Enarratio (from the Italian, Antw., 1581, 8vo); De Melo (Rom. Cath.), Commentarius (Fintel, 1594, 4to);
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Hirschfeld, Erläuterung (Saarh. 1865, 8vo); Diedrich, Erläuterung (Neu Rupp. 1865, 8vo); W. A. B. Lectures (Dubb. 1865, 8vo); De Rougemont, Explication (French, Neuchâtel, 1866, 8vo); Böhmer, Versuch (Breis. 1866, 8vo); Garrett, Commentary (Lond. 1866, 8vo); Harvey, Exposition (ibid. 1867, 4vo); Riemann, Erläuterung (Halle 1868, 4to); Hermann, Erläuterung (Lond. 1868, 8vo); Tomlin, Interpretation (ibid. 1868, 8vo); Snell, Notes (2 ed. ibid. 1869, 8vo); Seiss, Lectures (ibid. 1869, 8vo); Stone, Explanation (ibid. 1869, 12mo); Vaughan, Lectures (2d ed. ibid. 1870, 2 vols. 8vo); Kienlen, Erläuterung (Leips. 1870, 8vo); Anon., Commentary (Lond. 1870, 8vo); *Cowlles, Notes (N.Y. 1871, 12mo); Anon. Exposition (ibid. 1871, 8vo); Pond, Opening (Edinb. 1871, 8vo); Glasgow, Exposition (ibid. 1872, 8vo); Gärter, Erklärung (Stuttg. 1872, 8vo); Harms, Erläuterung (Leips. 1873, 8vo); *Kloeffl, Erklärung (ibid. 1874, 8 vols. 8vo); Lincoln, Lectures (Lond. 1874, 12mo); Fuller, Erklärung (Norclif. 1874, 8vo); Henley, Musings (Lond. 1874, 12mo); Robinson, Expositions (ibid. 1876, 8vo); Bayle, Commentary (ibid. 1877, 8vo); Wolfe, Exposition (ibid. 1877, 8vo). See New Testament.

The following are exclusively on the epistles to the seven churches: Laurentius, Expositio (Amst. 1649, 4to); Ramirez, Commentarius (Ludg. 1652, fol.); More, Exposition (Lond. 1669, 12mo); Smith, Epistolopoleis (Amst. 1676, 8vo); Johnson, Lectionem Aegypt (ibid. 1738, 8vo); Allen, Interpretatio (ibid. 1751, 8vo); Wadsworth, Lectures (Id. 1825, 12mo); Theime, Commentary (L. B. 1827, 4to); Wichelhaus, Predigten (Elberf. 1827, 8vo); *Arundel, Visit [descriptive] (Lond. 1828, 8vo); Milner [J.], Sermons (ibid. 1830, 8vo); Milner [T.], History (ibid. 1832, 8vo); Witty, Lectures (ibid. 1833, 8vo); Hyatt, Sermons (ibid. 1834, 12mo); Muir, Sermons (ibid. 1835, 12mo); *McFarlane, Sermon Churches [descriptive, with etchings] (ibid. 1836, 4to); Blunt, Exposition (ibid. 1838, 12mo); Carr, Sermons (ibid. 1840, 12mo); Witty (ibid. 1842, 8vo); Wilson, Discourses (ibid. 1846, 12mo); Thompson, Sermons (ibid. 1848, 8vo); Statham, Lectures (ibid. 1848, 12mo); Heubner, Predigten (Berl. 1850, 8vo); Tom, Die sieben Sendausche (Bayerl. 1850, 8vo); Cumming, Lectures (Lond. 1850, 12mo); Parker, Interpretation (ibid. 1852, 12mo); Chamberlain, Seven Ages (ibid. 1856, 8vo); Bibers, Sermons (ibid. 1857, 12mo); *Trench, Commentary (ibid. and N.Y. 1861, 12mo); *Svobode, Seven Churches [with 20 photographs, and Notes by Tristram] (Lond. 1863, 4to); Plumtree, Exposition (ibid. 1877, 12mo); Anon., Symbolica, 1877, 8vo.

REVELATIONS, SPURIOUS. The Apocalyptic character, which is occupied in describing the future splendor of the Messianic kingdom and its historical relations, presents itself for the first time in the book of Daniel, which is thus characterizedly distinguished from the former prophetic books. In the only prophetic book of the New Test., the Apocalypse of John, this idea is fully developed, and the several apocalyptic revelations are mere imitations, more or less happy, of these two canonical books, which furnished ideas to a numerous class of spurious and spurious Christian Church.

We here consider those especially which profess to be of a prophetic character. The principal spurious revelations extant have been published by Fabricius, in his Cod. Pseudep. V. T. et Cod. Apoc. N.T., and their character has been still more critically examined in recent times by bishopshawn (who has added to their number), by Nitzsch, Bleek, and others, and especially by Dr. Liceke, in his Einleit. in die Offenbarung Johan. und die gesammte apokryphische Literatur. (See the preceding article.) Tischendorf, in his Apocolypses Apocryphae Lips. 1863, 8vo, follows path path by the following:

"Apocalypsis Mariae" (Gr. ed. princeps); "Apocalypsis Eusei" (Gr. ed. princeps); "Apocalypsis Pauli" (Gr. ed. princeps); "Apocalypsis Johannae" (Gr. ed. princeps); "Johannis Liber de Dominatione Mariae" (Gr. ed. princeps); "Translatio Mariae" (Lat. ed. princeps); "Another Translatio Mariae" (Lat.); "Ad

dimenta ad Acta Apost. Apocrypha." "Ad Acta Andrea et Matthaei, ex codice uncial." "Ad Acta Philippi, ex cod. Parisiensis et Barocci." "Ad Acta Theoum, e cod. Monrealian et Bodleian." "Acta Petri et Andreae, in fine mutila, e cod. Barocci." In the account below we have brought together the most important of these apocryphal works. 1. Pseudo-Rightful Purporting to Refer to Hebrew Character.—These are principally the following:

1. 2. The Apocalypse of Adam and that of Abraham are cited by Epiphanius (Hier. xxxi. 8) as Gnostic productions. They are now wholly lost.

3. The Book of Enoch is one of the most curious of the spurious revelations, resembling in its outward form both the book of Daniel and the Apocalypse; but it is uncertain whether this latter work or the book of Enoch was first written. See Enoch, Book of.

4. The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs is a similar apocryphal production. See Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs.

5. The Apocalypse of Moses, mentioned by Syncellus (Chronog.) and Ceddrenus (Comp. Hist.), fragments of which have been published by Fabricius (ibid. supra), is conjectured by Croiset to have been a forgery of one of the ancient Christians.

In addition to this and the above work published by Tischendorf, there has lately been discovered an "Asscension" or "Assumption (Aṣṣūmq) of Moses," in the library at Munich, written in Arabic (Monumenta Sacra [Mediol. 1861]; Hilgenfeld (N. T. extra Canones [Lips. 1866]; Volkmar (Handb. z. d. Apokr. [Leips. 1867, vol. iii]); and Merx (Archiv f. wis. Exegetik, etc. [ibid. 1867, vol. ii]). It represents an interview between Moses and Joshua just before the death of the former, and professes to depict the future history of Israel. It seems to have been written by a Jew of the early Christian times (Ewald, Jahrbücher, 1852, 1853). See Moses.

These are different works from the so-called "Little Genesis." See Jubilees, Book of.

6. The Ascension and Vision of Isaiah (Avētēyēk kai ὁ Προφήτης Ἰσαάκ), although for a long time lost to the world, was a work well known to the ancients, as is indicated by the allusions in Justin Martyr, Origen, Tertullian, and Epiphanius. The first of these writers (Diol. c. Tryph. ed. Paris, p. 349) refers to the account therein contained of the death of Isaiah, who "was seen asunder with a wooden saw—a fact," he adds, "which was removed by the Jews from the sacred text." Tertullian, also (Adversus Marcionem), among other examples of the Scripture, refers to the same event, and in the next (the 8d) century Origen (Epist. ad Africam), after stating that the Jews were accustomed to remove many things from the knowledge of the people which they nevertheless preserved in apocryphal or secret writings, adds as an example the death of Isaiah, "who was seen asunder, as stated in a certain apocryphal writing, which the Jews perhaps corrupted in order to throw discredit on the whole." In his Comm. on Matt. he refers to the same events, observing that if this apocryphal work is not genuine, the account of the prophet's martyrdom, it should be believed upon the testimony borne to that work by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews (Heb. xi, 37); in the same manner as the account of the death of Zachariah should be credited upon the testimony borne by our Saviour to a writing not found in the common and published books (coiσιν καί διανομωσιν βιβλίων), but probably in an apocryphal work. Origen cites a passage from the apocryphal account of the martyrdom of Isaiah in one of his Homilies (ed. De La Rue, iii, 108). The Apocalypse of the Zealots contains in alphabetical order the books of Moses, Enoch, Adam, and Isaiah as writings of some antiquity.

The first writer, however, who mentions the Ascension of Isaiah by name is Epiphanius, in the 4th century, who observes (Hier. xi. 7) that the apocryphal As
occasion of Isaiah was adduced by the Archonites in sup-
port of their opinions respecting the seven heavens and the
seven angels, and the seven rays of the Egyptian Hiero-
clus and his followers in confirmation of their heretical
opinions respecting the Holy Spirit; at the same
time citing the passage from the "Evangelikon" to
which they refer (Ascens. of Isaiah ix, 27, 32–36; xi,
82, 83). Jerome also (in Serm. Levis, 4) expressly names
the work, asserting it to be an apocryphal production
originating in a passage in the New Test. (1 Cor. ii, 9).
St. Ambrose (Opp. ii, 1121) cites a passage contained
in it, but only as a traditionary report, "plerique ferunt
(Ascens. of Isaiah) v. 4–8; and that of the "Imi-
udo for Work Matthew," a work of the 5th century.
erroneously attributed to St. Chrysostom (Chrysostom. Op-
pos. I), evidently cites a passage from the same work
(Ascens. of Isaiah i, 1, etc.). After this period all trace
of the book is lost until the 11th century, when Euthy-
mus Zygabenus informs us that the Messalian heretics
made use of that "abominable epigraphical work the
Vision of Isaiah." It was also used (most probably
in a Latin version) by the Cathari in the West (P. Mo-
Isaiah was long regarded as canonical and Apocryphal
books in a Paris MS. (No. 1789), after the Quast. et Resp. of Anastasius (Cotelerius, P. I. Apotyp. i,
247, 349). Sixtus of Syria (Hed. Sac. 1566) states
that the Vision of Isaiah, as distinct from the "Antinonie"
as he calls it, had been printed at Venice. Referring
to this fact, his last editor, Laurence observes
that he had hoped to find in some bibliographical
work a further notice of it, but that he had searched
in vain; concluding, at the same time, that it must have
been a publication extracted from the Ascension of Isai-
ach or a Latin translation of the Vision, as the title of
it given by Sixtus was "Visio Admirabilis Evanist Prophete
in Sapta Manita, que Divinae Trinitatis Arcana et Lapsi
Generis Hominianem Redemtionem contineat." Dr. La-
urence observes also that the mode of Isaiah's death is
further in accordance with a Jewish tradition recorded
in the Talmud (Yoma, iv); and he supposes that
Mohammed may have founded his own journey through
seven different heavens on this same apocryphal work.
He shows, at the same time, by an extract from the Ro-
beth, that the same idea of the precise number of seven
heavens accorded with the Jewish creed, is engraved
on the fourth (called in the Ethiopic the first) book of
Edoras. It is entitled the Ascension of the Prophet Isai-
ach, the first chapters containing the martyrdom, and the
rest (for it is divided in the MS. into chapters and
verses) the Ascension, or Vision, of Isaiah. At the end
of the canonical book are the words, "Here ends the
prophet Isaiah;" after which follows the Ascension,
etc.; concluding with the words, "Here ends Isaiah
the prophet with his Ascension." Then follows a post-
scriptum, from which it appears that it was transcribed
for a priest named Aaron, at the cost of a piece of fine cloth
twelve measures long and four broad. The Ascension
of Isaiah was published by Dr. Laurence at Oxford in
1819, with a new Latin and an English version. This
discovery was first applied to the illustration of Scrip-
ture by Iseniuni (Com. on Levan). Some time after-
wards the indefatigable Dr. Angelo Mai (Nora Col-
two Latin fragments as an appendix to his sermon,
Arien. Fragments. Aparentia, which he conjectured to be
portions of apocryphal Isaiah. Niebuhr, however,
took possession of these fragments. The Ascension
and Vision of Isaiah; and Dr. Nitzsch (Nachweisung
zweier Bruchstücke, etc., in the Theolog. Stud. und
Kritik 1830) was enabled to compare them with the
two corresponding portions (ii. 14–15, 12; vii. 1–19) of
the Ethiopic version. Finally, in consequence of the
more complete and accurate study of the Greek text of
the Latin version given by Panzer (Annt. Typog. viii, 473),
Dr. Gieseler had a strict search made for it, which was
eventually crowned with success, a copy being discov-
ered in the library at Munich. This work, the date of
whose impression was 1592, contained also the "Con-
mille de Nicodemus et the Letter of Lentulus to the Eoman
Senate." The Latin version contains the Vision only,
corresponding to the last chapters of the Ethiopic ver-
sion.

The subject of the first part is the martyrdom of Isai-
ach, who is here said to have been sawn asunder in con-
sequence of the visions which he related to Hezekiah,
in the twenty-sixth year of the reign of that monarch,
different from those in the canonical book. These
relate principally to the coming of "Jesus Christ the
Lord" from the seventh heaven; he being changed into
the form of a man; the preaching of his twelve
apostles; his final rejection and suspension on a tree,
in company with the workers of iniquity, on the day before
the Sabbath; the spread of the Christian doctrine,
the last judgment; and his return to the character of
the Messiah. Before this, however, the arch-fiend Belial is to descend
on earth in the form of an impious monarch, the murder-
er of his mother, where, after his image is worshipped
in every city for three years seven months and twenty-
seven days, he and his powers are to be dragged into
hell, etc.

The second portion of the work gives a prolix account
of the prophet's ascent through seven heavens, each
more resplendent and more glorious than the other.
It contains distinct prophetical allusions to the miraculous
birth of Christ of the Virgin Mary at Bethlehem; his
crucifixion, resurrection, and ascension; and the worship of
"the Father, his beloved Christ, and the Holy Spirit." The
mode of the prophet's own death is also announced to
him. "The whole work," observes its learned trans-
lator, "is singularly characterized by simplicity of nar-
ration, by occasional sublimity of description, and by
richness as well as vigor of imagination." Dr. Laurence
conceives that the writer had no design of imposing
upon the world a spurious production of his own as that of
the prophet, but rather of composing a work, aw-
rivably fictitious, but accommodated to the character and
consistent with the prophecies of him to whom it is as-
cribed.

As to the age of this work, Dr. Laurence supposes,
from the obvious reference to Nero and the period of
three years seven months and twenty-seven days, and
again of the ascension of Isaiah and Belial in the year
which Berii was to be dragged to Gehenna, that the
work was written after the death of Nero (which took
place on June 9, A.D. 68), but before the close of the
year 69. Lübeck, however (Einleistung), looks upon
these numbers as purely arbitrary; and as translated,
and maintains that the dogmatical character of the
work, the allusion to the corruptions of the Church, the
absence of all reference to the destruction of Jerusa-
lem, and the Chiliasm view, all point to a later period.
All that can be considered as certain respecting its date
is that the first portion was extant before the time of
Origen and the whole before Epiphanius. It has been
doubted whether the work does not consist of two inde-
pendent productions, which were afterwards united into
one, as in the Ethiopic version; but this is a question
impossible to decide in the absence of the original. The
Latin fragments discovered by Mai correspond literally
with the Ethiopic; while they not only differ from the
Venetian edition in single phrases, but the latter con-
tains passages so striking as to induce the supposition
that it is derived from a later recension of the original
text.

The author was evidently a Jewish Christian, as ap-
ppears from the use made of the Talmudical legend al-
ready referred to, as well as by his representing the false
acquiescer of Isaiah as a Samaritan. The work also abounds in Gnostic, Valentinian, and Ophitic notions, such as the account of the seven heavens and the presiding angels of the first five, the gradual transmutation of Christ until he comes in the end of the world and finally the docetic conception of his history on earth. All this has induced Lücke (ut sup.) to consider the whole to be a Gnostic production of the 2d or 3d century, of which, however, the martyrdom was first written. Dr. Laurence finds so strong a resemblance between the account of the seven heavens here and in the testament of Levi (Twelve Patriarchs), that he suspects the latter to "be a tray a little plagiarism." If this learned divine were right in his conjecture respecting the early age of this production, it would doubtless afford an additional testimony, if such were wanting, to the antiquity of the belief in the miraculous conception and the proper deity of Jesus, who is here called the Beloved, the Lord, the Lord God, and the Lord Christ. In respect, however, to another passage, in which the Son and Holy Spirit are represented as worshipping God, the learned prelate truly observes that this takes place only in the character of angels, which they had assumed.

Dr. Lücke observes that the drapery only of the apocalyptic element of this work is Jewish, the internal character being altogether Christian. But in both form and substance there is an evident imitation, if not of the Apocalypse of St. John, at least of the book of Daniel and of the Sibylline oracles. The use of the canonical Apocalypse Lücke (op. cit. § 16) considers to be undeniable in vii, 45. Comp. Rev. vii, 21–23; xix, 10; xxii, 8, 9. See Isaiah.

7. The Epistle of Baruch is given as the "First Book of Baruch" in the Paris and London Polyglota in Syriac and Latin, the "Second Book of Baruch" being there what is commonly known as the apocryphal book of Baruch. This letter is also contained in the Syriac "Apocrypha" under the title of "Baruch," yet is not given among the books of the Bible in that title. It is a discourse to the people of Israel, written by Jeremiah, and addressed to the king. It is a warning and exhortation to the people to repent and return to the Lord. It is a prophecy of the future, and a record of the past. It is a history of the people of Israel, and a record of their sins and their sufferings. It is a prediction of the future, and a record of the past. It is a history of the people of Israel, and a record of their sins and their sufferings.

(I. The Design of this Epistle is to comfort the nine tribes and a half who were beyond the river Euphrates, by assuring them that the sufferings which they have to endure in their captivity, and which are far less than they deserve, are but for a season, and are intended to stone for their sins; and that God, whose love towards them is unchangeable, will speedily deliver them from their troubles and requite their oppressors. They are therefore not to be distracted by the prosperity of their wicked enemies, but to move on, but to observe the better Moses, and look forward to the day of judgment, when all that is now perplexing will be rectified.

(II. The Method or Plan which the writer adopted to carry out the design of this epistle will be best seen from an outline of its contents. Being convinced of the unchangeable love of God towards his people (1, 2) and of the close attachment subsisting between all the tribes (var. 8), Baruch feels constrained to write this epistle before he dies (var. 4) to comfort his captive brethren (amidst the sufferings of var. 6), which are far less than they deserve (var. 6), and are designed to stone for (var. 7, 8), as well as to wean them from their sins (var. 9), so that God might gather them together again. Baruch then informs them, first of all, that Zion has been delivered to Nebuchadnezzar because of the sins of the children of Israel (var. 11, 12). That the enemy, however, might not boast that he had destroyed the sanctuary of the Most High by the strength of his own arm, God sent angels from heaven to destroy the forts and walls, and also to hide some of the vessels of the temple of Jerusalem (var. 10–16); when upon the enemy carried the Jews as captives to Babylon, and left only few in Zion (var. 17), this being the burden of the epistle (var. 18, 19). But they are to be comforted (var. 20), for while he was mourning over Zion and praying for mercy (var. 21), one angel said to Baruch that he might comfort his brethren, which is the cause of his writing this epistle (var. 22, 24).
the day of judgment which is close at hand (i, 87-41), and the frequent reference to a future life. Ewald (Gesch. Isr. iv, 233) and Fritzsche (Keret. Handb. zu den Apokr. i, 175) contemptuously dismiss it in a few lines, and most unjustly regard it as written "in a profane and senseless style" by a woman. Besides the London manuscript, which contains a translation in the beautiful edition of the Apocrypha just published (Liberi Vetus Testamenti Apocrypha Syriaca, recogn. Paul. Anton. de Lagarde, Lond, 1861), and the Latin may be found in Fabricii Cod. Pseudoepigraph. V. T. ii, 147 sq. See also Barouch, 8.

The Apocrypha of Baruch was discovered in a Syrian manuscript, judged by Cureton to belong to the 6th century, and was first published by Cerrain in 1866 in a close Latin translation (Mon. Sac. et Prof. i, ii, 73-90), and in 1871 in the original Syriac (ibid. v, ii). The last few chapters, however, had long been known as the "Epistle of Baruch" noticed above.

(L) Contents.—The composer of this work has, like the author of the book of Baruch in the ordinary Apocrypha of the Old Test., chosen as the fictitious writer of the received and apostolic writings of Jeremiah. The scene is laid in or near Jerusalem; and the supposed time is that immediately preceding and following the destruction of the city and the transportation of the people to Babylon. The author professes to give to the world a new book, and makes it clear that those who shall subscribe to it, or who shall be worthy to live in that time, shall be a blessing to the world. The book contains many prophecies of future events, and has a Messianic character.

The work divides itself into seven parts, if we treat the letter to the nine and a half tribes as a kind of appendix. Baruch is throughout represented as the speaker, referring to himself in the first person. It is a new and independent work, and opens in the opening of ch. i and lxxviii, which are of the nature of a title.

The first part (ch. i-ix) opens by telling how the Word of the Lord came to Baruch, and warned him of the destruction of Jerusalem and the Babylonians. He was not told of the future glory of Zion, and prophesies vengeance against the victorious land now so prosperous. Having thus given vent to his grief, he again fasts for seven days.

In the second part (ch. x-xii) Jeremiah is sent to Babylon, but Baruch is told to remain amid the desolation of Zion, that God may show him what will come to pass at the end of days. So Baruch sits by the gates of the Temple and utters a lamentation over the fate of Zion, and prophesies vengeance against the victorious land now so prosperous. Having thus given vent to his grief, he again fasts for seven days.

In the third part (ch. xiii-xv) he stands on Mount Zion, and is told that he shall be preserved till the end of times, that he may bear testimony against the nations which oppressed his people. He answers that only few shall survive in those days to hear the word of the Lord, and complains that those who have not walked in vanity like other peoples have derived no advantage from their faithfulness. The Lord answers that the future world was made on account of the just, "for this world is a contest and trouble to them in much labor, and therefore that which is to come is a crown in great glory." In further conversation Baruch is advised not to estimate the blessings of life by its length, and to look upon the corruption of the earth as the beginning. He is then desired to sanctify himself and fast for seven days.

In the fourth part (ch. xvi-xx) he comes from a cave in the valley of Cedron, whither he had withdrawn to the place where God spoke with him before. It is a summary, and he begins to deplore the bitterness of life, and calls upon God to hasten the promised end. In reply he is reminded of his ignorance, and told that the predetermined number of men must be completed, but "that the end is not far distant." Baruch then says that he does not know what will happen to the enemies of his people, or at what time God will visit them. The signs of the last days are accordingly described, and the last time being divided into twelve parts, each with its distinguishing characteristic. These parts, however, are to be mixed together and to minister to one another. The specified signs shall affect the whole earth, and then Messiah will begin to be revealed." A description of the Messianic period follows, on which we need not dwell. With this the conversation terminates, and though the usual fast is not mentioned, the section evidently comes to a close.

In the fifth part (ch. xxxi-xliii) having consolled the people by telling them of the future glory of Zion, he goes and sits upon the ruins of the Temple. While he laments he falls asleep, and has a vision of a vine and a fortress, of which the interpretation is afterwards given to him. The vision relates to the triumph of the Messianic kingdom. Baruch then asks, To whom and to how many shall these things be, or who shall be worthy to live in that time? for many of God's people have thrown away the yoke of the law, but others have left their vanity and fled for refuge under God's wings. God answers this question, and Baruch prays blessings, and to those who despise will be the opposite of this.

Baruch is then commanded to go and instruct the people, and afterwards to fast for seven days, preparatory to further communications.

In the sixth part (ch. xliii-xliv) he calls together his father, his friend Gadeli, and seven of the elders of the people, and tells them that he is going to his fathers, according to the ways of all the earth. He exhorts them not to depart from the law, and promises that they shall see "the consolation of Zion." He goes on to dwell upon the glory of the law, and how the whole world desires them to advise the people, and assures them that, though he must die, "a wise man shall not be wanting to Israel, nor a son of the law to the race of Jacob." He then goes to Hebron, and fasts for seven days.

In the seventh part (ch. xliv-lxxxv) he prays for compassion on this people, the people whom God has chosen, and who are unlike all others. He is told that the time of tribulation must arise, and many of its circumstances are recounted. He deplores such sad consequences that Adam, and inquired if he was informed about the resurrection and its results. At last he falls asleep and has a vision. As this vision (ch. lxxii) and its interpretation (ch. lxxiv), though they bring us to no definite date, throw an interesting light upon the uncertain methods in which history has parcelled out into periods, we may notice them at more length than would otherwise be necessary. A cloud ascended from the great sea, and it was full of white and black waters, and a similitude of lightning appeared at its extremity. It passed quickly on and covered the earth. Afterward he was sent to discharge its rain; but the waters which descended from it were not all alike, for first there were very black waters for a time, and afterwards the waters became bright, but of these there were not many. Black waters succeeded and again gave place to bright, and no other for twelve times; but the black waters were always more than the bright. At the end of the cloud it rained black waters, and these were darker than all that had been before, and fire was mingled with them, and they brought corruption and ruin. Afterward he saw the lightning which he had seen in the extremity of the cloud flashed so that it illuminated the whole earth, and it healed those regions where the last waters had descended. After this twelve rivers ascended from the sea and surrounded that lightning, and were made subject to it. At this point Baruch awoke through fear. In answer to his prayer
for the interpretation of the vision, the angel Ramiel was sent to satisfy his request. The cloud symbolized the "angel of the waters". The four black waters were the sin of Adam, with its consequences, including the fall of the angels and the flood. The second—the bright waters—were Abraham and his descendants, and those who were like them. The third (black) waters were the mixture of all the sin-water after the death of those just prior to the entry of the land of Egypt. The fourth (bright) waters were the advent of Moses, Aaron, Miriam, Joshua, Caleb, and all who were like them, in whose time "the lamp of the eternal law shone upon all who were sitting in darkness." The fifth (black) waters were the punishment of the world, and the sins of the Israelites in the days of the judges. The sixth (bright) waters were the time of David and Solomon. The seventh (black) waters were the perversion of Jeroboam, and the sins of his successors, and the time of the captivity of the nine and a half tribes. The eighth (bright) waters were the righteousness of Hezekiah. The ninth (black) waters were the universal impurity in the days of Manasseh. The tenth (bright) waters were the purity of the generations of Josiah. The eleventh (black) waters were the calamity which had just happened to Babylon. The rest of the interpretation is, of course, given in the future tense. 

As for the twelfth (bright) waters which thou hast seen, this is the world. For the time shall come after these things when thy people shall fall into calamity, so as to be in danger of all sorts. But nevertheless they shall be saved, and their enemies shall fall before them. And they shall for some time have much joy. And in that time, after a little, Zion shall be again built, and its inhabitants shall be again established, and the priests shall return to their ministry, and the nations shall again come to glorify it, but nevertheless not fully, as in the beginning. But it shall come to pass after these things that there shall be the ruin of many nations. These are the bright waters which thou hast seen. The other waters, which were blacker than all the rest, after the twelfth, belonged to the whole world, and they represented times of trouble and conflict, which are described at some length; and all who survived these should be delivered into the hands of the Messiah. These last black waters are, in the interpretation, succeeded simply by bright waters representing the blessedness of the Messianic time. Baruch, having heard the words of the angel, expressed his wonder at the goodness of God. He is informed that, though he must depart from the earth, he shall not die. But before his removal he must go and instruct the people.

We learn (ch. lxvii) how Baruch went to the people and admonished them to be faithful, holding out hopes that their brethren might return from the captivity. The people promised to remember the good that God had done to them, and requested him to write a letter before his departure to their brethren in Babylon. He promised to do so, and send the epistle by the hands of men, and also to forward a letter to the nine and a half tribes by means of a bird. Accordingly, he sat alone under an oak and wrote two letters. One he sent by three men to Babylon, but the tribes beyond the Euphrates by an eagle which he called. He charged the eagle not to pause till he reached his destination, and, to encourage him, reminded him of Noah's dove, of Elijah's ravens, and how "Solomon, in the time of his reign, whithersoever he wished to send or to seek anything, commanded a bird, and it obeyed him as he had commanded it." Then the letter is subjoined (ch. lxviii—lxix.). It consists of a general exhortation to the captive tribes to be faithful, in the hope of being soon restored to a happier lot. The last (lxix-xlvii) relates how he wrote how he finished and sealed the letter, tied it to the eagle's neck, and despatched it.

In the ancient Latin chiasmus in Cotelarius (Apostolic Fathers), the Apocalypse of St. Peter is said to contain 2070 stichs, and that of John 1290. It is cited as an apocryphal book in the Indicales Scripturorum after the Quaestiones of Anastasius of Nicara, together with the Apocalypse of Ezechias and that of Paul. There is in the Bodleian Library a MS. of an Arabic Apocalypse of St. Peter, of which Nicoll has furnished an extract in his catalogue, and which may possibly be a translation of the Greek book. It is not mutilated and sealed.

The Apocalypse of St. Paul is mentioned by Augustine (Tract. 98 in Ev. Joan), who asserts that it abounds in fables, and was an invention to which occasion was furnished by 2 Cor. xii, 2-4. This appears from
Epiphanius (Harv. xxxviii, 2) to have been an anti-Jewish Gnostic production, and to be identical with the 'Anabasei of Paul, used only by the anti-Jewish sect of Gnostics called Caínites. It is said by Sozomen (Hist. Eccl., vii, 19) to have been held in great esteem. It was also known to Theophylact and Eusebius (on 2 Cor. iv. 4) and is mentioned in the Nicene Council (Cod. Th. ii, 354) and Grabe (Spicileg., i, 65). The Revelation of St. Paul, contained in an Oxford MS., is shown by Grabe (loc. cit.) to be a much later work. Theodosius of Alexandria (Epigr. episc. prope Constantinop., ii) says that the Apocalypse of St. Paul is not a work of the apostle, but of Paul of Samosata, from whom the Paulicians derived their name. The Revelation of St. Paul is one of the spurious works condemned by pope Gelasius, together with the Revelations of St. Thomas and St. Stephen.

3. There was an apocryphal Revelation of St. John extant in the time of Theodosius the Grammarian, the only one of the ancients who mentions it, and who calls it a pseudo-apostolic book. It was called what has become of it, until the identical work was recently published, from a Vatican as well as a Vienna manuscript, by Birch, in his Acta Sanctorum, under the title of "The Apocalypse of the Holy Apostle and Evangelist John the Divine." From the silence of the ancients respecting this work, it could scarcely have been written before the 3d or 4th century. Lücke has pointed out other internal marks of a later age, as, for instance, the mention of incense, which he observes first came into use in the Christian Church after the 4th century (although here the author of the spurious book may have taken his idea from Rev. v, 8; viii, 3); also of images and rich crosses, which were not in use before the "4th and 5th centuries." The name patriarch, applied here to a dignitary in the Church, belongs to the same age. The time in which Theodosius himself lived is not certain, but he cannot be placed earlier than the 5th century, which Lücke conceives to be the most probable age of the work itself. Regarding the object and occasion of the work (which is a rather servile imitation of the genuine Apocalypse), in consequence of the absence of dates and of internal characteristics, there are no certain indications. Birch's text, as well as his manuscripts, abounds in errors; but Thilo has collated two Paris manuscripts for his intended edition (see his Acta Thomæ, Proleg., p. lxxxiii). Assemani (Bibl. Orient. III, 1, 262) states that there is a manuscript of it preserved in MSS.

III. Pseudo-Revelations bearing Extraordinary Names.

—Of these the following deserve special notice:

1. The Prophecies of Hysaspes were in use among the Christians in the 2d century. This was apparently a pagan production, but is cited by Justin Martyr, in his Apology, as agreeing with the Sybarine oracles in predicting the destruction of the world by fire. Clemens Alexander (Strom. vii) and Lactantius (Instit, vii, 15) also cite passages from these prophecies, which bear a decidedly Christian character.

2. The collection entitled the Shepherd of Hermas is not without its apocalyptic elements. These, however, are confined to book i, 8, 4; but they are destitute of significance or originality. See Hermas.

3. The Apocalypse of Christiùs is mentioned by Eusebius (Hist. Eccl., ii, 38), and by Theodoret (Pud. Heli. iii, 3). Eusebius describes it as a revelation of an earthly and sensual kingdom of Christ, according to the heresy of the Chiliasm. Of the Revelations of St. Thomas and St. Stephen, we know nothing beyond their consideration as apocryphal. St. Augustin of Sienna observes that, according to Serapion, they were held in high repute by the Manichæans; but in the works of Serapion which we now possess there is no allusion to this. There is, however, an unpublished MS. of Serapion in the Hamburg Library, which is supposed to contain a more complete copy of his work. See Cas- trius.

4. The Sibylline Oracles is the title of an apocryphal work, evidently of Christian origin, of the early centuries of our era, written as a sort of parody on the famous Roman traditional books of that name. See Sibyl- line Oracle.

Revenge (vexāre, iecideri) means the return of injury for injury, or the infliction of pain on another in consequence of an injury received from him further than the just ends of reparation or punishment require. Revenge differs materially from resentment, which rises in the mind immediately on being injured; but revenge is a cool and deliberate wickedness, and is often engaged years after the offence is given. Revenge is considered as a perversion of anger. Anger, it is said, is a passion given to man for wise and proper purposes, but revenge is the corruption of anger, is unnatural, and therefore ought to be suppressed. It is observable that the proper object of anger is vice; but the object, in general, of revenge, is man. It transfers the hatred due to the vice to the man, to whom it is not due. It is forbidden by the Scriptures, and is unbecoming the character and spirit of a peaceful follower of Jesus Christ. See Anger.

Revelations of the Church. It is clearly taught in the New Test. that it is the duty of Christians to give temporal sustenance to their clergy. The Church was laid down by our Lord (Luke x, 7) that the laborer is worthy of his hire. Paul says, "Even so hath the Lord ordained that they which preach the Gospel should live of the Gospel" (1 Cor. xix, 14). The following passages treat of the relation which subsists between the minis- ters and the Church in this respect: Acts xviii, 3; xxiv, 17; 2 Cor. xi, 7; 8, xii, 18; Phil. iv, 16-18; 1 Tim. vi, 3; Titus i, 11. So we see that the Church is bound to provide for the maintenance of its pastors; but, at the same time, the pastors are bound to make no unnecessary demands upon the Church. These principles were carried out in the apostolic times and subsequently. Fixed stipends were not paid in early times, because the Church did not possess property, and therefore the contributions were voluntary. These voluntary offerings were of two sorts: 1. The weekly or daily ob- lations that were made at the altar; 2. The monthly ob- lations that were cast into the treasury of the Church. And then arose the custom of dividing up the monthly contribution and paying the clergy their share, according to the rule: "One out of every two of the members of the Church pay a half to the clergy, as are arose annually from the lands and possessions given to the Church, which were greatly increased in the time of Constantine, who authorized the bequeathing of prop- erty to the Church. A third source of revenue was the granting to the clergy an allowance out of the public money. Constantine both gave the clergy particular larg- esses, as their occasion required, and also settled upon them a standing allowance out of the exchequer. A fourth source of revenue was the estates of martyrs and confessors dying without heirs, which were settled upon the Church by Constantine. Still later rulers (Theodosius the younger and Valentinian III) settled upon the Church the estates of clergymen dying without heirs. Besides these sources of revenue, there were others, such as the donation of heathen temples and sometimes their revenues, heretical conventicles and the revenues of temporal clergy of heretics and monks who became seculars again. Great care, however, at first was taken not to receive estates donated to the Church to the great detriment of others. Respecting the ancient way of managing and distributing these revenues, we may re- member that the revenues of the whole diocese were in the hands of the bishop, and by his care distributed among the clergy. As a safeguard against mismanagement, he was obliged to give an account of his administration in a provincial synod; after a while this rule obtained in the Western Church. The division was usually into
three or four parts—one to the bishop, a second to the rest of the clergy, a third to the poor, and a fourth to the necessary uses of the Church. Suspension from participation in the revenues was one method of punishment, and in some cases, according to the clergy. See Bingham, Christ. Antig. bk. v, ch. vi, p. 1-6.

Reverence (usually some form of σεβασμός, φοβίζω, to fear), a respectful, submissive disposition of mind arising from affection and esteem, from a sense of superiority in the person revered. Hence children reverence their fathers even when their fathers correct them by stripes (Heb. xii, 9); hence subjects reverence their sovereign (2 Sam. ix, 6); hence wives reverence their husbands (Eph. v, 33); and hence all ought to reverence God. We reverence the name of God, the house of God, the worship of God, etc.; we reverence the attributes of God, the commands, dispensations, etc., of God; and we ought to demonstrate our reverence by overt acts, such as are suitable and becoming to time, place, and circumstances. For though a man may reverence God in his heart, yet unless he behave reverentially and give proofs of his reverence by demeanor, conduct, and obedience, he will not easily persuade his fellow-mortals that his bosom is the residence of this divine and heavenly disposition; for, in fact, reverence for God is not one of those lights which burn under a bushel, but one of those whose spirtually lustre illuminates wherever it is admired. Reverence is, strictly speaking, perhaps the internal disposition of the mind, φόβος (Rom. xii, 7); and honor, ὑπαρξία, the external expression of this disposition.

Reverend, a title prefixed by courtesy to the name of any clergyman, though "clerk" (clericus) is the legal and strictly proper description of clergyman, and is, in official documents, placed after (as "Reverend" is before) their names.

In the Church of England and the Protestant Episcopal and Roman Catholic churches the title is given to ecclesiastics of the second and third orders, the bishops being styled "right reverend." In some churches ordained abbesses and priresses are called "reverend mothers."

Revision of the Bible. See Authorized Version.

Revivals of Religion, a phrase commonly used to indicate renewed interest in religious subjects, or a period of religious awakening. It comes from revive (Latin rerenere), to arise again, and is often improperly applied to excitations which can hardly be called religious, because they do not apprehend, or propose to revive, the real, inner, spiritual life of the soul, which alone constitutes true religion. Setting out with erroneous views, and an effort to effect a work before he can see the excitations necessarily fall short of its accomplishment.

These words are also used to denote the conversion of sinners as well as the quickening of believers. This arises from the fact that the two events are generally (not always) coincident. Sinners, who withstand God himself, may resist the Church in her best estate; and they are sometimes converted when the Church, as a body, is spiritually asleep. Yet such is the influence of spiritual life, and such the usual sanction given by the Holy Ghost to its loving endeavors to save men, that a real revival of the Church leads directly to the conversion of others. Therefore "a revival is simply an increase of the best desires, affections, and exertions of persons who are already pious and benevolent, such an increase as, by the blessing of Heaven, awakens in the ungodly an anxiety for their salvation. . . . When these events are accompanied by a general repentence, and the conviction of God that they are unequivocally manifested anywhere, it is too late for an impartial observer to doubt that a genuine revival of religion has there commenced." To understand this subject in its bearings upon the different classes to be mentioned, we must examine the effects of the various acts of religion itself; the means of its attainment and abatement, and the evidences by which it is distinguished. These points, with some others necessarily involved, are indicated by the following propositions.

1. That all men reawakened by the grace of God are sinners. Paul represents them as dead in trespasses and in sins, and in conformity with the law of the world, according to the prince of the power of the air, having their conversation in the lusts of the flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind, and as by nature children of wrath.

2. This being their condition—corrupt in heart and disobedient in practice—they need two important works effected in and for them; namely, the pardon of all their sins, exempting them from the penalty of the law, and the renewal of their souls in righteousness, conforming them to the image of God, and thus fitting them to do his will from the heart here, and enjoy the holiness of heaven hereafter.

3. That the atonement of Christ provided for just these results, as may be seen by the following announcements: "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness" (1 John i, 9). "But ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God" (1 Cor. vi, 11).

And to show the absolute necessity of this double work, the Lord Jesus said, "Behold, the hour is coming, in which all things that are written of the law and the prophets shall be fulfilled." He, therefore, cannot see the kingdom of God" (John iii, 3). Revivals which aim at anything short of this are not revivals of religion in the proper sense of that word. They may arouse the fears of men and improve their habits, but they do not sure in the Gospel sense, nor will their results be satisfactory to the depraved and guilty sinner, or to any spiritual Church.

4. Another important fact to be remembered is, that this is the work of God. He only can forgive sins, or renew the heart. The object of a true revival is, therefore, not to absolve sinners, but to bring them to God; in other words, to persuade them to accept the terms of reconciliation, that he may save them. Pronouncing them converted on their avowing a "desire" or "purpose" to seek the Lord is unauthorized, and exceedingly dangerous. We should instruct and encourage them to wait in the way of duty till God shall do the work, when they will need no absolution from man. Many, it is to be feared, have been misled at this point, to their eternal sorrow. They have been taught to believe that religion is all their own work, a mere change of opinion on their part, and is often improperly applied to excitations which can hardly be called religious, because they do not apprehend, or propose to revive, the real, inner, spiritual life of the soul, which alone constitutes true religion. Setting out with erroneous views, and an effort to effect a work before he can see the excitations necessarily fall short of its accomplishment.

5. When this work is accomplished, it will be verified, first, by the Holy Spirit witnessing to the fact as it witnesses in conviction to the sinner's guilt, condemnation, and danger of the consequences of the opposite; and secondly, by a joy, peace, long suffering, etc., and aversion to former sins and associations. How does an awakened sinner know that he is a sinner? He feels that he is, and this is confirmed by the uniform conflict of his life and temper with the Word of God. How does a real convert know that he is converted? Because he now feels the same assurance in his heart that he is a Christian which he felt before that he was a sinner, and he knows that he is living a life of obedience: whereas, before, he lived in rebellion. He can say from the heart, with Paul, "Being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ, . . . and rejoice in the hope of the glory of God" (Rom. v, 1, 2); and, with John, "We know that we have passed from death unto life because we love the brethren" (1 John iii, 14). Converts who stop short of being saved in joyous faith, who have the evidences of the existence of religion itself, the means of its attainment and abatement, and the evidences by which it is distinguished. These
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moted by the inculation of the fundamental truths of the Gospel, such as human depravity, natural and acquired; the sinfulness of men in rebellion against God, and in refusing to accept of offered mercy; the certainty of their loss of heaven, and the endurance of eternal punishment; the necessity of an atonement for every one who will deny himself, take up his cross, and follow Christ, according to the light that is in and around him; the ability of sinners, by grace, to so repent and believe as to be saved; and the blessedness on earth and in heaven which God will bestow upon all who shall take him as their Saviour; but neglect its claims from worldly considerations. These obstacles need to be neutralized or removed. This can be more successfully done by showing their triviality in comparison with the tremendous interests at stake, and the religion that has thus exploded all heretical sentiments which their hearers would be glad to have true, but in which they have little confidence.

The most effective suggestion that we can make on this point is, perhaps, that the preacher aim to promote the revival of his Church and the conversion of sinners. Those who fail to do so seldom win souls to Christ. Revivals are not produced by such indifference. Says the immortal Richard Baxter to pastors: "If your heart is not set on the end of your labors, and if you do not long to see the conversion and edification of your hearers, and to rejoice in the white robes of the ninety percent of them, you are not likely to have much success. It is a sign of a false, self-seeking heart when a person is contented to be still doing without seeing any fruit of his labor, . . . He never had the right ends of a preacher in view who is indifferent whether he obtains them or not; who is not grieved when he misses them, and rejoices when he can see the desired issue."

With this aim, and a proper understanding of human nature and the Gospel, one will not seriously err in the selection of subjects. Nor will be preach so much about the matter as is proper. Effective preaching has always been characterized by their directness. Said Nathan to David, "Thou art the man;" and Joshua to Israel, "Choose you this day whom you will serve." When Peter preached on the day of Pentecost, "Let the house of Israel know assuredly that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ," his hearers were "pricked in their hearts, and said, Men and brethren, what shall we do?"

But revivals must not be left alone to preachers, or preaching. Every talent of the Church should be enlisted in all appropriate ways. Testimony as to personal experience is a powerful agency, and should be largely employed in private, and often in public. The same is true of lay instruction, exhortation, and persuasion. When these means fail, the object may be gained by a tract or book. The printed page has won grand fields inaccessible to living agencies, and where these have failed in vain. Prayer is another powerful means of revivals, which often prevails when everything else fails. Their history glows with the wonders of its power: "Oh, the power of prayer!" And in impressive manners. It attracts and softens many who care little for preaching or prayer. It has always been prominent in this work, but never more successful than at the present time.

7. Revivals are necessary from many considerations. First, because, as a matter of fact, most Christians do backslide more or less from their first love. The history of God's ancient people is little more than a consecutive account of their backslidings and recoveries. The apostolic age was clouded by similar defections, and followed by the "Dark Ages." The slumber of that long night was often penetrated by the sweet sleep of the gospel. The voice of Luther was heard from Wittenberg calling for reform. Even the Puritans of New England declined. Says Mr. Tracy, in speaking of their condition at the commencement of the great revival under Edwards, Whitefield, and others, "Such had been the downward degeneration in New England that there were many in the churches, and even some in the ministry, who were yet lingering among the supposed preliminaries to conversion. The difference between the Church and the world was vanishing away, and yet never, perhaps, had the expectation of reaching heaven at last been more general or confident." That revival changed all this for the time, but in less than half a century there was another and relapse. When the Wesleyans and Whitefield awoke to the claims of religion in England, the new birth was a dead letter, and conversions were scarcely known; when. Drinking, gambling, cock-fighting, and every species of popular vice were patronized by the Church and many of the clergy.

In view of these facts, what would have become of religion but for revivals? Had Joshua, and David, and Joseph, and Moses, and Nehemiah, and John, and Jesus, and Peter, and Paul, and John Wesley, and Whitefield, and other revivists, clung to established customs, and opposed innovations, as some did, and as others do now, the name of God would hardly have been preserved from oblivion.

The same tendency is observable in individuals and some churches now. They are in close fellowship with sin and the world, without God, and without any well-grounded hope.

Revivals are also necessary because there is no other cure for the evils to be remedied. Spiritual life can never spring to its full development until the church experiences revivals: reason, common-sense, and history are all against it. We may fill the Church with man-made converts, who have been coaxed into a profession of religion without having the first elements of a Christian character; but that is not God's work, nor is it religious: it is rather an attempt to cover the wolf in sheep's clothing, to be stripped of his false pretense when it is too late to repent and be saved. Nearly all the religion of the ages is attributable to revivals. Every device to supersede their necessity has failed. It may be added with special reference to the American states: the triumph of moral reforms. Experience has taught many that they cannot reform without the grace of God. Such were their habits of licentiousness, profligacy, intemperance, fraud, sinful amusements, etc., that all attempts at reform were fruitless until they came to God for salvation. They then found deliverance, not from the habitation only, but from all disposition to follow it. This is the only solid basis of reform, when bad appetites, passions, and habits are fully established. God only can save in these tailmiles.

8. Revival measures require great courage, zeal, and decision in their leaders to make them most effective. Because, first, they generally encounter opposition from without, and often from professors of religion. It may be silent, but still it is real and hurtful. Sometimes it is the form of friendship, as in the case of Nehemiah and Sanballat, and suggests damaging complications, which require clear perception and invincible firmness. At others it is outspoken and threatening, which is less hurtful. But not unfrequently genuine but misguided friends of the best deserve restraining to prevent their hindering what they fain would help. To do this successfully often requires much decision and tact. But it must be done. A few weak and fanatical people have sometimes been allowed to neutralize the best efforts. But there seems to be little danger from that quarter at the present time. These measures suffer more from
spiritual death than from overaction. And yet with some there is much dread of excitement that they may hastily fight the fires of revival for fear of an explosion. These circumstances call for courage to venture. But many who wish well to the cause have no faith in God or man. They cannot see how success is to be achieved, and therefore they hesitate to attempt it. Here is another call for courage. It is going to stop. This is the more faith in the leader, who will do well to review the book of Nehemiah. Then churches sometimes get weary, and want their evenings for rest, business, or recreation, and propose to suspend the meetings. A proper zeal will suggest some little modification of measures, and strike for new achievements. Revivals have been successfully carried on for years under this policy; not so much by holding meetings every evening as by making every meeting, whether regular or extra, to advance the work.

Lecture 8. "Thoughts on the Revival of Religion in New England" (1740); to which is prefixed A Narrative of the Surprising Work of God in New Hampshire, Mass., 1735 (N. Y.); Porter, Revivals of Religion, showing their Theory, Means, Objections, Importance, and Perversions, with the Duty of Christians in regard to them (N. Y., 1837); Finney, Lectures on Revivals of Religion (Oberlin, Ohio, 1868); Fish, Handbook of Revivals, for the Use of Winners of Souls (Boston, 1874). See North Brit. Rev. Nov. 1860; Mercersb. Rev. Jan. 1872. (J. P.)

Revoactus was a Christian martyr under Severus, a catechumen of Carthage, and a slave. On the day appointed for his execution, he was led to the amphitheatre, and, having denounced God's judgment upon his persecutors, was ordered to run the gantlet between the hunters. He was then destroyed by wild beasts, A.D. 205.—Fox, Book of Martyrs.

Excommunication. The name given to that change in the civil and ecclesiastical constitution of England which took place when James II had been expelled from the throne in the year 1688, and his son-in-law, William, prince of Orange, was elected by the voice of the people. The immediate occasion of the Revolution was the question of accommodation between James, under the pretence of extending toleration; but the true object of which was to place all the offices of trust in the hands of the papists, whose hopes had been revived by the death of Charles II. Some Protestant Dissenters were imprisoned by this specious pretence; but the sagacity of the bishops justly apprehending the intended consequences, they strenuously contended and petitioned against the proclamation, and alarmed the fears of Protestants throughout the kingdom.

Revolution Settlement. The settlement of the Church of Scotland under William and Mary is so called. It was dictated by policy, and did not restore the platform of 1688, but adopted the ratification of 1592. Its object was to restore peace and order, to put an end to agitation, and by the appearance of moderation to curb extremes, to take away all pretext for violence and sedition. All classes of the people to exhibit a loyal spirit to the new occupants of the British throne.

See Scotland, Church of.

Rex Christe, factor omnium, is the beginning of a hymn ascribed to Gregory the Great (q. v.).—Luther is said to have pronounced this to be the best hymn. We subjoin the first verse in both Latin and English:

"Rex Christe, factor omnium,
Redempi tor et credulitatem,
Pia cote volo supplementum,
Clementissim sulcitem,"

"O Christ, our king, Creator, Lord,
Saviour of all who trust thy Word,"

To them who seek thee ever near,
Now to our praises bend thine ear."

This is the translation as given in the Lyra Domestica, p. 206. Into German it has been translated by Simrock, in his Lauda Sion Salvatorem, p. 91, "Christ, König, Schöpfer aller Welt;" by Rambach, in his Anthologia, p. 115, "O Christus, König aller Welt;" by Königfeld, in his Heilige Gesänge, p. 72, "Christi, Schöpfer aller Welt," which is also adopted by Biseler, in his Auswahle achtzehnter Gesänge, p. 67, and by Fortlage, in his Gesänge chistlich. Vorzüg., p. 76, "O Christus, Herr der Majestät." Besides these translations, Koch enumerates a number of others (Opp. ii, 74). (B. P.)

Rey, Claude, a French prelate, was born at Aix, Nov. 27, 1713, and in 1800 he concluded his theological studies at the Seminary of St. Sulpice at Paris, and became secretary to the vicar-general. In 1816 he was titular canon of Aix, and prebend in 1821. In consequence of the stand he took concerning the new heads of the State, not considering it necessary to omit mentioning them in the public prayers of the Church, he was obliged to defend his position by a pamphlet. Notwithstanding this controversy, he was made capitular vicar-general, Nov. 24, 1830. In 1831 he was appointed bishop of Dijon. This was the first bishop appointed by Louis-Philippe, whose candidate for the see was held by the high clergy to be illegitimate. The court of Rome hesitated to confirm the appointment, but finally Gregory XVI preconized Rey, and authorized that he should be consecrated by a single bishop, assisted by a dignitary. But such proceedings against the proceeding that for a long time no one would consent to consecrate him. At last the ceremony was performed by the bishop of Carthage. The episcopacy of Rey lasted for six years, and was a constant contest for the rights of his position. A remonstrance was sent from Paris against his exercising public functions, and he was forced to resign. He left Dijon, June 21, 1838, and retired to Aix as canon of the Church of St. Denis, where he died, Aug. 17, 1858. His writings are, Précis pour la Construction d'un Évêché (1808); Précis historique de Notre Dame d' Aix (1816); Ré flexions sur les Affaires Ecclesiastiques du Diocèse de Dijon, etc.—Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, n. v.

Reyes, Nathan Abbott, a minister of the German Reformed Church, was born at Tolinton, N. H., Dec. 26, 1807. He graduated at Dartmouth College with honors in 1835, and afterwards studied theology at Andover and a Union Theological Seminary. Having been appointed by the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions as a missionary to Syria, he sailed for Beirut in 1840. Political and other disturbances, together with his impaired health, induced him to return, which he did, with the approbation of the board, in 1844. He now spent some time in ministerial labor in Charlemont and South Royalton, Mass.; and in the spring of 1847 was called to the pastorate of the German Reformed Church in Lancaster, Pa., in whose service he continued till 1855, when he resigned and took charge of a church in Prince ton, Ill., and after his return to St. George's at Vienne. At the time of the Revolution he embraced the popular ideas, and in 1792 was elected bishop of Isère. During the Reign of Terror he was arrested and kept in close confinement for nearly a year. He took part in the council of 1797, and was charged with publishing its act. In 1802 he signed the formula of retraction required by the pope, and was consecrated bishop of Dijon. During the empire he advocated the cause of Napoleon, which caused his removal by Louis XVIII, but he afterwards returned

Reynas, Caximodos de, a Spanish Hebraist, was born at Seville. He embraced the ecclesiastical life, but renounced it upon leaving his native country. He established himself in Frankfort and engaged in business, which he abandoned to take charge of a French congregation of the Jews. From there he went to Amsterdam, and again lived in Frankfort, where he openly avowed his acquaintance in the Confession of Augsburg. It is supposed he was living at Basel when his version of the Scriptures in Spanish was published. In the preface to this work he makes himself appear a Catholic, in order to secure a greater sale for the book. The title is *La Biblia, que es los Sacros Libros del V. y N. Testamento, traducida en Espanol* (Basel, 1569, 4to). Reyna pretended to have translated directly from the Hebrew, but it is said that he never saw any original except the Latin version and some criticisms, compiled by John Reina, which was prepared by Cyprian de Valera (Amst. 1596). Another work of Reyna is *Annnotations in Loca Selecta or Evangelii Joannis* (Frankfort, 1573). Reyna died at Frankfort, March 15, 1594. See Antonio, Bibl. Nova Hispana; Leclerc, Bibl. Sacra. - Hoezel, Nouv. Biog. Générale, &c.

Reynolds, Edward, D.D., an English prelate, was born in Southampton, November, 1599. In 1615 he became postmaster of Merton College, and in 1620 probationer fellow. He was made preacher at Lincoln’s Inn, and rector of Braynton, in Nottinghamshire; but in the following year he was deprived by the Presbyterians. In 1643 he was one of the Westminster Assembly divines, and took the covenant. In 1648 he became dean of Christ Church and vice-chancellor of the University of Oxford. He refused the Engagement (1651) and was ejected from his deanship; was vicar of St. Lawrence’s, Jewry, London; restored to his deanship in 1659, and in 1660 was made chaplain to Charles II. In the same year he was elected warden of Merton College, and made bishop of Norwich. He died in July 1667. He published *Sermons, Theological Treatises, Meditations, etc.*

Reynolds, Joshua (Sir), considered the founder of the English school of painting as regards its special characteristics, was born at Plympton, in Devonshire (where his father was rector), July 16, 1725. He was intended for the medical profession, but was induced by the perusal of Richardson’s *Essays on Painting*, etc., to take up painting as a profession. A hand-drawn edition of these essays was in 1773 dedicated to Sir Joshua by Richardson’s son, comprising *The Theory of Painting, Essay on the Art of Criticism, and The Science of a Connoisseur*. Reynolds’s first master was Hudson, the portrait-painter, with whom he was placed in 1741. He first set up as a portrait-painter at Devonport, but in 1746 settled in London, in St. Martin’s Lane. In 1749 he accompanied Commodore Keppel in the Centurion to the Mediterranean, and remained altogether about three years in Italy. He commenced business again in 1754. In 1755, he revived, “recovery of five who had missed the last stage” (ver. 6); that is, he conquered and held possession of the celebrated town of that name at the head of the Gulf of Akabah, which commanded one of the most important lines of trade in the East. Soon after this he was attacked by Tiglath-pileser II, king of Assyria, to whom Ahaz in his distress had made application. His armies were defeated by the Assyrian host; his city besieged and taken; his people carried away captive into Susiana; and he himself slain (ver. 2; comp. Tiglath-pileser’s own inscriptions, where the defeat of Rezin and the destruction of Damascus are distinctly mentioned). This treatment about £80,000, was inherited by his niece, Miss Palmer, who became afterwards marchioness of Thomond. His collection of works of art sold for nearly £17,000. Sir Joshua Reynolds, notwithstanding his careless and feeble drawing, was indisputably a great painter; some of his portraits are among the first masterpieces of the art, whether as character or as face and expression. For instance, Lord Heathfield, in the National Gallery, of the former class, and *Mrs. Siddons as the Tragic Muse*, at Dulwich, of the latter. His pictures are necessarily very numerous. Their chief excellence is their natural grace, fullness, tenderness of expression, substance, and frequently a charming richness of color and light and shade. Among the most remarkable are *The Cardinal and Christian Virtues, Nativity, and Holy Family*. Hiselogium cannot be better expressed than in the words of Burke: “He was the first Englishman who added the praise of the elegant arts to the other glories of his country. The loss of no man of his time can be felt with more sincere, general, and unmixed sorrow.” Sir Joshua has bequeathed to posterity, besides his paintings, fifteen elegant and valuable *Discourses*, of which a magnificent edition, edited by John Burnet, was published by James Carpenter in 1842. A later edition was published (Hudson, O. 1853, 12mo); and his *Life and Discourses* (N.Y. 1859, 12mo). There is a full *Life of Reynolds* by Northcote (Lond. 1819, 2 vols. 8vo).

Reya, Manuel de, a Portuguese Jesuit, was taught at Coimbra, and preached with great power and success. He died at Braga, April 21, 1699. His *Sermons* were printed at Evora (1717-24).

Reseph (Heb. Reseph, אֶשף, a hot stone, as in 1 Kings xix, 6; Sept. Paris, Ραρις, v. r. Ραπίς), one of the places which Sennacherib mentions, in his taunting message to Hezekiah, as having been destroyed by his precessors (2 Kings xvi, 12); Isa. xxix, 15. He couples it with Haran and other well-known Mesopotamian spots. It is supposed to be the same that Prolemy mentions under the name of Rheapoa (Ῥεαπὰ) as a city of Palmyrene (Greg. v, 15); and this, again, is possibly the same with the Rasapho which Abulfeda places at nearly a day’s journey west of the Euphrates. The name is still a common one, Yako’s Lexicon quoting these two and seven other less important towns so called. See Sennacherib.

Resli’ah (Heb. רועי, עָי, delight; Sept. Parash), the third named of three sons of Ulla, of the tribe of Asher (1 Chron. vii, 39). B.C. perhaps cir. 1618.

Rezin (Heb. Retzin; רֶץ, firm, perhaps prince), the name of two men.

1. (Sept. Parash, Ρασσοο) A king of Damascus, contemporary with Pekah in Israel, and with Jotham and Ahaz in Judaea. The policy of Rezin seems to have been to ally himself closely with the kingdom of Israel, and thus strengthened, to carry on constant war against the kings of Jotham. He attacked Jotham during the latter part of his reign (2 Kings xv, 37); but his chief war was with Ahaz, whose territories he invaded, in company with Pekah, soon after Ahaz had mounted the throne (B.C. cir. 740). The combined army laid siege to Jerusalem, where Ahaz was, but “could not prevail against it” (Isa. vii, 1; 2 Kings xvi, 5). Rezin, however, recovered Jerusalem, and made Ahaz in his distress, &c. (ver. 6); that is, he conquered and held possession of the celebrated town of that name at the head of the Gulf of Akabah, which commanded one of the most important lines of trade in the East. Soon after this he was attacked by Tiglath-pileser II, king of Assyria, to whom Ahaz in his distress had made application. His armies were defeated by the Assyrian host; his city besieged and taken; his people carried away captive into Susiana; and he himself slain (ver. 2; comp. Tiglath-pileser’s own inscriptions, where the defeat of Rezin and the destruction of Damascus are distinctly mentioned). This treatment
was probably owing to his being regarded as a rebel, since Damascus had been taken and laid under tribute by the Assyrians some time previously (Rawlinson, Herodotus, i. 467).

2. The head of one of the families of the Nethinim who returned from Babylon (Ezra ii. 48; Neh. vii. 50). B.C. ante 536.

Re'zon (Heb. Reson', רְעֹנָן, prince; Sept. Παζών v. r. 'Espōū), the son of Eliadah, a Syrian, who, when David defeated Hadadezer, king of Zobah, put himself at the head of a band of freebooters and set up a petty kingdom at Damascus (1 Kings xi. 23). B.C. post 1043. Whether he was an officer of Hadadezer, who, foreseeing the destruction which David would inflict, prudently escaped with some followers, or whether he gathered his band of the remnant of those who survived the slaughter, does not appear. The latter is more probable. The settlement of Rezon at Damascus could not have been till some time after the disastrous battle in which the power of Hadadezer was broken, for we are told that David at the same time defeated the army of Damascus in Damascus, and put garrisons in Damascus. From his position at Damascus he harassed the kingdom of Solomon during his whole reign. With regard to the statement of Nicolaus in the 4th book of his history, quoted by Josephus (Ant. vii. 5, 2), there is less difficulty, as there seems to be no reason for attributing it to any historical authority. He says that the name of the king of Damascus whom David defeated was Hadad, and that his descendants and successors took the same name for ten generations. If this be true, Rezon was a usurper, but the origin of the story is probably the confused account of the Sept. In the Vatican MS. of the Sept. the account of Rezon is inserted in ver. 14 in close connection with Hadad, and on this Josephus appears to have founded his story that Hadad, on leaving Egypt, en- deavored without success to excite Idumea to revolt, and then went to Syria, where he joined himself with Rezon, called by Josephus βασιλεύς (Βασιλεύς), who, at the head of a band of robbers, was plundering the country (Ant. viii. 7, 6). It was Hadad, and not Rezon, according to the account in Josephus, who established himself king of that part of Syria and made inroads upon the Israelites. In 1 Kings xv. 18, Benhadad, king of Damascus in the reign of Asa, is described as the grandson of Hezion; and from the resemblance between the names Reson and Hezion, when written in Hebrew characters, it has been suggested that the latter is a corrupt reading for the former. For this suggestion, however, there does not appear to be sufficient ground, though it was adopted by Sir John Marsham (Chron. Com. p. 346) and Sir Isaac Newton (Chronol. p. 221), as well as by some later translators and commentators (Junius, Köhler, Dathe, Ewald). Against it are, (a) that the number of generations of the Syrian kings would then be one less than those of the contemporary kings of Judah. But then the reign of Ahab was only three years, and, in fact, Jeroboam outlived both Rehoboam and his son. (3) The statement of Nicolaus of Damascus (Josephus, Ant. vii. 5, 2) that from the time of David for ten generations the kings of Syria were one dynasty, each king taking the name of Hadad, "as did the Ptolemies in Egypt." But this would exclude not only Hezion and Tabrimon, but Rezon, unless we may interpret the last sentence to mean that the official title of Hadad was held in addition to the ordinary name of the king. Bunsen (Bibelwerk, i. 271) makes Hezion contemporary with Rehoboam, and probably a grandson of Rezon. The name is Aramaic, and Ewald compares it with Resia.